

## **Migration, gender and vulnerability**

**Marlou Schrover**

Abstract

Theorising in the field of research on migration and gender has been pointed out as one of the greatest challenges for future research. This challenge is taken up in this article. I look critically and from a gender perspective at the theories on migration and settlement, and suggest an alternative theory.

Most of the older theories on migration in general use *profitability* as its central concept. In this article I argue that this concept should be replaced by the concept *vulnerability*. I argue that differences between migrant men and women can be explained by differences in (perceived) vulnerability of (potential) migrant women and men. Migrants themselves, their families, immigrant communities, employers, lawyers, governments, organisations and media reports all play a role in the construction of this vulnerability. In this article describe the assumptions and observations that underlie this hypothesis.

Vulnerability in one domain (for instance economic or legal) can be countered by reducing vulnerability in other domains (for instance socio-cultural). Furthermore, immigrant men and women are differently vulnerable in the legal and economic domains, and are perceived to be differently vulnerable in the social domain.

Migrant women are restricted in their migration differently than migrant men. In the public, political and academic discourse a lot of attention is paid to the trafficking of women. The narrative of victimhood and the assumption that women are forced leads to protective measures, which sometimes help women, but also restrict them in what they can do.

Legally we find differences in the grounds on which immigrant women are granted asylum. Furthermore, immigrant women, more often than men got and get a dependent residence permit.

Politically, we see that since the 1970s, many Western-European countries followed a multi-culturalistic policy. This policy had negative consequences for immigrant women since it created, stressed and maintained differences between immigrant men and women and put women in a dependent position and stressed their victimhood. By doing so it made immigrant women more vulnerable than immigrant men.

In the economic domain the segregation between formal and informal labour is important. Immigrant women encounter restrictions on their labour market participation because they were and are confronted with a labour market that is segregated by both gender and ethnicity. Immigrant women cluster in certain sectors (like immigrant men tend to do), but the number of sectors in which they cluster is less than what we find amongst immigrant men. The concentration of immigrant women in the (semi-)private sphere of domestic work, or work within family enterprises relegated them to the realm of invisible, informal and unregulated work, where they can claim fewer rights and as a result became more vulnerable. Formal labour market participation played an important role in legalizing residency.

In the social domain it is important to note that being considered more vulnerable may lead to more social monitoring which was meant to protect migrant women who were regarded to be more vulnerable than migrant men. The effect of the monitoring, however, often (but not always) is a restriction of options and hence an increased vulnerability. Strong social monitoring may also encourage some women to evade all monitoring and contacts and as a result become more vulnerable.

## **Migration, gender and vulnerability**

**Marlou Schrover**

### *Introduction*

Over the past decades, dozens of publications have appeared that start out by saying that the field of gender and migration is under-researched. It is a mantra that is not quite true anymore. The spring special issue of *International Migration Review* on gender and migration (2006) gave an impressive overview of what has been written about gender and migration in recent years. Suzanne Sinke (2006), in that IMR special issue surveys this topic from historical perspective and refers to the numerous publications. She – rightly – draws attention to the fact that Dirk Hoerder in his momentous *Cultures in Contact* (2002) (an overview of global migrations in the last millennium) systematically uses gender as an analytical concept. Most of the recent literature on migration thus shows a gender awareness, although some studies tend to look at women only, rather than comparing men and women.

In same special spring issue 2006 of IMR theorising in the field of research on migration and gender is pointed out as one the greatest challenges for future research. This challenge is taken up in this article. I look critically and from a gender perspective at the theories about migration and settlement, and suggest an alternative theory.<sup>1</sup>

Current historical and sociological research sees gender as one of the key markers of social relations, next to ethnicity and class (Stasiulis and Yuval-Davis 1995; Pettman 1995; Tilly 1998; Frager 1999; Schrover 2001). Early studies on migration either focused on men or else described migrants in gender-less terms. Models were largely based on male experience, and similar mechanisms were assumed to influence the migration decisions of both men and women. Women were ‘added’ later, but without applying gender as an analytical category, and hence without systematically explaining differences between migrant men and women. Recently, research on migration has become more gender-aware and this has resulted in excellent and important studies (for instance: Diner 1983; Phizacklea 1983; Simon and Brettell 1986; Gabaccia 1994; Hondagneu-Sotelo

1994; Green 1997; Kofman 2001; Salazar Parrenas 2001). Although differences between migrant men and women have been studied, they have not yet been mapped or described systematically over an extended period of time. Several authors have stressed the need for such an approach and for more research on migration from a gender perspective (see for instance Lutz 1997).

Many of the studies on migration that do include women focus on women only, rather than comparing men and women. Of course these studies do add greatly to our understanding of the gendered nature of migration, but the added value of a comparative approach is widely acknowledged (Lenz et al 2002; Morokvasic 2003). Furthermore, much of the earlier research is descriptive. It makes little or no use of explanatory models or uses gender insensitive models (as shows in Grieco and Boyd 1998).

Most of the older theories on migration in general use *profitability* as its central concept. In this article I argue that this concept should be replaced by the concept *vulnerability*. I argue that differences between migrant men and women can be explained by differences in (perceived) vulnerability of (potential) migrant women and men. Migrants themselves, their families, immigrant communities, employers, lawyers, governments, organisations and media reports all play a role in the construction of this vulnerability. Below I will describe the assumptions and observations that underlie this hypothesis.

### *Profitability*

The *neo-classical* or *push-and-pull model* and the *family strategy model* have long been used to explain differences between migrant men and women. The migration decision is seen as the outcome of a cost-benefit calculation, either by an individual (in the *neo-classical model*) (Sjaastad 1962; Todaro 1969; Todaro 1976) or by the family or household (in the *family strategy model*) (Stark 1991). In the *integrative model* the social context is given greater importance, and individuals or families are replaced by networks or primordial groups (Massey 1990; Zlotnik 1993; Zlotnik 1995). In the *migration system model* it is acknowledged that a migration system can continue after the original profitability has expired (Castles and Miller 1993). All these models use *perceived profitability* as the key explanatory concept. *Profitability* is defined from an economic

perspective: the move should be perceived as cost-effective to the migrant or his or her relatives. The term *perceived* implies that the outcome needs not really be cost-effective. It is sufficient that the people involved think it is. The *perceived profitability* models do acknowledge that the outcome of this calculation can be different for (potential) migrant men and women, and that the consequences of the decision can be different for men and women (Brettell 1986). However, the models do assume that the mechanism underlying the decision – the cost-benefit analysis - is the same for both sexes.

The models that use profitability focus on the migration *decision* and have little eye for differences between migrant men and women in the settlement process (Hondagneu-Sotelo; Grieco and Boyd 1998; Phizacklea 2003). Secondly, the models focus on labour migration and may therefore not apply to refugees and post-colonial migrants. Refugees and post-colonial migrants have more restricted options than labour migrants, but within these restrictions they do make choices that need to be explained.

In the third place, the assumption within the *perceived profitability* models is that decisions are made by rational, calculating individuals or are reached rationally by families. Individuals are not always rational and calculating, and families are not coherent, single-interest decision making social units (Grieco and Boyd 1998). Families do not operate in isolation (Goss and Linqiest 1995; Phizacklea 2003) and within those families, men and women do not always share the same interests (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994; Erel 2003).

In the fourth place, women migrate as much as men do, and this is not what the *perceived profitability* models predict. According to these models there should be more migrant men, because men have a comparative advantage over women in waged employment. The family that wishes to optimise its income decides to send away the family member whose migration will be most profitable for the family. Since men stand to earn a higher income than women do, it is the most logical from a family income perspective to let them migrate (Davis and Winters 2001). Originally this unpredicted outcome was explained by defining all women as tied movers, who followed husbands or fathers, whose migration was seen as profitable. Many women do migrate as tied movers, but definitely not all women fall within this category. Next, an explanation was sought in differences in remittance practices. According to this view, the migration of women

might seem at first instance to be less profitable than that of men, but if women send more money home, it was more profitable from a family strategy perspective to let them migrate rather than men. Research proved this assumption to be wrong as well. Some migrant women did send more money than their male counterparts (Curran 1995; Curran 1996; De Jong et al 1995), but other women send less (Grasmuck and Pessar).

The fifth, and most important problem is that the models hinge on the concept of work as paid productive labour in the public sphere, and therefore on the measurability of profitability. Unpaid work, in the private sphere, is not considered work (Lawson 1998). However, many women are involved in precisely that kind of work both before and after migration. They work for instance as domestic servants, or as workers in a family enterprise. If work in the private sphere is defined as non-work, the work of many women falls outside this frame of analysis and the profitability of their move cannot be assessed.

### *Vulnerability*

Critique on the *perceived profitability* models does not mean that these models have to be pushed aside completely. *Perceived profitability* will certainly play a role in the decision to migrate. The *vulnerability model* incorporates earlier models, since a high *perceived profitability* will contribute to the idea of reduced vulnerability. The *vulnerability model* is, however, not restricted to the migration decision, and aims to also explain differences in the subsequent settlement process. The *vulnerability model* builds on recent research on gendered assumptions about vulnerability in migration discourses.<sup>2</sup>

In order to clarify the model, we must first look more generally at the concept vulnerability. Recently Hogan and Marandola have given an overview of research that uses this concept and have collected 18 different definitions.<sup>3</sup> Many of these have to do with environmental vulnerability, and are less useful within the perspective of this article. Using a combination of several definitions, I define vulnerability as the degree to which groups and individuals within society are differentially at risk.<sup>4</sup> Not all groups and individuals are to the same extent exposed to risks, and groups and individuals differ in their capacity to deal with hazards.<sup>5</sup> Poverty makes people more vulnerable and so do forms of irregular, informal, intermittent or occasional employment.<sup>6</sup> These forms of employment weaken the bond of primary sociability (family, relatives, neighbourhood,

and community organisations). Political exclusion, social marginality and cultural discrimination influence vulnerability and so can age (the young and the aged are more at risk), health, ethnicity and gender. Vulnerability has to do with social inequality regarding citizenship. Lack of the feeling of belonging, breaking of the links between the state, citizenship and identity, make people vulnerable. Vulnerability is expressed in the restriction of economic, political or social rights.<sup>7</sup>

Groups or individuals can be vulnerable in multiple ways. Applied to migrants this means that all migrants will be more vulnerable on the labour market than non-migrants because they lack skills or their skills are not recognised, because their networks are smaller, or because they can be more easily fired since they have less socio-economic power. The vulnerability will be magnified for those migrants without citizenship, undocumented migrants or migrants who do illegal work, and for migrants with limited financial means.<sup>8</sup>

Vulnerabilities are not static and can change over time, for example when the competition for jobs increases, or because of changes in discourse after the 9/11 attacks. Furthermore, vulnerability in one field can be compensated by minimizing risks in another field. Undocumented migrants may compensate for their insecure legal position by trying to establish and maintain wide networks. Vulnerabilities can also be cumulative whereby vulnerability in one dimension can increase vulnerability in another dimension.<sup>9</sup> Rather than focusing on only ethnicity *or* gender researchers should look at multiple vulnerability (gender *and* ethnicity).<sup>10</sup>

A distinction has to be made between structural differences in vulnerabilities and cultural differences. If migrants are officially denied certain rights (right to vote, right to work, right to citizenship) there is a structural difference in vulnerability between migrants and non-migrants. Cultural vulnerability can vary per group of migrants, who are all subjected to the same structural differences in vulnerabilities, but to a different extent of stereotyping and exclusion.<sup>11</sup>

A second distinction has to be made between real vulnerability and perceived vulnerability. Restricted economic, political and social rights will affect the real vulnerability of groups and individuals. Individuals or groups can also be perceived as vulnerable. German women migrating to the Netherlands in the 1930s in order to work as

domestic servants, were generally perceived as vulnerable. Not all these women were young, but they were generally referred to as girls. Special organisations were set up to protect these girls against harm, especially sexual risks.<sup>12</sup> Similar organisations could be found in France (Moch) and the US. Differences in the perception of vulnerability can make groups or individuals more vulnerable in reality, because it can lead to a restriction of rights, but it can also enhance their capacity to deal with risks and thus reduce their vulnerability.

Within the framework of this paper it is important to note that both the structural and the cultural vulnerabilities, and the real and perceived vulnerabilities need not be the same for immigrant men and women. In what follows I will look at real and perceived differences in vulnerability between immigrant men and women, and how they were created and maintained.

### *Leaving*

Several authors have stressed that there is as yet no consensus about what the differences between migrant men and women are.<sup>13</sup> Various attempts have been made to take inventory of differences between migrant men and women, but researchers agree that the results have been somewhat disappointing.<sup>14</sup> It is also an exercise that is likely to fail if it tries to encompass a long historical period, many different countries and both migration and integration. A point, about which there is some consensus, is that women seem to migrate through older, more mature networks than men.<sup>15</sup>

The migration of women via older networks is explained by the process of cumulative causation.<sup>16</sup> This is the process whereby the propensity to migrate grows with each additional migrant. Networks and accumulated migrant experience demonstrate the benefits, diminish familial resistance, and increase security by providing information about and access to labour market opportunities. Networks make migration less risky for individuals by circulating information among potential migrants. As a result the nature of migration changes over time. The initial high risk, due to a lack of information, declines for individuals as more of their family and friends migrate. Denser networks of migrants provide potential migrants with more and increasingly reliable information.<sup>17</sup> Tight knit networks resulting from physical and social proximity make it easier to enforce trust and

support.<sup>18</sup> This facilitates the choice to migrate, making migration progressively more likely.<sup>19</sup>

Countries do not follow the same rules for men and women when it comes to granting permission for people to leave the country. In the nineteenth century, for instance, France and Germany forbade or restricted the (permanent) emigration of men who had not fulfilled their military duty (Moch 2003; Schrover 2001). There were no such restrictions for women.

In the nineteenth century, some German regions forbade the temporary migration of married women with small children, who intended to leave their children behind (Schrover 2001). For men there were no such restrictions. In an attempt to protect women, some of today's countries have banned or restricted the emigration of women (for instance Bangladesh, Indonesia, Burma and Nepal) (International seminar 2004; Siddiqui 2003).

Bans and restrictions on the migration of women have not stopped or reduced their migration, but they have driven them into clandestine travel and thus have made them more vulnerable.

### *Trafficking*

One of the most important issues on which the debates on differences between migrant men and women focus is the trafficking of women (Phizacklea 1998). It is as trafficked women that women migrants gain a high visibility, in academic, public and political discourse. Men are more often regarded as being smuggled, women as being trafficked. The definition of trafficking emphasises that people are transferred against their will, while the definition of smuggling stresses the aspect of irregular entry to which the migrant agrees and usually pays for (Koser 2005, 7). In debates, trafficking is often used as a synonym for prostitution (Agustin 2005; 108).

Both sending and receiving societies care for their women migrants when it comes to sexual risks. The gendered discourse about abuse is applied to women only (Agustin 2005; 97). The assumption that women are more often trafficked leads to a stronger monitoring of migrant women, as opposed to men (Erel 2003; Mak 2001). It also leads to all migrant women being portrayed as (potential) victims of rape and other sexual

harassment (Okin 1999). In the trafficking debate emphasis is laid on hypothetical large-scale crime organisations dedicated to enslaving migrants, although there is little proof that these indeed exist (Agustin 2005; 101).

Migrant women who work in prostitution are much less frequently deceived, than debates suggest. Women may hate their work and may have had few other options, but many did know what their work would be like before they migrated. This migration and choice is not a recent phenomenon, according to Thomas Orum (2001). Jewish women from Eastern Europe became prostitutes in the Amazon basin during the rubber boom (1850-1920). They chose to transfer their work location from the Pale to the Amazon, where their European background and light-coloured skin were a major asset, and where wages were higher (Orum 2001).

The result of the discourse of trafficking and prostitution is that designated victims take on an identity as victim that reduces her to a passive object of others' actions. Agustin (2005; 107) writes: 'Thus the protagonists in debates on "trafficking" are first-world citizens, not migrants, and migrant women are routinely characterized as pushed, obligated, or coerced, even when they travel for the same reasons as men: to expand their horizons and get ahead through work.'

Immigrant women, who work in prostitution, are not only restricted by the victimhood discourse. Brennan (2004) shows how women may also profit from this discourse by stressing that they are victims, referring to how they only do this work temporarily to help their children or siblings, and emphasising stress and suffering. This discourse increases their incomes and chances (including their chance of rescue from prostitution and subsequent migration as a wife to the rescuer's country of residence), and gives them a better position and income than when they would present themselves as professional sex workers.

The debates and measures regarding prostitution and trafficking are not new. During the White Slavery Scare of around 1900 European women were believed to be exported to the colonies and elsewhere and to be forced into prostitution. In 1904, this led to the adoption of the International Agreement for the Suppression of White Slave Traffic. This was followed in 1933 by the International Convention on the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age. In 1949, the United Nations adopted the Convention

for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others. Until 2000, the only other international treaty to address trafficking was the 1979 UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which required states to take all measures to suppress both trafficking and ‘exploitation of prostitution’ (Haynes 2004).

The narrative of victimhood and the assumption that women are forced leads to protective measures, which sometimes help women, but also restrict them in what they can do. Soderlund (2005, 65) has shown how in recent years the discourse on prostitution and trafficking has dominated conferences on (migrant) women’s rights usually leading to more restrictions. Restrictions on women’s rights are justified by claiming the protection women who are cast as victims. This discourse also serves a different, more political, purpose. President Bush in his 2003 Address to the United Nations moved effortlessly from the War on Terrorism to the War against Trafficking, in an attempt to give a feminised, human face to the War on Terrorism (Soderlund 2005, 77, 83).

### *Staying*

Authorities make differences between men and women regarding the grounds on which migrants are evicted from a country. In the Netherlands (as in many other countries) in the nineteenth and large parts of the twentieth century, men could be evicted because they lacked means of subsistence. Women could be evicted on moral grounds, suspected of amoral sexual behaviour (Henkes 1995; Mak 2001; Lucassen 2002). Although in practice not many women were indeed evicted on these grounds, the threat that they might, was always swaying above their heads like a Damocles sword. In the US, the authorities made use of the Likely to Become a Public Charge (LPC) provision to exclude or evict women who were suspected of amoral behaviour (Moloney 2006). Although men also could be excluded or deported under the LPC provision, in the period from 1892 to 1920 women were by far the main victims, especially women when they were travelling alone. The skills the women brought with them, which would qualify them for work in the industrialising American society, were not recognised. During their deportation hearings, women were questioned in great detail about their sexual practices and histories, while men were not.

In the literature there is a discussion if the recognition rate as refugees is the same for men and women. Spijkerboer has shown that the recognition rate is the same, but that the grounds on which refugee status is granted are different for men and women (Spijkerboer 1999; Spijkerboer 2002). Others, however, claim that women are much less frequently granted refugee status than men (Calavita 2006). There is also discussion not on whether the grounds are the same, but if they should be. An important and interesting discussion focuses on sexual violence, which is not recognised as a ground for asylum. Women are, however, much more often the victims of sexual violence than men are. Women who have been victims of, what is called, accidental or arbitrary rape (which is seen as sad but common part of regular warfare) are not seen as persecuted. Women who are raped to get information about others (such as the whereabouts of family members) are also not granted asylum. In recent years there has, however, been a change in asylum policies and laws. In the US, immigrant women may gain asylum and legal entry into the United States by claiming they are persecuted on account of female circumcision, honour killings, domestic violence, coercive family planning, forced marriages, or repressive social norms (Oxford 2005).

Asylum laws were generally developed between 1951 and 1980 and were targeting people fleeing communist regimes. Ground for asylum was defined as a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, or membership of a particular social group, or political opinion. Gender or gender related harm was absent as a category of persecution. Currently gender related harm is only seen as something that might happen to women and not to men. If reference is made to men, it is to homosexual men. Oxford (2005) in her recent discussion of asylum practices shows how women, since the recent change in US policies and laws, are convinced by attorneys to mention female circumcisions at the hearings, rather than tell stories about their role in a resistance movement. These stories about resistance, if told by women, are almost never acknowledged as a ground for asylum, whereas mentioning of female circumcision is.

The flip-side of the discourse that sees only men as freedom fighters and not women, is that it also only men who are seen as terrorist. Migrant men are subjected to restrictions that result from the so-called War on Terrorism more than women are.

In many countries the residence permit of women is dependent on that of their husbands. This was for instance true for the Netherlands. The so-called dependent residence permit of immigrant women was subject of political discussion for many years. Women who joined their husbands already living in the Netherlands got a permit to stay with their husbands if the husband had had legal work for a year and the prospect of work at least another year. Furthermore there was a minimum income requirement (1447 guilder – 700 Euro - net per month) and they had to provide suitable housing. For immigrant men the requirements on income were a barrier to bringing their wives over. However, for immigrant women living in the Netherlands, the income requirements made it almost impossible to bring over their husbands. Women, more often than men, worked in the informal economy and thus could not prove they had a sufficient income. Furthermore, as married women they fell into a higher tax category and had to earn a higher income before tax to meet income requirements after tax. They could not apply for role reversal under tax law (which would mean that they would fall into a lower tax) before their husbands actually lived in the Netherlands. Men could more easily bring over their wives legally than women could bring over their husbands.

Women, who joined their husbands, could only get an independent resident permit after she had been living in the Netherlands with her husband for three years. Women, who left their husbands or were left by their husbands within these three years, were officially evicted, but often stayed and became irregular residents. In 1983 the law changed. Woman had to be married at least three years, but now they only had to have lived in the Netherlands for one year, before they could apply for an independent residence permit. Although the Dutch law regarding the dependent residence permits is now the same for men and women, in practice it is still mostly women who get such a dependent permit (Kraus 2003).

On the whole it can be said that, although there is still discussion on whether women are less often granted asylum than men or not, it is clear that women do get asylum on different grounds. Furthermore, immigrant women, more often than men got and get a dependent residence permit.

### *Multiculturalism*

Since the 1970s, many countries, including the Netherlands, followed a so-called multi-culturalistic policy. This policy 'allowed' immigrants to be different. A debate has erupted over how this policy has created, stressed and maintained differences between immigrant men and women (Okin 1999). As part of this policy frequent reference was made to family, portraying all immigrant women as wives and mothers. Defences for certain practices (such as honour killings or forced marriages) were based on culture. Immigrants were granted group rights, which were different from those of non-migrants, but which were usually bad for immigrant women (and not for men). Multiculturalism also influenced ideas within the receiving society about what levels of harm had to be considered as 'acceptable' in the sending societies, and therefore not as reasons for international pressure (e.g. burning of widows, clitoridectomy, stoning of women adulterers, purdah). This multi-culturalistic policy is considered to have been bad for immigrant women since stress on cultural difference and traditional values often implied restricted rights for women. Furthermore, because they were seen as backward and traditional (especially when they came from Islamic countries), policy makers for a long time thought it best to reach immigrant women via men.<sup>20</sup> This increased the dependency of women.

The Dutch neighbourhood social work programs of the 1980s were part of the multi-culturalistic policy. Activities for immigrants (for men and women) were organised separate from more general neighbourhood activities.<sup>21</sup> Immigrant women were not included in more general projects aiming at, for instance, the emancipation of women. The first projects that were meant to encourage integration only targeted boys or men, under the assumption that girls and women would anyhow not be interested. Only after protests from immigrant communities, the first groups for girls and women were set up.<sup>22</sup>

In the 1970s, the discourse had focussed on (international) working class solidarity, targeting mostly immigrant men and their organisations. In the 1990s, the discourse shifted to religion and the assumed oppression of women within Islam. Originally the guestworkers were expected to go back to their country of origin, and the policy was directed towards retaining language and culture in order to facilitate an easy return. When the discourse that stressed temporaryness was finally dropped (after the arrival of women), it was replaced by a new discourse that stressed difference.<sup>23</sup> A

distinction was created between the immigrants who were assumed to be less problematic, because they came from Catholic countries such as Italy, Spain and Portugal, and immigrants from Islamic countries such as Turkey and Morocco. In this new discourse there was furthermore a tendency to problematise all aspects of migration and settlement and to deny all non-ethnic explanations for problems that were encountered. With this change in discourse also the way immigrant women and men were looked upon changed and attention focussed on the so-called double disadvantaged Islamic women (who were assumed to be double disadvantaged because they were both women and Muslim).<sup>24</sup>

The multi-culturalistic policy which was followed by many countries in the 1970s had negative consequences for immigrant women since it created, stressed and maintained differences between immigrant men and women and put women in a dependent position and stressed their victimhood. By doing so it made immigrant women more vulnerable than immigrant men.

### *Work*

Most studies focus rather one-sidedly on monetarized labour and neglect other types of economic activities (Tilly and Tilly 1994). Much of the work that can be regarded as typical women's work, such as the work of domestics, au pairs, prostitutes, cleaners and women working restaurants and the house industries (such as peeling shrimps, framing slides, or sewing), is of an irregular nature, also when it is done by non-immigrant women. With male workers we see a difference between non-immigrants in the formalised sectors of the economy and immigrants in the informal sector. In the case of women the divide is less clear, since also non-immigrant women often worked and work in the informal economy.

Formal work, not informal work, creates possibilities for regularised stay. In the Netherlands, social security numbers gave access to residence permits. Until 1991, a legal residence status was not required for getting a social security number and thus access to social security arrangements. Because immigrant men participated more in the formal economy than immigrant women did, they more often held a social security number. In 1991, irregularly residing immigrants who could prove they had been working regularly

for a minimum of 200 days per year for the past six years could legalise their stay. Many more immigrant men than immigrant women could prove they had worked accordingly, and as a result could legalise their stay.

In contemporary Dutch society, all labour migrants from outside the EU need employment permits. Rather strikingly, in three professions, which can safely be labelled 'women's work' - nurses, au pairs and prostitutes - the regulations for obtaining permits are different. As a rule employment permits are granted for three years. Nurses, however, are the only group of labour migrants that receive a permit for only two years. Furthermore, nurses from Suriname and South Africa could not apply for a permit, because government policies makers felt that they were needed more in their country of origin. In the case of male labour migrants (such as IT experts from India) there is no assessment of whether they are perhaps more needed elsewhere.

The work of au pairs is not considered work, but cultural exchange. They do need a permit, but it is only valid for one year, and not three. Their pay is labelled pocket money despite the fact that au pairs are allowed to work up to 30 hours a week and many work much longer (Spijkerboer 2002).

Lastly, prostitution is not forbidden in the Netherlands and the ban on brothels has been lifted, but foreign prostitutes still cannot apply for a permit, and cannot come as labour migrants.

Similar situations, whereby the work of women is not regarded as work, exist in other countries. The Japanese Labour Standard Law of 1995 does not apply to any enterprise or place of business employing only relatives living with the employer as family members nor to domestic employees. In the case of Norway and the Working environment Act of 1977 the crown can decide whether and to what extent this Act shall be applicable to work performed in the employees' home. The crown may further decide that the rules of this Act shall apply, wholly or in part, to workers who carry out domestic work, care or nursing in the home or household of private employers, and may in this connection stipulate particular regulations for such employees. In the US, under The National Labour Relations Act, the term employee shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural worker, or in the domestic service of any family or person at

his home.<sup>25</sup> The result is that many immigrant women work in sectors that are either not regarded as work, or work in sectors which are not regulated by labour laws.

Immigrant women workers, working as domestics, au pairs (for children or the elderly) and in house industries and restaurants are often described as or referred to by their employers as (almost) part of the family or just like a daughter (Schrover, Van der Leun, Quispel 2007). This creates the image that they work in a protective environment. In practice it however mostly means that they are not treated as employees, and are denied the rights of employees. They work 72 hours per week, without extra pay, at irregular hours and without contracts (Lutz 2002). The result is that they become highly dependent on their employers.

Italy and Spain work with quota systems which funnel many immigrant women into domestic work (and disallow them to do other work). Also in these countries legal residency is based almost entirely on being employed in the formal economy, excluding large numbers of immigrants who work in the underground economy. One of the few ways to enter Italy or Spain regularly is through annual quotas established in sectors of the economy where labour shortages appear to exist – primarily agriculture, construction, and domestic service. For those who enter irregularly or stay past the period of their initial employment on these quotas, legalisation programs are periodically launched. The result of this policy is that women, who want to enter Italy or Spain, and want to become regular immigrants, are confined to domestic work (Calavita 2006; 120).

It is important to point out that in the period after the Second World War recruitment of workers, for instance within the European guestworker migration regime and the US Bracero Program, targeted many more men than women. As a result in the past fifty years more migrant women than men could and did migrate within family reunification programs. Women migrated after the economic recession had set in and economic options for both immigrant men and women were severely restricted. Furthermore, in several countries and periods the requirement was made that women could join their husbands only if they would refrain from entering the labour market. In Austria for instance women entering within the framework of family unification are prohibited to work in the formal sector for four years after their arrival (Echsel 2003).

From 1970 onwards, Dutch governments followed a minority policy which hardly paid attention to immigrant women, and an emancipation policy (directed at women in general) with very little eye for immigrant women.<sup>26</sup> As a result, nothing was done until 1990 to improve the labour market position of immigrant women, while attention was paid to the improvement of the position of immigrant men. What may have explained this lack of attention - although hardly ever mentioned at the time - was that the level of labour market participation of immigrant women in the 1970s and 1980s was actually higher than that of non-immigrant women.<sup>27</sup> Their labour market participation was probably even higher than official data indicated.<sup>28</sup> They cleaned private houses, and they did homework,<sup>29</sup> which was mostly not included in official statistics. Especially the labour market participation of married women with children was higher than that of non-immigrant women. In the 1970s and 1980s it was noted that childcare facilities were not sufficiently available, too expensive and restricted to office hours. Women who cleaned offices early in the morning or in the evening required different hours of childcare. Nothing was done to solve this problem.

Like immigrant men, immigrant women worked in jobs that were regarded as unskilled and in which few demands were made on Dutch language skills. Immigrant men and women, for instance, both worked for the textile industry. This work in sweatshops was heavy, badly paid and offered little career perspective. Since people worked with other immigrants only, the sweatshops offered no possibilities for the improvement of language skills. As hours were long and all co-workers were immigrants, there were hardly any possibilities to meet non-immigrants. It is surprising therefore that policy makers suggested that immigrant women should be encouraged to work in these sweatshops or set them up themselves.<sup>30</sup> The idea was that this work fitted the cultural characteristics of the land of origin of the immigrant women. Some organisations protested against this idea, since the work would not offer a substantial income or esteem.<sup>31</sup> No attempts were made to increase the level of skill of women – although requests were made on that point by immigrant organisations.<sup>32</sup>

In 1980s, the labour market position of immigrant women sharply deteriorated, like that of immigrant men. The position of immigrant women, however, became worse than that of non-immigrant women. Dutch language skills now suddenly were regarded

as a prerequisite for finding work. In the 1980s a government employment agency in the Dutch town Utrecht decided that all immigrant women were to be regarded as persons for whom the agency would not be able to find work, and hence the agency felt it was under no obligation to try to do so. Immigrant women were collectively labelled Non Real Labour Supply and they were not longer included in the official unemployment statistics.<sup>33</sup> After protests from women, the measure was officially abolished, but the assumption is that it was in practice continued.<sup>34</sup>

In the 1980s, several programs were set up to improve the labour market position of immigrant women.<sup>35</sup> The programs mostly offered work in sectors that can be regarded as typical women's work (child-care, home-care, health-care).<sup>36</sup> Although it was never indicated officially, these programs mainly targeted Turkish and Moroccan women. The assumption was made that their labour market participation was restricted because of their 'traditional' attitude, meaning that they preferred caring tasks within the home to paid work outside the house. Their presumed attitudes towards work and care were regarded as backward, and the result of oppression by men. Immigrant women were offered the job of home help. This work was regarded as unskilled and was commonly done by people without any formal training. It did not offer a career perspective, and was not creative or intellectually fulfilling. Wages did not compensate for expenses on child-care. Within the immigrant communities it was seen as a job which would decrease the status of the women. The job of home help was chosen for the project because there were many unfilled vacancies. The job was, however, also chosen because it fitted the images of both 'immigrant work' and 'women's work'. The project was a failure.<sup>37</sup>

Overall, migrant women encountered multiple vulnerability in the labour market. Immigrant women encounter restrictions on their labour market participation because they are confronted with a labour market that is segregated by both gender and ethnicity. The result is that immigrant women do cluster in certain sectors (like immigrant men tend to do), but the number of sectors in which they cluster is less than what we find amongst immigrant men.<sup>38</sup> The concentration of immigrant women in the (semi-)private sphere of domestic work, or work within family enterprises relegated them to the realm of invisible, informal and unregulated work, where they can claim fewer rights and as a result became more vulnerable.

### *Social monitoring*

The influence of social monitoring on perceived vulnerability depends on how communities support individual men and women, and thus on how (potential) migrants are (believed to be) able to protect themselves. Social monitoring is based on ideas about how individuals can be harmed and how they can harm (or are believed to be able to harm) an immigrant community. This has led to harmful and inconsistent interventions (by families, governments, and organisations) that reduced the mobility and self-determination of migrant women.<sup>39</sup>

Social monitoring has to do with networks. Immigrant men and women have different networks. They are different in shape and aim. The question is if the differences in networks differ from those that generally exist between non-immigrant men and women. Networks are assumed to play a crucial role in reducing vulnerability.<sup>40</sup>

The vulnerability of migrants depends on their embeddedness<sup>41</sup> and is thus related to the migrants' networks.<sup>42</sup> *Forms of embeddedness* (Granovetter 1985, 1995, Portes 1995) or *modes of incorporation* (Portes and Rumbaut 1990) have to do with the insertion of human action into wider social structures. Portes distinguishes two types of embeddedness. First structural embeddedness which refers to the insertion in the wider society — including the labour market — which is heavily influenced by formal (migration) policies, and secondly relational embeddedness which refers to migrant communities as potential sources of social capital (cf. Coleman 1994; Kloosterman, Van der Leun and Rath 1999, Engbersen et al. 1999). Migrants may compensate for their lack in embeddedness in one sector by – for instance the labour market - by increasing their embeddedness in another sector – for instance by maintaining wide networks (Stewart 2005). The embeddedness of immigrant women is different from that of immigrant men. Immigrant women have different networks than immigrant men, and these network provide for different information and different support.

Granovetter's embeddedness is conceptually akin to Mahler and Pessar's concept of Social location (Mahler and Pessar, 2001; Pessar and Mahler, 2003). Social location is one of the four building blocks of what Mahler and Pessar call Gendered Geographies of Power (GGP). Social location differs from embeddedness in that it sees social location as

scalar and fluid, and plots individual and group identities and agencies along *multiple* social hierarchies or continuums at the same time. For example, a Moroccan immigrant in Spain may occupy low social locations with regard to race, class, and nationality while simultaneously occupying high social locations in his or her home country.

Formal and informal immigrant organisations (including those based on religion) play an important role in monitoring immigrant men and women. It has been found that immigrant women and men relate differently to immigrant organisations. Men tend to set up or join organisations that are oriented towards the sending society, whereas women favour organisations that are aimed at the receiving society.<sup>43</sup> From these organisations they hope to get more support. Within the guestworkers migration regime, the arrival of men before women meant that a male dominated organisational infrastructure was already in place when women arrived.

There are some indications that organisation based on religion (such as mosques) are important in a different way to immigrant men and women. Religious organisations may be important for women in retaining or stressing their virtue, and thus in reducing their vulnerability to gossip.<sup>44</sup>

Employers acted upon the idea that women migrants were more vulnerable than migrant men are. Worries about the sexual activities of immigrant women, led employers to constrain the physical mobility of their female employees.<sup>45</sup> Employers felt, and were made to feel, responsible for their immigrant women workers. The employers, however, monitored the women not only because they feared for their safety, but also because they feared harm to their own reputation.<sup>46</sup>

Immigrant women can be perceived – by themselves or others - to be more vulnerable to physical threats, but also to economic insecurity.<sup>47</sup> Women are also seen as more vulnerable to gossip than men are.<sup>48</sup> Gossip about the sexual conduct of women can harm families socially and economically.<sup>49</sup> The sexual conduct of men is less subject of gossip.

Social monitoring of girls (more than of boys) may also have positive consequences. Girls of immigrant families tend to do better within the Dutch educational system than boys. This is also true in other countries.<sup>50</sup> The reason is that parents and others assume that girls need more protection than boys. Boys are allowed to go out,

when girls are not. Girls, however, have to go to school, which is their most important place of socialisation.<sup>51</sup> They come early and stay longer.<sup>52</sup> From school, they go directly home to do homework, although they are also allowed to go the library. When they do well in school, they are granted more liberties.<sup>53</sup> Social monitoring and restrictions have caused these girls to do better in school than the male peers.

Women, their families and communities feel that they can more easily be harmed by the sexual behaviour of women than by that of men. Thus they stand to gain more from monitoring the behaviour of women, rather than that of men.<sup>54</sup>

Monitoring has to do with belonging (Stoler 1992; Stoler 1995). Men, rather than women, are often seen as belonging to a nation. The Portuguese government, for instance, only issued passports to men, and not to women, until 1989 (Brettell 1995). Migrant men are more likely than women are to maintain the nationality of the sending society (by choice or not). Governments in sending and receiving societies generally ascribe different rights to migrant men and women regarding gaining or retaining nationality (De Hart 1999; De Hart 2000; De Hart 2003). Generally women can more easily acquire a new nationality through marriage than men can (Boris 1995). In the US, the concept of dependent citizenship originated in 1855, when the Naturalization Act automatically conferred US citizenship on foreign women who married US citizens. The Expatriation Act of 1907 expatriated American women who married foreigners. In 1934, independent citizenship for women was finally achieved (Calavita 2006; 114). Until 1964, in the Netherlands foreign women could gain Dutch nationality via marriage to a Dutch man, while foreign men could not gain Dutch nationality in the same way (De Hart 1999). The same was true in many other countries. For South Africa this was true until 1991 (Dobson 2001). Women more often than men have a way to regularise their stay via marriage.

Men who are suspected of being involved in a marriage of convenience are treated differently from women suspected of the same (De Hart 2003). Men are suspected more easily of being involved in a bogus marriage in order to gain access to a country of economical purposes, when women are not regarded similarly.

Intermarriage of women is not perceived the same as that of men, neither from the perspective of the primordial group, nor from that of the sending or the receiving

society.<sup>55</sup> Women do not out-marry at the same rate as men. Turkish and Moroccan women marry Dutch men much less frequently, than Turkish and Moroccan men marry Dutch women.<sup>56</sup> If Dutch women are involved in a mixed marriage, they marry different ‘others’ than their male counterparts. Dutch men marry Asian and Eastern-European women, whereas Dutch women marry Spanish and Italian men.<sup>57</sup> Out-marriage of women, more than out-marriage of men, is seen as a priori problematic. Women are warned against out-marriage, whereas men are not.<sup>58</sup> After marriage, women, more than men, seem to cross over to the culture of their partner, even if their partner is the one who belongs to a minority. Furthermore, out-marrying women were described in sexually laden disapproving terms even if they were in a stable monogamous relationship, implying that by crossing one boundary – i.e. ethnic or religious – they have also crossed a boundary as to what is morally accepted.<sup>59</sup> Out-marrying women are accused of adultery, where the betrayed party is not a (potential) husband, but the group she is felt to belong to.<sup>60</sup> Out-marrying women are seen as being lost to their original community, whereas out-marrying men are not. Women are seen as objects of loss and gain, whereas men are seen as conquerors.<sup>61</sup> Families and primordial groups feel they need to be protected against this kind of ‘losses’.<sup>62</sup>

Being considered more vulnerable may lead to more social monitoring, but it does not necessarily imply victimisation or passiveness. Migrants can capitalise on differences in vulnerability and by doing so gain access to, for instance, social security arrangements. Several parties can profit from maintaining an image of vulnerability. Governments play a role in creating and maintaining an image of vulnerability, for instance by subsidising events or organisations that will target the position of women. Social monitoring is meant to protect migrant women who are regarded to be more vulnerable than migrant men. The effect of the monitoring, however, often (but not always) is a restriction of options and hence an increased vulnerability. Strong social monitoring may also encourage some women to evade all monitoring and contacts and a result become more vulnerable.<sup>63</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Theorising in the field of research on migration and gender has been pointed out as one the greatest challenges for future research. This challenge has been taken up in this article.

*Profitability* was for a long time commonly used as a key concept in explaining migration. Differences in (perceived) profitability have been used to explain differences between migrant men and women in migration and settlement. The problem with using profitability as a key concept is that it does not explain all differences. In this paper I have argued that the concept profitability can be replaced by the concept vulnerability. The *vulnerability model* incorporates the models that use profitability, since a high *perceived profitability* will contribute to the idea of reduced vulnerability. Differences between migrant men and women can be explained by differences in (perceived) vulnerability of (potential) migrant women and men. Migrants themselves, their families, immigrant communities, employers, lawyers, governments, organisations and media reports all play a role in the construction of this vulnerability.

As has been pointed out above, vulnerability in one domain can be countered by reducing vulnerability in other domains. Furthermore, immigrant men and women are differently vulnerable in the legal and economic domains, and are perceived to be differently vulnerable in the social domain.

Profitability, which was used as a key concept in older theories, has to some extent a positive connotation. Vulnerability especially when it is applied to women, implies victimhood and denies agency and empowerment. In this article I have tried to show that this is not how we *should* see migrant women, but that this is how they *are* seen and how measures that are taken – in part to protect women – are in fact increasing their vulnerability. To counter these vulnerabilities immigrant women construct and maintain networks that are different from those of immigrant men.

### *References*

Agnew, Vijay (1998), *In search of a safe place. Abused women and culturally sensitive services*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Agustin, Laura (2005), 'Migrants in the Mistress's House: other voices in the "trafficking debate', *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, vol. 12, nr. 1, 96-117.

Andall, Jacqueline (2000), *Gender, Migration and Domestic Service. The Politics of Black Women in Italy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Anthias, Floya, and Nira Yuval-Davis (1992), *Racialized boundaries. Race, nation, gender, colour and class and the anti-racist struggle*. London/New York: Routledge.

Apap, Joanna, Philippe de Bruycker and Catherine Schmitter (2000), *Regularisations of Illegal Aliens in the European Union: Summary Report of a Comparative Study*. Brussels: Bruylant Publishers.

Bauböck, R. (1996) 'Introduction', in: R. Bauböck, A. Heller and A. Zolberg (eds.), *The Challenge of Diversity, Integration and Pluralism in Societies of Immigration*. Aldershot: Avebury.

Bernini, P. and G. Engbersen (1999), 'Koppeling en uitsluiting: Over ongewenste en onbedoelde effecten van de Koppelingswet', *Nederlands Juristenblad*, vol. 74, nr. 2, 65-71.

Bodian, Miriam (1999), *Hebrews of the Portuguese nation. Conversos and community in early modern Amsterdam*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Boris, E. (1995), 'The racialized gendered state: constructions of citizenship in the United States', *Social Politics* vol. 2, nr. 2, 160-181.

Borjas, G. (1990), *Friends or strangers: The impact of immigrants on the U.S. economy*. New York: Basic Books.

Boyd, Monica (1989), 'Family and Personal Networks in International Migration: Recent Developments and New Agendas', *International Migration Review*, vol. 23, nr. 3, 638-70.

Brennan, Denise (2004), 'Women work, men sponge, and everyone gossips', *Anthropological Quarterly*, vol. 77, nr. 7, 705-733.

Caroline B. Brettell, *Men who migrate, women who wait. Population and history in a Portuguese parish* (Princeton 1986).

Brettell, C. B. (1995 ), *We Have Already Cried Many Tears: The Stories of Three Portuguese Migrant Women*. Prospect Heights IL: Waveland Press.

Burgers, J. and G. Engbersen (eds.) (1999), *De Ongekende Stad 1. Illegale vreemdelingen in Rotterdam*. Amsterdam: Boom.

Calavita, Kitty (2006), 'Gender, Migration, and Law: Crossing Borders and Bridging Discipline', *IMR*, vol. 40, nr. 1, 104-132.

S. Castles and M.J. Miller, *The age of migration. International population movements in the modern world* (London 1993) 22.

Chan, Sucheng (1991), *Entry denied. Exclusion and the Chinese community in America, 1882-1943*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Chant, Sylvia (ed.) *Gender and migration in developing countries* (London and New York 1992);

Chavez, L. (1991), 'Outside the imagined community: Undocumented settlers and experiences of incorporation', *American Ethnologist*, vol. 18, 257-278.

Chavez, L. (1994), 'The power of imagined community: The settlement of undocumented Mexicans and Central Americans in the United States'. *American Anthropologist*, vol. 96, nr. 1, 52-73.

Chiswick, B. (2000), 'The economics of illegal immigration for the Host economy', in: D. Çinar, A. Gächter and H. Waldrauch (eds.), *Irregular migration: Dynamics, Impact, policy options*. Vienna: European Centre, 165-174.

Cornelius, W. A., P.L. Martin and J. F. Hollifield (eds.) (1994), *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sara R. Curran, 'Gender Roles and Migration: "Good Sons" Vs. Daughters in Rural Thailand', Seattle Population Research Center Working Paper 95-11 (University of Washington 1995);

Sara R. Curran, 'Intrahousehold Exchange Relations: Explanations for Education and Migration Outcomes', Seattle Population Research Center Working Paper No. 96-5 (University of Washington 1996);

Benjamin Davis and Paul Winters, 'Gender, Networks and Mexico-US Migration', *The Journal of Development Studies*, 28 (2) (2001) 1-26 for a discussion on this point.

Gordon De Jong, Kerry Richter and Pimonpan Isarabhakdi, 'Gender, Values, and Intentions to Move in Rural Thailand', *International Migration Review* 30(3) (1995) 748-70.

Hasia R. Diner, *Erin's daughters in America. Irish immigrants women in the nineteenth century* (Baltimore / London 1983);

Dodson, Belinda (2001), 'Discrimination by default? Gender concerns in South African migration policy', *Africa today*, vol. 48, 73-89.

Echsel, Katharina (2003), 'Aufenthaltsrechtliche Situation von Migrantinnen in Österreich', in: Arbeitsgruppe Migrantinnen und Gewalt (ed.), *Migration von Frauen und strukturelle Gewalt*. Wien: Milena Verlag, 31-41.

Engbersen, Godfried (1999), 'The Undocumented Outsider Class', in: T. Boje et. al. (eds.), *European Societies: Fusion or Fission?* London: Routledge: 84-102

Engbersen, G. and J.P. van der Leun. (1999), 'Het Nederlandse illegalenbeleid: gedogen tussen onvermogen en mededogen', in: W. Bakker and F. van Waarden (eds.), *Ruimte rond regels. Stijlen van regulering en beleidsuitvoering vergeleken*. Amsterdam: Boom, 71-97.

Entzinger, H. (1985), 'The Netherlands' In: T. Hammar (ed.), *European Immigration Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 50-88.

Eltis, David (ed.) (2002), *Coerced and free migration. Global perspectives*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Erel, Umut (2003), 'Soziales Kapital und Migration: Die Kraft der Schwachen?', in: Castro Varela, Maria Do Mar and Dimitria Clayton (eds.), *Migration, Gender, Arbeitsmarkt; Neue Beitrage zu Frauen und Globalisierung*. Königstein/Taunus, 154-185.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990), *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Faist, T. (1997), 'From Common Questions to Common Concepts'. In: T. Hammar, G. Brochmann, K. Tamas and T. Faist (eds.), *International Migration, Immobility and Development: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg, 247-276.

Feldman, David (2003), 'Migrants, immigrants and welfare from the old Poor Law to the welfare state', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* vol. 13, 79-104.

Foner, Nancy (2000), *From Ellis Island to JFK. New York's two great waves of immigration*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ruth A. Frager, 'Labour history and the interlocking hierarchies of class, ethnicity, and gender: A Canadian perspective', *International Review of Social History* 44 (1999) 217-247.

Donna Gabaccia, *From the other side: women, gender, & immigrant life in the U.S. 1820-1990* (Bloomington/Indianapolis 1994)

Gabaccia, Donna (1997), 'The "Yellow peril" and the "Chinese of Europe": global perspectives on race and labor, 1815-1930', in: Jan Lucassen and Leo Lucassen (eds.), *Migration, migration history, history: old paradigms and new perspectives*. Bern: Peter Lang, 177-196.

J, Goss, and B. Linquist, 'Conceptualising international labour migration: a structuration perspective', *International Migration Review*, 29 (2) 1995, 317-351

Granovetter, M. (1985), 'Economic action and social structures: the problem of embeddedness', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 91, nr. 3, 481-510.

Granovetter, M. (1995), 'The economic sociology of firms and entrepreneurs', in: A. Portes (ed.), *The Economic Sociology of Immigration; Essays on Networks, Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship* . New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 128-165.

Green, Nancy (1997) *Ready-to-wear and ready-to-work: a century of industry and immigrants in Paris and New York*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Elizabeth M. Grieco and Monica Boyd, *Women and migration: incorporating gender into international migration theory*, working paper center for the study of population, Florida state university, college of social sciences (Florida State University 1998)

Groenendijk, K. and A. Böcker (2000), 'Haken en ogen van juridische definities', *Migrantenstudies* vol. 16, nr. 2, 81-86.

Grasmuck and Pessar, Two Islands.

Guiraudon, Virginie and Gallya Lahav (eds.) (2006), Special issue on Immigration policy in Europe: the politics of control. Immigration policy in Europe. *West European politics*; vol. 29, nr. 2.

Hart, Betty de (1999), 'Maria Toet en andere verhalen. De nationaliteit van de gehuwde vrouw en de constructie van de natiestaat', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* vol. 25, nr. 2, 183-205

Hart, Betty de (2000), 'De goede lobbes en de onbezonnen vrouw. Gemengde relaties en schijnhuwelijken', *Migrantenstudies* nr. 4, 246-259.

Hart, Betty de (2001), 'De verwerpelijkste van alle gemengde huwelijken. De Gemengde Huwelijken Regeling Nederlands-Indië 1898 en de Rijkswet op het Nederlanderschap 1892 vergeleken', *Gaan & Staan, Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* vol. 21, 60-80.

Hart, B. de (2003), *Onbezonnen vrouwen. Gemengde relaties in het nationaliteitsrecht en het vreemdelingenrecht*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Haynes, Dina Francesca (2004), 'Used, Abused, Arrested and Deported: Extending Immigration Benefits to Protect the Victims of Trafficking and to Secure the Prosecution of Traffickers', *Human Rights Quarterly* vol. 26, 221 –272.

Henkes, Barbara (1995), *Heimat in Holland. Duitse dienstmeisjes 1920-1950*. Amsterdam: Babylon-De Geus.

Hoerder, D. (2002), *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millennium*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.

Hollifield, J.F. (1992), *Immigrants, Markets, and States. The Political Economy of Postwar Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration* (Berkeley 1994)

International seminar on cross border movements and human rights (2004), *January 9-10, New Delhi, India (Report on this seminar published by the Centre for feminist legal research)*.

Isaacman, A. (2000), 'Chikunda Transfrontiersmen and Transnational Migrations in Pre-colonial South Central Africa, ca. 1850–1900', *Zambezia* vol. 27, nr. 2: 109–138.

Jahn, A. and T. Straubhaar. (1999), 'A Survey of the Economics of Illegal Migration.' In: M. Baldwin-Edwards and J. Arango (eds.), *Immigrants and the Informal Economy in Southern Europe*. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 16-42.

Joppke, Christian (2005), *Selecting by origin. Ethnic migration in the liberal state* Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Jordan, B. and D. Vogel (1997), *Which policies influence migration decisions? A comparative analysis of qualitative interviews with undocumented Brazilian immigrants in London and Berlin as a contribution to economic reasoning*. Bremen: Zentrum für Sozialpolitik/Universität Bremen.

Kloosterman, R.C., J.P. van der Leun and J. Rath (1999), 'Mixed Embeddedness: (In)formal Economic activities and immigrant businesses in the Netherlands', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. vol. 23, nr. 2, 252-265.

Eleonore Kofman, (et al), *Gender and International Migration in Europe (Gender, Racism, Ethnicity)* (London 2001)

Koser, Khalid (2005), Irregular migration, state security and human security. A paper prepared for the Policy Analysis and Research Programme of the Global Commission on International Migration September.

Kraus, Sabine (2003), 'Migrantenvrouwen en vrouwelijke migranten. Beeldvorming en werkelijkheid in het migratiebeleid', in: Christel Kohlmann, Sabine Kraus and Ines Orobio de Castro (eds.), *Vrouwen in het migratiebeleid*. Den Haag. 5-12.

Victoria A. Lawson, Hierarchical households and gendered migration in Latin America: feminist extensions to migration research, *Progress in Human Geography* 22, 1 (1998) 39-53.

Ilse Lenz, Helma Lutz, Mirjana Morokvasic, Claudia Schöng-Kalender, Helen Schwenken (eds.), *Crossing borders and shifting boundaries, vol. II. Gender, identities and networks* (Opladen 2002)

Lucassen, Leo (1996), *Zigeuner. Die Geschichte eines polizeilichen Ordnungsbegriffes in Deutschland 1700-1945*. Köln: Böhlau

Lucassen, Leo (1997), "'Harmful tramps". Police professionalization and gypsies in Germany, 1700-1945', *Crime, History & Societies* vol. 1, nr. 1, 29-50.

Lucassen, Leo, (2002), 'Administrative into social control: the aliens police and foreign female servants in the Netherlands (1918-1940), *Social History*, vol. 27, nr. 3, 327-342.

Lucassen, Leo (2005), *The Immigrant Threat: The integration of Old and New Migrants in Western Europe since 1850*. Urbana and Chicago: The University of Illinois Press.

Helma Lutz, 'Cherchez la femme perdue. Kritische aantekeningen vanuit een genderperspectief', *Migrantenstudies* nr. 2 (1997) 90-96;

Lutz, Helma (2002), 'The Long Shadows from the Past. The New Europe at a Crossroad', in: I. Lenz et al. (eds.), *Crossing Borders and Shifting Boundaries. Vol. II: Gender, Identities and Networks*. Opladen. 57-73.

Mahler, S.J. (1995), *American Dreaming. Immigrant Life on the Margins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mahler, S. J., and P. Pessar (2001), 'Gendered Geographies of Power: Analyzing Gender Across Transnational Spaces', *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* vol. 7, nr. 4: 441–459.

Mahler, Sarah J. (2006), 'Gender matters: ethnographers bring gender from the periphery toward the core of migration studies', *IMR*, vol. 40 nr. 1, 27-63.

Mak, Geertje (2001), 'Seksueel vreemdelingenverkeer', *Gaan & Staan, Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* vol. 21, 101-122.

Martens, E., Th. Roelandt and J. Veenman (1991), *Sociale positie en voorzieningengebruik van allochtonen en autochtonen*. Rotterdam.

Douglas Massey, 'Social Structure, Household Strategies, and the Cumulative Causation of Migration', *Population Index* 56(1) (1990) 3-26.

Massey, D., J. Arango, G. Hugo, A. Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino, J. Taylor (1993), 'Theories of international migration: a review and appraisal'. *Population and Development Review* vol. 19, nr. 3, 431-466.

Massey, D. and K. Espinosa. (1997), 'What's driving Mexico-US migration? A theoretical, empirical and policy analysis'. *American Journal of Sociology* vol. 12, nr. 4, 939-999.

McKeown, Adam (2001), *Chinese migrant networks and cultural change. Peru, Chicago, Hawaii, 1900-1936*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

Moch, Leslie Page (2003), *Moving Europeans. Migration in Western Europe since 1650*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Moloney, Deirdre M. (2006), 'Women, sexual orality, and Economic dependency in early U.S. deportation policy', *Journal of Women 's History*, vol. 18, nr. 2, 95–122.

Moon, David (2002), 'Peasant migration, the abolition of serfdom, and the internal passport system in the Russian empire, c. 1800-1914', in: David Eltis (ed.), *Coerced and free migration. Global perspectives*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 324-357.

Mirjana Morokvasic, Umut Erel, Kyoko Shinozaki (eds), *Crossing borders and shifting boundaries, vol. I. Gender on the move* (Opladen 2003)

Okin, Susan Moller (1999), 'Is multiculturalism bad for women?', in: J. Cohen, M. Howard and M. Nussbaum (eds.), *Is multiculturalism bad for women*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 9-24.

Orum, T. T. (2001), 'The Women of the Open Door: Jews in the Belle Époque Amazonian Demimonde, 1890–1920', *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* vol. 19, nr. 3: 86 –99.

Oxford, Connie G. (2005), 'Protectors and victims in the gender regime of asylum', *NWSA Journal*, vol. 17, nr. 3, 18-38.

Silvia Pedraza, 'Women and migration: the social consequences of gender', *Annual Review of Sociology* 17 (1991) 303-332;

Pessar, P. R., and S. J. Mahler (2003), 'Transnational Migration: Bringing Gender', *International Migration Review*, vol. 37, nr. 3, 812–846.

Jan Jindy Pettman, Race, ethnicity and gender in Australia.' In: Daiva Stasiulis en Nira Yuval-Davis (eds), *Unsettling settler societies. Articulations of gender, race, ethnicity and class* (London 1995) 65-94;

Phizacklea, A. (1998), 'Migration and Globalization: A Feminist Perspective', in: K. Koser and H. Lutz (eds.), *The New Migration in Europe*. London: Macmillan, 21–38.

Phizacklea, A. (ed.) (1983), *One way ticket. Migration and female labour*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul .

Phizacklea, A. (2003), 'Transnationalism, gender and global workers', in: Mirjana Morokvasic, Umut Erel, Kyoko Shinozaki (eds), *Crossing borders and shifting boundaries, vol. I. Gender on the move*. Opladen: VS Verlag, 79-100.

Portes, A. and R.G. Rumbaut (1990), *Immigrant America, A Portrait* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, A. (Ed.) (1995), *The Economic Sociology of Immigration. Essays on Networks, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Ruspini, P. (2000), 'Living on the edge: irregular immigrants in Italy', in: D. Çinar, A. Gächter and H. Waldrauch (eds.), *Irregular migration: Dynamics, Impact, policy options*. Vienna: European Centre, 81-94.

Rachel Salazar Parrenas, *Servants of Globalization: Women, migration and domestic work* (Stanford 2001)

Schrover, Marlou (2001a), 'Immigrant business and niche formation in a historical perspective. The Netherlands in the nineteenth century', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* vol. 27, nr. 2, 295-311.

Marlou Schrover, 'Gender en etniciteit. Overeenkomst en verschil in historisch perspectief', *Gaan & Staan, Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* 21 (Amsterdam 2001b) 180-207.

Schrover, Marlou, Joanne Van der Leun, Chris Quispel (2007), 'Niches, labour market segregation, ethnicity and gender', *JEMS* vol. 36 forthcoming.

Scott, J.C. (1998), *Seeing like a state. How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Siddiqui, Tarneen (2003), 'An anatomy of forced and voluntary migration from Bangladesh: a gendered perspective', in: Mirjana Morokvasic, Umut Erel, Kyoko Shinozaki (eds), *Crossing borders and shifting boundaries, vol. I. Gender on the move*. Opladen: VS Verlag, 155-176.

Rita James Simon and Caroline B. Brettell (eds.), *International migration. The female experience* (Totowa 1986);

Sinke, Suzanne M. (2006), 'Gender and Migration: Historical Perspectives', *IMR* vol. 40, nr. 1, 82-103

Larry A. Sjaastad, 'The Costs and Returns of Human Migration', *Journal of Political Economy* 70 (1962) 80-93

Soderlund, Gretchen (2005), 'Running from the rescuers: new U.S. crusaders against sex trafficking and the rhetoric of abolition', *NWSA Journal*, vol. 17, nr. 3, 64-87

Spijkerboer, Thomas (2000), *Gender and refugee status*. Aldershot [etc.] : Ashgate/Dartmouth

Spijkerboer, T. (2002), *Het VN-Vrouwenverdrag en het Nederlandse vreemdelingenrecht; discussiestuk geschreven op verzoek van de Adviescommissie voor Vreemdelingenzaken*. Amsterdam.

Oded Stark, *The Migration of Labor* (Cambridge 1991).

Daiva Stasiulis and Nira Yuval-Davis, 'Introduction: beyond dichotomies – gender, ethnicity and class in settler societies.' In: Daiva Stasiulis and Nira Yuval-Davis (eds), *Unsettling settler societies. Articulations of gender, race, ethnicity and class* (Londen 1995) 1-38;

Stewart, Emma (2005), 'Exploring the vulnerability of asylum seekers in the UK', *Population, space and place* vol. 11, 499-512 .

Stoler, A.L. (1992), 'Sexual affronts and racial frontiers: European identities and the cultural politics of exclusion in Colonial Southeast Asia', *Comparative studies in Society and History* vol. 34, 540-551

Stoler, A.L. (1995), *Race and the education of desire. Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Tilly, C. and L. Tilly (1994) 'Capitalist work and labor markets', in: N. Smelser and R. Swedberg (eds.), *The Handbook of economic sociology*. Princeton (N.J.) /New York: Princeton University Press, 283-312.

Charles Tilly, *Durable inequality* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/Londen 1998);

Tinnemans, W. (1994), *Een gouden armband. Een geschiedenis van mediterrane immigranten in Nederland (1945-1994)*. Utrecht: Nederlands Centrum Buitenlanders.

Michael Todaro, 'A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries', *American Economic Review* 59(1) (1969) 138-148;

Michael Todaro, *Internal Migration in Developing Countries* (Geneva 1976).

Torpey, John (2000), *The invention of the passport. Surveillance, citizenship and the state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van der Leun, J.P. (2003), *Looking for loopholes. Processes of incorporation of illegal immigrants in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

Van der Leun, J.P. and R.C. Kloosterman (2006) 'Going Underground. The labour market position of undocumented immigrants in the Netherlands', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie/ Journal of Economic & Social Geography*, vol. 97, nr. 1, 59–68.

Visser, J. and A. Hemerijck (1997), *A Dutch Miracle: Job Growth, Welfare Reform and Corporatism in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

*Vrouwelijke vluchtelingen. Handleiding voor rechtshulpverleners* (1992). Amsterdam.

Wang, Fei-Ling (2005), *Organizing through division and exclusion: China's Hukou system*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Weber, Eugen (1976), *Peasants into Frenchmen*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hania Zlotnik, 'Women As Migrants and Workers in Developing Countries', *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 30(1) (1993) 39-62;

H. Zlotnik, 'The South-to-North Migration of Women', *International Migration Review* 29 (1995) 229-254.

Zolberg, Aristide (2006), *A nation by design. Immigration policy in the fashioning of America*. New York and Cambridge Mass.: Russell Sage Foundation; Harvard University Press

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2006 I have started a large project, financed by the Dutch NWO and undertaken at Leiden University, which will describe these differences for the migration to the Netherlands between 1945 and 2005. The project will run until 2011.

<sup>2</sup> R. Fincher and P. Saunders (eds), *Creating Unequal Futures? Rethinking Poverty, Inequality and Disadvantage* (Sydney 2001); R. Fincher, et al., *Gender equity and Australian immigrant policy* (Canberra 1994); Kofman, *Gender and International Migration in Europe*; Maria Do Mar Castro Varela and Dimitria Clayton (eds), *Migration, Gender, Arbeitsmarkt; Neue Beitrage zu Frauen und Globalisierung* (Königstein/Taunus 2003); Geraldine Pratt, *Working feminism* (Philadelphia 2004); Shani D’Cruze and Anupama Rao, ‘Violence and the vulnerabilities of gender’, *Gender & History*, 16 (3) (November 2004) 495-512. See also: Chant and Radcliffe, ‘Migration and development: the importance of gender’, who have build notions on vulnerability into the family strategy model.

<sup>3</sup> Daniel Joseph Hogan and Eduardo Marandola, ‘Towards an interdisciplinary conceptualisation of vulnerability’, *Population, Space and Place*, 11, 455-471 (2005). See also Ulrich Beck, *Risk society: towards a new modernity* (London 1993-1992); Jorge A. Bustamante, ‘Immigrants’ vulnerability as subjects of human rights’, *IMR* vol. 36, number 2 (Summer 2002) 333-354.

<sup>4</sup> Based on the definition of Susman 1984, cited in Hogan and Marandola, ‘Towards an interdisciplinary conceptualisation’, 462.

<sup>5</sup> Based on the definitions of Dow 1992 and of Watts and Bohle 1993 cited in Hogan and Marandola. ‘Towards an interdisciplinary conceptualisation’, 462.

<sup>6</sup> Hogan and Marandola, ‘Towards an interdisciplinary conceptualisation’, 459.

<sup>7</sup> Hogan and Marandola, ‘Towards an interdisciplinary conceptualisation’, 458.

<sup>8</sup> Elli Heikkilä, ‘Mobile vulnerabilities: perspectives on vulnerabilities of immigrants in the Finnish labour market’, *Population, space and place* 11, 485-497 (2005) 486.

<sup>9</sup> Emma Stewart, ‘Exploring the vulnerability of asylum seekers in the UK’, *Population, space and place* 11, 499-512 (2005) 500.

<sup>10</sup> Hogan and Marandola, ‘Towards an interdisciplinary conceptualisation’, 463.

<sup>11</sup> Elli Heikkilä, ‘Mobile vulnerabilities’, 486.

<sup>12</sup> Henkes, *Heimat in Holland*. See also the paper of Leslie Page Moch for this conference.

<sup>13</sup> See Curran ‘Intrahousehold Exchange Relations’, for a discussion of this point.

<sup>14</sup> See Benjamin Davis and Paul Winters, ‘Gender, Networks and Mexico-US Migration’, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 28 (2) (2001) 1-26 for a discussion on this point.

<sup>15</sup> See for instance Boyd ‘Family and Personal Networks’; Cecilia Tacoli, ‘Gender and International Survival Strategies: a Research Agenda With Reference to Filipina Labour Migrants in Italy’, *TWPR* 17(2) (1995) 199-212.

<sup>16</sup> Douglas Massey, ‘Social Structure, Household Strategies, and the Cumulative Causation of Migration’, *Population Index* 56(1) (1990) 3-26.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> Alejandro Portes and Robert Bach, *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States* (Berkeley 1985); Julie DaVanzo, 'Does Unemployment Affect Migration? Evidence From Micro Data', *Review of Economics and Statistics* 60 (1978) 504-14; Massey, 'Social Structure'; Oded Stark, *The Migration of Labor* (Cambridge 1991).
- <sup>18</sup> Alejandro Portes and Julia Sensenbrenner, 'Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action', *American Journal of Sociology* 98(6) (1993) 1320-1350.
- <sup>19</sup> Massey 'Social Structure'.
- <sup>20</sup> Arib and Reijmers 1992.
- <sup>21</sup> *De laatste kans*, 52.
- <sup>22</sup> *De laatste kans*, 55.
- <sup>23</sup> Thijl Sunier, *Islam in beweging. Turkse jongeren en Islamitische organisaties* (Amsterdam 1996)1996.
- <sup>24</sup> Rinus Penninx, Henk Münstermann and Han Entzinger (eds), *Etnische minderheden en de multiculturele samenleving* (Groningen 1998), 576.
- <sup>25</sup> Women in the labor market in Kenya and abroad: third class citizens either way! A paper presented by Mary Okioma At the European conference on gendered borders Vrije universiteit Amsterdam Netherlands, September 30<sup>th</sup> – october 2<sup>nd</sup> 2004; *Facts on Migrant Labour*, International Labour Organization, International Labour Office.
- <sup>26</sup> Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2003–2004, 28 689, nrs. 8–9 Onderzoek integratiebeleid (Eindverslag van de commissie Blok).
- <sup>27</sup> Eindverslag commissie Blok 437
- <sup>28</sup> CBS data 1999. For Turkish and Moroccan women rates of labour market participation were less. In 1991 it was 30 percent for Turkish women and 16 for Moroccan women versus 50 percent for non-immigrant women. E. Martens, Th. Roelandt and J. Veenman, *Sociale positie en voorzieningengebruik van allochtonen en autochtonen* (Rotterdam 1991) 32.
- <sup>29</sup> *De laatste kans, Positieverbetering van buitenlandse vrouwen en meisjes in Nederland* (Utrecht 1983) Uitgave van het Nederlands Centrum Buitenlanders 12.
- <sup>30</sup> T.E.C.M. Ankoné and W.J. Kaufman, *Turkse en Marokkaanse vrouwen in Utrecht*. 67.
- <sup>31</sup> *De laatste kans, Positieverbetering van buitenlandse vrouwen en meisjes in Nederland* (Utrecht 1983) Uitgave van het Nederlands Centrum Buitenlanders 24.
- <sup>32</sup> Eindverslag commissie Blok 435
- <sup>33</sup> *De laatste kans*, 22.
- <sup>34</sup> *De laatste kans*, 22; Ankoné and Kaufman, *Turkse en Marokkaanse vrouwen in Utrecht*,78.
- <sup>35</sup> Sawitri Saharso. 'Een koperen bruiloft. Twaalf en een half jaar sekse en etniciteit in het gecombineerde vrouwen- en minderhedenbeleid, *Migrantenstudies* (1995) nr. 4, 241-257.
- <sup>36</sup> Eindverslag commissie Blok 441
- <sup>37</sup> Saharso. 'Een koperen bruiloft', 241-257.
- <sup>38</sup> Pedraza, 'Women and migration, 314.
- <sup>39</sup> International seminar 2004.
- <sup>40</sup> Mark S. Granovetter, 'The strength of weak ties', *The American Journal of Sociology* vol. 78. No. 6 (May 1973) 1360-1380; Grasmuck and Pessar, *Two island*; Page Moch and Fuchs, Getting along;

---

S.R.,Curran and A. Saguy, 'Migration and Cultural Change: A Role for Gender and Social Networks?', *Journal of International Women's Studies* 2 (2001) 54-77.

<sup>41</sup> R.C. Kloosterman and J.P. van der Leun, 'Just for starters. Commercial gentrification by immigrants entrepreneurs in Amsterdam and Rotterdam neighborhoods', *Housing Studies*, 1999 14 (5): 659-677.

<sup>42</sup> Karen S. Cook, Richard M. Emerson and Mary R. Gillmore, 'The distribution of power in exchange networks: theory and experimental results', *The American Journal of Sociology* vol 89, no. 2 (Sep. 1983) 275-305, 277; Joke van der Zwaard, 'De lusten en de lasten van een vriendinnenkring', *Migrantenstudies* nr.1 (2000) 27-44.

<sup>43</sup> Jones-Correa, Michael, 'Different paths: gender, immigration and political participation', *IMR* vol. 32, nr. 2 (Summer 1998) 326-349.

<sup>44</sup> For a comparable role of immigrant churches in the Early Modern Period see: Erika Kuijpers, *Migrantenstad. Immigratie en sociale verhoudingen in 17e-eeuws Amsterdam* (Amsterdam 2005).

<sup>45</sup> Katie Willis and Brenda Yeoh, 'Introduction', in: Katie Willis and Brenda Yeoh, *Gender and Migration* (Cheltenham/Northampton 2000) xi-xxii..

<sup>46</sup> Chotkowski, "'Baby's kunnen we niet huisvesten, moeder en kind willen we niet scheiden''.

<sup>47</sup> Bustamante, 'Immigrants' vulnerability as subjects of human rights', 340.

<sup>48</sup> Marlene de Vries, , *Ogen in je rug. Turkse meisjes en jonge vrouwen in Nederland* (Alphen aan de Rijn 1987); Roline Redmond, , 'Daar hoor ik ook bij'. *De zwarte en migrantenvrouwenbeweging in Nederland* (Leiden 1990); Erel, 'Soziales Kapital und Migration', 154-185; Hyacintha Dashorst and Milana van der Werf, *Tussen djellaba en disco. Marokkaanse meisjes aan het woord* (Amsterdam 1995, Stichting Kleur in 't werk) 29.

<sup>49</sup> Georg'ann Cattelona, 'Control and collaboration: the role of women in regulating female sexual behaviour in Early Modern Marseille', *French Historical Studies* 18:1 (Spring 1993) 13-33.

<sup>50</sup> Portes and Rumbaut, *Legacies*, 271

<sup>51</sup> SISWO p. 120 Eindverslag commissie Blok 420.

<sup>52</sup> Eindverslag commissie Blok 415

<sup>53</sup> Dashorst and Van der Werf; SCP, 2003, p. 117 Eindverslag commissie Blok 415.

<sup>54</sup> For examples see: Umut Erel, 'Soziales Kapital und Migration'.; Geertje Mak, 'Seksueel vreemdelingenverkeer', *Gaan & Staan, Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* 21 (2001) 101-122.

<sup>55</sup> Erna Hooghiemstra, 'Gemengd huwen en transnationaal huwen in Nederland: enkele feiten', *Migrantenstudies* nr. 4 (2000) 198-208; Erna Hooghiemstra, *Trouwen over de grens. Achtergronden van partnerkeuze van Turken en Marokkanen in Nederland* (Den Haag 2003); Marlou Schrover, 'Maria en Rocco. Gemengde huwelijken en integratie in de negentiende eeuw', *Gaan & Staan, Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* 21 (2001a) 81-100.

<sup>56</sup> Ingrid Esveldt and Isik Kulu-Glasgow, 'Gezinsvorming bij vrouwen van Turkse of Marokkaanse afkomst in Nederland: een literatuuronderzoek', in: R.F. van der Erf and A.C. Liefbroer (ed.) *Allochtonen vrouwen: thuis in Nederland? Bevolking en gezin. Boekaflevering 1994* (Den Haag 1994) 53-96.

<sup>57</sup> Hondius *Gemengde huwelijken, gemengde gevoelens*, 69.

<sup>58</sup> Hondius *Gemengde huwelijken, gemengde gevoelens*; Barbara Waldis, *Trotz der Differenz. Interkulturelle Kommunikation bei maghrebinisch-europäischen Paarbeziehungen in der Schweiz und in Tunesien* (Münster 1998); Breger and Hill 1998.

<sup>59</sup> Mak 'Seksueel vreemdelingenverkeer'.

---

<sup>60</sup> Monique Diederichs, "'Moffenmeiden". Nederlandse vrouwen en Duitse militairen 1940-1945', *Strijd om de Seksualiteit, Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* 20 (Amsterdam 2000) 41-64.

<sup>61</sup> Stoler, A.L., 'Sexual affronts and racial frontiers: European identities and the cultural politics of exclusion in Colonial Southeast Asia', *Comparative studies in Society and History* 34 (1992) 540-551.; Stoler, A.L., *Race and the education of desire. Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things* (Durham/London 1995).

<sup>62</sup> Hooghiemstra *Trouwen over de grens*.

<sup>63</sup> Several researchers have found this effect. See for instance: Pessar 1986; Pedraza 1991; Ortiz 1996.