SOSGEO2800 V21 – exam assessment guidelines

Short questions

1. Briefly explain how and why some researchers have looked into the social mobility of descendants of immigrants, and describe their findings.

The relevant literature for this question is mainly from lecture 11: de Haas (2020), chapter 12; Andersson (2010); Alba (2005); Hermansen (2016); Midtbøen (2014). The students are asked to explain both how and why; both should be answered.

How:
Examples that should be mentioned from the curriculum are Midtbøen's (2014) field experiment, documenting that descendants of Pakistani immigrants face discrimination in the Norwegian labour market, and in-depth interviews with employers to explore the decision-making processes leading to the disadvantages observed. Among his findings is that stereotypes associated with immigrants are inferred from ethnically distinct names by employers, and that negative experiences are generalised between ethnic groups and across generations. The implications for the employment opportunities of children of immigrants are potentially severe. Instead of experiencing equal access to the labour market, they encounter attitudes and stereotypes attached to their parents' generation, making their domestic educational qualifications and linguistic fluency 'invisible' in the eyes of employers. Another example is Hermansen's 2016 article where he studied the intergenerational transmission of educational attainment and adult earnings from immigrant parents to their second-generation children. The results suggest substantial intergenerational convergence in socio-economic life chances between the children of immigrants and the children of the native-born in the egalitarian Norwegian welfare state setting.

Why:
The students should mention some points from Midtbøen's lecture; for example:
   - We could talk about ethnic minorities and disregard generational differences (e.g. UK)
   - We could talk about nationals and disregard ethnic differences among non-migrants (e.g. France)
   - We need to know how descendants of immigrants fare relative to their parents and to the native majority to assess 1) progress/stagnation vis-à-vis the immigrant generation, and 2) advantage/disadvantage vis-à-vis native majority peers
   - The long-term consequences of immigration are in many ways determined by the fate of later generations: If descendants of immigrants experience upward social mobility and opportunities on par with their majority peers, it can (to a certain extent) be acceptable that immigrants often stagnate in positions at the margins
   - However, if descendants of immigrants experience blocked opportunities to social mobility, an ethnically based underclass may emerge – potentially resulting in social conflict and pressure on welfare budgets

- This is the reason why the educational and occupational outcomes of the second generation is often depicted as the litmus test of integration

Some answers may focus on discrimination, others may be more directed towards the theoretical points of assimilation and integration. Both are fine. A point made in the lecture was that there are many potential drivers, but social mobility in itself clearly does not shelter against discrimination; the very good answers might elaborate on this

2. Describe the push-pull theory and the segmented labour market theory. What paradigms do they belong to? What are their similarities and differences?

The main literature for this question is from lecture 2: de Haas (2020), chapters 3, 13.

In the lecture, the students were introduced to **functionalist migration theories:**
- See society as a collection of interdependent parts (individuals, groups, institutions etc.) in which exists an inherent tendency towards equilibrium & development
- Functioning of society is analogous to the functioning of an organism – each part has its own function which contributes to the functioning of the whole
- Migration is seen as a part of society & it thus also contributes towards the functioning and development of the society
- The push-pull model catalogues economic, environmental and demographic factors that push people out of places and pull them into places of destination
- Push factors:
    - population growth and density
    - lack of economic opportunities & unemployment
    - political repression and persecution
    - natural disasters
    - poverty and famine
- Pull factors that determine where immigrants move to and why:
    - demand for labour
    - economic opportunities (higher salaries)
    - availability of land
    - better living standard
    - education facilities
    - political freedoms

And to **historical-structuralist theories of migration:**
- As an alternative to the functionalist theories of migration came historical-structural theories in the 1970s and 1980s.
- They are rooted in the neo-Marxist political economy. (□ almost anything in society can be explained by looking at economics, especially who owns the means of production in a society)
- migration = one of the many manifestations / consequences of capitalism.
- Core aspect = belief that political and economic power is unequally distributed among countries and individuals.
- Migration perpetuates the divide between rich and poor countries and people.

- Migration is a mechanism that provides cheap, exploitable labour which serves the wealthy in the country of destination and drains the country of origin of valuable resources
- Migration hence does not lead to greater equilibrium between the countries and people, but rather reinforces global inequalities.
- Segmented labour market theory represents one example of the historical-structuralist theories:
- This theory claims that the economic and labour market structures of the receiving countries create a demand for a particular kind of labour – something that causes immigration to this country.
- piore (1979): Birds of passage - chronic and unavoidable demand for foreign workers
- now - with red level infection control measures - the borders are essentially closed for non-essential workers - many industries are at a loss and do not know what to do - entirely dependent on foreign workers
- This theory is namely based on the observation that there exists an unequal division between primary and secondary labour market in the country of destination:
- Primary labour market consists of well-paid and secure jobs with good working conditions. They are occupied by native workers or other individuals with high human capital, membership in the majority ethnic group and orderly legal status.
- Secondary labour market, on the other hand, consists of less-protected and poorly paid jobs. These are done by migrant workers and others who are disadvantaged in terms of education, as well as gender, race, minority status and irregular status.
- Migrants act hence seen as a 'reserve army of labour'.
- According to this theory, the above-presented labour market and migration dynamics lock the countries of origin and destination into a dependency relationship, and hence perpetuate the inequalities between them.
- opposite view from functionalism where migration leads to more equality

The push-pull models belong to the functionalist paradigm, and the segmented labour market theory to the historical-structuralist theories of migration. However, in de Haas 6th ed., the sorting criteria is a bit different than previously, and the segmented/dual labour market theory is listed under the heading "conceptualizing migratory agency" as part of a third set of theories. **We will therefore accept both answers.** Examples and critical remarks on both theories/paradigms should be rewarded.

3. Explain the concepts of race, nation and ethnicity.

These concepts were covered in lecture 6 and the key syllabus reference is Fenton (2010, ch. 1-3), which compares and contrasts ethnicity, race and nation as concepts. All three concepts bear family resemblance, referring to descent and culture communities, but there are also differences. Race refers to 1) local groups of universal categories of humankind (e.g. afro-americans), and 2) physical/visible difference; Nation refers to the assumption that nations link to state or state-like political forms on a territory; Ethnic groups refers to 1) a sub-set within nation-state; 2) cultural differences and cultural markers of social boundaries; 3) assumption of otherness ('foreign', 'minority') in regard to some majority not presumed to be 'ethnic'.

The candidate can also draw on Brubaker's (2009) article that compares these concepts along different axes (this is a recommended reading). de Haas and colleagues (2019) discusses different conceptions of ethnicity and also explains race and racism. Candidates can also draw on literature from lecture 9 on ethnicity and diversity, but since this lecture was cancelled, we do not expect them to reiterate these texts.

Since it is a short question, clarity and delineation of the question should be rewarded.

4. What do we mean by voluntary/involuntary migration? Define and describe voluntary/involuntary migration with regard to the main types of migration to/within Europe.

The categories of migration and the types of migration, and the problematic aspects of working with clear-cut categories of migration, have been mentioned in many lectures throughout this course. Relevant literature is de Haas (2020), chapters 1 and 2 (lecture 1), Brekke (2015); Black (2011); Crawley (2018); Scipioni (2018) (lecture 4), Abrego (2015); Kubal (2013); Menjívar (2016) (lecture 5).

Students may choose to use the legal categories of migrants when listing the main types of migrants to/within Europe: Labour migrants, family migrants, education migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. Others may choose to list the categories of Internal/international, Temporary/permanent, Forced/voluntary, Low-skilled/high-skilled, Legal/illegal. Those who mention the problematic aspects of categorization + lists examples from the curriculum should be rewarded.

Long questions

1.*Explain the concept of illegal/irregular migration. Discuss how categories like illegal/irregular can be problematic, and how some scholars are attempting to overcome the conception of legality/illegality*

This question is based on lecture 5, with the syllabus texts: de Haas (2020, kap. 2), Abrego (2015), Kubal (2013) og Menjívar (2016).

The candidate should give a clear definition of illegal/irregular migration. Good candidates make a distinction between these two terms. A good candidate is able to problematize social scientific categories in general and illegal/irregular category specifically. A recurrent focus in the course has been to problematize categories, and this was also covered in the first lecture.

It may be relevant to distinguish between illegal stay and illegal entry. One can problematize the illegality concept morally (only acts can be illegal, people cannot) and scientifically (it is analytically imprecise; it is not as clear-cut as it seems, migrants often occupy positions between full legality and illegality). Further, a good candidate can also problematize the irregular concept by pointing to some problems with this as well: it can also be imprecise because in some countries irregular migration is the norm, not the exception. If the candidate reflect on other critiques of these two categories, she/he should be rewarded. Kubal's concept of semi-legality and Menjivar's (2016; and also used in Abrego & Lakhani 2015) liminal legality are two attempts to overcome the conception of legality/illegality. The

candidate should be able to explain these concepts in a concise manner. Very good candidates will also critically evaluate these attempts.

2. *In recent years, right-wing populist parties have gained in strength in Western countries. Explain their surge in popularity. Then discuss possible connections between right-wing populism, racism and nationalism*

The relevant literature for this question is de Haas (2019), Brubaker (2017), Elgenius (2019) and Rzepnikowska (2019) (from lecture 7). Texts from lecture 6 (on ethnicity, race and nation) are also relevant here: Fenton 2010 in particular, but also Brubaker (2009) and Ponce (2019) – the two latter as recommended readings.

The candidate should first define right-wing populism; what is populism and what is right-wing populism. There are different ways of explaining the surge in popularity, but Brubaker's article is an obvious place to start. He analyzes the 'populist moment' and discusses different expressions of national-populisms in Northern Western Europe, East and Central Europe and the US. Rydgren and Elgenius show how appeals to nostalgia may increase support for the Swedish Democrats. The discussion of possible connections should include definitions of racism and nationalism. The last part of the question can be addressed in a wide range of ways. However, one relevant entry point is Rydgren & Elgenius engagement with Brubaker on whether the Swedish Democrats should be classified as ethno-nationalist or national-populist. Moreover, Rzepnikowska's study on Polish migrants' experiences with racism pre- and post Brexit can be used to discuss connections between these three phenomena. The last part of this question can be interpreted broadly and creative solutions, grounded in the syllabus, should be rewarded. A good candidate will nonetheless show both connections and disconnections and demonstrate that it may be hard to make clear-cut distinctions in some cases. Use of examples and cases is positive.