DISCOURSES CONCERNING IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION: A CRITICAL REVIEW

Abdi M. Hersi, (MA, Int'l Rel.)
Griffith Centre for Cultural Research, Griffith University, Australia

Abstract

Theoretical debates about integration are produced by concerned nation states responding to the cultural and religious diversity found within its citizenship. A significant amount of international migration literature is devoted to the subject of managing diversity. Integration is stated to be a product of the intersection between individual migrant aspirations, with regulatory frameworks in four domains – state, market, welfare and culture Freeman (2004). Traditionally, integration debates were classified as being either pluralist versus assimilationist (Gans, 2005) or differential exclusionist, assimilationist and multiculturalist (Castles and Miller 2003). This review departs from these classifications and argues that the above demarcations do not necessarily encompass the depth of the debates of integration in the post 11 September 2001 environment. In fact, the management of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity has become more necessary for governments, researchers and media commentators since the tragic events of 11 September 2001. As a result, this paper adopts more informative categorisations of the discourses concerning migrant integration that take into consideration important actors and players in the process of integration, namely the nation state, the academic field and the media.

Keywords: Discourse, migrant, integration, incorporation, diversity

Introduction

The management of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity has become necessary for governments, researchers and media commentators. A significant amount of international migration literature is devoted to this subject of managing diversity. Theoretical debates about integration are produced by concerned nation states responding to the cultural and religious diversity found within their citizens. Indeed, the increasing diversity among today's migrants presents both opportunities and challenges to all nations across the globe. Some of the opportunities include the advantages that diversity lends to a nation's trade competitiveness in global markets. It also includes the ease of development of global networks of business partners and suppliers. However, on the other hand, diversity poses some unique challenges in a globally interlinked world. One of its main challenges is the integration of newcomers into dominant host societies, especially when these newcomers have diverse racial, ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds.

The approaches adopted by each of the integration's constituent actors (states, academics and the media) in managing diversity has to date escaped in-depth scrutiny. However, the core principles of the management of diversity are assumed to be that the risk of avoiding that society's rich diversity does not cause the social and political fragmentation which makes achieving social cohesion difficult. It is this subject of managing diversity that has prompted public discussions about migrant integration in Europe, North America and Australia. Many immigrant receiving countries in the western world have developed integration policies in an attempt to manage the ever growing social diversity produced by

immigration. However, in most of these governments, social integration policies and the approaches to diversity management differ slightly. However a common concern for these governments remains the risks of inadequately addressing this issue of migrant integration, thus creating an environment in which public discussions about integration are conducted in a prejudiced, emotive fashion,. This paper provides an overview and an analysis of the discourses of integration debated in the scholarly literature and finds that the debates are dominated by three major discourses, namely state discourse, academic discourse and media discourse.

State Discourses about Integration

The management of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity is a major government function. The state, as an important actor, develops policies and programs to incorporate newcomers into their societies. It has legislative powers to determine the size and composition of the flow of migrants and newcomers into the sovereign state. It has a distinct and undeniable responsibility for the successful resettlement of migrants into their new societies to ensure that cohesiveness and inclusion into the wider society is realised. Based on its unique responsibilities in the integration discourse, the state is an important player in public debates about the integration of migrants. Across Europe, North America and Australia, migrant receiving nations have developed national models of immigrant integration. Whilst the model each country has adopted is dictated by the local environment, their anticipated aim remains to incorporate migrants successfully into the wider host society.

Discourses about immigrant incorporation at state level have been in existence for quite some time, and have been evolving and changing over many decades. The evolving and changing discourses of integration could be explained to be due to the significant increases of movement of people from one part of the world to another. An adjustment of social policy is required to manage the diversity of groups of people moving from their ancestral homes to countries with different cultures, ethnicity, race and religions. As a result, the state is now confronted by a new set of realities that are harder to cope with, which differ from the traditional ways of resettling newcomers from somewhat similar backgrounds. It has become imperative for the state to engage this in discussion in reference to the undeniable fact of today's globalised society which is characterised by diversity, not only in race but also in religion and ethnicity. Since the events of 9/11, contemporary migrant integration literature struggles to find a balance between diversity and integration, and faces dilemmas in the interplay between terrorism, radicalisation, extremism and integration. The importance of balancing the demands of integration with the reality of diverse communities is paramount, as "othering" some communities such as the Muslim community may in itself impede the lofty ideal of integration. Poynting (2009) notes a resurgence in the general public's worry about the integration of Muslims into Australian society, and calls Muslims the immigrants who are most discriminated against (or othered`), claiming this to also be a trend in Europe.

Among the most discussed themes found in the literature concerning these state discourses about integration are the models of assimilation, integration, multiculturalism and citizenship. Different states adopt different models of integration based on their political and social realities. State discourses about integration receive much more attention than academic discourses, as they become the governments' official integration discourses. These state discourses about integration include both assimilationist and pluralist ideals of incorporation. The oldest and the most discussed state discourse concerning integration is that of assimilation (Castles and Miller, 1998). This review found that despite being the oldest model of integration, to date, assimilation has significant relevance in public discussions about immigrant integration.

Assimilation was the dominant theory of immigrant incorporation during the period of the 1920s and 1930s (Castles and Miller, 1998), and is primarily associated with the work of Milton Gordon (1964). It is important to understand the various meanings and defintions given to the concept of assimilation. For instance, Heisler (1999) states:

> Assimilation is a multifarious process involving several stages (seven, to be exact) moving from mere acculturation (the adoption of language, religion and other cultural characteristics), structural integration (interaction in primary relationships and the absence of discrimination and prejudice) and finally assimilation.

Assimilation is also defined as the "policy of incorporating migrants into society through a one sided process of adaptation: immigrants are expected to give up their distinctive linguistic, cultural or social characteristics and become indistinguishable from the majority population (Castles, 1999)". However, the above definition is contested by contemporary scholars such as Bloemraad, Korteweg and Yurdakul (2008) who point out that this view of "single sequential path of assimilation" by which immigrants give up past languages, identities and cultural practices is being challenged by new models of "resurgent or reactive ethnicity" that suggest that racial hierarchies and/or limited economic opportunities shape identities and integration (p.163). This traditional view of assimilation also faces criticism from a number of other scholars. In fact, within a decade of the publication of Gordon's book in 1994, assimilation theory's hegemonic status came under attack (Kivisto, 2005).

But it is works like that of Glazer (2005) which question the practicality of assimilation as an effective method by citing the impact assimilation had on racial and ethnic elements in the United States, and its failure to successfully assimilate the African American populations. Other contemporary scholars such as Morawska (2005, p. 128) summarise the arguments for and against assimilation as follows:

> Political and moral arguments in favour of assimilation have been based on such beliefs as these: the drastic reduction of the salience of ethnic group membership supports greater equality, weakens the sources of discrimination, increases individual freedom, and helps create more flexible society. Political and moral arguments in favour of dissimilation – the preservation of subculture differences and even their revival – have been on such beliefs as these: ethnic groups can be powerful centres of opposition to coercive states, can protect valuable cultural resources that are lost in a basically one-way assimilation process, and can reduce anomie and the sense of alienation by giving individuals an identity in a complex and confusing world.

A significantly large bulk of literature views assimilation as being a model that has passed its use by date mainly because, since the 1960s, the world has gone through a significant technological, transportation and communication advancement, which has made the movement of people between oceans and countries easier. For example, Doomernick and Knippenberg (2003) criticised assimilation as an "illegitimate and virtually unusable model of incorporation in today's modern societies" and condemned it as being "a strategy that used violence, repression and coercion to absorb minorities into majority culture" (p.44). Other criticisms levelled against assimilation are its limitations and the narrow focus of primarily the newcomer to adjust, not giving enough attention to the necessary adjustments that receiving societies must make to accept and accommodate newcomers (Heisler, 1999).

This review acknowledges the existence in the literature of various understandings of assimilation. For instance, to illustrate the complexity of the term, Kivisto (2005) points out three incontrovertible facts about assimilation that he has identified: "(1) there is little consensus about what we mean by the term; (2) it remains highly contentious; (3) it is back in

vogue". Additionally, the way in which a state practices assimilation might be different to the way in which another state will employ this process. It is evident in the literature about immigrant incorporation that in the application of assimilationist models, there are variances between nations and societies. For instance, Legrain (2006, p. 266) explains the French model of assimilation as "exacting a heavy toll on personal freedoms, by striving to erase cultural differences, without delivering the equality and national cohesion it espouses". The author goes even further and asserts that this one size fits all homogenisation that the model proposes seems "neither desirable nor achievable" Legrain (2006).

In the contrasting ways in which states respond to immigrant incorporation, Castles (1999, p. 3-17) concludes that "pluralist models of incorporation depending on the degree of state intervention are far superior and more successful than assimilation and differential exclusion models". It is evident in the literature that some immigrant receiving nation states may have used a mix of migrant integration methods. However, Castles (1999, p.3) found that where nations have adopted an assimilation model but also attempted to embrace elements of the pluralist model, they found a contradiction between stated goals and actual policies. For instance, Castles (1999, p. 16) provides the example of countries such as France and the Netherlands as states based on political and cultural communities which tend to follow an assimilation model, however they seem to be partially moving to a pluralist model of immigrant incorporation.

In the case of countries such as Australia, Canada and the United States, Castles (1999, p. 16) found that a predominant model of immigrant incorporation is the pluralist one, based on "encouraging permanent residence with easy naturalisation and access to civil and political rights". In spite of all the criticism of assimilation as a model discussed above, there are defenders of assimilation policies, including some contemporary scholars. For instance, Glazer (2005) in answering his own question – Is assimilation dead? - states that "the word may be dead, the concept may be disreputable, but the reality continues to flourish" and he cites the high rate of intermarriage of European ethnic groups as a clear example of `how thin ethnicity became among Americans of European origin" (p125). Unlike theories about assimilation found in the literature, other discourses concerning immigrant incorporation in various states appear to be mainly pluralistic. Pluralist models of immigrant incorporation that are extensively discussed in the literature about immigrant incorporation are models describing citizenship and multiculturalism.

There also exists a significant amount of literature proposing a national model of citizenship as a prominent method of immigrant incorporation. Li (2003) states that successful integration is understood to mean a process of granting citizenship rights and entitlements to newcomers (pp.330). The grant of citizenship through a process of naturalisation is therefore a pluralist model of immigrant incorporation that is generally considered will encourage immigrants to become a permanent part of the mainstream society. Bloemraad et al. (2008) define citizenship as a "form of membership in a political and geographic community. It can be disaggregated into four dimensions: legal status, rights, political and other forms of participation in society, and a sense of belonging (p.154)". Bloemraad et al. (2008) also state that citizenship encompasses "legal status, rights, participation, and belonging which are traditionally anchored in a particular community with a defined national identity and territorial sovereignty (p.154-155)." Based on this definition, citizenship, that is legal status, rights, full participation or belonging, usually happens within the borders of the country in which immigrants settle. However, this is very much complicated by the fact that "over the past two decades, an expansive and growing literature questions such a bounded approach, raising normative and empirical questions about the relevance of state borders (Bloemraad et al, 2008)". However, other works such as that of Bloemraad (2004) found shortcomings in the model, and they argue that a traditional model

of citizenship naively assumes that immigrants gradually lose attachment to their country of original citizenship, and that most immigrants will change their primary identity and loyalty to that of the receiving country.

Erdal and Oeppen (2013) argue that integration is the "most common form of referring to migrant adaptation process, not only when discussing the normative dimensions of policy, but also when discussing empirical patterns or migrants' own experiences (p.869)". It is not entirely clear from the scholarly literature whether "integration" is a stand-alone discourse of immigrant incorporation. This apparent confusion on what "integration" means is the result of the proliferation in meanings of the term `integration`. This review notes this complexity and the confusing nature of various definitions and terms that are used to describe the processes of incorporating immigrants into their new societies. For example, Weiner (1996) points out that the different terms used, such as *integrate*, *absorb* and *assimilate*, all suggest the high level of complexity, ambiguity and contention in understandings of what integration actually means.

The confusion in the literature appears to come from the apparent interchangeable use of the terms "integration" and "incorporation". Further analysis of the literature reveals the existence of contradicting definitions (both assimilationist and integrationist) of what integration means. For instance, Shadid (1991) defined integration as "the participation of ethnic and religious minorities, individually and as groups, in the social structure of the host society while having possibilities to retain the distinctive aspects of their culture and identity". Others such as Mogahed and Nyiri (2007) propose a definition of integration as being less about cultural conformity, and more about having shared goals and commitment. Legrain (2006) argues that integration is a two way street, where immigrants need to have the will to assimilate to local ways; and natives must be willing to accept them, but he concludes that if society is racist, immigrants will not be able to integrate. It is apparent in the literature that the term `assimilation` is also defined in different ways.

A further confusion in the scholarly literature is a difference between one group and another concerning what 'integration' means. This problem is also noted in a United Nations briefing paper for a world summit which found that:

> Social integration might mean different things to different people. For some, it can be an inclusionary goal, meaning accessing equal opportunities by all. For others, becoming integrated can have a negative connotation and unwanted imposition of uniformity. For some, it might mean neither (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, 1994).

Furthermore, Mogahed and Nyiri (2007 p 2) in their article *Reinventing Integration: Muslims in the West* proposed that integration be redefined as being less about cultural conformity, and more about having shared goals and commitment. They opposed the use of the *hijab,* or woman's veil, and other religious symbols as a being seen as a measure of integration and suggested that more focus be placed on issues of substance rather than on artificial indicators of integration such as appearance. Soysal (1994, p.30) explains that integration occurs automatically as immigrants begin to participate in the legal system and organisational structures, and become part of the host nation's welfare system, become involved in starting businesses and securing permanent housing for themselves.. Integration also begins when migrants gain access to the rights and privileges afforded to the host society and participate in their new society's election procedures. Analysis of the current literature reveals that most of the work concentrates on the individual immigrant rather than on the receiving communities. According to Li (2003):

> "the current academic discourse on immigration seldom interrogates the notion of integration as a theoretical concept. Instead, it readily adopts a narrow empirical framework for studying integration by measuring how immigrants differ from native-

born Canadians. In so doing the academic discourse has unwittingly accepted the conformity premise of integration and has equated the extent of immigrants' integration with the degree of compliance with the average Canadian standard.

Overall, Erdal and Oeppen (2013) state that "integration has been used as a middle ground between multiculturalism and assimilation as it focuses on migrants' full participation in the labour market and their formal citizenship, but left matters of social membership and cultural preferences open to personal choice" (pp. 869).

Amongst all the discourses about immigrant integration, the concept of multiculturalism has received significant attention from policymakers, academics and the media. The discourse about multiculturalism and integration emerged from the realisation by the receiving countries that the notion that all newcomers should join the majority national culture is unworkable (Castles and Davidson, 2000). Arguably, until today, the concept has been resisted by individuals and groups in a number of western nations. Multiculturalism as a pluralist model of immigrant incorporation seems to overlap with other models of immigrant incorporation in some shape or form. For instance, Doomernick and Knippenberg (2003) assert that the dominant form of incorporation of immigrants into receiving societies is integration into a multicultural state. Furthermore, a report produced by the National Multicultural Advisory Council (1999) expressed the view that "concepts of citizenship and multiculturalism are interlinked but each is important in its own right" and the report explained that 'citizenship' does not negate the place and role of Australian multiculturalism.

On the other hand, multiculturalism as a concept may be embraced by a number of states and societies but its application and impact on the perceptions of the members of the host society might substantially differ. For example, Legrain (2006) points out how the Canadian model of multiculturalism is a great success by citing the city of Toronto's motto, "Diversity Our Strength", and the fact that "Canada as a country does more than pay lip service to multiculturalism by even encouraging children of immigrants to learn their parent's native languages" (p.284). Despite its popularity and its decades long use in many parts of the western world, the concept of "multiculturalism" has come under sustained pressure and criticism on a number of fronts. For example, Samani (2007) points out that the discourse about the terrorist attack in the USA in 2001, the attack on the London underground in 2005 and the Spanish train bombing in Madrid in 2004 implicate multiculturalism in part as being "culpable" for these criminal acts.Locally in Australia, there appear to be a bipartisan policy shift between the conservative Liberal and National parties and the Australian Labor party which moves between multiculturalism and integration. Bloemraard (2006 p. 233) points out that Australia, a country that previously embraced multiculturalism, is now retreating from this method of integration, and is adopting a *laissez faire* immigrant integration system similar to that of the United States. Assumptions built on the *laissez faire* model include the notion that an individual immigrant's choice, plus a framework of individual rights and anti-discrimination legislation, will result in the incorporation of new immigrants into a unified citizenry (Bloemraad 2006, p.233).

In the case of Australia, this shift in policy and approach is demonstrated by the 2007 Liberal National conservative coalition government's change of name of the federal Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA) to the Department of Immigrant and Citizenship (DIAC). The latter emphasises citizenship rather than multiculturalism, which has been removed from the department's name. It can be argued that the importance placed on citizenship, followed by requirements for immigrants to take citizenship tests, could seem to be creating a vetting process whereby citizenship is denied for some, or to ensure that their conformity to the mainstream is enforced. In government, the

Australian Labor party re-embraced multiculturalism and reignited the debate[135]. However, Portes and Rumbaut (2006) report that there is a widespread view among the members of many host societies, in particular in America, that having a distinct cultural and ethnic identity undermines unity and social integration. Others such as Jongkid (1992) assert that preserving one's own culture further increases the feelings of alienation (p.365).

In the discussion above it seems to be fairly obvious that there are multiple discourses about integration, all with various meanings and conceptualisations. Doomernick and Knippenberg (2003 p.46) explain that the "integrationist" model of immigrant incorporation appears to be superior to assimilationist notions of integration because of the former's culturally-pluralistic basis. In all of its different forms of incorporation, Erdal and Oeppen (2013) assert that state discourses about integration consist of a one way process where the burden is placed on migrants to integrate into the societies of settlement (p. 869). This point is vehemently rejected by Ehrkamp, (2006) who argues that "Integration should be a process of negotiation and relationship between members of host society and migrant groups and individuals" (p. 1673- 1692).

Correspondingly, there is an emerging number of non-state discourses concerning immigrant integration, namely the concepts of transnationalism, postnationalism and cosmopolitanism, which are discussed in the next section of this review.

Academic Discourses Concerning Integration

Discourses concerning migrant integration are not only debated in government circles and public policy forums. In fact, debates about the successful integration of immigrants and newcomers into the wider society are also taking place in the academic sphere. The distinction between these two parallel debates suggests that in academic circles, the debate tends to be generally pluralistic, if not universalistic. The major discourses of integration debated in the academic sphere include the concepts of transnationalism, postnationalism and cosmopolitanism. Sometimes referred to as theories of integration, these discourses are not models that are necessarily adopted by states as policies of incorporation, but they are theories about integration as documented in the academic arena. A common theme amongst these discourses is their pluralistic and universalistic nature, and their claim that the mass movement of people of diverse backgrounds from one part of the world to another demands a fresh approach, taking into account universal human rights. But the difficult is that, even though these discourses are sound in theory, they have not been tested either by states or societies. To date, no state has ever developed an integration policy including concepts of postnationalism, cosmopolitanism and transnationalism. Despite this fact, these concepts remain central to the academic debates concerning integration. Amongst the most popular of these academic theories is the concept of postnationalism.

Postnationalism is the notion that the grant of citizenship, including legal rights and status, is not sufficient to fully incorporate immigrants into the host society. In her book *Limits of Citizenship*, Soysal (1994) cites world pressures such as universal human rights as being a new force, making the existing models of citizenship less important. Whilst postnationalists acknowledge that citizenship occupies a central place in the processes of immigrant incorporation, according to Bloemraad (2004) they similarly assert that "theories of post nationalism challenge the very idea that citizenship remains linked with state membership be it territorialised or not (p. 392)". In the contemporary immigrant incorporation literature, this view is gaining momentum. It is in line with the idea that analysis solely centred on the experience of individual nation-states becomes a barrier to the

---

[135] The previous Labor government's Immigration Minister, Chris Bowen, explains how, in Australia, multiculturalism is different to that of Europe and refers to it as being "genius multiculturalism" (DIAC 2011).

understanding of the phenomenon of global immigration. In support, Thomas (2006) explains that postnationalism is the view that national citizenship is giving way to a new postnationalist perspective, which is influenced by international human rights norms and respect for personhood. Similar views of how human rights undermine traditional notions of citizenship, due to their power as an accepted normative framework, were also advanced by Bloomraad (2004). It is also claimed that "states are increasingly instruments of implementing international human rights conventions and norms" (Joppke 2005: 6). In general, according to scholars of postnationalism, human rights undermine traditional notions of citizenship due to their power as an accepted normative framework and through their institutionalisation (Bloemraad 2004 p. 392-396).

However, the literature concerning the postnationalism model of immigrant incorporation has been challenged by other scholars. For example, Joppke (1999, p. 187) asserts that the limitation of postnational membership is that it is well suited for the first generation of migrants who have a "deceptive" idea of returning home one day. Other criticisms include those of Bloemraad (2004 p. 389-426) who used a sample of Canadian statistical census data and found that "there is little evidence that immigrants adopt a strict postnational view of citizenship but reveal the possibilities of transnationalism and continued relevance of traditional frameworks". In reference to earlier models, and using the case of Germany as an example, Joppke (1999, p. 189) explains that postnationalists viewed assimilation as being both undesirable and unnecessary, as it violates the dignity of the individual and is against the constitution that protects the liberty of the person in spite of citizenship.

In an era of globalisation and massive international movement, with virtually blurred boundaries, one of the new and emerging concepts of immigrant incorporation is that of cosmopolitanism. Just like other academic discourses of integration discussed above, cosmopolitan theorists stress that the globalised and interconnected world we live in dictates that we identify beyond the boundaries of our nation-states. Today, the concept of citizenship is being contested in studies into the cosmopolitan identity. Within the literature about international migration, the contributions of the concept of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan citizenship cannot be ignored. Emphasising the importance of cosmopolitanism, Skirbis, Kendall and Woodward (2004) explain the level of interconnectedness and interdependence in the world, and cite Chernobyl, the AIDS virus, terrorism and CNN as being factors that influence the lives of many people in different parts of the world.

In relation to the extent to which people are connected to the world and to their local settings, Woodward, Skrbis and Bean (2008b) found that almost two-thirds or 65% of subjects in their study claimed that they feel that they are both a citizen of the world and of their country of origin. In spite of this, cosmopolitanism remains as an abstract concept and a good theory. To date, no state or government hasadopted cosmopolitanism as a model of immigrant incorporation. That is not to say that it cannot happen. It may perhaps happen if, as stated by Skrbis and Woodward (2007), society eliminates the contradiction of accepting the benefits of an interconnected world such as travel and international cuisine whilst being less keen on showing hospitality to foreigners, strangers and immigrants.

Transnationalism and transmigration as a form of incorporation of migrants is vehemently discussed in the academic literature (Erdal and Oeppen, 2013, Anghel 2012, Guarnizo et al., 2003, Portes et al. 1992, Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004, Portes and Haller 2006). It is evident from the literature concerning international migration that the concept of transnationalism has also created significant interest in the recent past. In response to one way assimilation, American sociologists and anthropologists have introduced transnationalism as being a new model of belonging and incorporation (Hagan, 2006).

Transnationalism is a concept that allows individual immigrants to have multiple attachments. Contemporary works such as that of Clark (2009) which addressed the concept of nation state belonging among Asian Australians and the question of transnationals, is worthy of note. Using the data on an Australian survey of social attitudes, Clark found that migrants are likely to develop multiple attachments to local and global allegiances that lie beyond boundaries of the nation state. The study also found that Asian Australian migrants hold similar views to the rest of the Australian population towards the nation state.

Transnationalism has direct interactions with the processes of migrant integration. The question is, what are the relationships between the concepts of integration and transnationalism? Erdal and Oeppen (2013) identify four different, overlapping positions in the literature about this relationship. Firstly there is the alarmist view – divided loyalty preventing migrants from integrating fully in the host community, then there is the less alarmist but pessimistic view that the state's transnational activities may help the integration of migrants who hold less human and cultural capital. This is followed by the positive position which states that integration and transnationalism could be mutually supportive, and finally there is the fourth proposition which states that transnational ties exist alongside processes of integration, so the concepts are not mutually exclusive (pp. 872-873). Central to the debates of transnationalism is the question of how migrants should organise themselves, or whether or not transnationalism is at odds with nationalism. This debate is concerned with how migrants' transnational posture interacts with the model of integration that is adopted by the state. In answering this important question, Erhkamp (2013) informs us that national models of integration alone do not shape the incorporation of migrants. In a study of ethnic Romanians who migrated to Germany and Romanian migrants who migrated to Italy, Anghel (2012) found that migrants' transnational involvement plays a crucial role in their status and sense of success at a national level (pp. 322). In fact, researchers found that transnationalism both advances international trade and helps provide an income strategy for underprivileged migrants, however at the same time, it impedes adequate incorporation into the host society (Snel, Engbersen and Leerkes 2006).

Contemporary research into transnationalism mainly focuses on the study of a specific ethnic group's transmigration and is generally concerned with how transnationalism affects the integration of ethnic minority groups. For example, Erik Snel, Engbersen Godfried and Leerkes Arjen (2006) conducted a survey of 300 immigrants (from USA, Japan, Iraq, the former Yugoslavia, Morocco and the Dutch Antilles) and found that, in general, transnational involvement does not impede integration. However, migrant groups known for their poor integration levels have less involvement in transnational activities. In the case of Moroccans and Antilleans who had the weakest participation in the labour market , it was found that they identified more strongly with their country of origin than the migrants from other countries. In general, the concept of transnationalism is a politically sensitive subject within certain states and groups in various societies and it is seen to be at odds with integration and citizenship.

Transmigration is also a controversial issue when arguments about divided loyalty can be exploited by powerful groups and dominant host society members. In fact, Bloemraad (2004) made the observation that denial of citizenship was justified as it undermined the exclusive link between an individual and the sovereign nation state (p. 389). From the above discussions about academic discourses of integration, it is apparent that academic theories of integration include some that are critical of pluralist forms of integration, instead promoting the notions of conformity and uniformity. However, the vast bulk of scholarly literature tends to support pluralist notions of integration. Li (2003) argues that the concept of integration in academic discourse is primarily about how to bring together various elements of society, and is mainly concerned with social order and social change. From this understanding, it appears

that academic discourses about integration are generally more accommodating than state discourses concerning integration, as discussed above. Just like the state and the academic spheres, the media has weighed into the debate about migrant integration.

Media discourses of integration - sensationalism

In analysing the media discourse concerning integration, this review is seeking to shed light on the image that the media portrays of immigration and migrant integration. It is imperative to understand the way that the media reports issues about integration, and this understanding may provide insight into the role the media plays in building a socially cohesive and harmonious society. This literature review looked at the media discourses about integration, as the role that the media plays in pluralist societies is crucial in maintaining social cohesion. The media's profound effect on its consumers understanding of the world view should be considered in matters of immigration, as the media has an important role in the integration of new immigrants (Christoph, 2012). The media is often referred to as a social institution and a major element of contemporary western society. Matters relating to immigration are quite often newsworthy in the major migrant resettlement countries in the west. This is coupled with the media's distinctive informational source that functions as a powerful co-author of individual understandings of social matters (Matei, 2011: 86). In most media outlets, debates about migrant integration are polarised. The reasons for this can be attributed to the fact that through the media, social processes create narratives or stories within interpretive frameworks that are imbedded in the cultural and political assumptions of the wider society (Aly, 2007: 27). In fact, arguments are advanced which include "most of our social and political knowledge and beliefs about the world derive from the dozens of news reports we read or see every day" (Dijk, 2006).

The power of the news media to set a nation's agenda, to focus public attention on a few key issues, is an immense and well documented influence (McCombs 2004:87). In the case of the Romanian print press, Matei (2011) finds that negative media reporting about migrants is sensationalised, relies on evidence based on isolated cases, lacks context and has a high degree of generality. Consumers rely heavily on the media's discourse about integration. In fact, claims have been made that "not only do people acquire factual information about public affairs from the news media, readers and viewers also learn how much importance to attach to a topic on the basis of the emphasis placed on it in the news" (McCombs 2004). The role of media in society is understood to be even deeper than news provision, as it is seen to also set public policy agenda. As McCombs (2004) states, the agenda-setting influence of the news media is not limited to this initial step of focusing public attention on a particular topic, but also influences the next step in the communication process, our understanding and perspective of the topic in the news.

With its powerful influence and its ability to set the agenda for society and influence public opinion, the media's discourse concerning integration is quite different to that adopted by governments and as stated in the vast bulk of academic literature. The role the media plays in the important debates and public discussions about migrant integration are usually negative. Regrettably, studies have shown that the media discourse concerning integration tends to represent negative reporting of news about ethnic minorities (Christoph, 2012). Issues of migration and integration are negatively reported in the Dutch media (Roggeband and Vliegenthart, 2007) as well as in the English media (Luchtenberg and McClelland,1998). In Australia, Muslim immigration has received a vast amount of negative media reporting, specifically in matters relating to Muslims' integration into the wider Australian society (Aly, 2007; Celermajer, 2007; Rane and Abdalla, 2008; Rane and Hersi, 2012).

The media's negative representation of migrants in general, and Muslims in particular, is different in Australia and in some West European countries. For example, a comparative

study conducted by Luchtenberg and McClelland (1998) found that Australia's print news media was more accommodating of diversity and multiculturalism than the German print news media. Despite this difference, the media's negative reporting of Muslim integration in Australia is well documented. Nearly 2.2 percent of the Australian population identify themselves as Muslims (ABS, 2011). Despite their numbers being insignificant in comparison with the rest of the population, Australian Muslims receive more attention than any other group in the media and in parliamentary politics (relating to immigration, policing, national security and integration, etc.) (Eric and Nahid, 2008: 18).

Debates about the integration or lack thereof of Australian Muslims continue to dominate the media in many western countries. It is therefore imperative to examine the way these important debates about Muslim integration are reported in Australia's print news media. Rane and Hersi (2012) found that the issues of Muslim integration reported in four of Australia's major newspapers, namely *The Age, The Australian,* the *Sydney Morning Herald* and *The Courier Mail* are biased. Using a framing perspective, the study found that the issue of Muslim integration occurs most frequently in coverage concerning the debates over multiculturalism and Australian values, as well as debates about terrorism and radicalisation. However, in only a minority of articles is any definition of integration provided. When the term is defined, cultural and civic indicators are most frequently used. Very few articles discuss integration in terms of legal, economic, political or broader social indicators. *The Australian's* press coverage of Muslim integration contains both favourable and pejorative representations of Muslims; on balance the coverage could not be said to be either pro or anti-Muslim. However, the coverage tends to focus on certain themes that represent only a minority of Muslims, such as radicalisation and terrorism, the emphasis on which is likely to negatively impact on social inclusion (Rane and Hersi 2012). Overall, the concern is that the press coverage of Muslim integration is unlikely to make any positive contribution to social inclusion. Rather, it is most likely to reinforce Muslim perceptions of social exclusion, and perceptions of Muslims among the wider society as the `other`.

It is argued that „the construction of Muslims as a homogenous unit enables the media to create narratives that both reflect and shape the cultural and political assumptions of the wider community vis-a-vis the Australian Muslims" (Aly, 2007:28). Questions that therefore remain unanswered include whether or not the media discourse about integration plays a positive role in shaping society's opinions and views about migrants. The media, as an intervening agency, has the potential to create the grounds in which migrants and non-migrants share a sense of belonging (Matei 2007, 86). However, the media discourse concerning integration is prone to be distorted by one's inclination to choose a particular definition of integration that supports one's own views of the world. For instance, activities and behaviours that impede the integration of Muslims into Australian society, such as discrimination, seem to be absent from this media discourse. This point is noted by Etzinger and Biezeveld, (2006) who claimed that discrimination, both in its covert form, that is, denying an immigrant a job, and its overt forms mainly referred to as "structural discrimination", impedes integration. For this reason, knowing the reported cases of discrimination, perceptions of migrants by the host society, incidence and effects of diversity policies and the role of the media need to become a part of the measurement of the level of integration of migrants (Entzinger and Biezeveld, 2006). Overall, the media's choice of how it portrays migrants and ethnic minorities may enhance or reduce the integration of migrants into their host societies. For instance, this choice might involve creating an image of immigrants as an indivisible group which may portray them negatively, or as individuals which portrays them positively (Christoph 2012, 977).

Conclusion

This literature review reveals the competing views of the discourses about integration between policy makers, academics and media outlets. The harmonisation of these competing views of what integration means may help relationships between members of a host society and the newcomers to that society. The review noted that whilst most state discourses have both assimilationist and pluralist discourses about integration, the non-state discourses tend to be mainly pluralistic, if not universalistic. In fact, by comparing assimilationist and pluralist discourses into integration, Doomernick and Knippenberg   (2003) conclude that "integrationist models of immigrant incorporation appear to be superior to assimilationist models because of their culturally-pluralistic basis (p.46)". The debates concerning the integration discourses become more complex when integration is also linked to the particular incorporation model that a particular state chooses to adopt. For example, the concept of multiculturalism is debated in the context of immigrant integration. This lack of a uniform discourse about integration between these important players may lead to confused public narratives of integration which have the potential to undermine social cohesion. In order to move forward, debates about discourses of integration rather require a balanced approach which examines the substance of the discussions and explores the similarities and differences between the various discourses about integration.

For instance, this review finds that academic theories suggest a notion of integration that mainly emphasises the interconnectedness of the world and the impact of the movement of people, therefore promoting a diversity management process that accommodates newcomers and immigrants. It can be argued that this notion of integration is influenced by the world's rapid advancement of technological and telecommunications fields, making it easier for people of diverse backgrounds to interact around the world. On the other hand, state discourses of integration appear in general to favour the normative conformist expectations of society. Emphasis seems to be on how immigrants are faring in the wider society, disregarding the acculturation processes that host society members must consider. With the exception of Dandy's (2009) research, most of the reviewed academic literature focuses on the newcomer and neglects the intergroup relations and dynamics that are involved in the integration process. This is despite research indicating that attitudes, beliefs and behaviours of host society members have a considerable influence on the experiences of newcomers (Bourhis, Moise, Perreault and Senecal, 1997). The media discourses concerning integration are guided purely by considerations about profit. Freeman (2004) asserts how media recognises that the major consumers of daily news are the members of the host society, rather than being people within the minority migrant groups. Integration debates between these three important actors are carried on with the exclusion of immigrants, and demands for assimilation while, at the same time, embracing multiculturalism (Freeman 2004).

This current study concludes that the existence of the above diverse discourses of integration, characterised by distinct sectoral and level analysis, further polarises the debates concerning immigrant integration. This review has provided an overview of the different discourses and has explained how each one of these discourses puts emphasis on aspects of integration which are generally negligible, or which are omitted from the other discourses about integration. This review also found that absent from the debates of the discourses of integration is the individual migrant's understanding and experience of integration with reference to their families and household experience. This is an aspect that is particularly ignored by the current immigrant integration scholarly literature. This review notes that debates about the discourses of integration tend to be either politicised as is the case with state discourses, dramatised as is the case with media discourses or bloated as is the case with academic theories.

References:

Aly, A. (2007) Australian Muslim Responses to the Discourse on Terrorism in the Australian Popular Media, *Australian Journal of Social Issues Vol.42 No.1 pp. 27-39*

Anghel, R. G. (2012) On successfulness: How National models of integration policies shape migrant's incorporation, *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies, vol, 10, pp. 319-337.*

Bloemraad, I. (2004). Who Claims Dual Citiizenship? The Limits of Postnationalism, the Possibilities of Transnationalism, and the persistence of Traditional Citizenship. *International Migration Review, 38*(2), 389-426.

Bloemraad, I. Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada, University of California press Ltd, London, England, 2006.

Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A, Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Asimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State. *Annual Review of Sociology* Retrieved 09/07/2008, 2009

Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International journal of psychology*, *32*(6), 369-386.

Castles, S. Challenges to National Identity and Citizenship: A Comparative Study of Immigration and Society in Germany, France and Australia. Wollongong, N.S.W.: University of Wollongong, 1999.

Castles, S., & Davidson, A. Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.

Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World (2nd ed.). Basingstoke, [U.K.]: Macmillan, 1998.

Castles, S and Miller, Mark J. The Age of Migration, New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Christoph, V. (2012) The Role of Mass Media in the Integration of Migrants, *International Mind Brain and Education, vol 6, 2, 97-107*

Clark, J. (2009). Nation-State Belonging among Asian Australians and the Question of Transnationalism. *International Sociological Association, 57*(27), 27-48.

Celermajer, D. (2007) If Islam is Our Other, Who Are 'We'? *Australian Journal of Social Issues, Vol.42 No.1, pp. 103-122*

Dandy, J. (2009) Refugee and Migrant Integration: Examining the discourse of the dominant, *Tamara Journal, vol 8, 2, pp. 225-233.*

Van Dijk, Teun A. "Discourse, context and cognition." *Discourse studies* 8.1 (2006): 159-177.

Doomernik, J., & Knippenberg, H. Migration and Immigrants: Between Policy and Reality. Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers, 2003.

Ehrkamp, p. (2006) We Turks are not German": Assimilation discourse and the dialectical construction of identities in German', *Environment and Planning Vol 38, 9, pp. 1673-1692.*

Entzinger, H., & Biezeveld, R. (2006) Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration, Rotterdam: European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations .

Erdal, M. B and Oeppen, C. (2013) Migrant Balancing Acts: Understanding the Interactions Between Integration and Transnationalism, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, Vol 39, 6, pp. 867-884.*

Freeman, G. P. (2004) Immigrant Incorporation in Western Democracies, Centre for Migration Studies, Vol 38, 3, pp. 945-969.

Gans, H. J. Toward a Reconcilliation of "Assimilation" and "pluralism": The Interplay of Acculturation and Ethnic Retention. In Kivisto, P. (Ed.), Incorporating Diversity: Rethinking Assimilation in a Multicultural Age. London: Paradigm Publishers, 2005.

Glazer, N. Is Assimilation Dead? In Kivisto, P. (Ed.), Incorporating Diversity: Rethinking Assimilation in a Multicultural Ag*e* (pp. 113-127). Colorado: Paradigm Publishers, 2005.

Gordon, M. The Nature of Assimilation: In Assimiliation of American life, New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Guarnizo, L. E, Portes, D. A. and Haller, W. (2003), Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants, American Journal of Sociology, Vol 108, 6. pp. 1211-1248.

Hagan, J. (2006). Negotiating Social Membership in the Contemporary World. *Social Forces, 85*(2), *631-642.*

Heisler, B. S. (1999). The Future of Immigrant Incorporation: Which Models? Which Concepts? In Vertovec, S. (Ed.), *Migration and Social Cohesion,Vol. 2, pp. 117-142.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jayasuria, L. (1990). Rethinking Australian Multiculturalism: Towards a New Paradigm, *The Australian Quarterly, Vol 2, No: pp. 50-63.*

Jongkid, F. (1992) Ethnic Identity, Societal Integration and Migrant's Alienation: State Policy and Academic Research in the Netherlands, *Ethnic and Racial Studies, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 365-380*

Joppke, C. Immigration and The Nation-State. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Kivisto, P. Incorporating Diversity: Rethinking Assimilation in a Multicultural Age. Boulder, Colorado, Paradigm Publishers, 2005.

Kolig, Erich and Kabir, Nahid (2008) Not Friend, Not Foe: The Rocky Road of Enfranchisement of Muslims into Multicultural Nationhood in Australia and New Zealand, *Immigrants & Minorities, 26: 3, 266 — 300*

Legrain, P. Immigrants Your Country Needs them. London: Little, Brown, 2006.

Li, P.S. (2003). Deconstructing Canada's Discourses of Immigrant Integration, *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *Vol 4, 3. pp. 315-333.*

Luchtenberg, S and McClelland, N. (1998) Multiculturalism, Migration and Racism: The Role of the Media. A Comparative study of Australian and German Print Media, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Vol 19:2. Pp. 187:206

Matei, S (2011) Media and Migration: Layers of Knowledge in Romanian Written Press, *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology*, *Vol 2:2. Pp. 85-102*

McCombs, M and Shaw, D. (1972). The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *Vol 36, p. 176-187.*

Mogahed, D., & Nyiri, Z. (2007). Re-inventing Integration: Muslims in the West. *Courting Africa, 29(2), 2-20.*

Morawska, E. In Defense of Assimilation Model. In Kivisto, P. (Ed.), Incorporating Diversity: Rethinking Assimilation in a Multicultural Age (pp. 128-137). Colorado: Paradigm Publishers, 2005.

National Multicultural Advisory Council. (1999). Australian Multiculturalism for a New Century: Towards   Inclusiveness.   retrieved   19/09/2013   from: http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/multicultural/nmac/chapt_2a.htm

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G.   Religion: The Enduring Presence (pp. 299-341). Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Portes, A. Haller, W. (2003) Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants, *American Journal of Sociology, Vol 108, 6, pp. 1211-1248.*

Poynting, S. (2009). The 'Lost' Girls: Muslim Young Women in Australia, *Journal of Intercultural Studies, Vol 30, no. 4, pp: 373-386*

Rane, H. and Abdalla, M. (2008), Mass Media Islam: The Impact of Media Imagery on Public Opinion, *Australian Journalism Review, Vol. 30(1), pp. 39-49*

Rane and Hersi (2012) Meaimgs of integration in the Australian Press Coverage of Muslims: Implications for Social Inclusion and Exclusion, *Media International Australia* Issue 142, p135

Roggeband, C. and Vliegenthart, R. (2007) Divergent Framing: The Public Debate on Migration in the Dutch parliament and Media, 1995-2004, *West European Politics,* vol. 30, 3. Pp. 524-548.

Samani, S. (2007). Rhetoric and Realities of Multiculturalism: The Perpetuation of Negative Constructions of Muslims in Australia. *International Journal of Diversity, 7(2), 113-119*.

Shadid, W. A. (1991). The integration of Muslim minorities in the Netherlands. *International Migration Review, 25*(2*), 355-374.*

Skirbis, Z., Kendall, G., & Woodward, I. (2004). Locating Cosmopolitanism Between Humanist Ideal and Grounded Social Category. *Theory, Culture and Society, 21(6), 115-136*.

Skrbis, Z., & Woodward, I. (2007). The Ambivalence of Ordinary Cosmopolitanism: Investigating the Limits of Cosmopolitan Openess. *The Sociological Review, 55(4), 730-746*.

Snel, E, Engbersen, G and Leerkes, A (2006). Transnational Involvement in Social Integration, *Global Networks, Vol 6, no. 3 pp. 285-308*

Soysal, Y. N. G. Limits of citizenship: migrants and postnational membership in Europe. Chicago: University of Chicago 1994.

Tate, J. (2009). John Howard's "Nation" and Citizenship Test: Multiculturalism, Citizenship and Identity*, Australian Journal of Politics and History, Vol 55, no: 1, pp. 97-120*

Thomas, E. R. (2006). Immigration and Changing Defintions of National Citizenship in France, Germany, and Britain. *French Politics, 4, 237-265.*

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. (1994). Social Integration: Approaches and Issues. Paper presented at the World Summit for Social Development. Retrieved from http://www.unrisd.org

Weiner, M. Determinants of Immigrant Integration: An International Comparative Analysis. In S. Vertovec (Ed.), Migration and Social Cohesion. Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc., 1996.

Woodward, I., Skrbis, Z., & Bean, C. (2008b). Attitudes Towards Globolisation and Cosmopolitanism: Cultural Diversity, Personal Consumption and the National Economy. *The British Journal of Sociology, 59*(2*), 207-226.*