

**Scholten, Peter. 2011. *Framing Immigrant Integration: Dutch Research-Policy Dialogues in Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
314 pages. ISBN: 9789089642844**

Anna Schlumbohm, Berlin Graduate School of Social Sciences

Scholten aims to explain why recent changes in immigration policies have occurred. More specifically, he argues that the relationship between research institutions and policy makers has shifted over time and that this has a direct impact on the definitions and goals of integration policies. Generally, the book provides the reader with clearly presented arguments on forms of governance and integration issues. In his thorough and detailed research, Scholten uses all data sources available and combines and presents them with great care in order to make the reader understand how exactly the given changes took place. His theoretical chapters are innovative and helpful and combine practise theories with ever more important insights on the interdependence of science and politics.

It is perhaps Scholten's most important innovation that he analyses changing integration policies *as such* instead of taking them as vantage point for further analysis. This enables us to question the usefulness of presumed national models (e.g. Great Britain is multiculturalist whereas Germany is an assimilationist country) and provides a more detailed and complex picture of recent immigration history.

Drawing on Bourdieu, Scholten uses a structuralist-constructivist approach. He holds that models of integration are in fact products of structured social relations and are therefore not a given but can constantly change. More specifically, he argues that the distribution of power and the 'rules of the game' are manifested in dealings between actors from science and politics. This can then explain

how and why these specific actors construct the research-policy nexus at hand. Scholten identifies four types of 'boundary configurations', which are differentiated by the demarcation of field structures (divergence vs. convergence) and the coordination of field structures (scientific vs. political primacy). The boundary configurations thus differ with respect to who has the final word and whether the two fields compete with each other or do in fact cooperate.

With the help of these models he explains how different types of integration policies have emerged in the Netherlands. After a period of differentialist integration policies in the 1970s, the early 1980 were characterised by a multiculturalist model of integration. This, according to Scholten, was a direct outcome of a specific boundary configuration (the Technocratic model) where a convergence between science and politics coincided with scientific primacy. This is so, because this specific boundary configuration confined policy development to a limited network of actors that shared a certain focus on minorities and also advocated a specific and favourable approach towards minorities. It also offered some structural opportunities as well constraints for a critical dialogue between research and policy.

In the late 1980s integration policy in the Netherland shifted towards a more universalist model in which immigrants were no longer seen as part of a certain minority but as a single category of individuals and equal citizens. The Universalist model also focused more on social-economic participation of immi-

grants. The key driving force for this change was, argues Scholten, the Enlightenment model of boundary configuration where science and politics diverge and scientific primacy remains. This led to an opening up of the policy field and subsequently challenged the old model of multiculturalism by inviting open discussions about immigrant integration.

From the year 2000 onwards, the so-called assimilationist turn caused a stronger focus on social-cultural differences between immigrants and the native population which could, it was argued, form obstacles to immigrants' social-economic participation. The prevailing Engineering model was characterised in this period by the political primacy of a few actors and a pick-and-choose attitude towards science. This strategically prevented more in-depth discussions about the use of integration policies and possible alternatives.

In a comparison with France, Germany, and the United Kingdom Scholten finds that the Technocratic model seems to be linked to multiculturalist policies. Similarly, a lack of institutionalisation of integration policies (like in Germany until 2000) leads to a more universalist integration policy. Finally, once immigrant integration becomes politicised, immigration policy turns more assimilationist.

To Scholten's credit, he highlights the importance and the actual *effect* social science research has on the 'real world'. He provides the reader with a very informative and convincing story by drawing a complete picture of both, political and scientific actors as well as their interactions. Immigrant integration research in the Netherlands thus is a prime example of how social science does not always remain in its ivory tower.

Similarly, the focus on the development of different models of integration is important and long overdue. The simple categorisation of countries into different types of integration models does no longer fit the reality. This is also why the comparison with France, Germany, and the United Kingdom is so interesting. Here, Scholten shows that models of integration have changed constantly over time and within different countries and can no longer be presumed a 'given'.

Unfortunately, Scholten's book does not display sufficient counterfactual thinking. The developed theory fits the data well but what the author repeatedly calls 'contextual developments' might well be *reasons* for a change in integration policy instead of mere surroundings. For Scholten, the main explanatory variable for policy change is the research-policy nexus. The discussed policy changes might, however, simply be a reaction to transformed socio-political settings, an altered economic situation, or the realisation that more immigrants stayed than anticipated. This is not to say that the nexus has not played an important part in the development of integration policies. It merely means that Scholten's argument would be more convincing had the author taken greater care to rule out other possible reasons for policy change.

Overall, the book is an important contribution to the field of immigrant integration research. By changing the perspective and making models of integration the object of research, Scholten draws our attention to the changing nature of presumably stable paradigms. This book is of interest to sociologists, political scientists and policy-makers who are interested in immigrant integration policies in Europe.

Citation:

Schlumbohm, Anna. 2011. Review of *Framing Immigrant Integration: Dutch Research-Policy Dialogues in Comparative Perspective* by Peter Scholten, *Berlin Reviews in Social Sciences*, Review No. 3.

The views expressed in the Berlin Reviews in Social Sciences are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the BGSS or of Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. The copyright stays with the author(s).