International Workshop: Reimagining Social Policy Toward Transnational Social Support

The 4th International Meeting of the "Transnational Social Support" Research Network

Kimberley Veller

Edited by Petra Molnar Diop

10/11/2012

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

TRANSNATIONAL SOCIAL SUPPORT
International Research Cluster

TRANSNATIONAL SOCIAL SUPPORT
DFG Research Training Group 1474 : University Mainz University Hildesheim

International Workshop: Reimagining Social Policy Toward Transnational Social Support
The 4th International Meeting of the "Transnational Social Support" Research Network

Kimberly Veller
Edited by Petra Molnar Diop
York University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
October 11th and 12th, 2012

Introduction

The 4th International Meeting of the Transnational Social Support Research Cluster took place at York University, Canada. It was jointly organized by Luann Good Gingrich of York University and Stefan Köngeter of Hildesheim University, with generous support from York University's Centre for Refugee Studies and funding provided by the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), York University (the Office of the Vice President of Research and Innovation, and the Faculty of Liberal Art & Professional Studies), and the Transnational Social Support Research Cluster. As stated in the workshop program, "transnational social policy is defined by the reciprocal transformation of national welfare states, policy systems, and formal and informal social support practices due to ongoing interconnections and flows of people, labour, capital, objects, institutions, knowledge, ideas, and models across national boundaries" (Glick Schiller & Levitt, 2006, p. 5). More than 40 scholars from North America, Europe, Australia, and Asia contributed to a rich and varied dialogue on transnational social policy and its implications for the provision of social support.

The Workshop Program and Format

The workshop took place over the course of two days, both of which showcased specific themes and concepts situated within panel presentations. These were enhanced by the addition of question and answer periods, poster presentation sessions, and a round table discussion at the culmination of the proceedings. While there was a remarkably diverse range of research interests presented by members of the Transnational Social Support Research Network, the workshop demonstrated cohesion in terms of the overarching theme as well as a tremendous potential for future collaborations and joint endeavours, which are outlined at the end of this report.

Presentations and Panel Discussions: Day One

The first half of day one saw an introductory presentation made by Stefan Köngeter and the opening address by Rianne Mahon. This was followed by the first panel of the workshop, entitled *Transnational Ideas – The Transnationalization of Policy Models*, which included four papers by Kirsten Scheiwe, Karen Swift and Daniel Kikulwe, Sofia An, and Frank Wang and Yu-Hui Lu. This panel was chaired by Julie Young.

Stefan Köngeter delivered the introductory address, *Reimagining Social Policy Toward Transnational Social Support,* situating the broader theme of transnational social policy firmly in the proceedings of the day. Köngeter argued the need for transnational perspectives on the political economy of care that highlight interdependency, drew attention to the growing transnationalization of the nation state and their institutions, and underscored the significance of the transnationalization of ideas and knowledge in the recent developments of social policy. He argued that on the level of ideas and knowledge one can clearly state an ongoing transnationalization and globalization process, but he was sceptical about the

optimistic assertion of Bob Deacon that we are on our way to a global welfare state. He posed this question to the group: Does the research of the workshop participants support this much-invoked development?

In *The OECD's Search for a New Social Policy Paradigm: From Welfare State to (Gendered) Active Society*, **Rianne Mahon** discussed the changing social policy paradigm of the OECD from a welfare state to what she phrased as a (gendered) active state. She asked: Is the OECD a purveyor of neoliberal social policy ideas (as Porter and Craig argue) or an early promoter of social investment as an alternative to neoliberalism (as per Jenson)? She argued that its initial version of social investment was consistent with a neoliberalism workfare orientation. However, resistance to neoliberalism within the Secretariat, as well as among member countries, opened the way for a more progressive version of the OECD, which recognized the need for a combination of social investment and social protection. Its subsequent incorporation of a gender perspective marked the return to the principle of universality, at least for all families with children. She concluded that the crisis of the Keynesian welfare state pushed OECD SA directorate to rethink goals and means of welfare state. The shift from universal to targeted programs within an 'active society' paradigm added a liberal social spin with practical applications, particularly in the workfare mandate. There was the rediscovery of universality and ultimately of gender equality (at least for heteronormative families). Mahon finished her remarks with a question – what impact does the current crisis and revived neoliberalism has on the advice and the mandate of the OECD?

Discussion
The questions and subsequent discussion raised by Rianne Mahon's talk drew on examining the connections between the current economic crisis and the move to recharge neoliberalism. More bluntly, is anybody making the connection that this approach will not work? The 2011 Minister's report was raised and it was agreed that it recognized that social policies must incorporate spending and economics. The discussion remained optimistic about the Global Social Protection Initiative of the ILO that was launched in 2009. However, it was noted that while there has been criticism of some European countries, the wider discussion remains silent on the United States, which has one of the worst records on social policies. The Economic Commission on Latin America was also raised, and lauded for pushing for more gender equality. Throughout the discussion, it became apparent that the Global South has become a much more important player in this new social policy paradigm.

Panel 1: *Transnational Ideas – The Transnationalization of Policy Models*

This panel focused on the transnationalization of social policy through the lenses of various comparative policy models, with case studies of various travelling transnational ideas and their social policy implementations from all around the world.

Kirsten Scheiwe spoke on the topic of *Kindergarten as a 'Traveling Idea' – A Comparative and Historical Approach.* Working with the case study of kindergarten, and examining locations within Europe and North America, Scheiwe highlighted the critical importance of situating research related to knowledge production and evolution within a historical framework. Her presentation demonstrated the wide range of factors that facilitate and hinder knowledge traveling, as well as those which impact the way ideas are taken up by different actors within different states. In particular, she highlighted the state and church conflict and the competition for resources at the end of the 19th century. The balance of power between church (particularly the Catholic Church) and state and their negotiations were decisive for the institutionalization of kindergarten.

Karen Swift and Daniel Kikulwee delivered a paper on *Child Protection: Transnational Comparisons,* which focused on the implementation of the *Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)* in Sub-Saharan Africa. Kikulwe and Swift introduced two models of implementation, calling attention to the relevance of the CRC's western origins and ideologies. Ultimately, they argued that underlying social and economic issues in the global South must be addressed before child rights can be fully realized and further, that those rights may not easily translate into a homogenous, universalized document.

Discussion

The discussion after the first two speakers in the panel centered on the travelling of ideas within social policy. Reference was made to three different ways in which ideas can travel: through individuals; epistemic communities; international or global institutions (unions, World Bank, churches). Ideas around the development of the CRC and its roots in 20th century imperialistic practices in Sub-Saharan Africa were raised, in particular highlighting the construction of the idea of the child as an entity, as there are great differences in the conceptions of what constitutes a child in different cultural and societal settings. Ideas of differing relationships between the state and its institutions, in particular the colonial state and conceptions of the 'proper' ways to be, were also raised as potential difficulties in the transnationalization of ideas and the travelling of social policy and knowledge. Importantly, once ideas receive political support, they travel differently, through national and then international institutions, though they adapt and vary at the national level.

Following the first half of the panel, **Sofia An and Adrienne Chambon** delivered a paper on *Transnational Dimension of Social Policy in the Context of post-Soviet 'Transition': The Case of Kazakhstan.* An and Chambon explored the development of social policy within the context of post-socialist or post-soviet society. Their deliberative use of the transnational approach reveals the translation processes that are involved when trans- and international social policy agencies encounter other actors in the welfare pentagon. This welfare pentagon includes the family, national NGOs, transnational organizations, the market and the state. An and Chambon focused on the development of child labour policy in Kazahkhstan in the soviet and post-soviet era with a special focus on the role of International Labour Organization and its approaches of using legal instruments and offering technical assistance.

Frank Wang and Yu-Hui Lu delivered a paper entitled: *When Clubhouse Meets Chinese Culture: The Story about Clubhouse Idea Traveling in Taiwan.* Picking up on the theme of traveling ideas and knowledge transformation, Wang and Lu looked at the crucial roles of culture and economics in impacting the ways in which ideas are taken up and adapted in new contexts. Having been the person to introduce the clubhouse structure to Taiwan, Wang drew on his intimate knowledge of its evolution in the nation to argue that changing models should not necessarily be viewed as a negative phenomenon.

Discussion

Some ambivalence was expressed about the conceptualization of the NGOs as a force of good in Sofia An's presentation. An responded that she did not intend to idealize the NGOs in Kazakhstan but she did think that they are important in revealing the interdependency and the struggle for agency in transnational networks. The process of forming and shaping transnational social policy can provoke change, and the idea of policy translation and the travelling of ideas is inspiring in its ability to bring about hope. Actors can actively translate knowledge and ideas, which is empowering at the state level. NGOs are easily criticized but they do have an important role to play in the implementation of policy

and in creating new ideas. Reference was made to the conception of CRC as being part of a dialogue and that it can also highlight how some practices can encourage policy translation and adaptation.

The discussion highlighted that it was interesting to have both historical and contemporary perspectives so far in the workshop presentations. Presentations more focused on contemporary transnational flows tended to give less emphasis to institutional roles, whereas historical presentations had heavy focus on their primacy. Ancient issues of child rights and religion for example may hold new knowledge and understandings for us now. An opening of the space of discussion was proposed, in which social policy can be viewed as a social movement, wherein a wide range of societal actors should be involved.

The catch term of 'idea' was also deconstructed in the discussion. Ideas are not single things, but a space, and a knowledge infrastructure. Knowledge infrastructure is institutionalized, but through what processes do they receive power, and through whom? Knowledge infrastructures are so powerful, as some are standardized, which makes it very difficult for other actors to openly engage with them. How do different knowledge infrastructures receive power? Which are powerful and which are not, and how did they come to be this way?

The second half of day included the second and third panel of the workshop. The second panel, entitled *Transnational Social Policy Between the Global North and South*, included presentations made by Wolfgang Schröer and Lucia Artner, Susan McGrath, and Katharina Mangold and was chaired by Hannah Rettig and Vincent Horn. The third panel, *Promoter, Preventer, and Profiteer of Transnationalization – The Changing Meaning and Function of the Nation State,* saw presentations by Seonggee Um, Wendy Smith, and Erica Righard and was chaired by Gavaza Maluleke.

Panel 2: *Transnational Social Policy Between the Global North and South*

The second panel of the day highlighted the messy nature of the traveling of social policy internationally, in particular between the Global North and Global South. Wolfgang Schröer and Lucia Artner's work provided a theoretical framework that served as a springboard for the two subsequent papers, which focused on two different locales: post-genocidal Rwanda and its social work practices; and the transnational volunteer services in Uganda.

Wolfgang Schröer and Lucia Artner presented *Delimitation of Social Policy. Care, Commons, Citizenship: The Three Cs of Transnational Social Work.* In it, they discussed the increasing permeability of borders, the dissolution of the three Cs: care, commons and citizenship, and challenges associated with social work in light of its dependency on normative understandings. Dr. Schröer and Ms. Artner posed several questions to the group, the most provocative of which asked if there can be citizenship without borders.

Discussion
This paper inspired a lot of discussion. A question was raised: Why so much reference to dissolution? Is transnational social policy not more about fortification and re-regulation? The discussion centered on the example of care workers who are now subject to the ILO regulations, showing a different direction from dissolution. It was then argued that putting all care work in the same box can homogenize a diverse phenomenon. The issue of differentiation and heterogeneity continued to flavour the discussion.

A response to this issue stated that new regulations cannot be discussed without also discussing dissolutions, as dissolutions often actually bring about new policies and regulations. It becomes about putting problems in new frames, which are comprised of the new dissolutions, and focusing on the dynamic processes of re-regulations and dissolutions. This is why a transnational lens is so important for us, in order to better understand the change, challenges, and the desire of nation-states to regulate social policy more stridently. The conflicts of our different perspectives of care are often not discussed in social work. We work with terms without addressing this conflicts, just like the term 'ideas' interrogated in the discussion for panel one. Wolfgang Schröer and Lucia Artner asserted that their argument is that the care discussion is not reflected enough in the debate on dissolution.

Second, **Susan McGrath** presented her paper *Academic Transnational Knowledge Exchange or Recolonization? Perspectives on a Rwanda/Canadian Research Collaboration,* which drew heavily on her role in a transnational research partnership. McGrath picked up on the themes of traveling ideas and knowledge production, and was careful to address the power imbalances inherent in North-South partnerships. Her presentation provided some best practice techniques for mitigating some of these dynamics.

Discussion
After hearing about the complicated situation in the Rwandan social work sector, the discussion that followed focused on the idea that when we speak of traveling ideas, we do not mention that ideas can also get lost. The travelling of ideas is not a linear process – they do not always come from or go somewhere. It is the process of transformation that is integral here, but this process may look different than expected. It may look better or worse, but who can decide what these terms actually mean? More importantly, in the case of Rwanda in particular, how do we negotiate the nature of best practices to support Rwandan needs? Accreditation support for their school of social work was mentioned as a possible point of support.

The issue of indigenous knowledge was also raised, and there was a general wish to know more about this. The theme of this discussion centered on the Western origin of social work and its colonialist nature. In particular, what is indigenous knowledge, when did it start, and how can it be defined in order to be utilized? Susan McGrath responded that social work as a discipline was not present in Rwanda prior to the 1994 genocide. The idea of care was always present, but the isolation of the villages played a big role. Post-genocide, the women responded by recognizing community needs and working to meet them. Then NGOs came in, with social work practice informing their work. In Rwanda, social work is very community-based, and very local. Importantly, little to no governmental support is required for this approach.

Katharina Mangold presented on her dissertation research in a paper titled *Transnationalization Versus Ethnicity Across Borders – German Volunteers in Uganda.* Mangold examined the Weltwärts international volunteer program through which German youth volunteer in the global south. Mangold looked at conceptions of transnationalism in terms of identity and place in the lives of volunteers. She introduced the idea of a complicated range of identities taken on by volunteers, which she described as being "either-or and not-only-but-also."

Discussion
This presentation generated a lively discussion, namely on the topic of the international volunteers. Critically important questions were raised: Given the ages of the volunteers, what do they give to Uganda? What skills do they have? What do the Ugandans get from having to host large numbers of German youth? Who supports these volunteers? These multilayered questions shed light on a problem

in international programs that have a development policy goal at their centre. Specifically, while transnational volunteers do bring some skills with them, they are not necessarily trained in the fields in which they volunteer. They can also experience positive racism (i.e. "white people are assumed to be good at math"). Crucially, an important question is: What do the Ugandans think of the German volunteers?

The mixed rationale behind the program was also discussed and it was proposed that another catchy term could be introduced to the discussion: "neither-nor," as in: neither do the volunteers learn the right thing, nor does development occur.

Panel 3: *Promoter, Preventer, and Profiteer of Transnationalization – The Changing Meaning and Function of the Nation State*

The last panel of the first day of the workshop examined the role of the state in three different locales and looked at the intersection of social care frameworks and the changing role and meaning of the nation state in the transnationalization of social policy.

Seonggee Um was regrettably absent, but Petra Molnar Diop read her paper, entitled *Transnational Elder Care Within Asia: Governing the Movement of Care To and From South Korea*. In it, she argued that the recruitment of migrant women in South Korea reinforces class and race identities and hierarchies, and that this phenomenon has come about through drastic change in South Korean society, as elder care was previously a family responsibility.

Wendy Smith presented *Examining Implications of National Policy Differences in the Management of Ethnic Diversity through a Focus on Social Protection On Turkish Muslim Migrant Communities in Australia and Germany.* She looked at transnationalism in terms of its ability to impact social inclusion and othering, and how cultures may inherently feature social protection. Against the background of the example of Zaqqat in Islam, she argued that religious transnationalism plays a decisive role in social service provision often neglected in the discourse on social policy.

Erica Righard presented on *Transnational Prospects in Swedish Social Policy or Social Prospects in Swedish Migration Policy*. Erica Righard examined the migration discourse in Sweden and the challenges for transnational social protection, particularly in relation to the labour market and networks of support. She drew from examples of refugees and healthcare migrant labour, challenged the notion of living in only one country, and asked the group whether Sweden should be seen as a promoter, preventer or profiteer of transnationalization.

Discussion
The discussion following Wendy Smith's paper centered on issues of integration, assimilation and multiculturalism and the differences between France, Germany and Australia were also discussed. The issue of social protection was also raised. Are the analyzed groups related to what is going on in the nation-states? Where do we see the differences in the groups analyzed? The mosque was highlighted as the central institution, the unit of analysis, and also the point of difference. In particular, in Australia, the state institutions are well-developed but they are not accessed to their potential. They are less established separately in Germany, but are more prominent in association with education systems. Though, in Germany, there is significant prejudice faced by youths in school in Germany.

The difficulties in migrant labour integration in Sweden were also raised, and it was noted that asylum

seekers can now apply for a work permit and have an opportunity to 'change track'.
Summary of Day 1:
Summary and Impressions of the First Day

- The presentations and discussions reminded of the need to examine care and social policy within the context of **socio-historical backgrounds**. The discussion centered on **the institutionalized aspects of social policy** over the last 150 years. More recently, the presence of INGOs, as well as faith-based communities and their philosophies of care have been added to the discussion. How do they graft onto local practices? Nation-states of the Global South are not empty vessels. Various philosophies of care exist outside of and perhaps in conjunction with Northern systems (Ubuntu in South Africa, for example). Also, the flow of gifts or the **transfer of care** needs to take into account countries of origin, resettlement, and return. What is left behind in such flows? There seem to be gaps filled by volunteers and NGOs. There are various levels of care in the workers that flow (doctors, domestic, sex workers). Borders are real because they are policed, but they are also facilitated. Wealthy countries restrict immigration and fail to demonstrate reciprocity, and often disallow rights to 'alien' residents.

- There is a tendency to stick to the national welfare state model. For example, this is evident when applying the notion of traveling, which may cover the conflicts that we seek to understand and mitigate. **Positions and belongings** are discussed, but what do they mean in terms of the welfare state? Who belongs and who does not? We must broaden our understanding of social policy and the position of the national welfare state in the context of today. Therefore, we must take into account the diversity in the various social relations that exist in categories of care, and how these variations in power and domination impact individuals and families.

- Also, the issue of **taxation** is relevant, in terms of tax-based social services. How do we consider this framework within the nation-state system? Who benefits and who pays? Both questions are profoundly important. Social work focuses on benefits, but not on payment. Equity is the big issue with payment – perhaps the only issue.

- The issues in the **flows** of people across national boundaries were also raised. Is Latvia expected to train the nurses for Norway? What happens when less wealthy nations invest in education, and subsequently loose highly educated persons through **labour migration**? Can/should there be mechanisms to combat this? Issues of technology can be the key here: people need not truly migrate to be migrant labourers.

- One of the key ideas today was the idea of **knowledge**. What is transnational knowledge? What are the different forms? What can we get out of it 'best practices' in terms of social support?

- The relation of **social support and social security**: they may interact and/or be contradictory, and are multilayered. Individuals use these concepts differently as well. The necessity of treaties and bilateral systems in managing and mitigating processes was raised.

- Idea of **transferring policy** that works. However, it may be too optimistic to assume that this is 'progress'. What works is often assimilated with what is cost effective.

Presentations and Panel Discussions Day Two

The first half of day two saw panel presentations. The first panel, entitled, *Transnational Social Policy from Below I – Migration, Vulnerability, and Refuge*, **included papers by Suzan Ilcan, Lenore Manderson, and Eberhard Raithelhuber and was chaired by Luann Good Gingrich and Stefan Köngeter. The second panel,** *Transnational Social Policy from Below II – Families and Care*, **included the work of Cornelia Schweppe, Hsiao-Chuan Hsia, and Kara Somerville and was chaired by Lucia Artner.**

Panel 3 – *Transnational Social Policy from Below I – Migration, Vulnerability, and Refuge*

The first panel of day two examined the movement of social policy from the ground up and provided a mix of case studies from different locales as well as conceptual formulations on boundaries, categories, and groupings within transnational social policy. Structural vulnerabilities were a theme running through all three papers.

Suzan Ilcan presented her paper on *Humanitarian Aid, Displaced Populations, and Demands for Transnational Social Support by Osire Camp Refugees.* In it, she explored the transnational dimensions of humanitarian aid using the case study of the Osire refugee camp in Namibia. Ilcan argued that emergency contexts lend themselves to the linking of certain groups, which may or may not pose problems for the authorities within those emergencies. She noted the centrality of space and place in the shaping of identity and political status. Ilcan finished by asking whether transnational policies are becoming more important in migrant rights, and if so, to what extent.

Lenore Manderson lectured on *Structural Vulnerability and Migrant Rights: Barriers to Support for New Immigrant Australians.* Her presentation looked at notions of belonging, and the concept of contingency, a term that highlights the limits of support that is available to migrants in a structurally vulnerable position. Manderson argued that geography reinforces social status for refugees in Melbourne, and that social capital takes different shapes in different contexts. She also highlighted the limitations to the capability approach and popular notions of agency, as these heavily relate to the precarious nature of citizenship for refugees. Manderson stressed the notion of structural violence, and the power of class, gender, and ethnicity in shaping refugees' lives and circumstances. Importantly, the fragility of being a refugee and the risk and precariousness of citizenship comes back to provisionality.

Eberhard Raithelhuber presented his conceptual paper, *Boundary Work and 'the Political' in Social Support Arrangements.* He asked: How does the issue of transnationalism inhere to migration service provisions? He introduced two important concepts: policing and the politics of social support, through which to understand the political within social policy, as per Ranciere's formulations. The central question is: How and why can the transnational dimension within everyday life of some people (not) emerge in direct support provision? Raithelhuber posed several difficult questions, including: Can transnational knowledge surface, or even be produced, within interactions within professional support contexts? Importantly, classification rules are applied by outside agents including social workers. There are mismatches between transnational realities as understood by migrants, and the policy decisions of nations in which they live. He ended with a thought provoking question: How are potential ruptures and disturbances within the given social policy police order possible?

Discussion

This panel generated lively discussion. The issue of structural vulnerability surrounded the debate. The model of the police state/politics was questioned, in particular the dichotomy, and the representation of transformation that is present in this model. It was argued that there is space for contestation; the space of politics and the police order is a negotiated state. Is it truly an either-or? Are there possible spaces of interaction between the police state and the politics as spaces, in which the participants are able to take up collaborative processes? Do they work together through dialogue? The issues of contestation and dissonance are very important to highlight. In relation to the Osire refugee camp, and throughout African refugee contexts, people are not passive victims. They resist, they connect themselves, and they demonstrate agency. They make use of resources including political organizations. NGO workers report that refugees try to impact social policy. There were resistance efforts within the camp, supported by outside NGOs: a transnational moment, and transnational resistance, that should not be thought of as localized.

The question of' the national' was also raised in relation to the three papers. Refugee camps seem to be strategically organized and de-nationalized spaces. There is tension there between authority and care/humanitarian aid. A denationalization opens the space for humanitarian aid. However, people within the camp take up transnational linkages in which they may develop more agency, while citizenship rights can be structurally diminished. What role do transnational linkages play? Are they burdens or are they supportive of agency and/or political agency or people?

The title of the panel refers to "below" and "above", and it was noted that social relations in the transnational are not so clear. The below or above question is really interesting, as social work is often meant to focus on the 'below'. However, these two positions speak to each other and do overlap. From above, international and transnational organizations impose, transplant, and translate certain ideas in very localized sites. From below, camp residents speak to the challenges from above and identify problems, the need for help, and potential sources of support.

The question of the cross-cultural is interesting. The politicization of knowledge and its embedded nature is very important in a cross-cultural context. Nationalized spaces and de-nationalized spaces occur within nation-states with representation from multiple actors. Transnational actors, ideas and policies interact and are invoked here. Thus, marginalized populations in particular are cognizant of this, and it impacts the ways/extent to which they access and advocate for their rights. These spaces straddle national and transnational lines.

Panel 4 - *Transnational Social Policy from Below II – Families and Care*

This panel looked at the notions of families and care in a transnational policy framework through the focus on everyday life and care practices of families. The notion of the transnational family was carefully interrogated, as it is difficult to define such a heterogeneous concept.

Cornelia Schweppe presented a paper entitled *Transnational Family Care as a Challenge of National Family Policies or Transnational Families – National Social Policies*. In it, she examined the marriage migration and the role and nature of families. She argued that transnational families face precarious situations, and that such families are increasingly difficult to define. Transnational families are usually described as having lives spread across transnational borders. This does not refer only to modular groups such as migrants, but also to those for whom this lifestyle has been normalized. There must be a transnational opening of social policies relating to families that includes a critical reflection of family ideologies, support for the needs of transnational families, and social policies that address global inequalities.

Hsiao-Chuan Hsia presented on *Marriage Migrants, Migrant Domestic Women and Reproduction Crisis,* drawing on research carried out in Taiwan. Hsia drew attention to the reproductive crisis born of gender preferencing, and its impact on labour and marriage migration. She argued that sacred family units, as within Taiwanese culture, are being split apart by marriage migration for low-income families with few home care options and that there is a connection between marriage migrants and migrant domestic workers. The lack of migrant domestic workers leads to the unofficial 'policy' that "illegal" migrants, such as marriage migrants who get divorced, can still work as domestic workers. This is all within the framework of the reproduction crisis and the restructuring of reproductive labour. Taiwan uses migrant domestic workers as a substitute for family care for middle class families, and marriage migrants become a solution for low class and low income families requiring domestic care.

Kara Somerville delivered a paper on *Making Family: Transnational Caregiving as Gendered Work.* Her primary points were twofold: that women's everyday activities in the homes involve transnational linkages, and that the symbolic importance in such labour is the creation of transnational families. Looking at providing food and healthcare, Somerville drew from research on Indian immigrants in Toronto to argue that transnational relations that act to sustain families are highly gendered and that broader conceptions of transnational families are needed.

Discussion

The discussion following this panel focused on the tenuous definition of transnationalization and what it means to discuss so-called 'transnational families.' A concern was raised that the label of transnationalism can once again elide the profound differences in experience for families separated across borders and space. There are indeed different degrees of transnationalism among families. Kara Somerville argued that it is integral to allow respondents to explain and define who family is to them and that the symbolic meaning – what actually symbolizes family to the population in question – is the most important. Transnational ties also change and can diminish (or strengthen) in time, and in subsequent generations transnationalism may be practiced quite differently, especially for people whose transnationalism was initiated at early stages in their lives. For second generation migrants, marriage and children in particular prompt self-engagment in India, reconnecting with same age cousins and peers in India.

The issue of children of marriage migrants and marriages of convenience was also raised. What happens with their cultural and national identities? Do women maintain connections with their home countries? There appears to be a huge variety in responses to transnational marriages. However, it is important to also interrogate the terms we use to describe these couples. The term 'binational couples' was suggested instead of 'marriages of convenience.'

The second half of day two saw the last panel presentation of the workshop, *Canadian Social Policy and the Transnational Challenge,* which included papers by Daniel Schugurensky, Kalyani Thurairajah, Naomi Lightman, and Marjorie Johnstone, and was chaired by Jessica Carriere. There was also a roundtable discussion featuring presentations by Joe Manion of the City of Toronto, Social Services Division, Howard Duncan of the Metropolis Project, and Adrienne Wiebe, a policy analyst for the Mennonite Central Committee.

Panel 5 - *Canadian Social Policy and the Transnational Challenge*

This panel examined the impact of transnationalization on Canadian social policy. The issues of multiculturalism in Canada was raised and interrogated, as well as changes in the civic and political participation of transnational persons across borders. The last two papers in particular also examined the education context of transnational migration and how notions of western education can impinge on the creation, or omission, of, social care policy for transnational families.

Daniel Schugurensky gave a talk on *Transnationalism, Migration, and Civic/Political Participation: The Case of Latin Americans in Canada.* The study focused on the effects of transnationalism on political participation. He argued that there are significant changes in home country and third country politics, as well as the respondents' engagement in these. In particular, he highlighted the interconnectivity among people across national borders, which comes into play in examining 'host country politics' vs. transnational politics. He argued that there are three types of the latter: home country politics (media, campaigns, participation), third country politics (people who focus their civic work in other countries aside from their home), and 'global' politics (Amnesty, Greenpeace, etc.).

Kalyani Thuraiajah delivered a paper entitled *From Post-National to Multicultural: A Pilot Study of Toronto Students' Canadian Discourse,* in which she examined multiculturalism and the case study of Sri Lankan Tamils. She argued that Tamil Canadian students expressed disappointment in the reaction of broader Canadian society to the context of the Tamil Tigers, but that, fascinatingly, they were keen to maintain their Canadian identity. Experiences of ostracism did not impact their sense of belonging to the nation, but rather, their understanding of other people within it. She ended with a question: What do the reactions and the perceived reactions of the wider Canadian population suggest about the true nature of multiculturalism in Canada?

Discussion

The discussion centered on questioning whether the policy – or even the concept – of multiculturalism is working. The policy was set at a time in history when social policy rather than economic policy was dominant and Canada wanted to distance itself from the United States. It was designed to be a behaviour changing policy, a sort of social engineering. Clearly, it is flawed, and can be seen as overshadowing classism, which speaks of its superficiality. However, does it continue to have an impact? What are we or the government doing to ensure that the aspirations of multiculturalism are achieved?
Australia and the Netherlands also have official policies of multiculturalism, through which indiciduals are able to associate and affiliate with others. This relates to the complexity of identity and what informs and supports it. There is an issue of the limits of political affiliation. These go hand in hand with issues of citizenship, as do recent tensions such as islamaphobia. In response to Kalyani Thurairajah's presentation of her work with the Tamil population, notions of tolerance and acceptance and multiculturalism in Canadian society were discussed and debated. There was expressed agreement that it was better to have a policy of multiculturalism than not, but its superficiality was discussed as well. Discrimination factored heavily as an aspect of the interviews.

Importantly, multiculturalism is a framework. It does not deal with structural inequalities. There is no comparative control group, except perhaps the United States, to investigate the role of multiculturalism policy in combatting racism. Conflict related to culture, religion, ethnicity, and so on, are prominent for many nations and societies, and a variety of responses are evident. For example, the discourse in Spain has shifted to interculturalism, often within one social/geographic location. It is more about dialogue.

Naomi Lightman presented on the very early stages of her dissertation research with her paper entitled *From Post-National to Multicultural: A Pilot Study of Toronto Students' Transnational Ties and Economic Class.* She intends to examine the shifts in education policy in Canada and the heightened recognition of transnationalism. She plans to examine how Toronto schools are responding to (or not) the ongoing ties that some immigrant students maintain to their places of origin and whether transnational students think that their transnational linkages are recognized in any way by the school system.

Marjorie Johnstone delivered the final paper presentation on *Transnationalism, Education Migration and Canadian Discourse.* Eunjung Lee (who regrettably could not attend the workshop) and Marjorie Johnstone studied the figure of the *kirogi* mother in Canada, women who have traveled from South Korea with their children in order to support their international education. Their research is ongoing, but at this stage, the data suggests that mothers bear the burden for these educational decisions, and that the benefits for the family as a whole are not certain. Johnstone encouraged the group to consider notions of portable citizenship, as well as the lack of support for children (and their mothers) who migrate to the west for Western education, and what this may say about the construction and prioritization of knowledge.

Discussion
The debate following these last two papers focused on education in a transnational frame of reference. In particular, a challenge was raised in reimagining social policy within a transnational social support frame as embedded within the Westphalian context. There is a major challenge in reimagining Western education into a transnational frame. Is there any future for the Western educational system in a transnational movement? There are many links with the Fordist order, in which schools are expected to produce workers. However, Western education is in a powerful education system globally. There are particular concerns about hegemony and neoliberalism moving in a direction of instrumental, work-related subjects within Western education. It seems very problematic to transplant children into the Western system. What happens to diversity in our world? The loss of their cultural knowledge is a very serious issue that requires careful interrogation.

It is also crucial to not overlook issues of class and economic privilege of the transnational student. Also, a concern remains for the role of the teachers and whether or not the lack of social support for transnational students should become the responsibility of individual teachers. Individual teachers do not get any additional support services, are not provided with special training to deal with transnational students, and their teaching resources are depleted in every way. They are carrying the weight of neoliberal cuts, and must also deal with the needs of international students, who have been recruited, at least in part, for revenue generation..

Roundtable Discussion on Social Policy Practice and the Transnational Challenge

Joe Manion of the City of Toronto, Social Services Division, presented on the local welfare system and its transformation into a soft workfare system. Manion argued that the focus of the system and the people it is being applied to represent a significant gap. With the transnational nature of the city of Toronto, these drastic changes in the welfare system disproportionately impact immigrants, who are given less care and support and more encouragement to enter the workforce at any level and for any pay.

Howard Duncan of the Metropolis Project presented some recommendations for incorporating transnationalism into social policy formation. He argued that the strength of influence that homelands

have on families is considerable and must be taken into account in policies. Duncan also argued that we must better utilize the Canadian diaspora, and encourage those connections to remain strong, which will better support Canadians, and encourage migrants to make Canada their home.

Adrienne Wiebe, Latin American policy analyst with the Mennonite Central Committee, presented on transnationalism reproducing our understanding of people as commodities. She argued that in the context of Mexican immigration to the United States, legal or otherwise, it is employers who benefit through inexpensive labour, and banks who profit from remittances. Wiebe encouraged the group to consider their positionality when considering their understandings of migration.

Discussion
This roundtable presentation invited a lively discussion. The movement and discourse of policy frames were brought forth, as well as the local implications for these frames. In particular, the temporary foreign workers program in Canada was used as an example, to highlight the language usage around temporary foreign workers. Where does this language come from, who is pushed to use it, and why? Language has meaning and it is important to interrogate where these meanings come from and how they structure our world and understanding of social policy. In welfare, is the person a client, consumer, customer, dependent? Each classifying label conjures images and specific social expectations. The changes of language over time reflect changing ideologically-driven social relations..

On the issue of temporary foreign workers (TFW), in 2010, temporary foreign workers exceeded immigrants in Canada. We import more temporary labour than we allow immigration. People do choose to come, from among their options, and whether migrants aspire to Canadian citizenship must remain an empirical question. We need therefore to be careful not to impose our values and priorities onto others.. Multiple systems and structures perpetuate the importation of devalued labour, including the TFW program. Remittances are sometimes, problematically, discussed as a form of development. What of the issue of tax, as the Global North benefits from these flows? Who pays and who benefits from social policies? What kind of system could permit "foreign" labour to be beneficial for people's home countries?

Concluding Remarks

At the end of the roundtable discussion on day two of the Transnational Social Policy Workshop, some concluding remarks were made and future directions were outlines.

In particular, should Canadian aboriginal population be seen as victims of transnationalism, as appears to be the case in Australia? Should we be discussing this?

Also, the issues of geographic space and status need to be further interrogated. There are many groups who are excluded in national systems, such as Central American women who are often considered to be 'in between'. This liminality creates many opportunities. However, there are also refugee camps, in depoliticized spaces, and people without status anywhere who do not have access to many social policies. It would be also interesting to discuss undocumented peoples and create opportunities for people to discuss ideas and solutions in their own countries. There is the idea of nation-building in relation to those who fall outside the borders of the nation-state. We actually mean people who fall outside our idea of normal. We need to explore this, as it is deeper than state lines. We do not yet have the language to describe this.

Language and particularly the use of categories are very important in transnational social policy work. Also, so is the ability of national law to cope with transnationality and the role of the nation-state at the next level up. How can this be done? There is the example of the introduction of Shariah law being incorporated.

In the future, we want to continue exploring these and other issues within our research network as a decentralized work model with members in different countries coming together to share findings on transnational social policy.

Themes, Concepts and Issues for Further Research, Reflection and Discussion
- The necessity of socio-historical contexts
- The disproportionate harm of the (transferred) welfare state on low-waged families and women
- International NGOs cannot be understood as a homogenous, equally powered group
- The production of knowledge: global South and global North, collaboration and shared efforts, the ability of ideas to travel and the evolution that occurs when they migrate
- Defining transnational: there seemed to be unanimous support on definitions of transnational, but in discussing practical issues, parameters of research, and the family unit, there was dissent in discussion
- Labour migration and marriage migration
- People as commodities within a globalized, capitalist world
- The shift of social policy and social support (in some countries) to focus almost exclusively on employability
- The problematic conflation of migration policy with social support policy
- Nation-building

Unanswered Questions
- How should taxation work for persons who live transnationally?
- Who should pay taxes and who should benefit from them?
- What remains behind in countries of origin after flows of migrant labour to other countries?
- How do we determine who belongs and who does not?
- Should nations be compensated for providing migrant labour to other nations?
- What potential exists for transnational rights? Bilateral? Unilateral?
- What is transnational knowledge?
- Are successfully transferred policies simply cost-effective policies?
- Can transnational knowledge be produced or taken up within professional support contexts?
- How do spaces shape identity and political status of marginalized people?
- To what extent do migrants experience their living situations as within transnational space?
- From where does the demand for transnational social support originate?
- What is (or should be) the relationship between social work and social policy?
- Are transnational linkages burdens or supports for the agency of individuals?
- What is (and what is not) a transnational family?
- Are there successful examples of multiculturalism or multicultural policy?
- Does multiculturalism overshadow class issues?
- Is there value in discussing interculturalism as in Spain, rather than multiculturalism?

- How do (or how can) education systems respond to the ongoing ties that some immigrant students maintain to their places of origin?
- Whose responsibility is it to provide support for people in transnational contexts?
- Who should be eligible for social protection?
- What are the implications of children migrating to the global North for primary and secondary education, given the way in which knowledge is constructed?
- Do temporary migrant labourers want citizenship? Why or why not?
- Can national law cope with transnationality?

Acknowledgements

The workshop concluded with the final remarks and acknowledgements made by the organizers, Luann Good Gingrich and Stefan Köngeter. They attributed the success of the workshop to the interdisciplinary nature of the presentations, the provocative questions raised, and the enthusiastic participation of the attendees.