

MACIMIDE Report

20 January 2025

11th MACIMIDE Annual Work Conference

Conference Report 2024

By **Lilli Schorpp, Guillermo Roy García and Talitha Dubow**

With contributions from Amirhossein Chitsazzadeh, Ana Filipa Cândido, Dieudonné van de Willige, Giulia Mori, Huub L.M. Mudde, Jasmin Lilian Diab, Julia Reinold, Katarzyna Strąk, Lalaine Siruno, Manisha Mukherjee, Marrit Westerweel, Matilde Perotti, Ngoc Hân Nguyen, Obaa Akua Konadu-Osei, Onallia Osei, Rahwa Yemane, Ruben Tans, Stanislav Avdeev, Susanne Sivonen, Tineke Strik and Tobias Hillenbrand.

MACIMIDE is Maastricht University's interdisciplinary research centre for interfaculty collaboration in the fields of migration, mobility, citizenship, development, and family life. Each year, MACIMIDE organises an Annual Work Conference where researchers present and discuss their work around diverse research themes cutting across the disciplinary fields represented by the faculties and schools of Maastricht University.

This year's conference took place on 23 September 2024 and brought together researchers from Maastricht University and from universities elsewhere in Europe and worldwide. The conference was organised by Talitha Dubow, Julia Reinold, Ruben Tans and Onallia Osei, with the generous support of Studio Europa Maastricht.

Introduction

For almost ten years, migration has been framed as a “crisis” within and for Europe. Public and political debate centre on particular “flashpoints”, typically irregular arrivals and the purported “failures” of integration. While the EU has sought to harmonise policy responses through the new Pact on Migration and Asylum, adopted this year, member states prioritise migration as an issue to be addressed at the national level, seeking exceptions to the shared framework. For example, recent months have seen 15 member states reinstate temporary border controls inside the Schengen Area.¹ In the Netherlands, the new government announced plans for the “strictest asylum policy ever” and requested an “opt-out” from the EU's Pact – a desire quickly seconded by Hungary.² Migration is now widely seen as a threat to society rather than as an intrinsic part of human existence and history and as a potential driver of positive change. UN Secretary-General António Guterres, recognising migration as a “fact of life and a force for good,”³ argues that the problem lies not in migration or mobility itself, but in the poor governance thereof, which is often shaped by hostile narratives that remain deaf to the weight of scientific evidence. In this context, interdisciplinary



research into diverse aspects of migration and mobility, across geographical contexts and longer timeframes, is crucial to advance scholarly, public and policy understandings of migration and mobility in their complexity.

Taking stock of these developments, this year's annual MACIMIDE Work Conference, organised with the generous support of Studio Europa Maastricht and hosted by UNU-MERIT, placed a particular focus on Europe and the societal impact of research. Participants had the opportunity to present their recent work and discuss new policy and research directions. Conversations took place over the course of five thematic panel sessions: (1) migration attitudes, experiences and decision-making; (2) multi-scalar migrant integration; (3) law and governance across European borders; (4) migration, development and sustainability; and (5) migration and education.



These five presentation sessions were accompanied by two special events, namely: a keynote speech on the challenges and opportunities of the new EU Pact on Migration and Asylum given by Professor and MEP Tineke Strik; as well as an interactive lecture on science communication by Dr Dieudonné van de Willige. The MACIMIDE conference provided a platform to engage in productive dialogue on new research findings and approaches. Enriched by the diverse range of topical foci and disciplinary perspectives, the annual conference offers an opportunity for the cross-fertilisation of ideas across a broad and welcoming academic community.

This report does not seek to provide an exhaustive account of this year's conference discussions, but instead aims to summarise the key takeaways from the five thematic panels, the keynote speech and the interactive lecture. In this way, the report serves as a record of the topics discussed, cross-cutting insights, directions for further research and implications for political action. We are grateful for the participation of all presenters and attendees at this year's conference and look

forward to continuing the discussions at future MACIMIDE events.

Keynote Speech

Unpacking the new EU Pact on Migration and Asylum

In her keynote speech, "Unpacking the Pact: Internal and External Dimensions," Professor Tineke Strik, Member of the European Parliament for GroenLinks, Professor of Citizenship and Migration Law at Radboud University, and chair of the complaints committee of the Refugee Council East Netherlands, offered an appraisal of whether and how the EU's new Pact on Migration and Asylum (henceforth, the "Pact") can breathe new life into the EU's common asylum system.

The Pact and its challenges

After nearly a decade of negotiations, the Pact was adopted by the European Parliament and Council of the EU in 2024 and will come into effect after a two-year transition period. It encompasses a package of reforms designed to provide a new shared framework for the EU's management of migration and asylum. Thereby, the Pact seeks to address long-standing issues in the EU's approach to migration and asylum, such as the disproportionate responsibility borne by front-line countries, as well as the lack of cooperation between member states. While some view this agreement as a landmark achievement in light of the complex and divergent national interests on migration, Prof. Strik warned of major shortcomings and challenges ahead.

Before diving into practical matters of implementation, Prof. Strik raised concerns over the democratic legitimacy of the process by which agreement on the Pact was finally reached, in which the European Parliament was significantly sidelined. With regards to the rules that have now been agreed, Prof. Strik warned that the flexibility at the heart of the new "solidarity mechanism" essentially allows member states to "buy their way out" of assuming responsibility for refugees and other migrants.

Meanwhile, front-line states will continue to face significant capacity constraints. Additionally, Prof. Strik highlighted the potential humanitarian risks posed by the new screening and fast-track return procedures. Aimed at accelerating the assessment of asylum claims, these measures could lead to increased ethnic profiling, an expanded use of immigration detention, and reduced safeguards for vulnerable people, should expediency be prioritised over the careful consideration of individual circumstances. Furthermore, Prof. Strik pointed out that, although the Pact was supposed

to promote solidarity and ensure shared responsibility among EU member states, the new framework is based on the externalisation of responsibility through deals with third countries to manage migration and reduce irregular border-crossings. In light of the EU's recent agreements with countries including Libya and Tunisia, Prof. Strik expressed particular concern that partnering with countries known for their poor human rights records would compromise the EU's core values.

Current developments

Prof. Strik noted that some of these challenges have already begun to manifest in recent discussions around the implementation of the Pact. Several states that were once strong advocates for the agreement now appear to be shifting their position, seeking ways to avoid compliance. This development takes place against the backdrop of surging nationalist populism and Euro-scepticism across member states – trends that have led to a growing reluctance to adhere to EU-wide rules and a simultaneous push for increasingly restrictive migration policies. Prof. Strik expressed concern that these attitudes may trigger a “race to the bottom” as countries fear being the only ones respecting the new rules. These dynamics threaten to undermine the minimum standards that the new framework has managed to put in place.

Future outlook and recommendations

Notwithstanding these challenges and concerns, Prof. Strik ended her speech on an encouraging note, acknowledging the Pact's potential to deliver on its promises of a fairer migration system. However, this will require careful focus on implementation and compliance, with a more assertive role and stricter oversight from the Commission. To prevent the Pact from becoming too permissive and eventually ineffective, Prof. Strik argued that the Commission must find a careful balance between enforcement and encouragement, penalising misconduct such as illegal pushbacks, while simultaneously motivating compliance by generously funding states' capacity to take responsibility.

Beyond political action, Prof. Strik stressed the importance of research, urging academics to contribute to public debates with evidence-based insights. Specifically, Prof. Strik pointed out that European publics often have sympathetic attitudes towards refugees and other migrants but are unaware of how EU policies are causing harm to such persons, their communities of origin, and the societies which receive them. Research that “joins the dots” for European citizens by visibilising the consequences and, often, incoherence of EU policies, is therefore particularly important. Such research

can empower voters to make informed decisions, hold governments accountable, and rebuild trust in EU institutions.

The Pact will come into full effect in 2026. Prof. Strik emphasised that the two-year transition period offers a critical window to ensure its successful implementation. The implementation plans submitted by member states will be scrutinised by the European Parliament. According to Prof. Strik, this will be a crucial moment for the EU to take decisive action, ensuring that the new Pact does not become a missed opportunity but rather the cornerstone for a fairer and more effective approach to managing asylum and migration.



Panel Session 1: Migration Attitudes, Experiences and Decision-making

Panel Session 1, chaired by Dr Onallia Osei, opened the conference with a set of studies examining the diverse influences on migration attitudes and behaviours.

Tobias Hillenbrand began the session by presenting the results of an original survey experiment designed to investigate public attitudes in Germany towards refugees. In this research, titled “**Let’s talk about migration – or better not? How media exposure to refugee migration shapes attitudes towards refugees,**” Hillenbrand finds that exposure to a video providing basic background information on Syrian refugees living in Turkish refugee camps – presented in a deliberately neutral tone – diminishes survey respondents’ humanitarian concerns and heightens their perceptions of migration-related security risks. This is particularly the case for respondents who live in areas of Germany which have seen larger increases in the share of foreign citizens. Hillenbrand concludes that attitudes towards refugee migration are shaped not only by the way in which migration issues are framed in the public sphere, but also by the fact that attention is drawn to refugees at all. These findings have important implications for the (de)politicisation of migration in social

and political life.

The second speaker, **Lalaine Siruno**, drew attention to a migrant community that has less prominence in public and policy debates, but that poses interesting questions for migration governance. In her presentation on **“Irregular migration and Filipino migrants in the Netherlands,”** Siruno shared an overview of her PhD project. She discussed the history of Filipino migration to the Netherlands, the evolution of Dutch policy responses, the aspirations that continue to motivate Filipino nationals to settle in the Netherlands, even irregularly, and their lived experiences as migrants. The case study offers insights for our understanding of the interplay between government policies and individual agency, and the implications of this for the Dutch approach to managing migration.

The third presentation was similarly interested in the Netherlands as a country of destination but shifted the focus to the “types” of migrants that countries like the Netherlands are often concerned to attract and retain as part of national economies. In this presentation, titled **“Migration vs. non-migration policies: examining deterrent effects on high-skilled migrants’ intentions to remain in the Netherlands,”** **Dr Julia Reinold** investigated to what extent, and how, policies – both those focussing specifically on migration and those that do not – shape the decision-making of high-skilled migrants to stay in the Netherlands. Dr Reinold presented an original framework (co-developed with Mathias Czaika) to conceptualise policy-driver interactions and guide an experimental approach to disentangling the particular effects of different policies on individual decision-making.



In the final presentation **Matilde Perotti** considered the broader context that shapes the migration decision-making of young people in Europe, and the implications of these decisions for social inequality. In her study of **“Forming intentions to leave the parental nest: A cross-national comparative study of migrant youths in Europe,”** Perotti

focussed on the transition to adulthood as a critical window for decision-making, embedded in broader socio-economic dynamics and related socio-cultural norms. Based on an econometric analysis of the Generations and Gender Survey (GGS), her study examines the interplay between economic stability, cultural diversity, and intentions to leave the parental home, and identifies the strategies that young people adopt in navigating their diverse family situations and socio-economic opportunities in pursuit of independence.

The studies presented in this first session highlighted the complex constellation of influences – including both “hard” factors such as economic opportunity and “soft” factors such as socio-cultural norms and emotions – on attitudes towards migration, both among those considering migration as a prospect for themselves and those considering the migration of others. These interactions draw attention to the interrelations between structure and agency, and challenge policy logics which assume a simple relationship between policy “levers” and their desired effects on migration attitudes and behaviours.

Panel Session 2: Multi-scalar Migrant Integration

Panel Session 2, chaired by Dr Talitha Dubow, explored diverse dimensions of integration in personal, familial, professional, and societal contexts.

In the first presentation on integration, the focus was on parenting practices which encompass not only the intimate relationships between parents and their children, but also relationships with other families, schools and other figures of authority. In this presentation, titled **“Cultural and religious influences on parenting for desirable child development outcomes by migrants of African descent in The Netherlands,”** **Dr Obaa Akua Konadu-Osei** called attention to the under-studied impact of transnationalism on parenting practices. Alongside her co-author, Dr Onallia Osei, Dr Konadu-Osei discussed the ways in which cultural values – for example relating to more collectivist versus individualist approaches – as well as religious beliefs and gender, may influence parenting practices. In their work, Dr Konadu-Osei and Dr Osei seek to analyse how immigrant parents may (mis)understand and navigate differences between parenting norms in their countries of origin and countries of destination. The discussion explored the methodological challenges of identifying the particular effect of different causal influences and promises rich insights for the future.

Building on the theme of socialisation and cultural adaptation, **Dr Ngoc Hân Nguyen’s** presentation focused on workplace integration as a critical factor for fostering innovation among

integration as a critical factor for fostering innovation among high-skilled migrants. Her study, titled **“Migrants’ integration in the workplace and their innovative work behaviours,”** draws from organisational socialisation and acculturation theories to explore how migrants transition from outsiders to insiders within companies. Dr Nguyen emphasised that integration is a two-way process, requiring both firms and migrants to engage actively. An inclusive environment plays a pivotal role, enabling individuals to feel valued and supported while fostering a sense of belonging and uniqueness. Through a survey of 300 migrants, the study revealed a significant relationship between inclusiveness and workplace integration. Integrated migrants were shown to contribute more to innovation, suggesting that a supportive environment not only enhances individual outcomes but also drives organisational creativity. However, Dr Nguyen also noted the challenges posed by perceived losses in migrating motivation, which can hinder successful integration of high-skilled migrants.

Concluding the session, **Ruben Tans** continued the analysis of integration from a legal perspective. Tans presented civic integration as a concept that encompasses efforts to promote equality between newcomers and nationals while facilitating the inclusion of immigrants into society. However, integration can also be employed as a tool for assimilation that prioritises cultural conformity over multiculturalism. In his presentation, **“Civic integration trajectories in Flanders and the Netherlands compared,”** Tans described how civic integration is shaped by international frameworks such as the Refugee Convention, human rights treaties (ICCPR, ICESCR, ICERD, ECHR), and EU legislation. However, he noted significant differences in how these frameworks are applied, particularly as EU integration policies are often geared toward controlling entry and participation. Comparing the models in Flanders and the Netherlands, Tans highlighted contrasting approaches: Flanders centralises its processes through contracts, while the Netherlands relies on local municipalities to develop tailored action plans. The presentation emphasised the tension between multiculturalism and assimilation, as well as the importance of balancing cultural recognition with societal inclusion.

The presentations in this panel demonstrated the different levels of, and actors involved in, processes of integration. The panel highlighted the importance of inclusive approaches and mutual accommodation, through which the integration of migrants can foster innovation and cohesion across society.

Panel Session 3: Law and Governance across European Borders

Session 3, chaired by Ruben Tans, explored inequalities in legal rights and access to labour mobility in the EU for Third Country Nationals (TCNs), and opportunities to reduce such

barriers and frictions.



Susanne Sivonen began the session with her presentation, **“Forgotten category of cross-border workers: Third-country nationals,”** which investigated the challenges TCNs face in cross-border labour markets. Drawing on an OECD project funded by the European Commission, Sivonen highlighted the legal and administrative barriers that cross-border commuting TCNs encounter, such as work and residence permit restrictions. Using case studies from regions like Greater Copenhagen, Belgium-Netherlands, and Austria-Germany, she emphasised how the fragmented implementation of EU and national migration and labour policies create systemic obstacles for TCNs. Promising practices, including the German cross-border commuter card and Dutch cross-border work endorsement stickers, offer partial solutions, but broader EU-level directives and pilot programs are needed to foster greater integration.

Complementing this first presentation on legal and administrative barriers for TCNs, **Dr Katarzyna Strąk’s** presentation, **“The substance of rights arising from EU citizenship,”** analysed the rights that TCNs can indirectly secure through their relationships with EU citizens. She highlighted the role of Article 20 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union in preventing situations where EU citizens – particularly minors – might be forced to leave the Union due to the deportation of TCN family members. Dr Strąk emphasised the European Court of Justice’s evolving interpretation of these rights, underscoring the importance of procedural fairness, proportionality, and safeguarding children’s best interests. She also examined the interaction between Article 20 and the Return Directive, highlighting the procedural safeguards required to protect TCN rights in deportation cases. Dr Strąk concluded by advocating for clearer legal frameworks to enhance the protection and integration of TCNs within EU law, complementing the broader policy recommendations outlined in Sivonen’s presentation.

Extending the discussions on TCNs' integration and legal rights, the session concluded with a presentation by **Rahwa Yemane** on the **"MOBILISE Project,"** a four-year initiative on Circular Talent Development for Climate-Smart Agriculture co-funded by the European Commission through the Migration Partnership Facility (MPF) and implemented by Maastricht School of Management – Maastricht University (MSM-UM) in partnership with Aeres Green Education Group. Focusing on circular labour mobility in the horticulture sector, the project facilitates the talent development of students and non-students from Tunisia, Egypt, and Ethiopia through a training programme in Europe, addressing labour shortages in all countries involved while promoting sustainable and green transitions. Yemane, also on behalf of her co-authors, Dr Huub L.M. Mudde and Stefano Locatelli, highlighted how participants undergo technical and cultural training in the Netherlands before internships with horticulture companies, gaining skills that enhance their employability. The project also provides post-mobility support, including career development and entrepreneurship training, and uses ongoing data collection to evaluate its impact. Ultimately, the project aims to inform policy recommendations and scale up circular mobility initiatives across Europe and Africa.

Taken together, the presentations in this session highlighted the challenges and opportunities associated with integrating TCNs into EU labour markets and societies. In addition to identifying the barriers, the presentations offered ideas and promising practices to facilitate TCN integration and foster mutual benefits for TCNs and host societies.

Panel Session 4: Migration, Development & Sustainability

Panel Session 4, which was chaired by Dr Julia Reinold, explored the complex relationship between migration patterns, climate change, and development.

The first panellist, **Ana Filipa Cândido**, kicked off Session 4 with an important reminder for both researchers and policymakers that the interrelation between migration and development should be understood as complex, heterogeneous and context-dependent. In her presentation **"Recalling migration transition theory: The Portuguese case,"** Cândido builds on Zelinsky's influential theory, which claims that, once a country reaches a certain stage of development, it becomes a net immigration country (emigration decreases and immigration increases).⁴ Against these expectations, Cândido analyses Portugal as a noticeable outlier. Whereas de Haas provides a global cross-sectional study,⁵ Cândido presented a longitudinal multivariate study, focused on European countries. Cândido's study not only considers GDP,

the indicator most often used in the research literature on the migration-development nexus, but also other theoretically relevant development indicators regarding political, economic, technology, demographic and cultural levels, adopting a social transformation perspective in line with de Haas.⁶ Cândido's reappraisal of foundational theory set the stage for the following presentations in this session which focused more specifically on how the interactions between migration and climate change play a significant role in both exacerbating and mitigating developmental challenges.

Elucidating first the aggravating effect of this relationship, **Manisha Mukherjee** drew attention to the risk of worsening existing disparities in her presentation titled **"Climate change, female migration and gender inequality: Evidence from rural India"**. Investigating whether rising temperatures are associated with changing migration rates and a gendered relocation of labour, Mukherjee presented findings showing that, while men tend to shift from the agricultural sector to construction work, women migrate at lower rates to cities, meaning that they remain trapped in subsistence agriculture. This effect is most pronounced in districts of rural India with a high share of women in the scheduled caste, the lowest class in India's societal hierarchy. Taking a specific geographical focus, this research underscores the importance of recognising how the migration-development-climate nexus intersects with regional particularities, cultural norms and gender roles.

In addition to the development hurdles associated with the interplay between climate change and migration, such as widening gender gaps, this panel session also explored new strategies to alleviate these challenges. In the last presentation, **Amirhossein Chitsazzadeh** placed his focus on diaspora engagement to foster sustainable development in rural areas and developing countries. More specifically, Chitsazzadeh discussed "Green Remittances" as a tool for **"Alleviating energy poverty in developing countries through utilisation of diaspora finances in renewable energy projects"**. In analysing the viability of remittances as a source of sustainable investment, Chitsazzadeh emphasised that, for Green Remittances to thrive, it is essential to nurture migrants' trust in financial projects, establish robust monetary distribution networks, involve local stakeholders, as well as integrate Green Remittances into a blended finance approach that draws on further resources. Chitsazzadeh stressed the need for further research and an innovative, future-oriented policy approach, which is informed by a narrative that recognises migration as an opportunity rather than as a problem to be solved.

Taken together, the Session 4 presentations highlight the

Taken together, the Session 4 presentations highlight the complexity and dynamic nature of the relationship between migration and development, which is shaped by historical contexts and local conditions. They call for an integrative, research-informed policy approach which prioritises inclusivity and sustainable practices to create strategies that harness the potential of migration to bring about positive development outcomes.



Panel Session 5: Migration & Education

The studies presented in Panel Session 5, chaired by Ruben Tans, discussed the intersection of migration and education. These presentations offered cross-cutting insights into both the challenges and opportunities related to integrating migrant and refugee students into educational systems in destination countries.

The first presentation was given by **Marrit Westerweel** on **“Opportunities and challenges in educational systems for minor asylum seekers and minor status holders in Belgium and the Netherlands”**. Her research addressed questions regarding the impact of language classes on the educational progress of minor asylum seekers and children holding a protection status in Belgium and the Netherlands. It assesses the practical implementation of the right to education on the national and local level in both countries and seeks to identify potential systemic shortcomings that could hinder children from accessing this right. Westerweel highlighted obstacles such as a lack of systematic support in mainstream education as well as a shortage of (qualified) teachers, but also acknowledged opportunities and existing positive examples involving parental involvement and the increased use of children’s mother tongue.

Next, **Dr Jasmin Lilian Diab** presented her study, **“Bordering belonging: A qualitative exploration of educational integration for Syrian refugees in Lebanon across perceived value and impact,”** which explores the experiences of Syrian refugees in both formal and informal educational settings in Lebanon. Dr Diab’s research revealed that, in the context

of systematic disadvantages and frequent discrimination in Lebanese schools faced by Syrian refugee children, parents overwhelmingly favoured informal education options, typically provided by the humanitarian sector. These alternative schools emerged as a valuable resource, offering education and teaching that was not only more accessible, inclusive and supportive, but also better tailored towards the lived experiences and future prospects of Syrian refugees. Building on her analysis of different educational models in crisis settings and conflict zones, Dr Diab’s findings call for informal educational programs to be recognised in the broader educational framework, as well as for policies to address gaps and challenges in the formal sector.

Stanislav Avdeev concluded the panel session on migration and education with his presentation, **“University as a melting pot: Long-term effects of international peers”**. Focussing specifically on the impact of international peer exposure in higher education on labour and social outcomes of native students, Avdeev highlighted the potential of internationalism for fostering more positive attitudes toward migration, as well as its possible impact on expanding and diversifying social networks. Simultaneously, he found no direct effect of internationalism on labour market outcomes. These insights serve as key policy takeaways, suggesting that student immigration not only strengthens social cohesion but also poses no harm to economic prospects for native students. By discarding protectionist measures and instead promoting inclusive educational environments, policymakers could encourage intercultural exchange and enhance societal integration without compromising job security.

Panel Session 5 outlined a clear picture of existing challenges related to migrants’ educational integration, highlighting both structural obstacles as well as potential solutions. The findings shared in this session underline the pressing need for systemic reform, informed by ongoing research, to create inclusive, well-resourced educational systems that support both migrant and native students. Importantly, the studies suggest that a holistic and research-informed policy approach holds significant promise in unlocking the long-term social and economic benefits of migration.

Interactive Lecture: A Practical Guide to Science Communication in 2024

In this interactive lecture, **Dr Dieudonné van de Willige**, Deputy Director of Maastricht University’s Faculty of Science and Engineering and Board member (general secretary) of SciCom NL, shared theoretical and practical insights to help the MACIMIDE research community engage policy and public audiences in their research processes and achieve meaningful impact. Dr van de Willige distinguished between three forms of science communication: dissemination, dialogue, and

participation. She encouraged conference participants to shift their focus from trying to disseminate research findings in a uni-directional, hierarchical approach towards greater dialogue, and co-creation, with broader audiences. Dr van de Willige explained that the traditional “deficit model” of science communication is flawed because it assumes that people will change their minds, or behaviours, if they are simply presented with the correct information. However, – and particularly when it comes to complex and highly politicised topics such as migration – people’s views are shaped by their emotions, values and worldviews, and researchers should seek to understand these different perspectives if they want to communicate effectively. Open-ended dialogue with societal stakeholders, which acknowledges their different experiences and expertise and that engages in collective sense-making to explore the meaning and implications of scientific findings, is much more likely to lead to shared understanding and social action.



Participatory approaches to science communication can, moreover, involve broader communities in the research process itself – from setting the research agenda to interpreting the data collected. Such co-creation practices can help to foster trust in the research process, strengthen connections between science and society, and leverage these relationships and insights towards more impactful research outcomes. Finally, and through a range of lively games, Dr van de Willige demonstrated that, at a minimum, scientists must define clear science communication objectives, and carefully consider the right methods to achieve these, if they aim to translate their research into societal impact. For more information on Maastricht University’s work in advancing science communications, see the Faculty of Science and Engineering’s SciComm incubator⁷.

Conclusion

The 11th MACIMIDE Annual Work Conference highlighted the critical role of research in understanding and communicating

the complex intertwinement between migration and human-centred development, and how these interactions can – and must – be shaped by evidence-based, tailored policy interventions. Panellists explored migration from multiple perspectives, and in diverse contexts, demonstrating the contributions that migration can make to innovation and sustainable and inclusive growth, as well as drawing attention to the ways in which risks and challenges must be carefully addressed. While the panel presentations highlighted the state of the art, and pointed to future research priorities, Prof. Strik’s keynote speech on current policy developments and Dr van de Willige’s interactive lecture on science communication urged the research community to engage in new ways with broader public and policy communities. Researchers should inform public understandings by: tackling myths, misinformation and over-simplified narratives; “joining the dots” for voters for whom the implications of migration and migration policies may not yet be clear; and taking seriously the lived experiences, concerns and aspirations of all members of our diverse societies. In these ways, scientific research can help to nuance public narratives and break through gridlocked policy debates on migration, to advance positive social change.

Endnotes

1 European Commission, “Temporary Reintroduction of Border Control,” Migration and Home Affairs, 2024, https://home-affairs.ec.europa.eu/policies/schengen-borders-and-visa/schengen-area/temporary-reintroduction-border-control_en.

2 European Council of Refugees and Exiles, “NETHERLANDS: Government Announces ‘Strictest Asylum Policy Ever’ and Requests Opt-Out from EU Migration Pact. Government Announces End to State-funded Housing for Rejected Asylum Applicants. Demonstration Against Self-declared ‘Asylum Crisis’. Emergency Shelter Required After Asylum Centre Exceeds Capacity,” September 27, 2024, <https://ecre.org/netherlands-government-announces-strictest-asylum-policy-ever-and-requests-opt-out-from-eu-migration-pact-%E2%80%95-government-announces-end-to-state-funded-housing-for-rejected-asy/>; J. Stanley-Smith, “Hungary Piggybacks on Dutch EU Migration Opt-Out Request,” Politico, September 18, 2024, <https://www.politico.eu/article/hungary-netherlands-opt-out-eu-migration-asylum-policies-janos-boka/>.

3 UN News, “Migration is a fact of life and a ‘force for good,’” United Nations, December 18, 2023, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/12/1144897>

4 Wilbur Zelinsky, “The Hypothesis of the Mobility Transition,” *Geographical Review* 61, no. 2 (April 1971): 219, <https://doi.org/10.2307/213996>.

5 Hein de Haas, *Migration Transitions: A Theoretical and Empirical Inquiry into the Developmental Drivers of International Migration*, Working Paper 24 (Oxford: International Migration Institute, Oxford Department of International Development, University of Oxford, 2010).

6 Ibid.

7 <https://www.maastrichtuniversity.nl/about-um/faculties/science-and-engineering/research/science-communication-incubator>

Maastricht Centre for Citizenship, Migration and Development (MACIMIDE) was set up at Maastricht University by an interdisciplinary group of scholars from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the Faculty of Science and Engineering, the Faculty of Law, and the School of Business and Economics. Building on and expanding the existing successful interfaculty collaboration initiatives, MACIMIDE is an expert centre on cross-border mobility, citizenship, transnationalism, migration and development.

The Centre is grounded in the Euregion, but focused on a globalizing world. For more information, and to sign up to the MACIMIDE newsletter, visit: <https://macimide.maastrichtuniversity.nl/>