

Research–Policy Relations in Migration and Forced Migration and Refugee Studies: An Introduction

Forced migration and the pursuit of asylum are often hotly debated, controversial and emotional topics. While Zimmerman (2019) notes a “trend towards evidence-free policy-making and a rising mistrust about globalization” and a “gap between facts and misperceptions”, Ruhs et al. (2019) claim that “research can be of important instrumental or problem-solving value as a tool for improving the processes and outcomes of migration, and human development more broadly” and therefore call for “increase[ing] the supply of policy-relevant research.” The purpose of this *briefing note* is to outline the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that are applied to the scholarly engagement with knowledge transfer, research–policy relations, the research–policy nexus or the research–policy dialogue, to name a few terms, in the research fields of migration and refugees. The topic is closely related to the themes of ‘evidence-based policy making’ and the ‘societal impact of research’ but also reflects some of the underlying ideas of ‘science diplomacy’. It also intersects with the issue of research impact and how to generate it. The *briefing note* is based on only a small set of mostly international, i.e. English-language, publications; however, Boswell (2015), Heckmann & Wiest (2015), Kraler & Perchinig (2017) as well as Zimmermann (2019) and Gonser et al. (2020) refer specifically to the German case in their works. All publications are written from an academic rather than a policy perspective, and some are purely analytical, whereas others are more prescriptive in tone.

While the literature tends to focus on migration and integration policy, with the sole though important exception of Gonser et al. (2020), the analytical tools used in migration and integration research are also relevant to the research–policy relationship in the area of forced migration and refugees. It should be noted that the literature cited does not explicitly discuss matters related to knowledge production, nor does it pay much attention to the positionality of researchers who may be as personally entangled and emotionally and politically charged as the field as a whole (e.g. some might de facto act as lobbyists or activists for migrants’ rights or, conversely, defend the interests of the more restrictive elements of host societies).

A key question implicit in the extracts below but not explicitly addressed here, and which may guide further discussion within and beyond the FFVT project, is how all of this plays out in Germany.

Premise

“Migration and integration are phenomena that are at the top of many national and international policy agendas and discussions. ... Public debates and attitudes to migrants are often based, at least in part, on strong value-related emotions that involve both hopes and fears. Processes of migration and integration have consequences for the welfare and security of a number of different actors, ranging from migrants themselves to members of communities in both host countries and countries of origin ... and involving potentially conflicting interests” (Ruhs et al., 2019).

It can be taken for granted that research and policy have different purposes, are governed by different standards, requirements and constraints (Ruhs et al., 2019) and develop corresponding ways of thinking, habits, cultures and vocabularies (Düvell & Vogel, 2006). In particular, research generates scientific knowledge while policy administers, manages and governs society. In short, because research and policy have different purposes, they speak different languages, each of which is potentially misunderstood or even contested by the other side. Because of these different purposes, research is constrained by scientific standards, including methodological rigour, involving time-consuming quality-checks while policy

is constrained by public opinion and, possibly, campaign strategies involving timely interventions (Gonser and Zimmer 2020). And whereas research tends to more comprehensively document the complexities at stake, policy tends to require quick fixes. Overlaps between research and policy can occur where policy seeks scientific evidence or where research studies policy and/or seeks to communicate its findings to policy. These different professional standards and purposes create scope for collaboration but are also the source of tension and conflict. Nevertheless, Ruhs et al. (2019) suggest that the different actors should “understand and appreciate each other’s primary aims and constraints” and thus show mutual respect. Knowledge transfer takes place through ad hoc channels and random encounters, personal contacts, networking (formal and informal networks), “experts known to and trusted by the government, who are co-opted into informal decision-making circles” (Boswell, 2015), institutional forms (external independent or in-house government expert groups and advisory boards) that relate to the exchange of good practices, consultations, knowledge dissemination or the raising of knowledge questions as well as policy briefs, blogs or articles in specialised media outlets (The Conversation, OpenDemocracy, Bylines, NWWF Blog etc.), manifestos (Heckmann & Wiest, 2015), or statements in the media (interviews, talk shows, press conferences or statements).

“Migration researchers are a prominent voice in the public debate around issues like the refugee crisis or radicalisation, and a broad range of institutes has evolved operating at the boundaries of science and politics” (Scholten, 2018).

Stierl (2020) criticises that there is a “growing intimacy between the worlds of migration scholarship and migration policy”. However, this cannot be generalised, as “major differences exist between European countries in the way relations between policy and research on immigrant integration have evolved” (Scholten et al., 2015). In contrast, Collett (2019) argues the opposite: “there has to be ... proximity between the worlds of politics and research.” In general, migration is a contested political issue, and there are also growing manifestations of knowledge conflicts within the science community, so science plays different roles in different contexts.

Because they serve different purposes, research and policy follow different logics. At certain times, “immigration and asylum policy are highly symbolic, with the implication that there is limited political interest in using knowledge to adjust policy” (Boswell, 2015). Kraler and Perchinig (2017) argue that migration policy tends to be driven by ideologies which limits the scope for the potential impact of scientific arguments on policy. Furthermore, there is a “multiplicity of knowledge claims” (Penninx & Scholten, 2009), suggesting that the contestation of migration is to some extent replicated within the scientific community. As a result, some “uneasiness about the relation between research and policy” has been observed; in particular, there is tension between the co-production of categories and deconstructive approaches (Penninx & Scholten, 2009, Stierl 2020). Curiously, with the exception of Kraler and Perchinig (2017) and Krause and Denkowski (2020), few of the authors cited here elaborate on the issue of power relations and in particular their imbalances (see below).

“Migration is characterized by a high level of social complexity. This complexity stems from uncertainty of global developments that may trigger mobilities, from multicausality making it difficult to adequately predict when and where migration will occur, and from the strongly multilevel component of the migration policy system that makes it complicate to put policies in practice. ... Likewise, migration governance is characterized by complexity. Governance in the areas of migration and diversity tends to involve disagreement not only on what would be the best way to solve the policy problem but also, on a simpler level, what the policy problem actually is, how it should be defined, and what might be to blame. As complexity refutes simple linear models where knowledge is produced-dissipated-applied, there are no 'grand models' for dissolving complexity and no quick fixes for complex problems” (Guia Gilardoni, ISMU, 2023).

It should be noted that in many publications, policy is narrowly defined as state policy, and knowledge transfer is usually seen in this context, while civil society policy, for example, or knowledge exchange with the researched groups, especially migrants and refugees, is usually neglected (see Krause & Denkowski, 2020). Instead, this *briefing note* proposes a broader conceptualisation of policy that recognises not only the policies of central government but also

those of cities and municipalities, as well as international organisations, civil society including refugee organisations and other actors. Moreover, Ruhs et al. (2019) even promote a “three-way conceptual framework for the analyses of the various national and international level experiences including research, public debate/media and policy-making.” However, this *briefing note* does not address the role of the media in any depth.

Aarnikuivo et al. (2019, p. 215) recall that there are four types of people who talk about migration: “Persons with *professional competence(s)* regarding migration and/or complex mobilities *and experience(s) of migration* or complex mobilities. Persons with *professional competence(s)* regarding migration and/or complex mobilities *but with no experience(s) of migration* or complex mobilities. Persons with *experience(s) of migration* and/or complex mobilities *but with no professional competence(s)* regarding these topics. Persons with *no professional competence (s)* regarding migration and/or complex mobilities *and no experience(s) of migration* or complex mobilities.”¹

Finally, research, policy, media and society should not be seen as completely different spheres or systems; rather, researchers may be members of policy institutions or are regular media columnists or have moved between all three systems, such as Penninx and Entzinger in the Netherlands, Crawley in the United Kingdom, Tamas in Sweden, Sagirolglu und Küçükcan in Turkey or Angenendt in Germany, and others.

Definitions, Dimensions, Models and Types

The research–policy nexus refers to the production of scientific knowledge, relationships, interaction and communication between research and policy. There are different types of knowledge production. In particular, there is basic research ('Grundlagenforschung') versus applied research ('angewandte Forschung'), and independent research versus policy-driven research ('Auftragsforschung'), with policy-relevant research falling somewhat in between. Subsequently, these types of knowledge production generate "very different 'types' of knowledge, such as conceptual or theoretical research, applied research, [administrative data], statistical analyses, policy analysis (including policy evaluation and policy-oriented studies), or more personalised and experience-based

expressions of 'expertise'" (Scholten et al., 2015), as well as prescriptive or predictive knowledge. The type of knowledge mobilised depends on the context. There is also knowledge held by non-scientific policy and other actors, such as expert knowledge, practitioner knowledge and experience-based knowledge, such as that by migrants and refugees.

It seems that in the literature five concepts are used:

- research–policy relations or nexus,
- research–policy dialogue,
- knowledge transfer,
- knowledge communication and the
- broader societal relevance of science.

“*Research-policy dialogues are defined broadly as all forms of interaction between researchers and policy-makers in the domain of immigration and immigrant integration. The term 'dialogues' is used to refer to the reciprocal nature of research-policy relations*” (Penninx et al., 2009).

Heckmann and Wiest (2015) frame this as mutual learning and knowledge sharing. Knowledge transfer is a process whereby those who create knowledge transfer it to those who need it. It can be thought of as a one-way process of transferring scientific expertise from scientists to societal stakeholders as well as a “two-way communication and mutual feedback system” (Science Direct, 2020). However, these representations neglect the unequal power relations between the two sides. Meanwhile, the simple concept of knowledge transfer has been largely eliminated from the Anglo-Saxon discourse (Gonser & Zimmer, 2020). Reference of research for society means that university activities are related to societal developments (Gonser & Zimmer 2020). Scholten et al. (2015) identify three aspects of research–policy dialogues:

“*firstly, ...concrete structures of research–policy dialogues (dialogue structures); secondly, ...cultures and practices of knowledge utilisation in policy processes (knowledge utilisation), [and] thirdly, ...cultures of knowledge production in the field of migration research itself (knowledge production).*”

So far, research suggests four models of research–policy dialogues (Scholten et al., 2015), which are:

- ‘The *enlightenment model* ('speaking truth to power') ...postulates sharp boundaries between

¹ Italics by the author

research and policy and assumes that scientific knowledge will eventually 'creep' into the policy-making process and thus (indirectly)" influence policy.

- In the "*technocratic model*, researchers ('experts') are more directly involved in policymaking, ... [they] do more than just provide knowledge ... [but] frame policy problems and develop solutions; they come much closer to taking on the role of policymakers themselves."
- "In the *bureaucratic model*, research is supposed to provide data ('facts') that are required by policymakers to develop policies and to reach decisions."
- "The *engineering model* allows researchers a more far-reaching role in policymaking, while assuming, however, that politics keeps its primacy and is at liberty to select ("pick-and-choose") those strands of expertise that it sees fit."²

However, this *briefing note* proposes adding a fifth model, namely the *adverse model* where one or both sides, or parts of these, reject acknowledging and collaborating with the other side (e.g. Braun et al., 2018). For example, Kraler and Perchinig (2017) suggest that in a politicised context, policymakers may see scientists as partisan actors and, therefore, reject them as experts whereas scientists may act as advocates seeing policymakers as opponents.

Aarnikoivu et al. (2019) add some important analytical concepts, in particular the "site of engagement" when "repeated regularly, it becomes a nexus of practice" while the "discourses regularly intersecting in these ... spaces are called discourses in place" This raises the question of the setting in which the research-policy nexus takes place, for example, a conference in a luxurious setting, an issue also critically highlighted by Feldman (2011), who points to a certain lack of distance between the various actors and certain high-profile events, even suggesting the risk of moral corruption.

As in any other relationship, power issues play a role in the relationship between research and policy. Kraler and Perchinig (2017, also see Gonser and Zimmer 2020) show that there are important structural power inequalities at play, as government agencies, foundations or other key actors have the power to decide which research is funded and which

is not, whereas researchers are often dependent on research funders, not only to conduct research but even to keep their jobs. The power of research funders can even influence the nature and quality of the knowledge produced to the extent that funders have the power and ability to fabricate and enforce convenient findings. Policy actors also often have the power to choose whom to invite for knowledge transfer and to decide which knowledge to use and which not to use. Unequal power relations in the research-policy dialogue are even more pronounced in processes in the Global South and Global East (also see *FFVT project note 1*). And Krause and Denkowski (2020) draw attention to the unequal relations between the researched, the researchers and policy and address the challenge of how best to deal with this.

The different models are partly determined by different "national cultures of knowledge utilisation" (Scholten et al., 2015). Here, cultures are understood as "historically specific and cumulatively learned patterns of values and beliefs that orient social action" (Boswell, 2015). On this basis, Kraler and Perchinig (2017) distinguish between an Anglo-Saxon entrepreneurial pragmatic 'solution-oriented model' and a rational continental 'rules-based' model. Other determinants of national cultures are "different attitudes towards science" (Boswell, 2015). Heckmann and Wiest (2015) show in their study in Germany that there are national variations or even additional models. Each model then triggers specific forms of research-policy dialogue structures (Penninx et al., 2009). Kraler and Perchinig (2017) argue that the boundaries between science and policy are more pronounced in Germany than in Anglo-Saxon environments.

An important issue is mutual accessibility, both for knowledge producers and of end users (Head, 2010). This refers to the ability of researchers to communicate research findings and to identify and access potential users, as well as the ability of government officials, civil society representatives or other users to identify, get access to and use knowledge.

Finally, as mentioned above, there are not only two actors, researchers and policymakers, but also an intermediate group of so-called knowledge brokers (Pätsch, 2019, Ruhs et al., 2019), such as think tanks, foundations and media services (e.g. Mediendienst Integration in Germany). Knowledge brokers may

² Italics by the author

be able to translate scientific findings into publicly understandable knowledge, analyse and mitigate the risks of research in terms of causing harm or misinterpretation, and address accessibility issues but also build bridges between otherwise adversarial actors who are hampered by conflicting cultures. The media, in particular, play an important role in giving research a voice to communicate with the public, although they can also play a role in the potential politicisation of the issues at stake (Ruhs et al., 2019).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The literature addresses different issues and questions:

- » There is a need to critically reflect on key concepts, assumptions and premises: What counts as scientific evidence, what counts as policy and practice, and so on?
- » What is the relationship between the co-production of knowledge that replicates or reinforces social and political constructs and reflexive knowledge?
- » How has the research–policy nexus been configured, and why has it been configured differently in different European countries/Germany (Penninx & Scholten, 2009)?
- » “How are research–policy dialogues structured. How are dialogues organised, in what venues do they take place, what types of actors are involved, what type of knowledge is communicated, and what issues are discussed” (Scholten et al., 2015)?
- » What is the function of knowledge in organisations (Boswell, 2015)? “How is knowledge utilised in policymaking” (Boswell, 2015)? Why, where and when do specific types of knowledge use emerge (Boswell, 2009)?
- » How much value do different administrations place on different levels of research or expertise (Boswell, 2015)?
- » “How does knowledge production influence [research–policy] dialogues and, vice versa, how do dialogues affect migrant integration research itself” (Scholten et al., 2015)?
- » “How does expertise from research finds its ways into policy decision-making” (Heckmann & Wiest, 2015)?
- » How has the desire for policy relevance entered into processes of knowledge production on migration (Stierl, 2020)?

- » How can the consequences of research–policy dialogues be evaluated (Gonser, 2020)?
- » Is the research–policy dialogue a win-win situation (Stierl, 2020)?
- » How do researchers deal with the potential of misuse of their findings?
- » Scholten et al. (2015) hypothesise that “politicisation leads to de-institutionalisation of existing research–policy relations.”
- » “Knowledge production, knowledge utilisation and research–policy dialogue configurations are inherently connected” (Scholten et al., 2015).
- » Are there types of collaboration that are unethical or on the borderline? What are the ethical requirements for research–policy cooperation?

Some Findings from Research

With regard to research on the research–policy nexus, the idea of “evidence-based policy making” has gained widespread recognition, at least discursively. Researchers help to “steer society in a rational way”, “speaking truth to power”, “promote a “making sense together” or identify policy alternatives (‘lost frames’) which get excluded from the prevailing policy setting and help policymakers reflect on policy alternatives and their possible consequences (all Penninx & Scholten, 2009), or they may stay away from policy and society altogether.

However, “providing robust evidence is not enough for a policy adviser to succeed” (Zimmermann, 2019). Boswell’s (2009) earlier research suggests that politicians and policymakers often only use scientific research for symbolic rather than instrumental purposes. Her subsequent research (Boswell, 2015) even found that in case of Germany at certain times (2000-2006), there was some “disregard [of] the ‘evidence’ in decision-making”, that “respect for research on the part of policymakers was often largely ceremonial” and that “a rhetorical commitment to the importance of research was coupled with a readiness to debate decisions on an entirely different basis”, whereas in another case (United Kingdom) “officials did quite frequently draw on or commission research to substantiate policy.” Instead, “political discourse and media coverage [often] relied predominantly on arguments linked to values and interests rather than expert knowledge” (Boswell, 2015). And with regard to science, Scholten et al. (2015) found that certain

research–policy structures “have hampered the theoretical development of migration research ... [and] the rise of a more critical approach [whereas facilitating] the rise of [specific] ‘integration paradigms’” so that “migration researchers have (co-)produced specific national models.”

In this context, “knowledge ... may be used for different purposes: to give policies a sound conceptual basis, to develop policy instruments and measures, to monitor and evaluate policies” (Scholten et al., 2015), and, one could add, to provide policy and society with scenarios or forecasts of certain developments or to justify policies. The use of knowledge can thus be instrumental, indirect or symbolic (e.g. to substantiate or legitimise policy choices) (Penninx & Scholten, 2009; Scholten et al., 2015). In particular, “reflective research transcends instrumental forms of knowledge production and utilisation in favour of a research model that critically examines basic policy concepts and theories and explores policy alternatives” (Penninx & Scholten, 2009). Yet, Heckmann and Wiest (2015) remind us that “knowledge may be ignored and not utilised at all”, for example, when knowledge contains “unwelcome messages” (Penninx et al., 2009) that contradict dominant discourses, interests or policy proposals. Knowledge brokers may even act as knowledge preventers, shielding users from uncomfortable truths.

To be heard and have an impact, “patience, persistent argumentation, and the propagation of successful migrant role models seem to be of key importance to influencing public debates and policy-making on migration and integration”, Zimmermann (2019) found.

And while Krause and Denkowski (2020) insist that “the ultimate aim of transfer activities in forced migration research is to improve the situation and protection of displaced people”, others, by contrast, seem to rather have the interests of host societies—and sometimes specifically their disadvantaged members—in mind. However, Ruhs et al. (2019) argue for recognising the complexities and, therefore, potentially conflicting interests at stake and thus a balanced approach.

This brief discussion implies that the relationship between research and policy is rather mixed.

Forms

Penninx and Scholten (2009) distinguish between dialogues at the local, national, supranational or global levels (municipalities, governments, EU institutions, international organisations) as well as between different levels of institutionalisation of the research–policy nexus. A further distinction should be made between the hierarchical levels within organisations, i.e. whether the dialogue takes place at the decision-making, management or implementation level.

“The specific role of social scientists in shaping policies also varies greatly: in some cases, researchers have been quite active both in the scientific process of formulating the content of policies and in the political process of getting policies established. In other cases, social scientists have distanced themselves, or have been kept at a distance, from policymaking. Between these two positions many variations also exist” (Penninx & Scholten 2009).

Thus, there is no single model for organising the research–policy nexus; rather, different national, historical and situational or cultural settings require different types of research–policy dialogues (Penninx & Scholten, 2009). Penninx & Scholten (2009) therefore, recommend “identifying the circumstances under which the research-policy nexus can be organised in productive ways”.

Drivers and Determinants

An important driver of the research–policy nexus is the quest for evidence-based policy. However, this is “an aspiration rather than an accomplished outcome” (Head, 2010). “Academic research and expertise [can be a] driver of migration and integration policies” (Penninx & Scholten, 2009). Stierl (2020) also notes a “quest for policy-relevance” of research, notably by research funders. Penninx & Scholten (2009) identify two main patterns, research-driven policy vs policy-driven research. The former refers to the role of research in policy: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy implementation and policy evaluation, whereas the latter refers to migration-related research that is shaped by policy developments. In addition, there are complex supply and demand structures at play (Heckmann & Wiest, 2015): Supply and demand for knowledge and expertise, supply and demand for external funding, and demand for and efforts to generate impact. Furthermore, trust or mistrust, as well as acceptance and acceptability, also play a role in research–policy relations.

Challenges

The multiple dimensions of the research–policy nexus and its analysis pose a number of challenges.

Deciding whether or not research should or wants to be policy relevant and, if the decision is positive, striking a balance in the relationship between research and policy—not too intimate, but close enough to be recognised as an actor—is another challenge.

While several studies take it for granted that science should have an interest in communicating and disseminating knowledge to society, there are significant differences across the European Union. For example, the EU Commission and the UK’s Economic and Social Research Council ESRC require extensive dissemination, impact and a detailed impact management plan for any research funding proposal to be successful. In Germany, however, there appears to be little formal requirement for societal impact. The emphasis placed on certain funders (DFG) and the low importance they have so far attached to societal knowledge transfer is not necessarily conducive to research–policy interaction (Gluns, 2020). On the other hand, Penninx (2020) warns that the urge of some academics to respond to political demands or to seize an opportunity to appear in the media could also be at the expense of academic quality.

As suggested so far, research may play no or only a symbolic or even instrumental role in policy-making; the key challenge is “to provide the institutional context that allows research to play a positive instrumental role in policy-making” (Ruhs et al., 2019). Other concrete challenges arise from some definitions and problems of demarcation, such as the difference between scientific knowledge and other knowledge, or scientific and non-scientific contexts, and the different languages or frames used. Also, the questions raised and the demand for knowledge expressed by policy actors tend to be framed in a particular way. Therefore, before responding to or engaging with policy, researchers need to decode and, to some extent, tolerate the frames used (Penninx, 2020).

While it is easy to refer to (empirical) evidence-based policy, Hansen (2019) reminds us that “evidence seldom speaks for itself” but requires theories and interpretations (the choice of which can be subjective). Moreover, “complexity tends to be lost when research is incorporated in policy processes” (Stierl, 2020). In any case, “it

is difficult to establish a direct link between expertise and immediate policy changes” (Heckmann & Wiest 2015) and thus to assess the actual impact of research.

Regarding the “credibility of research, scientific credibility must be constantly produced and reproduced” (Penninx & Scholten, 2009). Several authors cited here argue that the independence of the researcher and of research is crucial. The “reliability of advice” (Head, 2010) is an issue. Ruhs et al. (2019) suggest that in science communication and media engagement, the language used should be compatible with public discourses; however, this condition may be difficult to reconcile with the call for reflexive perspectives. In this context, the positionality of researchers is an issue, and there is a blurred line between advice and lobbying (Gonser, 2020).

It is quite unusual for researchers to be trained in communication and policy and media engagement. In fact, incentives have been found to be rather limited (Ruhs et al., 2019). This leads to a “need for knowledge brokers” (Ruhs et al., 2019). The management of media relations, for example, is another challenge. On the one hand, it is the media that builds bridges between research and society, between policy and society and between research and the public. Meanwhile, the media can also act as a filter determining which research findings receive public attention and which not. On the other hand, as Ruhs et al. (2019) conclude, “it is important to find ways of avoiding or minimising the politicisation of research” by the media. Finding the right balance is an art in itself; therefore, “engaging the media carefully and strategically is critical for success” (Ruhs et al., 2019). This means that making noise is not always the best way to reach policymakers, given the often sensitive and emotional nature of migration issues; more discreet forms of communication may be more appropriate.

Finally, there is the question of how inclusive or exclusive research–policy relationships or dialogues are, and who participates in them. As with convenient sampling in research dialogues, if only a sub-set of researchers or policymakers are involved, while others are excluded, this could potentially lead to biased results.

Franck Düvell

Literature

- Aarnikoivu, M., Korhonen, S., Habti, D., & Hoffman, D. (2019). Explaining the Difference between Policy-Based Evidence and Evidence-Based Policy: A Nexus Analysis Approach to Mobilities and Migration. *Journal of Finnish Studies*, 22(1-2), 213–240.
- Boswell, C. (2015). Cultures of Knowledge Use in Policymaking: The Functions of Research in German and UK Immigration Policy. In P. Scholten, H. Entzinger, R. Penninx & S. Verbeek (Eds.), *Integrating Immigrants in Europe* (pp. 19–38). Springer, <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-319-16256-0#toc>
- Boswell, C. (2009). *The political uses of expert knowledge: Immigration policy and social research*. Cambridge University Press.
- Braun, K., Georgi, F., Matthies, R., Pagano, S., Rodatz, M., & Schwertl, M. (2018). Umkämpfte Wissensproduktionen der Migration. *Movements* 4(1), 9–27.
- Collett, E. (2019). Understanding the Role of Evidence in EU Policy Development: A Case Study of the ‚Migration Crisis‘. In M. Ruhs, K. Tamas, & J. Palme (Eds.), *Bridging the Gaps: Linking Research to Public Debates and Policy Making on Migration and Integration* (pp. 169–188). Oxford, OUP, <https://academic.oup.com/book/34908/chapter/298485112>
- Düvell, F., & Vogel, D. (2006). Polish Migrants: Tensions between Sociological Typologies and State Categories. In A. Triandafyllidou (Ed.), *Contemporary Polish Migration in Europe. Complex Patterns of Movement and Settlement* (pp. 267–289). Edwin Mellen Press.
- Feldman, G. (2011). *The Migration Apparatus. Security, Labor, and Policymaking in the European Union*. Stanford: SUP.
- Gluns, D. (2020). Transfer in der Fluchtforschung. In M. Gonser, K. Zimmer, N. Mühlhäußer, & D. Gluns (Eds.), *Wissensmobilisierung und Transfer in der Fluchtforschung*. Waxmann.
- Gonser, M., & Zimmer, K. (2020). Wissensmobilisierung und Transfer in der Fluchtforschung. Begriffsbestimmung und Bestandsaufnahme. In M. Gonser, K. Zimmer, N. Mühlhäußer, & D. Gluns (Eds.), *Wissensmobilisierung und Transfer in der Fluchtforschung* (pp. 245–260). Waxmann.
- Hansen, L. P. (2019, February). Purely evidence-based policy doesn't exist. *Chicago Booth Review*. <https://review.chicagobooth.edu/economics/2019/article/purely-evidence-based-policy-doesn-t-exist>
- Head, B. (2010). Evidence-based policy: principles and requirements. In Australian Government (Ed.), *Strengthening Evidence-based Policy in the Australian Federation*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242709855_2_Evidence-based_policy_principles_and_requirements
- Kraler, A., & Perchinig, B. (2017). Der Nexus von Politik und Forschung im Bereich Migration, Integration und Asyl. In L. Karasz (Ed.), *Migration und die Macht der Forschung* (pp. 63–88). OGB Verlag.
- Krause, U., & Dembowski, C. von (2020). Transfer of Knowledge for and with Whom?. In M. Gonser, K. Zimmer, N. Mühlhäußer, & D. Gluns (Eds.), *Wissensmobilisierung und Transfer in der Fluchtforschung* (pp. 137–150). Waxmann.
- Pätsch, A. (2019). Politikberatung durch Stiftungen. In S. Falk, M. Glaab, A. Römmele, H. Schober, & M. Thunert (Eds.), *Handbuch Politikberatung* (pp. 1–19). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-07461-6_19-1
- Penninx, R., & Scholten, P. (2009). *Research-Policy Dialogues on Migration and Integration in Europe* (IMISCOE policy brief 15). International Migration Research Network.
- Ruhs, M., Tamas, K., & Palme, J. (Eds.). (2019). *Bridging the Gaps: Linking Research to Public Debates and Policy Making on Migration and Integration*. Oxford: OUP.
- Science Direct (2020). Knowledge Transfer. <https://www.science-direct.com/topics/social-sciences/humanities-education> (accessed 28/2/2025)
- Scholten, P. (2018). Research-Policy Relations and Migration Studies. In R. Zapata-Barrero, & E. Yalaz (Eds.), *Qualitative Research in European Migration Studies* (pp. 287–302). Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-76861-8_16
- Scholten, P., Entzinger, Ha., & Penninx, R. (2015). Research-Policy Dialogues on Migrant Integration in Europe: A Conceptual Framework and Key Questions. In P. Scholten, H. Entzinger, R. Penninx, & S. Verbeek (Eds.), *Integrating Immigrants in Europe* (pp. 1–16). Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-16256-0_1
- Stierl, M. (2020). Do no harm? The impact of policy on migration scholarship. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 40(5), 1083–1102. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2399654420965567>
- Zimmermann, K. F. (2019). Gaps and Challenges of Migration Policy Advice: The German Experience. In M. Ruhs, K. Tamas, & J. Palme (Eds.), *Bridging the Gaps: Linking Research to Public Debates and Policy Making on Migration and Integration* (pp. 111–126). Oxford, OUP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198834557.003.0008>

Project Info

Forced Migration and Refugee Studies: Networking and Knowledge Transfer

The cooperation project “Forced Migration and Refugee Studies: Networking and Knowledge Transfer” (FFVT) aims to strengthen interdisciplinary forced migration and refugee research in Germany. To this end, the project, which is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), brings together research on migration, development, conflict and violence, climate change, health, governance and human rights and other topics. In this way, FFVT supports the networking of researchers and institutes working in all relevant research fields dealing with forced migration. To provide young academics with teaching and training opportunities in forced migration and refugee studies, it plans to establish study and graduate programmes. Furthermore, FFVT plans to promote the internationalisation of German research activities further and, therefore, offers a global fellowship programme, among other things. The dialogue between academia, practitioners, the media and politicians is another key element of its work. FFVT is to contribute to establishing a sustainable infrastructure for research on forced migration and refugee studies in Germany to facilitate excellent academic work in this field.

FFVT is jointly run by the Bonn International Centre for Conversion (bicc), the Centre for Human Rights Erlangen-Nürnberg (CHREN, University of Erlangen Nuremberg), Bonn) and the Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies (IMIS, Osnabrück University).

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author. They do not purport to reflect the opinions or views of FFVT, its members or funders.

Author: © Franck Düvell, 2025

Copyeditor: Heike Webb

Editorial Design: Ann-Christin Komes & Marja Vormann

Layout: Heike Webb

Publication date: 29 Januar 2025

Contact

Sekretariat

„Flucht- und Flüchtlingsforschung:
Vernetzung und Transfer“

Seminarstraße 19 a/b, 49074 Osnabrück

www.ffvt.net

contact@ffvt.net

SPONSORED BY THE



Federal Ministry
of Education
and Research

Project Partners

bicc Bonn
International Centre
for Conflict Studies

Centre for Human Rights
Erlangen-Nürnberg
CHREN

Institut für Migrationsforschung
und Interkulturelle Studien

IMIS

Institute for Migration Research
and Intercultural Studies