



LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

Minderbroedersstraat 4 – bus 5602  
3000 Leuven, Belgium  
T + 32 16 32 53 45 • F + 32 16 53 52  
E [info@lup.be](mailto:info@lup.be) • [www.lup.be](http://www.lup.be)

Call for contributions - CeMIS Migration and Intercultural Studies Series

# Co-creation in migration research and policy making

Editor-in-chief: Lore Van Praag

## Call for contributions

The aim of this book is to contribute to debates on the ways in which innovative strategies to address migrant-related challenges, in particular co-creative methods, may advance migrant integration. More specifically, in this book, we aim to gather contributions that investigate how these co-creative research strategies may provide insights into how these integration processes into various domains of the immigrant society (e.g., language learning, housing, employment) are shaped, and how they can contribute to policy making and new policy practices. This book intends to provide an overview in which the use of such co-creative methodologies in migration studies is critically assessed. This book will first offer a theoretical framework outlining the existing co-creative methodologies used in academic research in general, and migration studies in particular. The chapters in this opening section should discuss particular methods and theoretical approaches to co-creative methodologies and citizen science. In the second, empirical part, ongoing research experiences to incorporate co-creative methodologies and citizen science in academic research are documented and critically assessed. The third, likewise empirical part, reflects upon how co-creative research methods and citizen science have actually contributed to the creation of migrant integration policies and discuss their added value. The concluding chapter offers an overall analysis of the use of co-creative research methodologies in migrant research and policy making and a reflection upon the conditions to successfully implement and conduct co-creative research in migrant research and policy making.

## Submission

In this call for contributions, the editor welcomes proposals written by established scholars as well as by promising young researchers.

Three main types of contributions are welcomed:

1. Contributions that provide a particular co-creative methodology/approach to citizen science
2. Contributions that focus on the use of co-creative methodologies and citizen science in academic research and critically assess these methodologies
3. Contributions that studies how co-creative research methods and citizen science contributes to the creation of policies on migrant integration

**Send an abstract of max. 300 words to [An.Daems@UAntwerpen.be](mailto:An.Daems@UAntwerpen.be) and [Lore.VanPraag@UAntwerpen.be](mailto:Lore.VanPraag@UAntwerpen.be) before the 15<sup>th</sup> of October 2019. Include the type of contribution and a short bio (max. 150 words). Based on the content and numbers of submissions, a selection will be made and all contributors will be informed before the 1<sup>st</sup> of November about their participation.**



### **International outreach**

The book will be published in English and written for an international audience of scholars and policy makers. They are submitted to peer review and therefore receive the quality label ‘Guaranteed Peer Reviewed Content’ (GPRC).

The CeMIS Series is distributed and promoted worldwide. Within Europe, Leuven University Press collaborates with distribution partners such as CB and NBN International. In North America, the series is distributed by Cornell University Press, Leuven University Press’ structural partner in the US and Canada. Next to an international network of distributors and booksellers, Leuven University Press makes use of digital platforms such as JSTOR, Project Muse, Amazon and Google Books to ensure maximum visibility of its titles.

Leuven University Press also supports Open Access publishing and authors may seek support from the KU Leuven Fund for Fair Open Access.

### **Main rationale of the book**

The process of migrant integration into new immigrant societies is a two-way process (Celesta et al., 2014; Van Praag et al., 2015). In this process, both migrants and non-migrants interact and shape integration processes within the particular immigrant society context. However, both in research practices and policy making, this idea that migrant acculturation is a two-directional process is hardly translated into practice. In academic research, little is actually known about the meanings, definitions and expectations people have attributed to processes of acculturation and their views on newcomer integration in immigrant societies (Blommaert & Verschueren, 1991; Martiniello, 2006). Furthermore, migrants and their descendants do not participate as active actors in research but are rather seen as ‘study objects’. Similarly, whereas migration has been increasingly foregrounded in policy making over the last decades, migrants themselves are hardly involved to reflect on integration issues and to express their needs with regards to this acculturation process. This ignorance to actively involve migrants in research and policy making, has large consequences for the knowledge gathering and creation of academic canons, the obtained knowledge on migration integration issues, and the development of suitable policies dealing with migrant integration and migration in general. Moreover, this particular knowledge is also very context-specific, and therefore difficult to transfer from one migrant context to another. Migrant integration processes are structured and shaped by the situations in which people find themselves as well as the larger societal context (Berry et al., 1989; Piontkowski et al., 2000; Alba & Nee, 2003; Celesta et al., 2014). This complicates the transfer of existing insights on migrant integration to other contexts and situations, and even hampers migrant integration processes. This requires a radical reshaping of both research practices and policy making processes, in which migrants are actively involved and participate themselves as equal and relevant actors.



To realise this end, the use of co-creative methods has come to the fore in research and policy making. New trends occur in which innovative approaches to address migrant-related challenges are increasingly applied and experimented with in research domains investigating for instance, housing, employment, communication, education, solidarity, and health care. In this line of research, co-creative methods are applied, i.e. participatory and inductive research methods focused on the stimulation of collective creativity. Jointly developed ideas could later turn into the actual development of a tool, policy or product. These methods advocate to involve a wide variety of stakeholders throughout the entire co-creative process. These stakeholders can range from policy makers to entrepreneurs but are especially aimed at involving the target group itself – in this case migrants (Stembert, 2017). Although the use of co-creative methods has become increasingly popular within various fields, ranging from medicine to politics (e.g., Elsbernd et al., 2018), academic research on the evaluation of the use of such co-creative and participatory methods and its impact on both research and policy making is still lagging behind. Hence, more research is needed in this field to evaluate these methods' possible advantages and disadvantages, their possible pitfalls as well as good practices.

#### **References**

- Alba, R., & V. Nee (2003). *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Berry, J.W., Uichol Kim, S., Power, M.Y., & M. Bujaki (1989). Acculturation Attitudes in Plural Societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 3 (2): 185–206. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1989.tb01208.x.
- Blommaert, J. & J. Verschuere (1991). The Pragmatics of Minority Politics. *Pragmatics* 20(4), 503–531
- Celesta, L., Rupert Brown, L.K.T., & C. Matera (2014). Acculturation Is a Two-way Street: Majority–minority Perspectives of Outgroup Acculturation Preferences and the Mediating Role of Multiculturalism and Threat. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 43 (Part B), 304–320. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.10.002.
- Gordon, E.W. (1992). Human diversity, cultural hegemony, and the integrity of the academic canon. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 61(3), 405–418.
- Martiniello, M. (2006). Towards a Coherent Approach to Immigrant Integration Policy(ies) in the European Union. Accessed on. <http://www.oecd.org/dev/38295165.pdf>.
- Nowotny H., & Gibbons M. (2001). *Rethinking science. Knowledge and the public*. London: Polity Press.
- Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hoelker, P. & P. Obdržálek (2000). Predicting Acculturation Attitudes of Dominant and Non-dominant Groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24: 1–26. doi:10.1016/S0147-1767(99)00020-6.
- Stembert, N. (2017). *Co-Creative Workshop Methodology Handbook*. Rotterdam: U4IoT.
- Van Roy, K., Vyncke, V., Piccardi, C., De Maesschalck, S., & S. Willems (2018). *Diversiteit in gezondheid en gezondheidszorggebruik: analyse van de data uit de Belgische gezondheidsenquête*. Ghent.