

Converging Logics? Managing Migration and Managing Diversity

Sara de Jong

*Marie Curie Research Fellow, Department for Development Studies, University of Vienna,
Vienna, Austria*

Sensengasse 3/2/2

1090 Vienna

Austria

sara.de.jong@univie.ac.at

0043 (0)69917028282

Acknowledgements: An early version of this article has been presented at the 3. Jahrestagung der Migrations- und Integrationsforschung in Vienna, Austria in September 2014. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers as well as KriMi colleagues Irene Messinger and Gerd Valchars for their helpful and constructive comments. This work was supported by the EU Marie Curie Actions— Intra-European Fellowships (IEF) under Grant number 624577.

Converging Logics? Managing Migration and Managing Diversity

Migration management and diversity management are recognised as central paradigms in the context of migration and plural societies. A review of scholarly literature analysing the discourses and practices of migration and diversity management reveal that the two phenomena have been studied in isolation and that research on diversity management has predominantly been published in organisation and management literature rather than being integrated in the field of ethnic and migration studies. This article argues that it is relevant and fruitful to study migration management and diversity management in conjunction, since there are significant thematic and logical convergences, and to incorporate diversity management in the study of migration in order to obtain a deeper understanding of the entanglement of migration and diversity management. Based on a synthesis of scholarship and analysis of European reports, the article proposes to recognise three main convergences between the logic of migration management and diversity management: the presentation of migration and plurality as the ‘new’ norm; optimisation; and, technocracy. Finally, I suggest directions for a shared research agenda, and, drawing on the prominence of a Foucauldian governmentality framework in critical studies of migration and diversity management, present this as a potentially useful point of departure.

Keywords: Diversity; Migration; Management; Governmentality; Policy

Introduction

In the last two decades, we have witnessed the introduction of two central paradigms in the context of migration and plural societies. The first, migration management, stands for a particular approach for dealing with increased migration. The second, diversity management, signals a certain perspective on the management of a diverse workforce. While diversity management could refer to diversity in a broad sense, including for example, gender, age and sexuality, it is also associated with, and sometimes reduced to, the inclusion of ethnic minority employees and migrant employees (Faist 2012). It is at this junction that it most obviously meets with the field of migration.

Migration management and diversity management have each received a substantial amount of policy and scholarly attention, especially since the 2000s, ranging from *applied work*, which propose migration and diversity management strategies, to *analytical studies* that seek to understand and analyse migration and diversity management, to *critical approaches* that aim at unpacking problematic implications. While the corpus for this article's analysis comes from each of these approaches, I align myself with and seek to extend the latter's position, which counters the usually celebratory language of diversity and migration management with a critical view to the ways in which inequalities get (re-)inscribed. At the European level, notable publications about diversity include the European Commission reports 'The Costs and Benefits of Diversity' (2003) by the Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services, 'Realising the Business Benefits with European Diversity Charters: Managing Diversity at Work' (2012), but also the critically positioned 2008 Council of Europe publication 'The Politics of Diversity in Europe', edited by Gavan Titley and Alana Lentin. On migration management there is, amongst others, the EC Communication 'Strengthening the Global Approach to Migration: Increasing Coordination, Coherence and Synergies' (2008), the EU Justice and Home Affairs Council 2008 'Action on Migratory Pressures - A Strategic Response' and the strategy 'Towards a Migration Management Strategy' (2002) by The European Committee on Migration (CDMG) of the Council of Europe.

Migration management and diversity management are however rarely discussed together. For example, while critical migration scholar Georgi (2009) contextualises migration management in relation to the introduction of other management approaches in the political realm, such as public management and water management, remarkably he does not link it to diversity management. Whereas migration management studies have mostly been published in migration journals like *Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *Migration Letters*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, and *Citizenship Studies*, academic research on diversity management has predominantly

appeared in organisation and management journals, such as the *Journal of Management Studies*, *Gender, Work & Organization* and *Organization*, with the latter publishing a special issue on Diversity in 2010 (Zanoni et al. 2010). This also broadly reflects a disciplinary divide or, at least, a separation of research areas, between those that study respectively diversity management and migration managementⁱ.

The work of some critical race scholars, who have engaged with diversity management addressing ethnic minority employees, is an exception to that rule, because it has found an outlet in journals and series that address migration. For example Sara Ahmed's 2007 article "‘You end up doing the document rather than doing the doing’: Diversity, race equality and the politics of documentation", was published in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* and the book 'Diversity Management and Discrimination: Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities in the EU' by John Wrench (2007) in the Ashgate Research in Migration and Ethnic Relations Series. This article wants to extend the 'bridging work' of these scholars by proposing to understand migration management and diversity management as two related phenomena that are relevant for ethnic and migration studies. I suggest that it is constructive to study not just the locations where, but also the ways in which diversity management and migration management converge and to analyse them in conjunction with one another. This article therefore seeks to synthesise studies on migration and diversity management. I will argue that such synthesised analysis will reveal that migration management and diversity management have a common logic and that identifying these commonalities will help to more fully understand the mechanisms of diversity and migration management.

In the following section I will first provide a short description of how the phenomena of migration and diversity management have been discussed. The article will then identify three main convergences between the two phenomena, migration management and diversity

management. This will be done by synthesising scholarly literature that discusses *either* diversity *or* migration management, as well as by analysing selected policy documents at the European level, which address diversity and migration management respectively.ⁱⁱ I label the convergences that I identify as follows: firstly, the ‘new’ norm; secondly, optimisation; and, thirdly, technocracy. In the final section I will propose that given the fact that a fair share of critical scholars on migration and diversity management have analysed these respective phenomena as instances of Foucauldian governmentality, a governmentality approach could be a constructive -though by no means the only- point of departure for thinking migration and diversity management together.

Migration Management and Diversity Management

Bimal Ghosh is commonly credited with having introduced the notion of ‘migration management’ in 1993, in response to an invitation by the UN Commission on Global Governance and the Swedish government (Geiger and Pécoud 2010). According to Ghosh (2007), migration management requires a comprehensive approach that encompasses all forms of migration as well as harmonisation of policies across different states and close cooperation between states and intergovernmental bodies. Migration management departs from earlier policy approaches that tried to halt migration altogether, but does not go as far as radical proposals to open borders for everyone. In Ghosh’s own words, ‘we should strive for a regime of managed migration that is based on the concept of regulated openness’ (Ghosh 2007, 99). Migration scholars who are concerned with some of the human rights abuses linked to migration control and who see its solution in a more coordinated and comprehensive approach, have therefore been sympathetic to (the opportunities offered by) migration management (Betts 2006, 674-675; Martin, Abella and Kuptsch 2006; Betts 2011). Other scholars already anticipated and critically reviewed the

increasingly precise system of differentiation among migrants and the changing nature of borders that migration management has heralded (Balibar and Williams 2002; Nyers 2003; Walters 2004; Bigo 2005; Schuster 2005).

Since its introduction, the term ‘migration management’ has become connected to at least three related phenomena, as Martin Geiger and Antoine Pécoud (2010), editors of the 2010 volume ‘The Politics of International Migration Management’, argue. First, migration management is associated with emerging political actors, such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and their interventions. Second, it has been linked to new policy practices, such as increased capacity building activities and projects that jointly address migration and development. Thirdly, migration management has been viewed as a set of discourses about how migration should be understood and what kind of responses migration calls for (Geiger and Pécoud 2010).

This paper will mostly concentrate on the latter and thereby follow their idea that migration management discourses creates a distinct way of understanding what migration is, and hence what the appropriate measures are to ‘deal with’ migration. In a similar vein, I will approach diversity management as a discourse that constructs a (hierarchical) range of diverse identities following Bendl, Fleischmann and Walenta (2008; cf. Meriläinen et al. 2009). Hence the article will follow a discourse analytical approach to read the policy documents introduced in the next sections. This means that rather than focussing on the (effects of) policy actions proposed, I will look at the ways in which visions and programmes are introduced, narrated, and justified through linguistic devices (Shore and Wright 1997). This approach has some overlap with the policy narrative approach in migration policy-making, proposed by Boswell, Geddes and Scholten (2011), but has a wider scope by referring to broader ideas rather than focussing on (the function of) cognitive content.

Like migration management, which Scheel and Ratfisch describe as a ‘diffuse concept’ (2014, 925), it is often claimed that there is neither a consistent way of understanding ‘diversity’ nor a coherent set of methods and goals associated with diversity management (Hunter and Swan 2007; Wrench 2007; van Ewijk 2011). First emerging in the USA, it is increasingly implemented in Europe, where it first entered the policy field in the late 1990s (Gordon 1995; Lorbiecki and Jack 2000; Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010; Neuhold and Scheibelhofer 2010). Single and comparative case-studies of diversity management in different national contexts show that diversity (management) takes on different meanings in relation to national migration histories and policies as well as equality legislation (Greene, Kirton and Wrench 2005; Kalonaityte 2009; Meriläinen et al. 2009; Sénac and Forest 2015; cf. Pécoud 2015, 38-39 on the difficult translatability of migration management). The lack of clear definition and programmatic approach persists despite the fact that diversity management is increasingly widely adopted in the public and private sector (Lentin and Titley 2008). As Thomas Faist argues:

Diversity as a concept and a set of - not necessarily coherent - policies, programmes, and routines straddles many worlds: it appeals to those who emphasize individual economic competence and self-reliance of migrants (‘neo-liberals’), to those who cherish the public competence of immigrants in public affairs (republicans), as well as to those, like the European Commission, who push for structural reforms to turn incorporation into a two-way process (2010, 173; cf. Vertovec 2012).

Nevertheless, as Vertovec claims, it is possible to identify a “‘diversity’ corpus’ (Vertovec 2012, 289). Most authors agree that diversity management concentrates on the added benefits that different employees could bring and that diversity management, while rooted in identity politics, is strongly inspired by and associated with neoliberal individualistic and entrepreneurial ideologies. In the next section, which argues that there are three key convergences between diversity and migration management, the temporal context of diversity and migration

management will receive further attention as I discuss their respective claims to plurality and diversity as the ‘new’ norm.

Convergences between Migration and Diversity Management

The ‘new’ norm

Both migration management and diversity management are commonly presented in relation to a diagnosis of the current state of contemporary western societies. Diversity approaches describe diversity as the norm rather than as the exception (Kuhn 2012; de Jong 2014). In a recent study on diversity policies in three Western European cities, Maria Schiller identifies the principle ‘diversity as a fact’ as one of the main underlying principles of diversity policy texts (Schiller 2015, 7). In a similar vein, as Pécoud observes, international migration management is presented as an approach that ‘is in line with the growing awareness that migration is [...] a normal feature of a globalizing world’ (Pécoud 2009, 338; cf. Kalm 2010). Bimal Ghosh (2007), for example, commences his case for migration management with the observation that migration is increasingly large scale. Moreover, in these discourses, diversity and migration are not just presented as norm(al) but also described as essential. Paul Mecheril, for example, writes about diversity: ‘Programmatically, diversity is accompanied by the insight that the diversity of differences is constitutive for societal reality’ (Mecheril 2007, 1 [translation by the author]), while migration is presented as ‘an indispensable and unavoidable process, for demographic, economic or environmental factors notably’ (Pécoud 2009, 338).

In the literature, this diagnosis of contemporary western societies is normally followed by a remedy, which takes the form of migration or diversity management. Diversity management is presented as a reasonable and necessary response to the reality of ethnically plural societies. One

of the basic logics of diversity, is, as Mecheril claims, the realisation that the recognition and management of diversity is sensible and even required (Mecheril 2007, 2; cf. Ghorashi and Sabelis 2013). The brochure ‘Realising the Business Benefits with European Diversity Charters: Managing Diversity at Work’, produced by the Diversity Charters exchange platform, and funded by the European Commissionⁱⁱⁱ puts it as follows: ‘Managing diversity and promoting inclusion increasingly form part of the business world's strategic agenda in response to a more diversified society, customer base, market structure and overall business environment’ (European Union 2012, 4). Proponents of diversity management rely on a critique of its supposed precursors, multiculturalism and affirmative action (US) or equal opportunities (UK) policies (Wrench 2007; Lentin and Titley 2008; Faist 2010). In contrast to multicultural approaches, diversity focusses on the individual rather than on collectivities (Knoppers, Claringbould, and Dortants 2013). It employs a language of competences and benefits that ethnic minorities can bring (the so-called ‘business case’) instead of (solely) concentrating on their rights of inclusion (Maxwell 2004). Vertovec contrasts affirmative action policies and diversity management in terms of their temporal orientation: ‘while AA policies had been premised on the correction of past injustices, a new awareness of demographic shifts re-oriented “diversity management” to focus on the future’ (Vertovec 2012, 290). This future would be one in which ethnic minorities would comprise a major part of society, as employees, customers and clients of commercial and public services (Zanoni et al. 2010). Diversity management was widely embraced as the ‘palatable alternative’ amongst sceptics of affirmative action (Lorbiecki and Jack 2000, 20; cf. Ahmed 2012).

In a comparable vein, the language of change and newness is pervasive in relation to migration management. The document ‘Towards a Migration Management Strategy’ adopted by the CDMG of the Council of Europe^{iv} at their 42nd meeting in May 2000, commences as follows: ‘As Europe’s migration policy makers confront the *new* millennium, they are able to reflect on a

decade of change, which has thrown up a number of *novelties*' (2002, 9 [italics added]). Seemingly paradoxically, the foreword of the same document, stresses that Europe has always been marked by migration, in order to justify and align it with the claim to normality (2002, 7; cf. EC 2015, 2; Martin, Abella and Kuptsch. 2006). Migration management is introduced as the only reasonable and pragmatic option to deal with migration (Taylor 2005; Martin, Abella and Kuptsch 2006). This language of realism cannot only be linked to the depoliticisation associated with migration management - as will be discussed later in this article - but should also be read in the light of critiques of previous policy approaches that migration management discourse presents as inadequate and unfeasible. As migration scholars Ataç and Kraler summarise: 'Migration control is out, migration management is in' (Ataç and Kraler 2006, 25 [translation by the author]). In the aforementioned CDMG strategy, the previous policy model based on border control and social integration, is called 'inadequate' (2002, 12) and a 'piecemeal approach' that 'is no longer sustainable' (2002, 7; cf. European Commission 2008). It even employs a literary 'mobilizing metaphor' (Shore and Wright 1997, 3) to illustrate this point:

The position of King Canute in trying to stem the ocean tide is as ineffective now as it was in the 11th century. The best that governments can do is to guide and influence flows, implementing policies, which work with the tide rather than against it. (COE, 2002, 15).

Coercive immigration and border control is evaluated as 'reactive and inward-looking' (Ghosh 2007, 97) and as having produced a range of 'unintended [sic] negative consequences' (Betts 2006, 675; cf. Martin, Abella and Kuptsch 2006). Also, such border control is presented as deriving from a false understanding of the nature of migration as being an easy calculation of push and pull factors. According to the 2003 publication 'Managing Migration', IOM's second World Migration Report, which was organised around the theme of migration management^v, migration management is necessary in the light of the recognition that 'migration has a life on its

own' (2003, 52). This perspective (selectively) adopts the autonomy of migration perspective of critical migration scholarship (e.g. Papadopoulos and Tsianos 2003; Nyers and Rygiel 2012). In a feasibility study of resettlement schemes in the EU, Van Schelm reinforces the contrast between migration control and management as follows:

'Control' implies that the state can determine whether or not individuals arrive at its borders, and the fact that they are present therefore makes the state seem lacking somehow.

'Management' implies rather that the state acknowledges that there is a situation with which it must deal to the generally mutual satisfaction of the various actors that depend on it to do so. (2005, 573).

With his reference to the benefits for different actors, Van Schelm introduces what will be discussed in the following section as the second key convergence between migration and diversity management discourses, 'optimisation'.

Optimisation

Arguments for migration management are commonly framed around the notion of the so-called 'triple win', the belief that if migration streams are 'managed' in the appropriate way, three parties, namely the country of origin, the 'host country' and the migrant, would benefit (Geiger and Pécoud 2010). Diversity management similarly aspires to triple win, albeit not commonly labelling it as such, stressing the value for employers, employees and customers/service users (EC 2012). A fourth beneficiary could even be added to this list, namely the country of origin, when in line with a diversity management approach, migrants are employed as development experts whose value is based on the expertise emerging from their 'difference' (cf. Faist 2010). Since the combination of migration and development has gained a prominent position in migration management discourse, this is a concrete junction where migration and diversity management meet. As the IOM argues, migration management should take into account the

‘building [of] bridges between diasporas and home countries so they can contribute to development efforts’ (IOM 2003, 54). The 2006 CDMG report ‘Towards a Migration Management Strategy: Challenges for Countries of Origin’, a supplementary report to the earlier mentioned document ‘Towards a Migration Management Strategy’ stresses the important role of remittances and diaspora engagement in development (2006, 29-34).

Integration (measures) is another key field where diversity and migration management operate in conjunction and follow the logic of optimisation. This can for example be seen in the ‘European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals’, adopted by the European Commission on the 20th of July 2011 to ‘enhance the economic, social and cultural benefits of migration in Europe’ (EC Press Release, Brussels, 20 July 2011). The Agenda proposes ‘integration as a way of realising the potential of migration’ (EC 2011, 2) and breaths the language of migration management in its emphasis on maximising benefits and minimising costs, the necessity for partnerships between states as well as with civil society actors, and the triple win for migrants, host countries and countries of origin. The short document features the word ‘diversity’ nine times of which three times in conjunction with ‘managing’ (EC 2011). Diversity is not only used as a descriptive term to introduce the idea that diverse societies are the new norm, but also to make more normative claims: such as ‘a positive attitude towards diversity’; ‘potential of this diversity’; ‘promoting diversity’; and the use of diversity and equality principles (cf. de Jong 2014). Diversity and migration management’s optimisation converge when the Agenda imbues migrants with the potential to alleviate Europe’s demographic pressures, as well as with innovative, entrepreneurial spirit and recommends EU states to ‘capitalise on the potential of diversity’ that students with a migration background bring (EC 2011, 6).

The flexibility of the notions of diversity and migration management and the variety of approaches associated with it, allow a broad range of potential beneficiaries of either

management approach. Migration management documents, such as the one by the CDMG (2002) and the IOM (2003) employ a human rights framework with assumed benefits for migrants alongside arguments about economic productivity from which host countries, countries of origin and the income generating migrant can profit. As Scheel and Ratfisch (2014) have critically observed, the organisation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) presented the protection of refugees and migration management as ‘distinct yet complementary activities’ (UNHCR 2006; no page number). For diversity management, Vertovec (2012) remarks that it is not clear whether it is aiming for social mobility of marginalised constituencies, as some diversity policies that focus on redistribution, recognition and representation would suggest. Or, if such measures are mainly benefitting those in a hegemonic position to be more competitive, more creative and better able to serve different clients.

Both diversity management and migration management are thus not only framed as the appropriate and reasonable responses to the inevitable phenomena of migration and plural societies, and as proactive rather than reactive (cf. Pécoud 2009), but, even more positively, as being able to produce or tease out added value. The IOM describe their concept of migration management as ‘relat[ing] to the shaping of clear and comprehensive policies, laws and administrative arrangements to ensure that population movements occur to the mutual benefit of migrants, societies and governments’ (2003, 53). Both migration management and diversity management have to be understood in relation to (the demands of) capitalism (Overbeek 2002; Squires 2008; Swan 2010; Buckel et al. 2014). As Elisabeth Prügl argues, diversity management ‘embraces a neoliberal logic’ (2011, 83), or, turning it around, Elaine Swan writes, following Giroux, that ‘capitalism [...] likes some kind of difference’ (2010, 94). In his rather tautological definition of migration management, Ghosh formulates it as follows: ‘Central to management migration is the establishment of a regime that is capable of ensuring that movement of people

becomes more orderly, predictable *and productive*, and thus more manageable' (2007, 107 italics added).

In this language of optimisation, there is a shift from locating the 'problem' to be addressed in the phenomenon of migration or plurality itself, as is evident in for example border control measures, to understanding the 'problem' to be *mismanagement*. This is understood in terms of misguided, incoherent or partial previous policies, as already mentioned in the above section on the 'new' norm. For example, the CDMG's 'Towards a Migration Management Strategy' of 2002, presents 'illegality' as a side effect of previous policies or the lack of (appropriate) policies: 'the existence of irregularity is an indication that migration policies are not working' (2002, 22). The 2015 European Agenda on Migration, which was compiled by the European Commission following migrants' deaths and suffering in the Mediterranean, frames this crisis not only in terms of 'a spotlight on immediate needs' but also as '*an opportunity* [sic!] for the EU to [...] send a clear message to citizens that migration can be better managed collectively by all EU actors' (EC 2015, 6, italics added). With regards to diversity, the 2011 'European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals' reads as follows:

Over-qualification of third-country nationals for their jobs, especially of women, is noticeable in all Member States where data are available. Unemployed migrants or migrants employed in positions for which they are overqualified are an underutilised resource and a waste of human capital. In addition, this situation can be perceived by the migrants as degrading (EC 2011, 5).

The 2014 EC publication 'Overview of Diversity Management: Implementation and Impact amongst Diversity Charter Signatories in the European Union' states that 'business benefits do not accrue merely by the presence of diversity in the workforce, they require effective diversity management' (EC 2014). Hence, both diversity and migration management rely on the assumption that migration and diversity are not problematic per se, and could even hold positive

value when ‘properly’ managed. This connects with another feature that diversity and migration management share, namely their technocratic and, potentially, depoliticised character.

Technocracy

In Claudio Radaelli’s analysis of the role of expertise in the European Union, written in the context of criticism of technocracy and depoliticisation, he emphasises that technocracy is not defined by the kinds of actors (experts vs. democratically elected politicians), but by a ‘change in the nature of power’ (Radaelli 1999, 759). He argues that the conflict over whether an issue should be subject to political debate or addressed with technical solutions is a key element of policy struggles. As alluded to above, the language of realism and pragmatism that surrounds both migration and diversity management as well as the technocratic approaches associated with it, have been linked to a depoliticisation of otherwise highly politicised topics. For example, as Christine Oelgemöller critically discusses migration management: ‘As a paradigm, Migration Management is now regarded as an appropriate answer to interdependence and globalisation; one which enables governments to avoid contentious deliberations and to operate at the level of pragmatism and technocracy’ (2011, 409). In Fabian Georgi’s words, migration management ‘is presented as a kind of apolitical politics, as rational management of technical problems’ (Georgi 2009, 82 [translation by the author]; cf. Boswell, Geddes and Scholten 2011; Geiger 2013). Anna Lorbiecki and Gavin Jack conclude on the basis of a discursive analysis of U.S. based definitions of diversity management that ‘there is an implicit and mechanistic rationale underpinnings these definitions’ (2000, 19).

The policy measures broadly associated with migration management are usually cast in technical terms, ranging from increased coordination and cooperation, capacity building, extended research and standardisation of statistics and involvement of multiple stake holders, with ‘comprehensiveness’ featuring as important buzzword (cf. IOM 2003; Betts 2006). In their

strategy paper, the CDMG (2002) advocates for an understanding of international migration as an international business in which the state adopts the main managerial role in partnership with others, such as employers, migrants as well as relevant organisations. Diversity management, on the other hand, is broadly associated with a shift from an imperative of justice to an interest in increasing organisations' effectiveness. Diversity management measures include audits, training, charters, development of indicators and statistical research (European Commission 2003; European Commission 2013; Wrench 2007). Sara Ahmed explains the effect of audit culture in diversity management in Higher Education as follows: 'In other words, you can become good at audit by producing auditable documents, which would mean the universities who "did well" on race equality would be simply the ones that were good at creating auditable systems' (2007, 597). Here, technical success becomes disassociated from the original political incentives.

To show the link between technocracy and depoliticisation without conflating the two, Pécoud's (2015) discourse analysis of 'international migration narratives' (IMN) is relevant. Describing IMN as the growing body of publications on migration by international organisations, where the notion of 'migration management' plays a central role, he detects in IMN a 'double depoliticisation process' (2015, 125). The first of these processes amounts to a depoliticisation through technocracy. Here the foregrounding of technical recommendations as effective solutions, masks and ignores the structural inequalities at the roots of migration. The second element of depoliticisation goes beyond that, but can also find its counterpart in diversity management. Here Pécoud (2015) observes that the cited aims of IMN, such as protection against abuse and exploitation, are so self-evident and uncontroversial, that they close spaces for political debate and make a critical counter-position virtually impossible. Similarly, also migration management's instruments of 'harmonisation' and 'cooperation' sound unobjectionable and hardly politically charged (de Jong, Koevoets and van Leeuwen 2014, 105).

This is mirrored in diversity management, for instance, in a sentence from the brochure ‘Realising the Business Benefits with European Diversity Charters’: ‘Effective Diversity Management also protects your company from risk, allowing you to reap the business awards of diversity whilst also promoting equality and adhering to national and European equality legislation’ (EC 2012, 4). The background document to this brochure as well as to the aforementioned 2013 and 2014 diversity management publications from the EU- Directorate General for Justice, is the 2005 EC study ‘The Business Case for Diversity – good practices in the workplace’. This study was presented as providing a so-called ‘rational framework’ for the business case for diversity in the EU (European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities Website, Features 02/12/2008).

In both diversity management and migration management, there is a strong emphasis on (increasing) expertise and knowledge. Radaelli’s work is helpful in disentangling the role of expertise from technocracy, insisting that they should not be equated, but do stand in relation to one another. Expertise can also be applied to support explicitly politicised processes, for example in supporting the formulation of different political interests. It only becomes technocratic ‘when the political implications of decisions are denied, the conflicts over ends neglected, and technocracy proceeds as if problems were challenging [...] yet ultimately computational’ (1999, 764). This can be for example found in the 2013 European Commission report ‘Assessing Diversity, Impact in Business’, again by the European Union Platform of Diversity Charters, in one of their presented case studies on BNP Paribas Group Luxembourg. In the short description of the case, BNP Paribas’s success is presented in terms of the creation of the position of ‘Diversity Officer’ at senior management level, so that ‘the promotion of diversity is thus managed in the same way as any other strategic project undertaken by the company’ (2013, 18).

Proponents of either management strategy have explicitly argued in favour of this technocratic approach that moves away from the polarised political discussions around migration and diversity. For example, while the CDMG Strategy acknowledges the force of (negative) public opinion in relation to migration, it formulates the appropriate response of migration management in a passive sentence structure that eliminates political controversies and avoids debate on contentious concepts like ‘integration’: ‘Conditions must be created in which minority and majority populations accept that it is in their own best interests for the integration process to succeed’ (COE 2002; cf. IOM 2011). As the first of four pillars ‘to manage migration better’, the European Commission’s European Agenda on Migration presents the alignment of interests as an uncontested fact: ‘It is in the interests of all to address the root causes which cause people to seek a life elsewhere, to crack down on smugglers and traffickers, and to provide clarity and predictability in return policies’ (2015, 7; cf. Martin, Abella and Kuptsch, 2006). Some advocates for diversity management see its advantage vis-à-vis affirmative action in the fact that it does not invite the same kind of backlash, as observed by Wrench (2007).

Critics have also addressed depoliticisation, albeit with more concern. With regards to migration management, Geiger and Pécoud (2010) emphasise that the shift to management has taken migration measures out of the political and into the bureaucratic realm, silencing political debate about the choices made. They also argue that the triple win dogma ignores the fact that the different stakeholders (migrants, country of origin and host country) might have diverging interests that cannot be brought in line with one another (Geiger and Pécoud 2010). Stefan Rother (2013) points to the ways in which the management discourse legitimises top-down regulations that leave little space for migrants’ rights advocacy.

Both migration and diversity management do not address underlying social inequalities. Sceptics of diversity management are afraid that the recognition of structural (labour market)

discrimination as hampering ethnic minorities' labour market participation, which underpinned affirmative action and equal opportunities measures, gets lost in the celebratory 'positive approach' (Wrench 2007, 3) of diversity management. A return to the above mentioned quote from the 2011 EC 'Agenda for the Integration of Third Country Nationals' about migrants' overqualification and unemployment as an 'underutilised resource', reveals that it is an afterthought that this situation '*can be perceived by the migrants as degrading*' (EC 2011, 5 italics added). Moreover, the use of 'perceive' relegates this degrading to the subjective realm of migrants' experiences (cf. Pécoud 2015: 9-10 for a similar example). Especially in the UK context, where diversity management approaches were often preceded by equal opportunity policies, but also more broadly, there has been discussion about the implications of the shift from a case for justice to a business case and the way in which political goals got lost (Maxwell 2004; Greene, Kirton and Wrench 2005; Squires 2008). Critics associate its depoliticisation with ignoring inequality and a bracketing out of what is constructed as 'dangerous difference' (Faist 2010; Anthias 2013, 328). In fact, the embracement of diversity has been understood as a new step in the depoliticisation of anti-racist politics (Lentin and Titley 2008; cf. Gordon 1995). While the above presents strong arguments for considering migration and diversity management as technocratic and depoliticised approaches, the language of depoliticisation might at the same time blind us for the ways in which both interventions are deeply political and replete with power dynamics (cf. Georgi 2009; Kalm 2010).

In the next section, I will present the work of some authors that have discussed both forms of management as instances of governmentality, thereby highlighting the particular form the 'political' and power takes. Governmentality, deriving from Foucault, describes the way in which power functions not through coercion but through the establishing of norms to manage (self-)conduct (Larner and Walters 2004; Lemke 2007; Dean 2010). Thinking in terms of

governmentality therefore exposes technologies of power that are present in both migration management and diversity management, which are at the same time described as de-politicised. More importantly though for the purpose of this article, which argues for the relevance of a synthesis between research on migration and diversity management, is that I will propose, given the conceptual compatibility of many of the critical studies on either diversity management or migration management, that a governmentality approach could be a constructive - but by no means the only possible - point of departure for thinking migration and diversity management together as converging phenomena with similar logics.

Thinking Research Together

Both diversity management and migration management have invited a range of critical responses that have worked to uncover the political and normative implications of these paradigms as well as studying the power dynamics at stake. Ghorashi and Sabelis observe two different conceptions of power in critical studies on diversity management, a domination approach derived from the work of Marx and Gramsci, and what they call a 'Foucauldian approach or discursive approach', expressed in routinisation and normalisation (2013, 80-81). Their broad distinction between those critical diversity management scholars who work with a notion of power as held by a ruling group versus those who understand power as all-encompassing and circulating, does not specify 'which Foucault', but hints at his earlier conception of 'microphysics of power' that formed the prelude for his notion of governmentality (Walters 2012, 14). Based on my own review of the critical literature of both diversity and migration management, I would suggest that much of this work has drawn on both early and late Foucault, with a governmentality framework emerging as a particularly salient way to analyse the workings of diversity and migration management

(Gordon 1995; Kalm 2010; Prügl 2011; Geiger and Pécoud 2013; Ahonen et al. 2014; Scheel and Ratfisch 2014). As Walters (2012) has argued, there is no single, conclusive definition of governmentality and the different studies that I refer to, take up different aspects. Encouraged, however, by the interdisciplinary dialogue that a governmentality framework could facilitate (Larner and Walters 2004) between what so far have been disparate fields of study, I will sketch some contours of how a synthesised analysis of diversity management and migration management could develop.

For example, the earlier mentioned research of Scheel and Ratfisch who trace the role of UNHCR as ‘conducting the conduct of countries’ in their case studies of UNHCR’s activities in Turkey and Morocco (2014, 926), suggests links with critical diversity management literature. Their article highlights the ways in which the UNHCR has embraced and fostered a migration management logic that is both embedded in and producing categorisations of ‘migrants’, differentiating between so-called genuine refugees and illegal migrants (2014, 938). Their focus on the effect of categorisations could have fruitful points of connection with Floya Anthias’ study of integration and diversity discourses in the UK and Europe more broadly, which emphasises a differentiation between ‘salient’ and problematic differences (2013, 327; cf. Ahonen et al. 2014). In turn, the mechanisms and effects of categorisation can be further theorised in relation to the above logic of optimisation shared by migration and diversity management. Scheel’s and Ratfisch’s analysis of UNHCR’s engagement with migration management, also speaks to Elisabeth Prügl’s argument to understand diversity management as a technology of government (2011). Importantly, she stresses that a Foucaultian governmentality approach encourages an analysis that moves away from a focus on the nation-state or the UN to consider practices of governing produced through the interaction between different institutions. From this perspective it is not contradictory that the expertise of the UNHCR gets aligned with migration management

in the same way that ‘feminist knowledge becomes part of a logic of government’ (Prügl 2011, 77). The synthesis between these studies could provide tools for advancing the analysis of the converging logic of technocracy common to diversity and migration management as discussed in the preceding section of this article.

Thinking migration management and diversity management together as forms of governmentality could suggest a range of further research queries. For example, using a Foucauldian apparatus one could ask what subjectivities are (re-)produced at the nexus of the governmentality of migration- and diversity management. Another question could draw on the understanding of neoliberalism as an art of governance (Larner and Walters 2004) to further probe into migration and diversity’s management’s neoliberal logic. One could investigate how technologies of government operate at the meeting point of migration management’s and diversity management. Or engage with the question of how the ‘existence of a degree of freedom’, which is entailed in governmentality (Walters 2012, 14), reflects itself in migration management’s notion of regulated openness and’s diversity management’s productive diversity.

Such questions and many others can be asked in relation to concrete instances where migration management and diversity management encounter one another. Existing studies of diversity and migration management that employ a Foucauldian framework could provide some groundwork for answering these questions and for combining the insights generated in the respective fields. Beyond particular research approaches that suggest combined research questions or invite a synthesis between existing studies, a shared research agenda can more broadly develop by bringing insights from concrete studies in diversity management to migration management research and vice versa. This can start a constructive dialogue around commonalities and differences and inspire deeper analysis in both fields.

Conclusion

This article has intervened in the scholarship on two current central paradigms, migration management and diversity management, by suggesting that there is a need to synthesise the insights of these respective fields of research within the area of ethnic and migration studies. I have argued that such synthesis is necessary since a mapping of migration management and diversity management alongside each other shows important convergences between the two phenomena, not just in certain fields, such as integration or diaspora engagement, but, more importantly, in terms of their broader logic. Based on a combined analysis of scholarly literature and policy documents, I have claimed that the logics of migration management and diversity management converge in three major ways: a) migration and diversity are introduced as the ‘new’ norm, b) the goal is optimisation and c) a technocratic approach is advocated with the ambition to move away from migration and diversity’s history as ‘controversial’ issues. Importantly, these three convergences are not peripheral but central defining features of both diversity and migration management. In fact, the notion of migration management comprises exactly these three facets, when Pécoud defines it as ‘refer[ing] to a presumably ‘new’ way of approaching migration, based on the assumption that it is a ‘normal’ reality that should be governed in a dispassionate fashion by governments, and perceived as an opportunity rather than as a challenge or a threat’ (2015, 21). While each of these features has been discussed, sometimes implicitly, other times explicitly, in the separate bodies of scholarship on diversity management and migration management, they have not been combined for a fuller understanding of the entanglement between (the logic of) migration and diversity management.

Subsequently, I have suggested that the development of a common research agenda could be aided by the fact that much critical scholarship on respectively migration and diversity management has drawn on a Foucauldian governmentality framework. I have proposed that given the conceptual affinity and compatibility of these studies this framework could be one useful

possible point of departure for a dialogue between the two fields that should lead to a deeper understanding of the convergences of diversity and migration management. Numerous studies in the field of ethnic and migration studies offer a wealth of additional material which invites an analysis of the implications of the practices and discourses articulated at the nexus of migration and diversity management. Together they justify scholarly effort in ethnic and migration studies to integrate diversity management as a research topic and to bridge the current gap with research in organisational and management studies.

References

- Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2009. "Embodying Diversity: Problems and Paradoxes for Black Feminists." *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 12(1): 41-52. doi: 10.1080/13613320802650931.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2007. "'You end up doing the document rather than doing the doing': Diversity, Race equality and the Politics of Documentation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(4): 590-609. doi: 10.1080/01419870701356015.
- Ahonen, Pasi, Janne Tienari, Susan Meriläinen, and Alison Pullen. 2014. "Hidden Contexts and Invisible Power Relations: A Foucauldian Reading of Diversity Research." *Human Relations* 67(3): 263-286. doi: 10.1177/0018726713491772.
- Anthias, Floya. 2013. "Moving Beyond the Janus Face of Integration and Diversity Discourses: Towards an Intersectional Framing." *The Sociological Review* 61: 323-343.
- Ataç, Ilker and Kraler, Albert. 2006. "'Gewünschte', 'Geduldete' und 'Unerwünschte': Klassifizieren, Selektieren, Stratifizieren. Migrationspolitik als Strategie des Filterns', *Malmö* 33: 25-26.
- Balibar, Etienne and Erin M. Williams. 2002. "World Borders, Political Borders." *PMLA* 117(1): 71-78.
- Bendl, Regine, Alexander Fleischmann and Christa Walenta. 2008. "Diversity Management Discourse meets Queer Theory." *Gender in Management* 23(6): 382-394.
- Betts, Alexander (ed.). 2011. *Global Migration Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bigo, Didier. 2005. "Frontier Controls in the European Union: Who is in Control?" In *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement Into and Within Europe*, edited by Didier Bigo and Elspeth Guild, 49-99. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Boswell, Christina, Andrew Geddes and Peter Scholten. 2011. "The Role of Narratives in Migration Policy-Making: a Research Framework." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 13:1-11.
- Buckel, Sonja, Fabian Georgi, John Kannankulam, and Jens Wissel. 2014. "Staat, Europa und Migrationskontrolle: Theoretische Grundlagen einer materialistischen Perspektive." In *Kämpfe um Migrationspolitik. Theorie, Methoden und Analysen kritischer Europaforschung*, edited by Forschungsgruppe Staatsprojekt Europa, 21-42. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Council of Europe. 2002. *Towards a Migration Management Strategy*. Strasbourg. http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/migration/archives/Documentation/Migration%20management/Towards_Migration_Management_Strategy_en.pdf.
- Council of Europe. 2006. *Towards a Migration Management Strategy: Challenges for Countries of Origin*. Strasbourg. http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/migration/archives/Documentation/Migration%20management/CDMG_2006_11e%20Final%20Report%20_MG-R-PE_en.pdf.
- Council of the European Union, 2012. *EU Action on Migratory Pressures—A Strategic Response*. Brussels. <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2012/apr/eu-council-actioun-plan-migratory-pressure-8714-rev1-12.pdf>.
- Dean, Mitchell. 2010. *Governmentality: power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.
- De Jong, Sara. 2014. "Diversity Politics and the Politics of Difference." In *Revisiting I.M. Young on Normalisation, Inclusion and Democracy*, edited by Ulrike M. Vieten, 87-105. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- De Jong, Sara, Sanne Koevoets and Fleur van Leeuwen. 2014. "Gendered Fortress Europe." *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies* 17(2): 105-113.
- European Commission. 2003. *The Costs and Benefits of Diversity. A Study on Methods and Indicators to Measure the Cost-Effectiveness of Diversity Policies in Enterprises. Executive Summary*. Directorate-General for Employment, Industrial Relations and Social Affairs. Unit D/3.
- European Commission. 2005. *The Business Case for Diversity – good practices in the workplace*.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2008. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Strengthening the global approach to migration: increasing coordination, coherence and synergies.* <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/NOT/?uri=CELEX:52008DC0611>.

European Commission. 2011. *European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals.* Brussels. <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=1440&langId=en>.

European Commission- Directorate General for Justice. 2012. *Realising the Business Benefits with European Diversity Charters: Managing Diversity at Work.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/managing_diversity_atwork_en.pdf.

European Commission - Directorate General for Justice. 2013. *Assessing Diversity: Impact in Business.* Brussels. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/events/hle-2013/files/assessing_diversity2013_en.pdf.

European Commission - Directorate General for Justice. 2014. *Overview of Diversity Management: Implementation and Impacts amongst Diversity Charter signatories in the European Union.* Brussels. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/diversity_report2014_en.pdf.

European Commission. 2015. *A European Agenda on Migration.* Brussels. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/docs/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf.

Faist, Thomas. 2010. "Cultural Diversity and Social Inequalities." *Social Research* 77(1): 297-324.

Faist, Thomas. 2012. "The Blind Spot of Multiculturalism: From Heterogeneities to Social (In)Equalities", COMCAD Working Papers, edited by Thomas Faist. Bielefeld. https://www.uni-bielefeld.de/tdrc/ag_comcad/downloads/Workingpaper_108_Faist.pdf

Geiger, Martin and Antoine Pécoud. 2010. "The Politics of International Migration Management." In *The Politics of International Migration Management: Migration, Minorities and Citizenship*, edited by Martin Geiger and Antoine Pécoud, 1-20. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Georgi, Fabian. 2009. "Kritik des Migrationsmanagements: Historische Einordnung eines politischen Projekts." *Juridikum: Zeitschrift für Politik, Recht, Gesellschaft* 2, 81-84.
- Ghorashi, Halleh and Ida Sabelis. 2013. "Juggling Difference and Sameness: Rethinking Strategies for Diversity in Organizations." *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 29: 78-86.
- Ghosh, Bimal. 2007. "Managing Migration: towards the Missing Regime?" In *Migration Without Borders: Essays on the Free Movement of People*, edited by Antoine Pécoud, Paul F. A. Guchteneire, 96-118. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Gordon, Avery. 1995. "The Work of Corporate Culture: Diversity Management." *Social Text* 44: 3-30.
- Greene, Anne-Marie, Gill Kirton and John Wrench. 2005. "Trade Union Perspectives on Diversity Management: A Comparison of the UK and Denmark." *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 11(2): 179-196.
- Hunter, Shona and Elaine Swan. 2007. "The Politics of Equality: Professionals, States and Activists, Equal Opportunities International." *Equal Opportunities International* 26(5): 377 – 386. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02610150710756608>.
- International Organization for Migration. 2011. *Communicating Effectively about Migration*. Geneva: IOM.
- International Organization for Migration. 2003. *Managing Migration: Challenges and Responses for People on the Move*. Geneva: IOM.
- Kalm, Sara. 2010. "Liberalizing Movements? The Political Rationality of Global Migration Management." In *The Politics of International Migration Management: Migration, Minorities and Citizenship*, edited by Martin Geiger and Antoine Pécoud, 21-44. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kalonaityte, Viktorija. 2010. "The Case of Vanishing Borders: Theorizing Diversity Management as Internal Border Control." *Organization* 17(31):31-52. doi: 10.1177/1350508409350238.
- Knoppers, Annelies, Inge Claringbould, and Marianne Dortants. 2013. "Discursive Managerial Practices of Diversity and Homogeneity." *Journal of Gender Studies* doi: 10.1080/09589236.2013.833086.

- Kuhn, Melanie. 2012. "Herrschaftskritische Perspektiven auf Diversity-Konzepte in der Pädagogik. Potenzial und Grenze." Paper presented at Bundesvorstand der SJD, Die Falken in Oer-Erkenschwick, 28. April 2012.
- Larner, Wendy and William Walters, eds. 2004. *Global Governmentality*. London: Routledge
- Lemke, Thomas. 2007. "An indigestible meal? Foucault, Governmentality and State Theory." *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 8(2): 43-64. doi: 10.1080/1600910X.2007.9672946.
- Lentin, Alana and Gavan Titley. 2008. "More Benetton than barricades? The politics of diversity in Europe." In *The Politics of Diversity in Europe*, edited by Gavan Titley and Alana Lentin, 9-30. Strassbourg: Council of Europe.
- Lorbiecki, Anna and Gavin Jack. 2000. "Critical Turns in the Evolution of Diversity Management." *British Journal of Management* 11: 17-31. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.11.s1.3.
- Maxwell, Gillian A. 2004. "Minority Report: taking the Initiative in Managing Diversity at BBC Scotland." *Employee Relations* 26(2): 182-202.
- Martin, Philip, Manola Abella, and Christiane Kuptsch. 2006. *Managing Labor Migration in the Twenty-first Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mecheril, Paul. 2007. *Diversity. Die Macht des Einbezugs. In: Dossier Managing Diversity – Alle Chancen genutzt?* http://www.migration-boell.de/web/diversity/48_1012.asp.
- Meriläinen, Susan, Janne Tienari, Saija Katila, Yvonne Benschop. 2009. "Diversity Management Versus Gender Equality: The Finnish Case." *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 26(3): 230-243.
- Mügge, Liza and Sara de Jong. 2013. "Intersectionalizing European politics: bridging gender and ethnicity." *Politics, Groups and Identities* 1(3): 380-389.
- Neuhold, Petra and Scheibelhofer, Paul. 2010. "Provincialising Multiculturalism: Postkoloniale Perspektiven auf Multikulturalismus, Diversität und Emanzipation." *PROKLA, Zeitschrift für kritische Sozialwissenschaft* 158, 40(1): 85-100.
- Nyers, Peter and Kim Rygiel, eds. 2012. *Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Nyers, Peter. 2003. "Abject Cosmpolitanism: the Politics of Protection in the Anti-Deportation Movement." *Third World Quarterly* 24(6): 1069-1093.

- Overbeek, Henk. 2002. "Globalisation and Governance: Contradictions of Neo-Liberal Migration Management." *HWWA Discussion Paper 174*, Hamburg Institute for International Economics. <http://purl.umn.edu/26363>.
- Papadopoulos, Dimitris and Vassilis S. Tsianos. 2013. "After citizenship: Autonomy of Migration, Organisational Ontology and Mobile Commons." *Citizenship Studies* 17:2, 178-196, doi:10.1080/13621025.2013.780736.
- Pécoud, Antoine. 2009. "The UN Convention on Migrant Workers's Rights and International Migration Management." *Global Society* 22(33): 333-350. doi: 10.1080/13600820902958741.
- Prügl, Elisabeth. 2011. "Diversity Management and Gender Mainstreaming as Technologies of Government." *Politics & Gender* 7:71-89.
- Radaelli, Claudio M. 1999. "The public policy of the European Union: whither politics of expertise?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 6:5: 757-774.
- Rother, Stefan. 2013. "A Tale of Two Tactics: Civil Society and Competing Visions of Global Migration Governance from Below." In *Disciplining the Transnational Mobility of People*, edited by Martin Geiger and Antoine Pécoud, 41-62. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scheel, Stephan and Philipp Ratfisch. 2014. "Refugee Protection Meets Migration Management: UNHCR as a Global Police of Populations." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(6): 924-941. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2013.855074.
- Schiller, Maria. 2015. "Paradigmatic Pragmatism and the Politics of Diversity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2014.992925.
- Schuster, Liza. 2005. *The Realities of a New Asylum Paradigm (Report No. WP-05-20)*. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS).
- Sénac, Réjane and Maxime Forest. 2015. "Discursive Shifts in the Making of French 'Diversity Policy': Towards an Intersectional Citizenship?" Paper presented at the European Conference on Politics and Gender, Uppsala, June 11-13.
- Shore, Cris and Susan Wright, eds. 1997. *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives of Governance and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Squires, Judith. 2008. "Intersecting Inequalities: Reflecting on the Subjects and Objects of Equality." *The Political Quarterly* 79(1): 53-61. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-923X.2008.00902.x.
- Swan, Elaine. 2010. "Commodity Diversity: Smiling Faces as a Strategy of Containment." *Organization* 17(7): 77-100. doi: 10.1177/1350508409350043.

- Taylor, Savitri. 2005. "From Border Control to Migration Management: The Case for a Paradigm Change in the Western Response to Transborder Population Movement." *Social Policy and Administration* 29(6): 563-586.
- Titley, Gavan and Alana Lentin, eds. 2008. *The Politics of Diversity in Europe*. Strassbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- UNHCR. 2006. *High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development: UNHCR's Observations and Recommendations*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- Van Ewijk, Anne R. 2011. "Diversity and Diversity Policy: Diving into Fundamental Differences." *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 24(5):680-694. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534811111158921>.
- Vertovec, Steven. 2012. "'Diversity' and the Social Imaginery." *European Journal of Sociology* 53, 3, pp. 287-312. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S000397561200015X>.
- Walters, William. 2004. "The Political Rationality of European Integration." In *Global Governmentality*, edited by Wendy Larner and William Walters, 155-173. London: Routledge.
- Walters, William. 2012. *Governmentality: Critical Encounters*. New York: Routledge.
- Wrench, John. 2007. *Diversity Management and Discrimination: Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities in the EU*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Zanoni, Patrizia and Maddy Janssens. 2007. "Minority Employees Engaging with (Diversity) Management: An Analysis of Control, Agency and Micro-Emancipation." *Journal of Management Studies* 44, 8, pp. 1371-1397.
- Zanoni, Patrizia, Maddy Janssens, Yvonne Benschop and Stella Nkomo, eds. 2010. Special Issue: *Diversity Organization* 17(1): 9-29.

ⁱ Since a substantial part of the scholarship on diversity management comes from feminist and gender scholars, this divide might also be reflective of a wider issue of a lacking dialogue between two interdisciplinary strands of European scholarship on politics: Gender Studies, and Migration and Ethnic Studies (Mügge and de Jong 2013).

ⁱⁱ The reports used for the analysis of this article are all European, either produced by the European Union or by the Council of Europe, to enable a certain level of consistency. Such restriction diminishes (but does not eliminate) varieties that exist in the face of different national interpretations of diversity. The focus at the European level facilitates the synthesis between publications on diversity and migration management, since in both fields many initiatives and programmes have emerged at this level. The selection of 11 publications (5 on diversity, 5 on migration, 1 on integration) was based on a combination of the author's own search and on an orientation towards

sources described as significant in the secondary literature on diversity and migration management. All reports have been published in the last 15 years, during which both migration and diversity management discourses gained prominence and are available online.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Diversity Charters meet three times a year at an in 2010 created EU platform, founded in the context of the project 'Support for voluntary initiatives promoting diversity management at the workplace across the EU' funded by the PROGRESS programme. The PROGRESS programme supports EU policy in the broader field of work and inclusion (European Union 2012).

^{iv} The CDMG was from 1984 responsible for developing European co-operation on migration, integration and community relations.

^v The titles of subsequent IOM Migration Reports reveal the continuing course on the path of migration management, with the most revealing titles being the 2005 publication 'Costs and Benefits of International Migration', the 2008 publication 'Managing Labour Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy' and the 2011 title 'Communicating Effectively about Migration'.