



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### Progress of migration scholarship over 60 years of International Migration

Icduygu, A.; Rath, J.; Sert, D.; Ustubici, A.

**DOI**

[10.1111/imig.12934](https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12934)

**Publication date**

2021

**Document Version**

Final published version

**Published in**

International Migration

**License**

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Icduygu, A., Rath, J., Sert, D., & Ustubici, A. (2021). Progress of migration scholarship over 60 years of *International Migration*. *International Migration*, 59(6), 3-7.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12934>

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



## EDITORIAL

# Progress of migration scholarship over 60 years of *International Migration*

A posting on Facebook earlier this year – showcasing the 60th anniversary logo of *International Migration* – elicited one viewer to exclaim: 'Congrats on 60 years of migration scholarship!' Such kind words suggest that the Journal has been a self-evident outlet and a place for the exchange of scholarly knowledge on issues related to international migration and population diversity. Most scholars today have a clear picture of what that entails: it pertains to the outcomes of research that have followed internationally accepted academic standards, applied rigorous methodologies, displayed soundness and precision in terms of planning, data collection, analysis and reporting; that explored and further developed a unique theoretical argument, and that has undergone strict peer-reviewing procedures before finally reaching the stage of publication. Indeed, that is exactly what *International Migration* is practicing nowadays, as can be witnessed by the collections of fifteen or more articles in each of the six issues in each annual volume as well as the much higher number of submissions that are being rejected during the editorial process.

The Journal was established in 1961 under the name *Migration* by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), which was known at the time as the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM). ICEM was the successor of the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME), which was founded with an initial mandate to respond to the chaos and displacement in Western Europe where an estimated eleven million people were uprooted during the Second World War. PICMME, later known as ICEM, assisted the European governments to relocate nearly a million migrants during the 1950s. The organization took the name Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM) in 1980, and finally the International Organization for Migration (IOM) in 1989. A series of name changes mirrors the organization's evolution over half a century from a logistics agency to a migration agency. At the same time, the Journal also went through a name change and was granted its current title *International Migration* in 1963.

In commemoration of the 60th anniversary of *International Migration*, we have gone back in time and examined the evolution of the Journal since the first issue that came out on 3 January 1961 with the foreword penned by Marcus Daly, the Director of ICEM then. It is not wrong to state here that when the Journal was first established it was merely a formal Journal of ICEM where most articles were written by the official state authorities, that is ministers, bureaucrats and policymakers. For instance, the Australian Minister for Immigration, Alexander R. Downer, wrote an article with the title '*The Influence of Migration on Australian Foreign Policy*' in the first issue of the Journal. Similarly, the Journal published an article, entitled '*How Migration Affects the Country of Emigration*' written by Francesco M. Dominedo, who was the Under-Secretary of State in the Italian Ministry of Justice. It also appeared that in the early issues, the Journal published descriptive papers that focused on policies and ongoing realities of migration with a section that was devoted to documentation of new legislations, regulations and factual developments, and publishing bibliographies from time to time.

In its initial years, the journal was not only more policy oriented, but rather Euro-centric as well, reflecting the migratory context immediately after the Second World War. Besides the domination of policy-oriented papers in the Journal, we also see prominence of demography as a discipline, especially along articles published by

renowned demographers from Australia: W. D. Borrie and C. Price were only two examples, where the latter, a well-known scholar, published *The Integration of Religious Group in Australia* in July 1963. The focus of the articles was mostly migration of Europeans, that is largely British, Greek, Italian, German and Scandinavian, to traditional immigration countries of Australia, Canada, the United States and partially to Latin America and Israel. Articles on Latin America during this period were particularly interested in issues of agriculture and development and their relationship with international migration. For instance, an article by M. Diegues, *Rural Settlement in Latin America: Some Observations and Several Suggestions* appeared in the April 1963 issue.

Overtime, we observe a slow trend from more descriptive, policy related and state-centric issues to more scholarly, analytical and migration-focused volumes. Here, two examples can be mentioned: *Determinants of Migration: The Highly Skilled* by H.G. Grubel and A.D. Scott, and *The Influence of the Ethnic Association on Assimilation of its Immigrant Members* by R. Johnston. Especially after 1965, more articles were published on post-war-intra-European labour migration where integration appears to be a trending concept albeit analysed under different labels such as adaptation and assimilation. The trend develops in relation to migration from South to North Europe, and migration from Turkey or former colonies to Europe: a good example in this context is an article by J. R. McDonald published in January 1969, *Toward a Typology of European Labour Migration*. Interestingly, brain drain and the need for highly skilled migrants in Europe also emerged as parts of policy discussion.

While the overall Euro-centric focus of the Journal did not change very fast in the early 1970s, there was a trend of change, with a few articles concentrating on migration issues in some new geographies, such as refugee flows from Cuba to the United States and migration from African states to other parts of the world. In the same period, there was also a new focus on the temporary versus permanent migration debate where return was discussed in the context of Europe and the North America: an article by C. B. Keely, published in July 1975, *Temporary Workers in the United States* is a good example in this context.

In fact, in the earlier years of the Journal, the common practice did not really reveal a manifest outlet for the exchange of scholarly knowledge on issues related to international migration. The volumes published until 1992 warrant us to rethink such pretentious assumptions as exploring the output in those years suggests a different story indeed. Not one single volume in this period comprised six issues, it was four at most, and in some years even just two (bound together in one booklet). Furthermore, not one single issue in this period comprised 15+ fully fledged, 8,000-word articles. Some issues only had a handful of articles, while the average was six to eight. This does not suggest a blossoming field of study; on the contrary, one gets the impression that it was very hard to find manuscripts to publish.

Volumes between the years 1978 and 1992 revealed not only quantitative changes but also qualitative ones, especially after the demise of Günther Beyer (1904–1983) and the appointment of Wilfried Dumon as the managing editor in 1982. *First*, articles in older volumes tended to be extremely descriptive and comprised simple inventories or the state-of-the-art overviews. Little was done to go beyond that and to elevate the questions and findings to a more theoretical level. Such flat descriptions devoid of any theoretical depth were perhaps needed in those days, but they would not be accepted today.

*Second*, and probably related to the previous point, most contributions were strongly policy-driven, while most authors seemed to speak to the world of policy advisors. An article by D. G. Papademetriou, P. L. Martin and M. J. Miller in 1983 *US Immigration Policy: The Guestworker Option Revisited* and by C. B. Keely in 1986 *Return of Talent Programs: Rationale and Evaluation Criteria for Programs to Ameliorate a "Brain Drain"* are cases in point. They wrote about the guestworker system, and thus about the economic dimensions of migration, a topic that today no longer receives the attention it deserves. The new managing editor in his inaugural presentation nonetheless – and to our surprise – stated that: 'scholarly articles being policy related or having any relevance for policy-making are rather scarce'. But he added: 'Still we would strongly make a call for articles being theoretical based, methodological sound and having policy relevance (Dumon 1982)'. Slowly but gradually, the contributions started to speak to wider theoretical debates. Various articles began theorizing about migratory developments, for example, S. Mancho wrote in 1982 about second-generation migrants in the *Role of Associations as regards Second-generation*

*Migrants, especially from the Point of View of maintaining cultural Links with the Country of Origin*'; W. Koot and J. Rath published *'Ethnicity and Emancipation'* in 1987; and Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı authored *'Alienation of the Outsider: The Plight of Migrants'* the same year. Looking back, we also notice the emergence of the topical issues of those times: In 1986, T. Hammer contributed an influential paper on *'Citizenship: Membership of a Nation and of a State'*. The same year, M. Boyd and C. Taylor, drew attention to gender issues in *'The Feminization of Temporary Workers: The Canadian Case'*, which was followed by M. Morokvasic's influential work *'Roads to Independence: Self-Employed Immigrants and Minority Women in Five European States'* in 1991. R. Miles published *'Migration to Britain: The Significance of a Historical Approach'* the same year, contributing to the field a distinguished paper where he argued that current issues can be better understood only if conceptualized as part of a larger historical framework.

Third, most papers were based on research in North America and Australia, Europe followed later, demonstrating a marked difference from the initial periods when European migration issues held precedence. Research on and in other continents remained thin on the ground for a very long time. In this regard, Dumon noted: 'The international character of our Journal will be developed in giving priority to migration problems and events in Latin America, Asia and Africa, without disregarding Europe or Northern America, so that a well-balanced representation of the actual migration situation in the world can be guaranteed'. Some research from this period responded to this call as demonstrated in *'The Long Road from Nador to Brussels'* (1986) by M. F. Cammaert which highlighted the transnational aspects of Moroccan migration and K. Kirişçi's *'Refugee Movements and Turkey'* in 1991.

Has it mattered? Have the articles made any impact? This is difficult to measure. Except for two or three articles, none of the contributions to volumes 16–30 have been included by Harzing's Publish and Perish tool (which is based on Google Scholar and monitoring the citations of approximate 1,000 articles published in *International Migration* after 1969), suggesting limited or minimal impact. Two disclaimers apply however. First, the period under scrutiny here (1978–1992) dates from before the emergence of the Internet and the introduction of online Journals. This means that it was far more difficult – and costly – to keep track of citations. Secondly, many of today's scholars were not even born when Günther Beyer started his editorial work for *International Migration*, and they probably consider papers from 1978 as old and irrelevant. Admittedly, the sparsity of articles, the different migration situation in those days, the rise of new and more urgent issues, the lack of theoretical breadth and so forth are conditions that discourage delving into the older volumes of the Journal. But there is also a tendency to assume that what is old is uninteresting and irrelevant, especially for those who wish to carry out cutting edge research. Such a tendency, for as far as it exists, would be a mistake, as the following collection of articles demonstrates.

The older collections of the Journal must be understood in their temporal context and approached as serving a different purpose than that assigned for more recent research. In her *Commentary* published in this issue, Susan Martin (2021) notes on the 1980s that *Publications, Periodicals and Pamphlets* were particularly useful as it introduced audiences to materials from Africa, Asia and Latin America that were not widely known in the United States. Some of these were published bilingually, for example in French and Spanish, and the Journal was multilingual at different periods of time. A similar trend continued in the 1990s as for example, Volume 31:1 entailed a conference proceeding on Japan with a summary and overview in Japanese. It can be argued that the editors at the time also had more flexibility in the management of the Journal, enabling them to insert different subheadings such as *Seminar, Conference, Workshop, Case Reports, Data and Perspectives, Notes and Commentary, Emerging Research* as well as *Student Papers*.

We can argue that starting in the early 1990s, the geographical focus of the Journal expanded from the so-called Global North to diverse regions like Asia, Africa and Latin America. There were also an increasing number of Turkey-related papers in this period, treating Turkey as a country of emigration. We also see continuous contributions on previously emergent themes like gender, for example, A. Kadioğlu's article *'The Impact of Migration on Gender Roles: Findings of Field Research in Turkey'*. However, most articles were still mere case studies rather than theoretical contributions. Merged issues with only seven-eight articles were common practice, thus, continuity was an issue at that time. Although academic contributions began to have a certain level

of predominance in the Journal, *International Migration* continued to serve as a venue for discussion regarding important policy matters. For example, a whole issue (Volume 36:4) was devoted to *Migration and AIDS Special Issue* by the UNAIDS and the IOM, which was policy-oriented, but touched upon a very timely topic for the time.

As of 2000, the Journal began to publish more issues per year and there was a rise in the number of Special Issues included such as *Understanding Migration between China and Europe* (Volume 43:1). Moreover, the Journal maintained its links with the policy world, as for example, a large segment of Volume 44:4 was *Comments on the Global Commission on International Migration Report*. In time, the number of articles published per issue gradually increased signalling a growing interest in migration studies as well as rising scholarly productivity. An upward trend with professionalization continued in the field with more funding available for migration research arguably leading to the production and later publication of more articles. *International Migration* position as a venue for scholars and policymakers alike was entrenched during this period. In addition, while some articles included a section on the policy implications of the research, there was also an increase in theoretical contributions like H. De Haas' '*The migration and development pendulum: A critical view on research and policy*'.

In the meantime, new and more diverse themes continued to emerge as a response to the changes in migration trends and situations. As a result, the articles published have become more diverse and focus on a wide array of thematic issues. For instance, the impact of the 2004 EU enlargement on migration patterns, South-South migration, human smuggling, highly skilled and academic mobility, Syrian displacement and Venezuelan exodus emerged as new themes. Special issue on topical policy development, yet with more academic vigour have also continued, for example *Global Compacts on Refugees and for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration*.

Over time, digitalization of the Journal has certainly increased access both in terms of reaching a wider audience as well as easing the article submission process for potential authors from all over the world. Although there are still some gaps in terms of global access, there are increased efforts to address these issues as demonstrated in the decision of the current editors, to introduce a *Book Reviews* and *Commentaries* sections with free access options, intending to attract a more general audience interested in migration studies. Reflecting on the 60 years of *International Migration* is also an exercise in reflecting on the establishment and overall development of migration scholarship. The process highlights key trends following a move from policy orientation to academic scholarship, from Global North to Global South, and from single-discipline perspectives to inter-disciplinary discussions. As the current editors, we are thankful to all past editors for laying the groundwork especially the most recent ones, Reginald Appleyard, Elżbieta M. Goździak and Howard Duncan who made important contributions to establishing the Journal's pivotal position in the field of migration scholarship. We also would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the work of all authors, reviewers as well as readers. Finally, we would like to thank the IOM and the team at Wiley for their continuous support of our work. Moreover, as editors, we take this 60th anniversary as an opportunity to reflect and acknowledge further aspects and dimensions that require improvement. In this vein, we reiterate our commitment to migration-scholarship emerging from the Global South and expanding avenues for publication especially for younger authors from diverse backgrounds. As we stated in our first editorial in January 2020, '*the field of international migration studies is undergoing an extraordinary process of transformation*', and we continue our pledge to not just follow, but also to lead this transformation.

Ahmet Icduygu<sup>1</sup>

Jan Rath<sup>2</sup> 

Deniz Sert<sup>3</sup> 

Aysen Ustubici<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>MiReKoc – International Relations, Koc University, Istanbul, Sariyer, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Department of Sociology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

<sup>3</sup>Department of International Relations, Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey

**ORCID**

*Jan Rath*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1961-2763>

*Deniz Sert*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5360-6642>

*Aysen Ustubici*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1498-0025>