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This last year has been challenging for many members of our section and excruciating for some. Many of us have dealt with COVID uncertainties, shutdowns, juggling work responsibilities with restless children at home, separation from many family and friends, reworking courses for online teaching, and too many hours in Zoom meetings. Some of us have struggled with significant economic insecurity, coronavirus illness, and the loss of loved ones. Some of our members also have endured increased anti-Asian racism and violence during the pandemic, while the murder of George Floyd has served as a searing inflection point in the longstanding struggle for Black lives and the battle against generations of police violence against Black, Latino and indigenous people. It has all been a lot.

It would be understandable under these circumstances to check out of the work of our section. Yet we have been floored by the willingness of so many members to lend their talents and precious time to serving the section. Our 2021 Program Co-Chairs, Michael Sullivan and Monica Varsanyi, have tackled one of the section’s biggest jobs of planning our annual program offerings amidst uncertainties of a hybrid APSA meeting. Your elected leadership team – including Rebecca Hamlin (Secretary), Melanie Kolbe (Treasurer), Ahmed Khattab (Council), Noora Lori (Council), Rahsaan Maxwell (Council), Rachel Torres (Council), Ines Valdez (Council), and Monica Varsanyi (Council) — has been deliberating about exciting new plans for mentoring junior scholars, future preconference offerings, and maintaining vibrant receptions within a realistic budget. Our awards committees are in the hands of an impressive group of colleagues: Colin Brown, Christine Brenner, Barbara Buckinx, Janice Fine, Agustin Goenaga Orrego, Guy Grossman, James Hollifield, Loren Landau, Kimberly Morgan, Lina Newton, Ines Valdez, and Beth Elise Whitaker. This year’s nominating committee was James McCann, Kelsey Norman, and Kamal Sadiq.
Finally, this newsletter represents another of our section’s heaviest lifts, and it is the product of the creativity, hard work, and impressive execution of our Co-Editors Laura Cleton and Annika Hinze. As this list captures, sustaining a section requires a strong community of scholars willing to carve out time for our shared work despite all the usual teaching, service, and research demands. We are enormously grateful to all of these colleagues for their generous contributions, and we look forward to expanding this leadership team each year.

Compared to most of its APSA counterparts, our section stands out for several reasons. First of all, the Migration and Citizenship section is one of APSA’s youngest (still only nine-years-old). In contrast to the narrower specializations or subfield-dominated foci of other sections, the questions and topics that unify our section liberate us from the usual silos of our discipline and bring together scholars working in comparative politics, international relations, political theory, U.S. politics, and other fields. For the same reason, members of our section are regularly in conversation with migration and citizenship scholars in other academic disciplines, and we embrace interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary work. Among other distinctive qualities, our section also features an extraordinary number of people engaged in public scholarship who use their research and expertise to build greater public understanding about all categories of migration and migration. This public engagement is especially powerful in a period when enduring xenophobia, exclusion, and subjugation have gained new forms of political traction. We are inspired by the exceptional work being done by members of our section, and we urge you to encourage kindred spirits to join our ranks.

To contact the Co-Presidents, email Antje Ellermann (antje.ellermann@ubc.ca) and Daniel J. Tichenor (tichenor@uoregon.edu)
Letter from the Co-Editors

Annika Hinze
Fordham University

Laura Cleton
University of Antwerp

10 May, 2021

We are very happy to present this new issue of the APSA migration & citizenship newsletter to you, which is the first under our editorship. We took over from Fiona Barker and Ruxandra Paul in fall 2020 and would like to take a moment to thank them for their hard work, commitment to the Migration & Citizenship community and inspiring issues they put together over the past two years. We only hope that we will be able to do the same and continue to foster a sense of community in times where this is not self-evident. We would like to take the opportunity to briefly introduce ourselves before digging deeper into the theme of this issue and the contributions. Annika Hinze is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Fordham University and the Director of Fordham’s Urban Studies Program. Her research is focused on urban immigrant communities, minority and identity politics, urban development, and democratic inclusion. Laura Cleton is a third-year PhD researcher at the University of Antwerp, specializing in gender & migration studies, and is currently writing her thesis on the way European governments resort to boundary work to legitimize the deportation of non-citizen children. While we are both in very different stages of academic careers and personal lives, live on two different continents and face different challenges related to the pandemic, we share a commitment to research on migration and citizenship, as well as the need to provide space to our members to reflect on how the COVID-19 pandemic impacts their work and our profession.

Of course, the COVID-19 pandemic is still ongoing. We are witnessing differentiated responses and capabilities in efforts to combat the pandemic, which bring about new concerns related to inequalities in health and socio-economic mobility. The Washington Post recently wrote that “in 2021, the globe has been split into coronavirus vaccine ‘haves’ and ‘havenots’, creating a gap
that may define the next phase of the pandemic”. Their data reveals that 45% of all vaccine doses administered so far have gone to just 16% of the world’s population who live in high-income countries. This shocking and deeply unjust imbalance in the distribution of the coronavirus vaccines between high-income and lower-income countries was termed ‘vaccine apartheid’ in a recent article in Foreign Policy. It is bound to lead to deep-seated inequity with regard to pandemic vulnerability, loss of life, risks further mutations of the virus, and it will continue to deepen persisting social and economic inequalities. While the Biden administration recently threw its support behind a proposal to waive intellectual property for the vaccines, so that it can be produced at lower costs and become available for communities worldwide, Angela Merkel expressed her doubts: “the protection of intellectual property is a source of innovation and it must remain so in the future”. For citizens of such high-income countries who already have broad access to COVID vaccines or will so in the next months, the next big question centers on how to get back to ‘normal’. The United States and the European Commission are expected to rely on ‘vaccine passports’ to get domestic and international mobility back to their pre-pandemic levels. But with unequal access to vaccines, these passports also raise important ethical questions, as they will effectively prioritize the mobility of people in rich countries, who are privileged to have unrestricted access to COVID vaccines. This, in turn, will further exacerbate the long-standing mobility gap between citizens of the Global North and Global South.

It is in the light of these ongoing challenges that we want to focus on the COVID-19 pandemic in this issue of the Migration & Citizenship newsletter. The pandemic has affected many of us in different ways, both personally and professionally, and this issue provides space to discuss the impact that COVID-19 has on our research and academic trajectories. In the interview with the “Migration, Gender and COVID-19” team (p. 9), we can clearly see how the pandemic’s impact on the refugee women in question, the research team and the broader environment in Portland shaped the study. Sandra Morgenstern and Laura Cleton (p. 25) candidly detail their experiences of being PhD researchers during a global pandemic and highlight their difficulties, as well as coping strategies and hopes for the future. On a practical level, Nick Micinski and Kelsey Norman (p. 13), as well as Judith de Jong (p. 20), detail how they had to adjust their data collection and show how this benefitted their studies in unexpected ways. Finally, the Digital Fieldwork Team (p. 17) provide a source of inspiration for scholars who need to switch from conducting (ethnographic) fieldwork to online modes of collecting data. Together, these contributions provide honest insights in the ongoing disruptions that COVID-19 has on our work, professional lives and the day-to-day realities of our research participants. This issue is completed by Rebecca Hamlin’s Policy Brief on COVID, mobility and the Trump

3 https://naturemicrobiologycommunity.nature.com/posts/how-vaccine-passports-will-worsen-inequities-in-global-health
4 https://www.ft.com/content/76a05a85-b83c-4e36-b04d-7f4f63e57b0
Agenda (p. 31), and an introduction by our colleagues in Florence at the Migration Policy Center (p. 35), who have done extensive work on migration, citizenship and the pandemic over the past 14 months. We would like to thank all contributors for their efforts and hope that their stories will provide as a source of inspiration to you.

To contact the co-editors, email Annika Hinze (ahinze1@fordham.edu) and Laura Cleton (laura.cleton@uantwerpen.be)
Researching Migration & Citizenship in times of COVID-19: experiences and reflections

0. Introduction by Laura Cleton

For this newsletter’s edition, the editors wanted to focus on the impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had and continues to have on the research projects and career paths of our section members. Since the outbreak of the pandemic, Migration and Citizenship scholars have immediately focused their attention on its consequences for mobility and migration worldwide. The first ten months of 2020, for example, marked a dramatic decrease in refugee numbers in both the United States and the European Union. The EU saw a 33% decrease in asylum applications and 10% in ‘irregular border crossings’ compared to the same period in 2019.\(^6\) Despite these apparent reductions in arrivals to the EU, arrivals in Malta and Italy steadily continued. At the same time, NGOs and humanitarian organizations over the past year frequently voiced their concern about the situation on the Greek and Italian Islands. In both Greece and Italy, relief organizations criticized the governments for using COVID-19 as an excuse to detain asylum seekers in poor conditions and further restrict access to the asylum system.\(^7\) Already in April 2020, Human Rights Watch was alarmed about the lack of protective measures, hygiene and capacity to maintain social distance in refugee camps in Greece, worrying about COVID-19 outbreaks that further puts the lives of those fleeing at risk.\(^8\) Restrictions on travel worldwide, obviously also impacted labor and family migrants, as well as opportunities and health outcomes for ‘settled immigrants’. A recent OECD study, for example, shows that recently settled immigrants were significantly more vulnerable to getting a COVID-19 infection and being discriminated against on the labor market in times of crisis.\(^9\)

In the United States, 2020 marked the final year in which the outgoing Trump administration could pursue its policy of further reducing immigration to the country (see also this issue’s Policy Brief). The admission ceiling for refugees and asylum seekers for the fiscal year 2020 was 18,000, but only 66% (11,800 resettled refugees) of that ceiling were reached, in part due to the administration’s dismantling of much of the infrastructure required for the resettlement process.\(^10\) The Trump administration had intended to further decrease the refugee ceiling to 15,000 for the 2021 fiscal year, the lowest ceiling the resettlement program had seen since its inception in 1980. The impact of this had ripple effects across the world and proved particularly devastating during a

---

pandemic year that saw record numbers in displaced people around the world, totaling 80 million – among them 45.7 million internally displaced people, 26.3 million refugees, 4.2 million asylum seekers, and 3.6 million internationally displaced Venezuelans. All these numbers are low estimates, and the actual number of displaced people is expected to be even higher. And while the Biden administration has already announced a dramatic increase in the U.S. refugee ceiling to 125,000 for FY 2022, these changes will not be felt as immediately as they are needed.

All of the above obviously also impacts the academic work that is done on migration, mobility, and membership by our members. We are studying the pandemic changes in the processes and policies along with their impact on people worldwide, including ourselves. The pandemic affects our access to funding and our workloads, and it raises important ethical questions on how we design our research projects and collect our data. The following contributions will all detail how COVID-19 influenced their research projects and how they dealt with it. They will center on questions related to changing research topics, dealing with professional uncertainty, collecting different data than envisioned and collecting data online. These pieces share crucial insights that are fruitful for section members to shape their current and future conversations and research practices.

11 [https://www.unhcr.org/refugee-statistics/](https://www.unhcr.org/refugee-statistics/)
Editors: Can you include a brief summary on your research project, members & its main conclusions?

Between May and July 2020, we conducted ethnographic research on COVID-19’s impact on refugee women’s livelihoods in Portland (OR). This included interviews with fifteen refugee women and representatives of organizations working in the context of migration. We complemented these interviews with online observations of community efforts that provide essential services to refugees. Based on our interviews and observations, we found that refugee women’s livelihoods have been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in various specific ways: from losing jobs and healthcare to becoming essential workers and assuming additional caretaker roles, to finding oneself again in unprecedented situations of limited mobility and social isolation. These impacts have been informed by restricted access to resources and services, lack of information about resources and services, and paramount fear due to ever-changing policy.

The project is led by Dr. Lara-Zuzan Golesorkhi, with assistance from researchers Grace Fortson, Katherine Harder, and Trevor Riedmann.12 Preliminary findings

12 Dr. Golesorkhi is an Assistant Professor of Political Science and a scholar-practitioner at the University of Portland. She is the founder and executive director of the Center for Migration, Gender and Justice (CMGJ).
have been published by the *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* and will be presented at this year’s American Political Science Association Annual Meeting. We are currently working on a chapter for an edited book volume “Philosophical Perspectives on the Social Consequences of the COVID-19 Pandemic” to be published by Springer in late 2021. Since the project emerged as a community-based/informed practice based on our positions at the Center for Migration, Gender, and Justice, we are also preparing a practitioner / field report for a Special Issue on “Migration, Asylum and Refuge during a Global Pandemic: Perspectives of Migrants, Researchers and Practitioners” in *Refugee Review*.

The research was funded by the University of Portland College of Arts and Sciences Summer Research Grant (CAS SURE Grant) and continued funding for the project has been secured (University of Portland College Provost Research Grant).

**Editors: How did your research team deal with the ever-changing COVID-19 restrictions in designing and conducting qualitative/ethnographic research? Did it prompt you to change research design or methods, and if so, how was your research affected by this?**

Our research was supported by the University of Portland College of Arts and Sciences Summer Research Grant (CAS SURE Grant), which we initially received for a related research topic. Although we could have continued to pursue this initial topic, we found it to be imperative to address the additional challenges faced by refugee women during this pandemic as well as to let the women’s lived experiences guide our research more fully. This was evident in our learning of the importance of community efforts in these unprecedented times.

Making the decision to adapt our research topic to the current moment meant that we had to quickly adjust our research methodology, redesign our interview and observation protocol, and follow procedure to amend our IRB approval. While the challenges posed by COVID-19 forced us to make these changes, it also allowed us to think creatively and in an innovative manner to capture the moment as it was unfolding. A concrete example in this context includes meaning making through online observations and using social media to track community efforts. We created a data sheet on community-based organizations and observed daily activities in providing resources and services to refugees. These frequent observations enabled us to identify the varied actors involved in sustaining refugee livelihoods and to delineate adjustments made based on changing needs and challenges of refugee communities (i.e., moving from providing personal protective equipment to calling on allies to donate their stimulus funds).

Grace Fortson is a Senior at the University of Portland, majoring in Political Science and Global Affairs with a minor in Gender and Women’s Studies. Katherine Harder is pursuing a BA in Political Science and Global Affairs, and Communications at the University of Portland. Trevor Riedmann is also at the University of Portland, majoring in Political Science and Global Affairs with a minor in Social Justice.
Editors: Did COVID-19 pose any additional restrictions for the individual researcher team members? How did you address these, and what sort of impact did they have on the overall project?

Each team member was uniquely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition to transitioning to online learning, we dealt with financial and housing challenges, health concerns, and changes in family roles. Additionally, one of our team members was directly affected by the ever-changing migration policies that we explore in our research. Each one of us dealt with these emotional tolls (added stress and increased anxiety). Knowing that we were all collectively struggling, and continue to struggle, has informed - indeed - strengthened our team spirit and has made this research experience one of a kind. We made sure to check in with one another regularly and planned for flexibility in deadlines and scheduling, with the understanding that some things may require more time due to these unprecedented circumstances. We fostered a tone of compassion and support throughout the research process which directly impacted the nature of our research; living through something like this while researching it in real time made us vulnerable, honest, and reflective as researchers. This, in turn, affected our interview content and practices in some ways. It was admittedly difficult to separate our research from our own experiences during this time. In personalizing our interview structure and in sharing our own experiences (where appropriate), we created connections beyond our research agenda. The interviewees welcomed this personalized approach in that it created a space of compassion and empathy, a space so needed at the time.

Editors: Can you pinpoint some of the biggest impacts of COVID-19 for your research participants – essential workers and refugee women?

Some of the biggest impacts of COVID-19 on refugee women were a result of restricted access to resources and services, lack of information about resources and services, and paramount fear due to ever-changing policy. At the time of our research, mobility restrictions in Portland included closed schools and childcare facilities, as is still common in many localities. This led to increased childcare responsibilities for refugee women including home schooling. The restrictions on movement also led to further isolation of refugee women from each other, from their communities, and from community organizations/service providers. This social isolation (in concert with other stressors) produced, and continues to produce, significant mental health regressions among refugee women who experience heightened depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder. Lastly, labor market participation of refugee women was negatively impacted by COVID-19. Many of the employment sectors that refugee women work in (i.e. service industry) shut down due to lock-down measures. Yet, we also learned that refugee women began to take up essential and front-line positions including employment in food-, health-, and agricultural- industries. While navigating these complicated employment dynamics, refugee women had to simultaneously track and respond to ever-changing policy regarding access to health resources and services as well as to the receipt of aid measures.
Editors: What are the lessons learned for the practice of qualitative migration research for the (non-pandemic) years to come?

We hope that several lessons learned from our work can guide the practice of qualitative migration research for the years to come. First and foremost, we hold that there must be an increased understanding that individuals with lived experiences (in our case refugee women) are indeed the experts; they can best identify the impacts of policy decisions, delineate gaps in responses to crises, and propose targeted solutions. Intentionally seeking to connect with and learn from individuals with lived experiences is invaluable to migration discourse and politics. Second, within a research team, we learned about the importance to accommodate varied personal and professional developments via check-ins and flexibility in scheduling. This positively shaped our team dynamics and increased the quality of the work produced. Third, and specific to the topic addressed in our research (migration-gender relations), we find it crucial to challenge dominant methodological approaches. While quantitative models remain a "gold standard" in migration research, the complex interplay between gender and migration requires a qualitative approach. In line with this important methodological intervention, we used interviews and observations as a means of contextualizing, understanding and situating the impact of COVID-19 on refugee women’s livelihoods in Portland. Community-based/engaged research is imperative in this context and hence to the practice of qualitative research for the (non-pandemic) years to come.

Please direct inquiries about this piece to Dr. Lara-Zuzan Golesorkhi (golesork@up.edu) or info@migrationgenderjustice.com. More information about the Migration, Gender and COVID-19 project can be found here: https://www.migrationgenderjustice.com/spotlight-project-migrationgendercovid19
The European Union and its member states have invested billions of euros in migration management programs that purport to promote “good migration governance” around the world. But what is the impact of migration management aid on governance in recipient states? The EU promotes and funds “good migration governance” with the aim of reducing irregular migration from African countries—going so far as to set up the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF) in 2015 to specifically finance migration management projects throughout the continent. The international community embraced migration management with the adoption of the 2018 Global Compact for Migration and the Global Compact on Refugees.

While a substantial and growing literature has critiqued the efficacy of migration management aid, it has not been critically examined in the same way as other forms of foreign aid such as democracy assistance. In this project, we examine how the empowerment and capacity-building of domestic actors in a recipient state—for example, ministries of interior or state security forces—may have spillover effects not just for migrants or would-be migrants but for citizens.

Our research design involves a paired comparative case study of four African transit and host countries: Kenya, Ethiopia, Egypt and Sudan. All four of these states have received significant EU migration management funding over the last three decades, representing their significance to European policymakers as key transit or host states for preventing migrants and refugees from reaching Europe, but vary in terms of their governance structures. They also fall along a single migratory trajectory leading from the Horn of Africa up toward Europe.

This original planned project had two general phases: fieldwork and analysis. In early 2020 we received fieldwork grants from Le Centre d’Études et de Documentation Économiques, Juridiques et Sociales Khartoum and the APSA Small Research Grant program. We planned to interview government officials,
representatives of intergovernmental migration organizations including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM), EU or European member state diplomats, and civil society organizations that work on the issue of migrant or refugee rights. The goal of these interviews was to understand how EU financial assistance dedicated to migration management was being spent in the recipient state. While in-country, we also planned to conduct archival research for policy documents and reports pertaining to migration policies, migration management agreements, project evaluations, and development aid.

The arrival of COVID-19 closed borders and stopped most migration, impacting both the migration management projects we are studying and our ability to study them. Like most of the world, our universities halted all non-essential in-person work and banned international travel. Our case study countries also imposed temporary travel bans and testing requirements, before opening up slightly. In addition to these barriers, we agreed it was an unreasonable risk to attempt any in-person fieldwork while COVID-19 was still a pandemic. Out of necessity, we redesigned our immediate research plan to focus on a large-scale coding project of primary and secondary EUTF documents. Our previous plans included some document analysis, but this was a significant shift in scale and centrality to the research methodology. We still intend to conduct in-person interviews—or perhaps interviews via local partner organizations and onsite researchers if pandemic conditions persist—but are evaluating what is safe and practical during this uncertainty time.

For the coding project, we worked with a team of research assistants to download over 1,000 documents directly from the EUTF website, comprising a total of 169 projects in Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Sudan that are funded via the EUTF. Using an inductive approach and the assistance of NVivo software, we are currently coding all the documents to understand the EU’s stated project goals, how the money is being spent, which actors in a recipient state receive funding, and what possible governance externalities might result from the project. We are also collecting and coding any NGO reports, white papers, or newspaper articles related to specific EUTF projects that might give us more insight into how the projects are actually being shaped on the ground.

So far this has yielded some fascinating findings. For example, the scope of how the EU believes migration management funding will impact governance, economic development, and human rights in recipient countries is much broader than we originally believed when beginning this project, including topics such as disaster preparedness and climate change, peacebuilding and transitional justice, and the relationship between federal and local governments. The actors involved are also broader in scope than we originally understood, with funding recipients including not just government ministries or domestic NGOs, but also private sector and microfinance institutions, regional government bodies, media organizations and trade unions.

But there are also many challenges to adjusting the research strategy of our project. The first challenge is that there are questions that cannot be adequately addressed with an analysis of policy documents. We can only understand the
goals and parameters of the EUTF projects, not the implementation and outcomes. It is also difficult to cut through the jargon of bureaucracies and evaluation reports to get to really insightful data. We are interested in the relationships, connections, and power struggles inherent in any large-scale policy projects, but those dynamics are not often readily apparent in official reports.

Interviews with informants in civil society, government and at international organizations would help to reveal these dynamics, but a second challenge is the logistics of interviews via Zoom. Our previous book projects relied heavily on in-depth fieldwork and trusting relationships with informants that were built over time, but in the age of COVID-19, it is nearly impossible to arrange for the type of off-the-record, deep background interviews that made our previous projects successful. It is difficult to build the kind of confidence and rapport over Zoom that is required for in-depth qualitative research. Further interviews over Zoom or Skype are challenging with informants who have poor Internet connections or who may be uncomfortable speaking about sensitive issues online. In addition, we have been reluctant to ask potential interviewees to add another Zoom meeting to their already overwhelmed schedules during a global pandemic—honestly, our project does not seem like the most pressing issue!

Considering these barriers, we are currently delaying all interviews (in-person or online) until we have better clarity about the ethics and logistics of this part of the research during the pandemic. We have fortunately been able to delay or repurpose our grant funding and we plan to reapply for additional funding when the logistics of fieldwork become clearer. However, we understand that this solution may not work for all researchers, especially graduate students who are under tight deadlines to move forward with their dissertation research.

We hope that when travel becomes feasible and safe again, we will conduct the originally planned fieldwork in-person in order to better understand the scope and impact of the EUTF projects on the ground in each recipient country. We were forced to modify our research design by including a large, qualitative content analysis in addition to our original planned fieldwork. But despite the setback caused by the pandemic, we feel that our project will be richer because we were forced to conduct a large-scale coding project before heading to the field. First, the process of developing a codebook has helped us more clearly define the parameters of our project and the policy areas in which migration management aid is most likely having an impact. Second, we will be able to ask better questions of our interviewees after such a thorough analysis of the EUTF documents. For example, while coding we have carefully flagged any unclear statement or ‘bureaucratese’ that seems to be masking a controversy or possible disconnect between EU and recipient country intentions. When we are able to speak in-person to those involved about these topics—hopefully in 2022—we will be able to have much more informed discussions and will be better able to structure our time in the field.

While the COVID-19 pandemic has paused our fieldwork, it did not derail our project. Instead, we were forced to be innovative with our methodology by relying more heavily on a large-scale qualitative analysis of policy documents, rather than in-person interviews and fieldwork, and to extend the timeline of our
project by several years. We hope this slight detour will deepen our analysis and lead to more fruitful connections, more historical context, and ultimately more relevant findings.

Please direct inquiries about this piece to Kelsey Norman (kpnorman@rice.edu) or Nick Micinski (nicholas.micinski@maine.edu).

Many scholars of citizenship and migration engage in fieldwork and for many of us, field research requires “being there”. Invaluable insights are gained, and complex dynamics understood, through the face-to-face interviews, everyday interactions, serendipitous meetings, and discovery of new information sources that fieldwork makes possible.

The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly disrupted the conduct of field research. Yet, it is also the case that fieldwork has been, and will continue to be, out-of-reach for many scholars around the world for reasons that have little to do with the global health crisis that emerged in 2020. Scholars with limited research budgets often struggle to cover the expenses fieldwork entails -- a problem that can be particularly daunting for scholars based at public universities or those at resource-poor institutions in the Global South or those who are self-funded. Responsibilities related to teaching, administrative roles, children, elder care, and many other kinds of commitments also restrict scholars’ ability to spend time in the field. Research through this pandemic year has confirmed that these responsibilities and the attendant impact fall disproportionately on women scholars. Travel to the field can also be restricted by global visa and immigration regimes.

Built by researchers for researchers, the new “Digital Fieldwork” website (www.digitalfieldwork.org) offers a collaborative forum where scholars with limited ability to conduct traditional fieldwork can help each other to identify and capitalize on the data-gathering opportunities, and explore and address the data-gathering challenges, involved in conducting “digital fieldwork”.

Through the process of building this website, we have learned from the remarkable resources and insights offered by scholars using a variety of methodological approaches from multiple disciplines, field sites, and home institutions, who have long been unable to conduct or had interrupted fieldwork. We assemble here not only new resources from those who recently experienced interrupted fieldwork, or were unable to travel in the past year, but also ideas
and strategies from well-experienced adapters and innovators. In her reflection on shifting her work in Ghana, historian Jennifer Hart acknowledges that there is a precedent for disruption: “This kind of research adjustment isn’t completely unheard of. Before I began my fieldwork in grad school, I heard about colleagues and mentors who had to completely change their field sites, learn new languages, and shift methodologies due to extraordinary conditions beyond their control.”

In the context of these new and long-standing challenges, technological development and increased global engagement with technology encourage and facilitate new ways of thinking about and conducting field research. Broadening our conceptualization of fieldwork to include digital techniques can democratize field research, allowing more scholars to imagine conducting fieldwork. Further, accessing digital historical archives, interacting with research interlocutors using digital platforms, and drawing on digital media can catalyze the development of new techniques for data generation and research interaction.

Of course, as we develop new techniques for gathering data, new intellectual, ethical, and practical challenges emerge. How can we protect research subjects and researchers when new tools are used in the contexts and digital spaces in which we work? Whose voices are silenced – and amplified – when fieldwork is conducted digitally? What kinds of inequalities are increased and which ones are exacerbated by digital forms of research? How does conducting human participant research digitally affect the process of gaining informed consent from our interlocutors and approval from Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)? Which technologies are safest? How can our on-the-ground experience with data generation inform our use of digital tools and techniques and help us overcome barriers to employing them? Being attendant to these questions will make us more ethical and effective researchers.

Another issue that is considered and critically discussed is how researchers can determine when it is safe, ethical, and effective to resume on-the-ground fieldwork. Christopher Gore and colleagues were part of a large research team with scholars based in Canada, the U.S. and Kenya. They had completed enumerator training and a pilot and were just about to field a survey when the pandemic was hitting Kenya. The team was forced to quickly gather information from the field and assess whether and how to continue their work. Initially their in-country collaborators were willing to continue, but the team decided to put the survey on pause. Over nine months later, they worked with their Kenyan counterparts to field a phone survey instead.

Another type of ethical question raised by some of the site’s contributors concerns the nature of the research questions themselves. Do changing conditions necessitate shifts in the focus of the research in order to be more relevant? Emma Backe relates this to the practice of “pragmatic solidarity” or addressing the immediate needs and concerns of one’s interlocutors in their research praxis. She describes how the pandemic not only led her to delay fieldwork as others have done, but led to a shift in the ways that she engaged with and supported the gender-based violence organizations in Cape Town, South Africa that she was working with over the last year. The pandemic and the
shift to new forms of fieldwork may in fact change not just our tools but our focus of research at times, but this can be enriching and substantively productive.

To date, little training has emerged to help scholars wrestle with these questions. The website highlights a few of the innovative courses and webinars that have been organized in recent months, and we plan to continue to showcase these events. Sharing our collective knowledge in one centralized place is one goal. We hope this new website will encourage dialogue about the nature of research in a digital age, and about how to accomplish our intellectual goals as ways of thinking about and accessing our research sites, participants, and materials evolve.

We invite you to join us in this endeavor! Please visit the site and consider contributing your ideas and materials. The site offers three types of content:

- **Reflections**: original, personal and experiential "thought pieces" developed in a variety of media (photo essays, poems, artistic representation, audio, videos, prose, poems, etc.) that discuss how to carry out, manage, or address challenges in conducting digital fieldwork, or offer reactions to the experience of doing so.

- **Resources**: information about events and webinars, organizations and websites, trainings and workshops, as well as collections of digital archival and news media resources related to digital fieldwork

- **References**: citations for books, articles, and guides on digital fieldwork.

Please direct inquiries about this piece to Diana Kapiszewski (dk784@georgetown.edu), Lauren MacLean (macleanl@indiana.edu) or Lahra Smith (Lahra.Smith@georgetown.edu). You can visit the website (www.digitalfieldwork.org) and become a contributor (see “Contribute” in the drop-down menu).
4. Talking about politics online: Conducting sensitive focus groups during the COVID-19 pandemic

Judith de Jong
University of Amsterdam

During my PhD-project, three research assistants and I had made arrangements to conduct focus groups in two local neighbourhood centers in Amsterdam. The study explored how minoritized citizens with a migration history assess their political (non/mis)representation in Western European democracies, and focus groups are essential to tackle this question. However, because the country went into lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we were forced to move the face-to-face focus groups online. A digital format can prove a challenge, especially since the research pertains to a sensitive topic: political representation among citizens with a Turkish, Moroccan and Surinamese migration history, who often face exclusion and racism (Ghorashi, 2014; Mepschen et al., 2010). Feminist researchers have noted how minoritized individuals can feel more at ease in a focus group vis-à-vis an individual interview setting, as it allows for mutual support between participants and shifts control away from the researchers (Barbour et al., 2011, 64-65). Does this also apply to an online setting, where participants are physically separated and communicate only via screens?

In this short contribution, I look back on how moving online affected the focus group study. I touch upon how using the videoconferencing platform Zoom affected who we could and could not reach, how it impacted the group moderation, and participants’ own takes on the focus group experience. Although conducting focus groups online came with some downsides, we also experienced many advantages that we did not anticipate. My aim is to encourage future

---

13 My PhD research is part of the Misrepresenting Diversity project (NWO VIDI, 452-17-008), headed by Dr. Liza Mügge.
14 Although I use the term ‘minoritized citizens with a migration history’ here, I acknowledge that this categorization is limited. Depending on the context, ethnicity, religion, racism and migration history may all play a role in how citizens’ assess their political representation.
15 Due to university requirement, we used the videoconferencing platform Zoom. For a comprehensive overview regarding the use of online platforms in relation to privacy concerns, see Lobe et al., 2020; Morgan & Lobe, 2015.
researchers to keep experimenting with- and improving online focus group methods.

Reaching people: Participants joining and leaving the meeting

Grasping with the new lockdown circumstances, we first sought to contact people who might be interested to be part of an online focus group. We reached out to participants by posting advertisements on social media platforms, contacting neighborhood centers, and mobilizing our networks. Online recruitment affected our reach: people who completed a scientific education or higher vocational training and/or had stable internet connections at home were more likely to participate. However, the online format does allow for participants with physical disabilities or those who would need to travel, for example from the islands Aruba, Bonaire and Curacao – formally part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The latter provided us with new insights in how these citizens experience a lack of involvement in decision-making on their behalf. We continuously adapted our strategies to connect to underrepresented groups. For instance, we asked former participants for acquaintances with a specific profile and called first-time online platform users, such as first-generation labor migrants with a Turkish and Moroccan background, in advance to assist setting up the meeting.

Online focus groups reduced the number of "no-shows". Participants indicated a lower threshold for participation when joining a Zoom-meeting than having to travel to a location. A disadvantage of this lower threshold is the relative ease with which participants can drop out, as leaving a Zoom meeting is only a click away. This became apparent in a focus group that we organized with Turkish-Dutch citizens\(^{16}\). At the start, two male participants turned out to be close friends. They were very dissatisfied with Dutch politics, which they related to discrimination they had experienced personally. One female student, Naslı\(^{17}\), opposed their statements. The men seemed not to take her position seriously and Naslı suddenly exited the Zoom call. We checked in with Naslı afterwards, fortunately ending the call on a positive note.

The situation can be attributed to lack of proper screening and intervention, but it was also related to the online setting. The moderators and I had found it more complicated to adequately read Naslı’s discomfort via the screen. We drew several lessons from this experience. We paid more attention to power hierarchies in terms of age, gender and social class. We also took more time to discuss conversation rules at the start: letting each other finish, keeping one’s intervention short and stressing that all opinion counted equally. We limited the number of participants to five at most. While this situation would ideally not have occurred, the online format did allow the participant to exit an uncomfortable situation without explaining herself. It decreased the social pressure to stay, which can be an issue in a physical group setting.

\(^{16}\) With ‘Turkish-Dutch’, I refer to Dutch citizens who were born in Turkey, or have at least one parent born in Turkey. Participants most often self-identified as both Dutch and Turkish.

\(^{17}\) Names have been replaced by pseudonyms throughout the text to ensure participants’ anonymity.
The online setting not only creates a lower threshold to exit a meeting, but also to join one. Because of no-shows, one focus group involved only three participants: one 20-year old student and two senior participants. After a break, the junior attendee asked whether a friend could join us, which we agreed to. A minute later, we were joined by the student’s friend. Her intervention remedied a possible power imbalance and considerably improved the conversation. Although the online focus groups setting may complicate reading participants’ discomfort, it also provides participants with more agency to join and leave.

**Moderation: Using the Zoom chat**

A major advantage to conducting focus groups online is that moderators can privately message each other or communicate with the group using the live chat function offered by most online discussion software. Focus group moderators – in this study, two trained student assistants – engage in many tasks at once: listening carefully, ensuring that all topics are covered, and balancing participants’ contributions. Guidelines to team focus group projects often advise extensive training to ensure agreement on the research objectives and topic list. Afterwards moderators are ‘on their own’: they are responsible for making quick decisions during the sessions on the order of questions and how to follow-up (Hennink, 2017, 72).

Without disturbing the conversation, my research assistants and I used the private chat to reconsider the order of questions and to ask each other for a ‘second opinion’ if the group conversation went off-topic. The chat was also used to ‘divide tasks’ in case of a complicated group dynamic. The moderator continued to focus on guiding the conversation, while the note-taker privately integrated latecomers, helped out participants who had connectivity issues, or dealt with situations in which people did not adhere to privacy concerns. Participants, in turn, used private messages to notify us when they had a comment and used the public chat as an additional outlet to express their views. They notified the others that they wanted to respond when talked over, rendering them less dependent on the moderator to allocate turns.

The private chat function can notably reduce the reliance on and responsibility of a single moderator by providing the research team with an entirely different medium to touch base without disruption, improving the data quality. Once the meeting ends, Zoom automatically saves the chat transcript, including participant names and time stamps. Therefore, the Zoom chat offers moderators the opportunity to analyze their interventions and their considerations for doing so, providing additional insight in how to improve moderation in future sessions.

**Participants’ reflections on the online setting**

Despite the online setting, participants connected as a group and offered mutual support. During debriefing, participants indicated that they experienced the meeting as positive and valued getting to know the other attendees. In one group, a female participant stated: “Of course, it’s a study, but I forgot about that during the conversation. So, I really liked that. That I got to speak with and
see other women, strong women, was very beautiful to me.” Other participants noted that they felt more relaxed in the online setting because they did not have to be too concerned with their appearance. The camera was solely focused on their upper body, while in offline focus groups, the whole body and appearance are visible (an advantage also mentioned by Morgan & Lobe, 2015, 201).

Additionally, attendees reflected on how speaking together over Zoom affected the conversation as opposed to meeting offline, connecting the online setting to social desirability:

Hatice: You do have a buffer in front of you, making you dare to be more honest or more open. Whereas if you’re all sitting together, maybe you’re afraid of provoking certain discussions or that it’s going to get too heated –

Sarah: Nobody can hit each other [everyone laughs].

Hatice: Which you might hold back if you’re in a certain neighborhood…

Their conversation highlights how the online setting may allow participants to be more transparent about their political opinions, as they are physically separated and are less likely to run into each other afterwards.

**Conclusion**

Conducting focus groups about a politically sensitive topic online may appear daunting to researchers. Our experience shows it is advisable to be attentive to participant discomfort, to minimize social hierarchies in the group and to continuously reflect on ways to maintain a safe environment. At the same time, the moderators and I were surprised to find that digital discussions also came with many unexpected advantages. Conducting focus groups online may be useful in studies that seek to expand their geographical scope or include participants who would be unable to meet physically. However, researchers should be aware that an online setting may exclude others, as participation requires (some) digital proficiency, resources like a device and stable internet connection, and a secure home environment. These disadvantages require continuous reflection on who may (not) be included and why. Especially when working in a research team or with externally hired moderators, using the private messaging tool in online conferencing can improve the quality of the conversations. Participants connect with each other via the screen and may even feel more at ease to express (deviant) opinions. Depending on the research question, moving a focus group study online can remain an advantageous alternative to researchers, which merits further exploration in post-COVID times.
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5. Doing PhD research in times of COVID-19 - reflections on practical and emotional consequences

Sandra Morgenstern  
University of Mannheim

Laura Cleton  
University of Antwerp

The time in which academics pursue their PhD is in many ways special, as we are sure many of APSA’s newsletter readers can relate to. One is at the start of a possible academic career and needs to generate a high level of knowledge in a relatively short amount of time - becoming “the expert on your topic” - but is also faced with the emotional side of doing so. It is therefore not surprising that PhD trajectories are narrated in terms of journeys, rites of passage, or even academic hunger games. In this short contribution, we want to reflect on our experiences with pursuing a PhD in pandemic times. For both of us, the pandemic certainly disrupted the journey we had envisioned ourselves at the start of our degrees. While we want to stress that we speak strictly from our own positions - as a now postdoctoral researcher and a midway-PhD student - our aim is to open up further dialogue among migration PhD students and their networks. We do not only discuss the practical aspects of being a doctoral candidate during a pandemic, but also focus on its emotional and psychological aspects and exemplary coping strategies we perceived as valuable.

In practical terms, a PhD journey often involves juggling multiple new things at the same time. In our experience, it seems to be expected to write a coherent dissertation, publish papers from that dissertation and/or "side projects", teach at your university, build a network of academic peers for support and future career opportunities, get valuable working experience in other research institutes (preferably abroad), organize workshops and conferences; the list goes on. As for all academics, the pandemic has created additional tasks on top of these: learning how to teach online, work effectively from home and setting up new, online support channels among peers and our wider academic community. What we feel distinguishes our experience from our more senior and tenured colleagues in managing these old and new ‘stressors’, is the need to get these
things done within a relatively short time span - one that seems to have become even shorter during the current pandemic. We feel supported by those who speak out on social media platforms like Twitter, pressing other academics to take it easy and focus on issues that really matter, such as homeschooling, (psychosocial) wellbeing and supporting students. Yet, for those of us who are not directly affected by these very tangible issues - needing to take care of children, not being able to work due to a COVID-19 infection or high teaching loads - the implicit message has largely been to 'Keep Calm and Carry On'. Even if we wanted to, we cannot always take it easy, as our contracts expire and any work we are unable to do possibly has consequences for our future job prospects. The pandemic on the one hand ensured that some of the ‘old’ stressors became a little less relevant, for example arranging a research visit abroad or forced, awkward ‘networking’ in face-to-face conferences. Yet, it also exacerbates others, such as getting enough creative ideas necessary for publishing and finishing your doctorate, finding outlets to test your work and receive feedback, building a network for future career opportunities and building a CV that will help you to navigate the stressed academic job market.

For some, managing all of these practicalities also comes with emotional challenges - even under ‘normal’ circumstances. Writing your doctorate is considered a lonely process; for many PhDs it is unfortunately also a time where they are met with challenging psychosocial circumstances and feelings of being burned out. While this experience might obviously differ from individual to individual, for us, coping and giving voice to our psychosocial difficulties in a time of forced isolation has not always been easy. We have identified two facets that we feel got exacerbated by the pandemic for ourselves. First, the imposter feeling got stronger. The forced isolation and limited social contacts resulting from the measures taken to combat the pandemic enhances loneliness. Informal gatherings with more senior colleagues who acknowledge their difficulties during graduate school, as well as day-to-day discussions with peers always helped us to put our own struggles into perspective. Being alone for the majority of our working day leaves time and room to let thoughts circle and get caught up in them, resulting in the feeling that we were ‘failing’ or simply not suited for this job. Second, although we are now well adjusted to having our meetings and conferences online, the pandemic also affects our sense of belonging to our academic communities. As both tenured colleagues and fellow PhD students are not easily or readily available for daily conversations, over time, a challenging threshold to get in touch emerged. While for some, sending out a request to colleagues or even academics you have never met in person is not a big of a deal, for others this might be a huge hurdle. Keeping in touch with your academic community, however, is of great importance: even if they do not work on similar topics or are able to provide you with in-depth feedback, they can fulfill the role of emotional support. All of this creates a shared sense of belonging that helps to combat imposter feelings.

We acknowledge that such practical and emotional difficulties can differ depending on the stage that you are in. PhDs who started at the beginning of the pandemic, or just slightly before that, might have a harder time finding their academic community and building contacts that will help in the remainder of
their trajectory. They might also feel overwhelmed by needing to change the topic or methodological approach with which they applied to graduate school. Candidates midway through their PhDs are also faced with their research plans falling apart. Here, however, options to replace one method with the other, start from scratch, or postpone one’s plans for a while are generally missing. Laura, for example, had to cancel plans for a research stay abroad, international conference travel and delimit her data collection - simply because her research topic was no longer ‘observable’. Re-adjusting and coming to terms with this can cost a lot of energy and can lead to decreasing levels of motivation. For those close to finishing their PhD, the prospect of navigating the academic job market becomes another stressor. While already under ‘normal’ circumstances, there are not many opportunities for postdocs or assistant professor positions, in pandemic times this worsened. Sandra feared that the cancelled conferences and research stays were vital for her ‘network’ and CV building, in order to eventually succeed in the competitive academic job market. For many in our networks, such missed opportunities often caused doubts and serious questioning of their future in academia. Besides navigating the academic job market, finding motivation, confidence, and the self-discipline to write up a cohesive thesis can be difficult.

In some countries or funding-institutions, COVID-related extensions of contracts are possible. While these are not always readily advertised, it might be worth checking whether you are eligible. Yet be aware that currently, the four to six years of hard work will merely be ‘rewarded’ with an online celebration and a certificate in your mailbox. The subsequent transitioning to a new position - geographically and emotionally - is different when you continue to work from home. In Sandra’s case, closure with her PhD and academic institution Konstanz and the transition to a postdoc in her new department in Mannheim is still an ongoing process.

Altogether, our aim for this reflection was not to paint a gruesome picture, but rather to provide honest insight in the ways that we, and the members of our professional and personal support networks, dealt with working on a PhD in pandemic times. Fortunately, we see a lot of encouraging examples of how PhDs and other early career researchers cope with these difficulties. In our respective departments, junior researchers recently started a ‘Working Apart Together’-group or organized regular ‘Zoom-Coffee-Rooms’ who gather once every two weeks to catch up and discuss difficulties or questions that arise while working from home. While these sessions are not focused on a specific topic, they help to create a sense of belonging, counter feelings of loneliness and help beat imposter syndrome.

While it is difficult, we also feel that it is essential to make an effort to be open about your situation. For us, it proved helpful when tenured colleagues and supervisors actively discussed the aforementioned issues with their PhD students and fostered peer-to-peer interactions between them. We also would wish to encourage PhD students – ourselves included - to reach out for help if you feel like you need it. Laura recently did so, by contacting a labor psychologist to talk about the impact working from home, in isolation, has on her and her progress.
We feel that the pandemic also brought about a softening in academic hierarchies: as everyone is affected by the pandemic - although perhaps not evenly or in the same way - some senior academics began to see it as an obligation to support their PhD students. In a weird sense, reaching out to them for feedback might therefore also be easier. Laura, for example, is currently in the process of organizing an online workshop in which primarily early-career researchers can present their work and all senior academics we contacted to act as discussants, and these well-established names in the field all responded positively.

Finally, working online seems to make academia more inclusive than ever. With geographic boundaries suddenly dissolved by virtual meetings, we both started to attend seminars and workshops in places we could not have been otherwise in terms of logistics. This is underscored by the PhD activities Sandra is co-organizing as part of a bigger conference, where PhDs from many different countries are registered. Although we both celebrate this new-born inclusiveness, we are both skeptical about its future in the likely case that events will happen in person again.

Please direct inquiries about this piece to Sandra Morgernstern (sandra.morgenstern@mzes.uni-mannheim.de) or Laura Cleton (laura.cleton@uantwerpen.be)
6. Reflections by Annika Hinze

The COVID-19 pandemic wrought havoc on our work, our personal lives, our mental health and physical health, as well as our socio-economic status and safety. It also exacerbated more or less all of the inequalities that existed in our societies before the pandemic: people of color, indigenous people, people with medical conditions, people who live in poverty, people who live in unsafe conditions, with undocumented immigration status, people who are displaced, refugees, asylum seekers, women – all these groups already dealing with disadvantage, discrimination and uncertainty were plunged into worse situations during the past year.

A study of New York City by the Furman Center at New York University from April 2020 captured the differentiated impact of COVID-19 on different social groups. An early epicenter of the pandemic, New York City was like a microcosm of COVID’s discrimination against the most marginalized groups in American society: race, ethnicity, income level, and citizenship were all indicators for how the pandemic’s discriminating impact on the city. For instance, in the neighborhoods with the lowest incidence of COVID cases, white people outnumbered Black people by more than 3:1. Similarly, the median income in the highest incidence neighborhoods was nearly half that of the median income in the lowest incidence neighborhoods, and the share of college educated individuals was twice as high in neighborhoods with the lowest COVID caseloads compared to those with the highest.

Women, who are disproportionately working in informal, insecure, or lower-income jobs and also do the bulk of unpaid carework, were also disproportionately affected by the pandemic: in comparison to men, women lost more jobs and were doing more of the at-home carework during the COVID-19 pandemic, further marginalizing their comparatively less stable and underpaid position in the labor market. In the U.S., these effects were felt even more deeply by women of color, LatinX and foreign-born women. So, while the political rhetoric surrounding the fallout from the pandemic has always centered around the mantra of “We are in this together,” when we look at the numbers, it becomes clear that we are not, by any means, in this together! In fact, we can now predict, based on socio-economic indicators, how badly any given member of our society is likely to be affected by the pandemic fallout – and how wide that range will span, depending on race, ethnicity, gender, pre-existing medical conditions – even by zip code.

In the United States, more so than in any rich industrialized country, the pandemic laid bare, once again, the enduring legacy of institutionalized racism, a broken immigration system, and the appalling absence of socialized health- and childcare. The consequences are not merely social, with regard to the pain and suffering caused to large segments of American society by the absence of a comprehensive social contract, but also economic: equal access to opportunity

19 https://www.voanews.com/africa/international-womens-day-marked-increased-hardships-women?fbclid=IwAR2p5mLY40dPcUnsP2os1-k5o-EspFysqmbyuTS-yhF2iAEilbXvBymul
for people of color, indigenous people and ethnic minorities, immigrants, women, people with disability, and others could create a more robust economy, and a healthier and more resilient population.

In the contributions in this section, authors tell tales of resilience: how they adapted their research to the conditions of the pandemic, how they created a stronger sense of community among themselves in order to be able to deal with the personal and professional challenges of the pandemic and how their research subjects endured or adapted to the impossible pandemic reality. Some stories also speak of hardship, of mental health challenges, of professional uncertainty, of pain. Reading them had me reflect on the creativity and resilience required of researchers: even before the pandemic, we had to be creative, often improvise in the face of missing data, of an unforeseen turn in the fieldwork situation – and the pandemic has only amplified this need to a new level! It also made me think of how different our positions as researchers are – depending on how much access we have to resources, such as funding, even time - we will be more easily able to pivot in order to address and work with sudden challenges to our research, pandemic and otherwise.

Our discipline, like the populations we research, is not an even playing field. As researchers of the power dynamics surrounding citizenship and experts on the trauma of marginalization by means of exclusionary citizenship policies, undocumented status, statelessness, or displacement, it is important that we start looking inward as well: how can we help diversify the perspectives of our research field by elevating the voices of those marginalized by job insecurity, immigration status, and historic injustice? I hope the pandemic experience will inspire those of us in positions of (relative) power to push harder for a more equitable playing field – in and outside of academia!
Policy Brief: COVID, Mobility, and the Trump Agenda

Rebecca Hamlin
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

The COVID-19 pandemic has transformed the politics of human mobility in the United States. Pandemics do not eliminate the myriad factors that drive people to leave their homes. In fact, they can exacerbate those factors. But in 2020, fear of the virus combined with pre-existing nationalism and xenophobia to facilitate the harshest crackdowns on entry to the United States in almost a century. It also hardened borders within the United States, a phenomenon with which most residents were completely unaccustomed. Most strikingly, President Trump also capitalized on COVID panic to push his larger immigration agenda. The result of that harnessing has been an abjectly tragic disaster for both hopeful arrivals to the US, and those who were already here when the pandemic hit. For many privileged Americans, it has highlighted the ways in which we take mobility for granted.

The first hint of what was to come occurred on January 31, 2020, when President Trump responded to news of the novel Coronavirus by banning all travelers from the People’s Republic of China who were not U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents. Since that moment, Trump consistently referred to COVID-19 as the “China virus,” a phrase which has been tied to a wave of anti-Asian hostility and hate crimes. On February 29, Trump extended the ban to include Iran, because cases of the virus were being reported there as well. The week of March 1, many observers were surprised when Trump extended that temporary ban to include most of Europe, which was also being hit hard.

Beyond these fairly reasonable efforts to control the spread of the virus, President Trump also quickly used COVID to push his larger anti-immigration agenda. Trump had already attempted to declare a national emergency at the southern border in February of 2019, a full year before COVID, based on his claim that criminals were entering the country unchecked. Congress acted to prevent that move, but Trump’s intentions had been made clear. Also in 2019, the Trump administration instituted the Migrant Protection Protocols (MPP),
otherwise known as the ‘Remain in Mexico’ program, requiring individuals who wished to seek asylum in the United States to wait on the Mexican side of the border for their immigration court hearing. In March of 2020, the Supreme Court allowed the program to continue while legal challenges made their way up through the judiciary. That decision left tens of thousands of people in limbo, waiting near the border as the pandemic ran its course.

Thus, when the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) used an order from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to turn away people who were legally seeking asylum at the US/Mexico border beginning in March 2020, DHS was simply building on many previous attempts to stop people entering the United States through the south. DHS claimed that this order was needed because asylum seekers posed a particular public health risk. But this policy merely represented a continuation of MPP, which predated COVID by over a year. Meanwhile, border traffic that has been deemed essential to the economy has been allowed to continue. In an open letter, a group of leading public health experts urged the administration not to “circumvent laws and treaty protections designed to save lives and enable the mass expulsion of asylum seekers”. The letter went on to accuse the administration of using COVID as a “pretext” to override the United States’ humanitarian obligations.

The hardening of borders did not just impact the most vulnerable, however. Many Americans, accustomed to the power of their passports, have been dismayed to learn that most countries in the world have restricted travel from the US due to the relatively high rates of COVID in this country. That experience has given the privileged a small taste of what the vast majority of people around the world experience all the time: a lack of freedom of mobility. There is some irony in the fact that citizens of a country whose leader has been very vocal about stopping arrivals and building a wall find themselves facing the very same limitations on movement that the US government has touted for years.

Even within the United States, most state governments instituted travel restrictions, and quarantine and testing requirements for people who engaged in inter-state travel. Many Americans were outraged to learn that they could not take a summer vacation in Maine, for example, a state whose slogan is “Vacationland” and whose economy depends on out-of-state tourists. The hardening of internal borders is virtually unprecedented in the United States, and yet, the COVID crisis has highlighted the local policy variation that is a feature of the US’ federalist structure.

Aside from the impact on borders (both external and internal), the pandemic has also created new challenges and injustices for non-citizens living in the United States. COVID has disproportionately affected workers on the frontlines, often referred to as “essential workers.” The most affected professions, such as health care and food service, have high proportions of non-citizens, including many undocumented people. Undocumented workers who were laid off had limited eligibility for unemployment benefits, and undocumented Americans did not receive either of the federal stimulus checks that were distributed thus far during the pandemic. Despite their disproportionate vulnerability to exposure, the Nebraska Governor recently stated that undocumented residents would be
deprioritized for the COVID-19 vaccine, which would need to be given to all legal residents of Nebraska first.

COVID has also dramatically affected the lives of people who are hoping to have their immigration cases adjudicated, sponsor a relative, have a visa processed, or naturalize to US citizenship, because the internal provision of immigration services has been massively disrupted. Beginning on March 17 2020, US Citizenship and Immigration Services temporarily shut down all of its offices, suspending naturalization ceremonies, green card interviews, and other functions. In the eleven months since that time, USCIS has processed paperwork much more slowly than usual, and both USCIS offices and immigration courts, which are part of the Department of Justice, have shut down repeatedly due to COVID scares, slowing down the pace of processing cases to a crawl.

Finally, as with any carceral setting, detention centers have been devastating hot spots for the spread of COVID, where social distancing has not been possible and unsanitary conditions have been widely reported.

The brand-new Biden administration is openly committed to trying to reverse course on the twin tragedies of COVID and Trump’s immigration agenda, but it is a daunting task. While the vaccine rollout has brought some hope, COVID numbers are still extraordinarily high across the country, with an average of about 150,000 new cases per day. President Biden has been busy issuing a slew of executive orders and proclamations designed to unravel some of the most egregious Trump immigration policies. However, so-called ‘caravans’ of hopeful migrants will continue to come north from Central America, fleeing violence, poverty, and natural disasters. The Biden administration has yet to figure out how, precisely, to balance its humanitarian protection obligations with pandemic pressures. Meanwhile, tens of thousands of people continue to languish in Mexico in crowded, unsafe conditions, vulnerable to the gangs that many were attempting to flee. Even if this policy is drawn to a close under Biden, so much irreversible damage has already been done, in terms of loss of life, trauma, and stress for immigrants and their families.

One glimmer of hope comes from the fact that, despite the rise in anti-Asian sentiments described above, COVID does not seem to have increased general public hostility to undocumented immigrants. According to a Pew Research Center study during the summer of 2020, three-fourths of Americans still support a path to citizenship for people who are here without authorization, and 77% believe that unauthorized immigrants do jobs that American citizens do not want to do. These trends make clear that even during the midst of a pandemic, the policies of the Trump administration were way out of step with public attitudes.

As the COVID crises slows and eventually recedes into the rear-view, Political Scientists who study migration are positioned to provide some really thoughtful analysis that explores these themes further. There is much to still be understood about which aspects of life harden and become more hostile to immigrants in a crisis, how powers of the state get invoked, the ways in which people become more comfortable with increased government authority over mobility during pandemics, and the circumstances under which non-citizens (or people who are
incorrectly assumed to be foreign) are scapegoated. There is also a great need for a continued accounting of the enormous damage the combination of COVID and Trump’s immigration agenda has wrought.

Please direct inquiries about this piece to Rebecca Hamlin (rhamlin@umass.edu).
The Migration Policy Centre (MPC) is located within the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at the European University Institute, Florence, Italy. The EUI is an international post-doctoral and post-graduate teaching and research institute located in the hills just outside Florence.

A long-standing tradition of research on international migration at EUI was consolidated in 2012 when the MPC was established with support from the European Commission. Since then, the MPC has focused on three main activities:

- advanced research on the transnational governance of migration, asylum and mobility with the aim of providing new ideas, rigorous evidence and critical thinking to inform European and global policy debates;
- the promotion of policy dialogue between various actors and stakeholders involved in the transnational governance of migration, asylum and mobility;
- provision of executive training and our annual Summer School (our 16th annual Summer School was postponed in 2020 due to COVID but will run on-line in 2021).
At any time, there are usually between 15-20 researchers based in the MPC including full-time staff (professors, research fellows and research associates) plus part-time professors as well as visiting fellows who are based in the MPC for between 1 and 10 months. The EUI offers extensive opportunities for visiting fellows, which could include cooperation with the MPC, including the Max Weber post-doctoral programme, Jean Monnet fellowships typically for early career researchers, as well as fellowships for more senior researchers.
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MPC research is currently organized around seven main themes. Within each thematic area, the MPC has secured support from a wide range of funding organizations, including the EU, private foundations, national research councils and international organizations. The seven current main research themes are:

- Public attitudes to migration and migration policies. To study this, the Observatory of Public Attitudes to Migration (OPAM) was created in 2017. MPC regularly collaborates with the International Centre for Migration Policy Development on public attitudes and their implications for communicating about migration in Europe, North Africa and the Middle East.

- Labor markets, welfare states and migration policies, including research on the tension between the free movement of workers and European welfare states under the ‘freeEUmove’ project: a collaboration with researchers at Uppsala University.

- Migration, foreign aid and development, including research funded by the MERCATOR Stiftung that investigates the channels through which foreign aid affects the decision to migrate in African countries. It also addresses how the pattern of official development assistance (ODA) allocation is changing in response to the refugee and migration crises.
Migration governance, including research funded by the European Research Council (ERC) on the drivers of migration governance at regional level in Europe, North America, South America and Southeast Asia.

Border enforcement, migration controls and mobility practices, including work funded by the European Commission analyzing communication channels used by migrants and asylum seekers.

The Global Mobilities Database gathers information on a large palette of spatial mobilities, including their demographic, economic, sociological and legal-political aspects. Drawing on a range of sources from international organizations to private companies, from digital-trace to administrative data, the GMD covers connections between countries from around the world in a longitudinal perspective.

Linking research and policy debates through our commitment to policy dialogue and also our close engagement with a wide range of stakeholders.

As of April 2021, funded projects include:

**ASILE** The MPC is a partner in an EU Horizon 2020 funded project led by the Centre for European Policy Studies in Brussels. The project studies the interactions between emerging international protection systems and the United Nations Global Compact for Refugees (UNGCR), with particular focus on the European Union’s role and contribution. It examines the characteristics of international, country-specific and EU asylum governance instruments and arrangements, their gender and age specific impacts on individuals and the sharing of responsibility with regard to their effectiveness, fairness and consistency with international and regional human rights and refugee law standards.

**ITFLOWS** The MPC is a partner in an EU Horizon 2020 project that aims to create an evidence-based information and communication technology-enabled solution, the so-called EUMigraTool. The tool will ease the reception, relocation, settlement and integration of migrants. Intended to be used mainly by first-line practitioners, second-level reception organizations and municipalities, it will also help to predict migration flows and identify the potential risks of tensions between migrants and EU citizens. Ultimately, the project will formulate recommendations and good practices for the attention of policy makers, governments and EU institutions.

**Whole COM** The MPC is a partner in an EU Horizon 2020 funded project on ‘whole of community’ approaches to integration that will begin in Spring 2021 led by the University of Turin. It will analyze the integration of post-2014 migrants to Europe in smaller towns and cities.

**MEDAM** The MPC is a partner in a project funded by the Mercator Stiftung in collaboration with the Kiel Institute for the World Economy and the European Policy Centre that conducts research to inform European policy debates on
asylum and migration. MEDAM seeks to develop solutions for asylum and immigration policies in the EU and its member states that: allow the EU to meet its humanitarian obligations towards refugees; harness both intra-EU mobility and immigration from third countries for growth and development in countries of origin and destination; recognize the role of labor migration in promoting integration with EU accession and neighborhood countries; address the migration implications for Europe of population growth and demographic change in developing countries; promote the social and labor market integration of immigrants and their descendants, increasing their contribution to Europe’s economic growth.

**EuroMed Migration V** is a project funded by the European Union (EU) and implemented by the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) with the MPC as a partner. It supports EU Member States and the European Neighborhood Instrument Southern Partner Countries (ENI SPCs) in establishing a comprehensive, constructive and operational dialogue and cooperation framework on migration, with a particular focus on reinforcing instruments and capacities to develop and implement evidence-based migration policies.

**E-MINDFUL** is a project funded by the European Commission and implemented by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and International Labor Organization (ILO) with the MPC as a partner. The project aims to provide evidence-based and action-oriented guidance that can orient future communications’ efforts on migration and migrants. The overall objective is to promote a social and economic environment where everyone, migrants and nationals, feel welcome and belonging so as to encourage effective migration policy-making, particularly in the field of economic migration.

A significant development at EUI has been the creation in 2019 of the **School of Transnational Governance** that provides Masters-level teaching and executive education. The MPC’s future training provision will be closely aligned with the development of the STG.

**The Impact of COVID-19**

![MPC Webinar Series](image)
As with all research centers, COVID-19 had a major effect on our activities. We have not been able to host an in-person event since March 2020, but decided to move our seminars online and create a ‘lockdown webinar’ series. On a very diverse range of themes, including the effects of COVID-19 on migration and migrants, as well as book launches and consideration of other key challenges, including the climate crisis, populist politics and refugee protection, more than 20 webinars were held between March 2021 and April 2021. These proved highly successful both in terms of the numbers of people engaging, for example, cumulative views of more than 14,000, but also in allowing us to reach a global audience that would not be able to attend our in-person seminars in Florence.

MPC has also developed research activities with a COVID-19 focus, particularly the Migrants and Systemic Resilience: A Global COVID19 Research and Policy Hub (MigResHub) which is a collaboration between the MPC and Migration Mobilities Bristol at the University of Bristol (UK). The primary aim of MigResHub is to facilitate research and policy debates on how migrant labor shapes the resilience of the provision of essential goods and services to the current COVID-19 pandemic and to similar shocks in the future. The Hub concentrates on three essential goods and services around the world: food and agriculture; health services; and social care. MigResHub takes a comparative and transnational approach that includes countries and supply chains covering all major regions of the world. A particular focus will be on exploring how the relationships between reliance on migrant workers and the systemic resilience of the provision of food, health, and social care vary across countries with different institutional and policy frameworks for the provision of these essential services.

Please direct inquiries about this piece to migration@eui.eu. You can find more information on MPC’s activities at their website (www.migrationpolicycentre.eu), Youtube channel (https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCoRq_MUOqMgeel0R3WA8THA) and social media (Twitter: @MPC_EU, Facebook: MigrationPolicyCentre)
In memoriam: Martin O. Heisler (University of Maryland)

Martin O. Heisler, Professor Emeritus, University of Maryland, died on February 8, 2021 in Lake Oswego, Oregon. Martin was born in Budapest Hungary in 1938 and immigrated to the United States in 1950. He completed his education in Political Science at UCLA, receiving a B.A. (1960), M.A. (1962) and PhD (1969).

After spending two years (1964-1966) at the University of Illinois, Professor Heisler joined the Department of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland in 1966. He gave the department, college, and University 40 years of service until his retirement in 2006. During his tenure at the University of Maryland, he had visiting professorships at the Institut d’Études Politiques in Paris, the Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick (United Kingdom), and the Institute of Political Science, Aarhus University (Demark).

Martin had a long and distinguished career in comparative politics and international relations. His intellectual and professional interests ranged widely. He particularly valued exploration of theoretical and policy-related questions through transdisciplinary approaches to the social sciences. In addition to his book, Politics in Europe, Martin edited several books and journals and contributed many journal articles, book chapters and monographs.

Professor Heisler was an active member of the American Political Science Association and the association’s Migration and Citizenship section. He served on many committees, organized many panels and presented many papers at Annual Meetings. In 2014, he chaired the “Best Book Award” Committee of the Migration and Citizenship section. Martin ranks among the early social scientists to make significant contributions to the burgeoning field of migration and citizenship studies. In 1986, he co-edited (with Barbara Schmitter Heisler) a volume of The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, From Foreign Workers to Settlers? Transnational Migration and the Emergence of New Minorities and contributed two articles to the volume. At the time of his death, he was working on a book-length manuscript that viewed migration and world politics through a diachronically and synchronically comparative approach.
Lamis Abdelaaty (Syracuse University)
- Published "Rivalry, Ethnicity, and Asylum Admissions Worldwide". *International Interactions* (2020), Advance online publication: [https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2020.1814768](https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2020.1814768)
- Published with Liza G. Steele, "Explaining Attitudes towards Refugees in Europe". *Political Studies* (2020), Advance online publication: [https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321720950217](https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321720950217)

Sener Akturk (Koç University)
- Published with Yury Katliarou "Institutionalization of Ethnocultural Diversity and the Representation of European Muslims". *Perspectives on Politics* (2020), Advance online publication: [https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001334](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001334)

Hajer Al-Faham (University of Pennsylvania)
- Published “Researching American Muslims: A Case Study of Surveillance and Racialized State Control”. *Perspective on Politics* (2021), Advance online publication: [https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720003655](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720003655)

Fiona Barker (Victoria University of Wellington)

Anne Marie Baylouny (Naval Postgraduate School)
Charles D. Brockett (Sewanee: The University of the South)
- Published President Biden and Immigration Reform. Decatur: Wishing Up Press. https://www.amazon.com/President-Biden-Prospects-Immigration-Reform-ebook/dp/B08W2V7SK1

Geoffrey Cameron (University of Toronto)

Andy Scott Chang (Singapore Management University)
- Published “Selling a Resume and Buying a Job: Stratification of Gender and Occupation by States and Brokers in International Migration from Indonesia”. Social Problems (2021), Advance online publication: doi: 10.1093/socpro/spab002.

Erin Aeran Chung (Johns Hopkins University)
- Chung’s book, Immigrant Incorporation in East Asian Democracies, was published last October by Cambridge University Press. The data archives associated with the book are available for download by the public at: https://archive.data.jhu.edu/dataverse/IIEAD_Focus_Groups_Japan_and_South_Korea
- Chung was recently awarded a five-year grant from the Academy of Korean Studies (AKS) for the completion of her next book project on Citizenship, Social Capital, and Racial Politics in the Korean Diaspora
- Chung’s co-authored paper with Jaeeun Kim, “Pacifying Citizenship: Three Tales of Political Incorporation in the United States, Japan, and China,” was awarded the ISA Ethnicity, Nationalism and Migration Studies (ENMISA) Section Award for Best Paper scheduled to be presented at the 2020 ISA annual meeting

Laura Cleton (University of Antwerp)

**Allan Collbern** (Arizona State University)

**Antje Ellermann** (University of British Columbia)
- New institution: Founding Director of the new UBC Centre for Migration Studies ([https://migration.ubc.ca/home](https://migration.ubc.ca/home))
- Grant awarded with Mireille Paquet and Frederik Kohlert, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, “Graphic Narratives of Migration”, $25,000
- Grant Awarded, UBC Office of the Vice-President Research + Innovation, Grants for Catalyzing Research Clusters, $200,000 (2021-23)

**Victoria Finn** (Universidad Diego Portales & Leiden University)

**Els de Graauw** (Political Science, Baruch College, CUNY):
Keneshia Grant  (Howard University)


Leila Hadj-Abdou  (European University Institute)

- Published with Tim Bale and Andrew Geddes “Centre-right Parties and Immigration in an Era of Politicization”. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (2021), Advance online publication:  
  https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1853901
- Published with Didier Ruedin “The Austrian People’s Party: an Anti-immigrant Right Party?”. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (2021), Advance online publication:  
  https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1853904
- Published “From the Migration Crisis to the New Pact on Migration and Asylum: The Status Quo Problem”. *BRIDGE Network Working Paper 11* (2021), Available at  

Rebecca Hamlin  (University of Massachussets, Amherst)

  https://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=31446

Imke Harbers  (University of Amsterdam)

- Published “Legal identity For All? Gender inequality in the Timing of Birth Registration in Mexico”. *World Development*, Vol. 128,  
- Received a Starting Grant from the European Research Council for the project “CitizenGap – Legal Identity for All?”

Ron Hayduk  (San Francisco State University)

- Published “Migration and Inequality: A Structural Approach”. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* (2020),  
  http://tupress.temple.edu/book/20000000009551

Annika Marlen Hinze (Fordham University)

Michael Rabinder James (Bucknell University)
• Published “Spanish Citizenship and Responsibility for the Past: The Case of the Sephardim, Moriscos, and Saharawis”. Politics, Groups, and Identities (2021), Advance online publication: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2020.1852944

Konrad Kalicki (National University of Singapore)
https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2020.15

David Kaufmann (ETH Zürich)
• Published with Markus Hinterleitner and Eva Thomann “The Fit Between Regulatory Instruments and Targets: Regulating the Economic Integration of Migrants”. Regulation & Governance (2020), Advance online publication: https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12319

Alexander Kustov (Postdoctoral Associate, Yale University)
• Job/appointment: Assistant Professor, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
- Published “‘Bloom where you’re planted’: explaining public opposition to (e)migration”. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (2020), Advance online publication: [https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1754770](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1754770)

**Narayani Lasala-Blanco** (Arizona State University)

**Willem Maas** (York University)
- Was awarded funding (as part of a 12-institution consortium) the WholeCOMM project, to investigate the integration of migrants in small and medium-sized towns and rural areas.

**James A. McCann** (Purdue University)

**Sara Niedzwiecki** (University of California, Santa Cruz)
- During 2020-2021, Sara Niedzwiecki was a Visiting fellow at the University of Notre Dame’s Kellogg Institute for International Studies working on a new book project on immigration and social policy in Latin America. For more information, see: [https://kellogg.nd.edu/sara-niedzwiecki](https://kellogg.nd.edu/sara-niedzwiecki)

**Kelsey Norman** (Rice University’s Baker Institute for Public Policy)
- Published *Reluctant Reception: Refugees, Migration and Governance in the Middle East and North Africa*. Cambridge University Press (2020). [https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/reluctant-reception/558E2A93FF99B8F295347A8FA2053698](https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/reluctant-reception/558E2A93FF99B8F295347A8FA2053698)

**John O’Keefe** (Ohio University-Chillicothe)
Jeffrey D. Pugh (University of Massachusetts Boston)
  • *The Invisibility Bargain* received the Arthur P. Whitaker Prize for best book in the past two years from the Middle Atlantic Council of Latin American Studies (MACLAS)

Caress Schenk (Nazarbayev University)
• Published “The Migrant Other: Exclusion Without Nationalism?”. *Nationalities Papers* (2021), Advance online publication: doi:10.1017/nps.2020.82.
• Received a grant from the National Council for Eurasian and East European Research (NCEEER) to support data collection on COVID-19 policies including border closures and visa restrictions for countries worldwide.

Albana Shehaj (Harvard University)
• Published with Merih Angin and Adrian J. Sihn “Inside Job: Migration and Distributive Politics in the European Union”. *Economics and Politics* (2021), Advance online publication: https://doi.org/10.1111/ecpo.12170

Eliska Schnabel (University of Illinois at Chicago)

Marc Smyrl (University of Montpellier)

Florian Trauner (Vrije Universiteit Brussels)
• Published with Olivia Sundberg Diez *EU Return Sponsorships: High Stakes, Low Gains?* (EPC Discussion Paper 2021).

Inés Valdez (Ohio State University)
• Granted the Sussex Prize for International Theory (University of Sussex Center for Advanced International Theory) for her book *Transnational
Cosmopolitanism: Kant, Du Bois, and Justice as a Political Craft.
Cambridge University Press (2019)

Monica Varsanyi (City University New York)

Sara Wallace Goodman (UC Irvine)
- Published “Immigration Threat, Partisanship, and Democratic Citizenship: Evidence from the US, UK, and Germany”. Comparative Political Studies (2021), Advance online publication: https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0010414021997165
- Published with Frank Schimmelfennig “Migration: a Step Too Far For the Contemporary Global Order?”. Journal of European Public Policy 27(7): 1103-1113 (2020).
- Received grant from Russell Sage Foundation (Grant # 2005-24358), “Partisanship, Outgroup Prejudice, and Public Health during the COVID-19 Pandemic” (2020).
- Received grant from National Science Foundation (Award # 2026737), “RAPID: Impact of Coronavirus Understanding, Trust, and Other Public Beliefs and Attitudes on Behavioral Responses” (2020).
- Organized Workshop on European Integration, Claremont European Union Center of California (Cancelled due to COVID-19) (2020).

Myra Waterbury (Ohio University)


Elizabeth Iams Wellman (Williams College)
- Published with Beth Elise Whitaker “Diaspora Voting in Kenya: A Promise Denied”. *African Affairs* (2021), Advance online publication: https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adab008
- New Appointment: Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Williams College (2020 - 2022)
- New Appointment: Postdoctoral Research Associate with The African Centre for Migration and Society, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

Beth Elise Whitaker (University of North Carolina at Charlotte)

Christina Isabel Zuber (Konstanz University)
Recent articles across the discipline

The articles are drawn from a search of over 70 disciplinary and national/area studies journals - excluding those that focus primarily on migration, refugees or citizenship - to draw members’ attention to recent work that they might not otherwise see.

**Acta Politica**


**African Affairs**


**American Behavioral Scientist**


**American Journal of Political Science**


**Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science**


Antipode


Asian Journal of Political Science


Australian Journal of International Affairs


Comparative European Politics


Comparative Political Studies


Contemporary Italian Politics


Electoral Studies


East European Politics and Societies


Ethics and Global Politics


Ethics and International Affairs


European Journal of International Relations

European Journal of Political Research

European Journal of Political Theory

European Union Politics
Politics, Advance online publication:
https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1465116520988905

International Affairs

International Organization

International Studies Quarterly

International Studies Review

JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies


**Journal of European Public Policy**


Law and Society Review


Mediterranean Politics


Parliamentary Affairs


Perspectives on Politics


Political Geography

in Sweden”. *Political Geography, 87*, Advance online publication: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102394


**Political Studies**


**Politics, Groups and Identities**


**Politics and Society**


**Political Theory**


**Public Opinion Quarterly**

Immigration Policies and Candidates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Advance online publication: [https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfaa048](https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfaa048)

**Scandinavian Political Studies**


**Security Dialogue**


**Social Politics**


**Territory, Politics, Governance**

West European Politics
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