

National Academies of Sciences, Committee on Population,
Workshop on Forced Migration Research: From Theory to Practice in
Promoting Migrant Well-Being

Concept essay prepared for the
Session: “Conceptual and Definitional Issues in Forced Migration Research”

Ellen Percy Kraly
Malmö University and Colgate University

The chapter, “Concepts of Refugee and Forced Migration: Considerations for Demographic Analysis,” by Keely and Kraly concludes:

We conclude that the field of forced migration studies will not be helped very much by more detailed parsing of definitions or attempts at neologisms for their particular use. The field will continue to be untidy intellectually. What is required is clarity in research design, operational definition, measurement techniques, and openness to diversity and emergence in patterns, trends and characteristics. Then perhaps, further advances can be made in theory and explanation. We should not be overly negative. Progress has been made in migration studies. The incorporation of migration into population projection analysis has taught us new things and changes political discussion about immigration, for example. The application of the forced migration label has been useful to opening up discussion to issues of State action, coerced migration and coerced return, and so on. Much of this has had more impact on policy than on demography. But demography continues to have its place in understanding this particular aspect of human behavior and for understanding its causes and consequences, both demographically and for societies (Keely and Kraly 2018).

These sentiments, with origins in the original draft of the chapter prepared by Charlie Keely, underscores both the *potential* of demography to contribute to research driven theoretical and conceptual development in forced migration studies, as well as *places* for appropriate and effective contributions of the population sciences in building knowledge that is policy relevant and scientifically sound.

The concept paper presented here seeks to build on each of these theses by setting out several points for assessment of concepts relevant for demographic research concerning forced migration and refugees. First, a glossary of the recurring concepts, categories and terms is set out. Second, a brief overview of recent and very rich scholarly discussions concerning concepts and categories of forced migration is presented. Third, the strong work of others informs the specification of concepts of forced and refugee migration and displacement. Fourth, I will offer a partial outline of ideas for workshop consideration for each of the analytic spaces in which demography is most adept: research design that seeks to support external and internal validity; measurement that fosters comparative research; and empirical research and data collection that fosters flexibility and responsiveness to emerging patterns and trends in migration studies.

- i. Glossary of concepts and categories employed in forced migration and refugee policy and policy analysis.

The following is a partial list of terms used largely in the implementation of the programs of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The definitions provided here are largely drawn from the documentation of the UNHCR supporting the annual *Global Trends in Displacement* (UNHCR 2017) and the IOM Glossary of Migration (IOM 2011) which seeks to promote common understanding among stakeholders in international migration governance and policy relevant research. For example, the following summary table of the 2017 UNHCR *Global Trends* is often a starting point for global and regional as well as bilateral analysis of refugee and asylee populations and specifies eight categories of ‘persons of concern to the agency.’

UNHCR Persons of concern, by category of concern and region of asylum, 2017

Region of asylum	Total population of concern	Total refugees and people in refugee-like situations	Refugees	People in refugee-like situations	Asylum-seekers	Returned refugees	IDPs of concern to UNHCR	Returned IDPs	Persons under UNHCR's statelessness mandate	Others of concern to UNHCR
<i>Number</i>										
Total	71,439,506	19,941,347	19,617,082	324,265	3,090,898	667,381	39,118,516	4,228,971	2,796,204	1,596,189
Africa	25,064,621	6,687,326	6,629,617	57,709	610,268	526,521	14,692,631	1,326,142	711,589	510,144
Asia	30,016,253	9,945,930	9,854,358	91,572	559,612	140,243	14,386,749	2,902,636	1,530,803	550,280
Europe	6,331,983	2,602,942	2,592,473	10,469	993,776	412	2,116,027	193	547,277	71,356
Latin America, Caribbean	8,826,832	252,288	92,354	159,934	184,128	205	7,923,109	-	2,693	464,409
Northern America	1,090,292	391,907	391,907	-	694,595	-	-	-	3,790	-
Oceania	109,525	60,954	56,373	4,581	48,519	-	-	-	52	-
<i>Percent</i>										
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Africa	35.1	33.5	33.8	17.8	19.7	78.9	37.6	31.4	25.4	32.0
Asia	42.0	49.9	50.2	28.2	18.1	21.0	36.8	68.6	54.7	34.5
Europe	8.9	13.1	13.2	3.2	32.2	0.1	5.4	0.0	19.6	4.5
Latin America, Caribbean	12.4	1.3	0.5	49.3	6.0	0.0	20.3	0.0	0.1	29.1
Northern America	1.5	2.0	2.0	0.0	22.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Oceania	0.2	0.3	0.3	1.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

UNHCR 2018 Annexes and Tables

Because of the analytic and research orientation of the workshop, standard statistical definitions of international migration currently endorsed by UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistical Commission are provided in recognition of international efforts for the exchange of comparable data on international population movements. The order of the list is not alphabetical but seeks to follow the sequence of critical analysis of first, concepts of forced migration by setting out initially, legal and operational definitions related to forced and refugee migration, followed by statistical concepts concerning international migration. Black et al (2011) provides a cogent specification of the concept of displacement.

Refugee: A person who, "owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinions, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country. (Art. 1(A)(2), Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, Art. 1A(2), 1951 as modified by the 1967 Protocol). In addition to the refugee definition in the 1951 Refugee Convention, Art. 1(2), 1969 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention defines a refugee as any person compelled to leave his or her country "owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his country or origin or nationality." Similarly, the 1984 Cartagena Declaration states that refugees also include persons who flee their country "because their lives, security or freedom have been threatened by generalised violence, foreign aggression, internal conflicts, massive violations of human rights or other circumstances which have seriously disturbed public order" (IOM 2019).

Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights asserts the right of everyone to seek and enjoy asylum. However, no clear content was given to the notion of asylum at the international level until the 1951 Convention related to the Status of Refugees [the '1951 Convention'] was adopted, and UNHCR was tasked to supervise its implementation. The 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol, as well as regional legal instruments, such as the 1969 OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa, are the cornerstone of the modern refugee protection regime. They set forth a universal refugee definition and incorporate the basic rights and obligations of refugees.

The provisions of the 1951 Convention remain the primary international standard against which any measures for the protection and treatment of refugees are judged. Its most important provision, the principle of *non-refoulement* (meaning no forced returns) contained in Article 33, is the bedrock of the regime. According to this principle, refugees must not be expelled or returned to situations where their life or freedom would be under threat. States bear the primary responsibility for this protection. UNHCR works closely with governments, advising and supporting them as needed, to implement their responsibilities (UNHCR 2018).

Persons in refugee-like situations: This category is descriptive in nature and includes groups of persons who are outside their country or territory of origin and who face protection risks similar to those of refugees, but for whom refugee status has, for practical or other reasons, not been ascertained (UNHCR 2018)

Asylum seeker: A person who seeks safety from persecution or serious harm in a country other than his or her own and awaits a decision on the application for refugee status under relevant international and national instruments. In case of a negative decision, the person must leave the country and may be expelled, as may any non-national in an irregular or unlawful situation, unless permission to stay is provided on humanitarian or other related grounds (IOM 2019).

Internally displaced persons: Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border (Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, UN Doc E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.2.) (IOM 2019).

IDPs of concern to UNHCR, including people in IDP-like situations: Persons who are displaced within their country and to whom UNHCR extends protection or assistance. It also includes people in IDP-like situations. This category is descriptive in nature and includes groups of persons who are inside their country of nationality or habitual residence and who face protection risks similar to those of IDPs but who, for practical or other reasons, could not be reported as such (UNHCR 2018).

Stateless Persons: A person who is not considered as a national by any State under the operation of its law (UNHCR) (Art. 1, UN Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, 1954). As such, a stateless person lacks those rights attributable to national/diplomatic protection of a State, no inherent right of sojourn in the State of residence and no right of return in case he or she travels (IOM2019).

Forced migration: A migratory movement in which an element of coercion exists, including threats to life and livelihood, whether arising from natural or man-made causes (e.g. movements of refugees and internally displaced persons as well as people displaced by natural or environmental disasters, chemical or nuclear disasters, famine, or development projects) (IOM2019).

Displacement: “Although a distinction is drawn between mobility and displacement, it is recognised that these can be seen as two ends of a continuum. movement associated with discrete events that challenge safety, security or livelihoods. Much displacement is, in effect, involuntary or forced, and sometimes sudden if associated with rapid onset hazards. Mobility is broadly interpreted as a proactive move to improve livelihoods and opportunities, and is typically voluntary and planned” (Black et al. 2011 S6).

Migrant: IOM defines a migrant as any person who is moving or has moved across an international border or within a State away from his/her habitual place of residence, regardless of (1) the person’s legal status; (2) whether the movement is voluntary or involuntary; (3) what the causes for the movement are; or (4) what the length of the stay is. IOM concerns itself with migrants and migration-related issues and, in agreement with relevant States, with migrants who are in need of international migration services (IOM2019).

Migration: The movement of a person or a group of persons, either across an international border, or within a State. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons moving for other purposes, including family reunification (IOM2019).

Statistical definitions of international population movements based in the UN *Recommendations on International Migration* (UN DESA 1998):

Long-term migrant: A person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least a year (12 months), so that the country of destination effectively becomes his or her new country of usual residence. From the perspective of the country of departure, the person will be a long-term emigrant and from that of the country of arrival, the person will be a long-term immigrant.

Short-term migrant: A person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least three months but less than a year (12 months) except in cases where the movement to that country is for purposes of recreation, holiday, visits to friends or relatives, business, medical treatment or religious pilgrimage. For purposes of international migration statistics, the country of usual residence of short-term migrants is considered to be the country of destination during the period they spend in it.

International visitors (Foreign visitors): Persons who do not reside in the country of arrival and who are admitted for short stays for purposes of leisure, recreation, holidays; visits to friends and relatives; business or professional activities not remunerated from within the receiving country; health treatment; or religious pilgrimages. Visitors include excursionists, tourists and business travelers.

Transit migrants (Foreigners in transit): Persons who arrive in the receiving country but do not enter it formally because they are on their way to another destination.

Refugees: Foreign persons granted refugee status either at the time of admission or before admission. This category therefore includes foreign persons granted refugee status while abroad and entering to be resettled in the receiving country as well as persons granted refugee status on a group basis upon arrival in the country. In some cases, refugee status may be granted when the persons involved are still in their country of origin through "in-country processing" of requests for asylum. Refugee status may be granted on the basis of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol or pertinent regional instruments.

Foreigners seeking asylum: A category that encompasses both persons who are eventually allowed to file an application for asylum (asylum-seekers proper) and those who do not enter the asylum adjudication system formally but are nevertheless granted the permission to stay until they can return safely to their countries of origin (that is to say, they become foreigners granted temporary protected status).

ii. Perspectives on concepts and categories in forced migration studies

The scholarly literature on concepts of forced and refugee migration and population displacement has emerged as particularly engaged and engaging in unabashed aspirations to serve goals for both intellectual rigor and policy relevance. To be sure Bakewell (2008) argues persuasively for the essential role of ‘policy irrelevant’ research to inform effective, responsive, and evolving migration policy and programs of support to migrants. The literature addressing conceptual dimensions of forced and refugee migration is multi-, inter- and increasingly trans-disciplinary, moving forward with the call for inclusion of migrants and communities to inform knowledge generation.

Review of the field is beyond the scope of this essay and, to be sure, has been effectively accomplished by others who offer critical perspectives on the development and applications of concepts and categories of persons moving in search of safe haven from the vantage of theory and analysis, policy, and human rights and ethics (see in particular analyses by Zetter 2019; Hyndman and Giles 2016; Black et al 2011, 2012; Van Hear 2012). The case to challenge legal and normative categories deriving from international refugee regimes is made in smart and compelling terms. From my modest vantage, these academic statements, expressed with eloquence, beauty and analytic strength hold authority within the space of the present workshop, and may serve as anchors in our discussions of the role of demographic measurement and analysis in serving human security and well-being.

In a series of papers addressing environmental dimensions of migration, Richard Black and his colleagues (2011, 2012) advance an analytical framework that specifies the interrelationships among environmental change and events, community and individual characteristics and capacities and human mobility and places migration resulting from environmental change (and also conflict related drivers of population movements) within a broader set of dynamics:

...if this point that migration is an established social phenomenon is accepted the key question becomes less the identification of ‘environmental migrants’ who might be counted and possibly provided some form of legal or other protection, and more the question of the net effect of environmental change on migration in aggregate (2011, S4).

The case of extreme environmental events also puts into relief the interplay between protection and exclusion of persons:

...disaster risk reduction which seeks simply to reduce vulnerability of populations in situ runs the risk of replicating the same problems of a ‘root causes’ response to violence and persecution – it can be seen as a policy of ‘containment’ (c.f. Hyndman, 2005). This at best pre-determines the types of ‘acceptable’ adaptation to extreme events (whether ‘natural’ or ‘conflict’-related); at worst, it leaves people trapped in conditions where they are potentially even more vulnerable if the protection measures fail (2012, S40).

Drawing empirical research conducted with migrants crossing the Mediterranean Sea during 2015, Heaven Crawley and Dimitri Skleparis (2017) interrogate policy and perspectives concerning the European refugee migration ‘crisis’:

Whilst dominant representations of the ‘crisis’ typically give the impression of a linear, uninterrupted flow

of people heading towards Europe (Mainwaring and Brigden 2016; Crawley et al. 2016a, 2016b), many of those arriving in Europe during 2015 had been living for months or even years in countries other than those in which they were born, requiring us to engage with the complex economic, social and political realities of the ‘in between’.

In this context, our aim is to challenge what Apostolova (2015) has described as a form of ‘categorical fetishism’ which, despite significant academic critique, continues to treat the categories ‘refugee’ and ‘migrant’ as if they simply exist, out there, as empty vessels into which people can be placed in some neutral ordering process like a small child putting bricks into a series of coloured buckets (2017, 49).

In the introduction to their forthcoming study, Jennifer Hyndman and Winona Giles offer an intricate integration of literature concerning knowledge about whom and where vis a vis forced and displaced people. Hyndman and Giles set forth the lack of policy and research attention to persons in extended exile, well beyond the circumstances of protracted refugee situations, and more generally the lived experiences of forced migrants, families and households.

The 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol codify a laudable set of protections and entitlements for refugees whose cases are adjudicated on an individual basis, but the vast majority of those fleeing their homes cannot access this status. They are literally caught in a web where they lack permanent legal status, experience restricted livelihoods in their place of temporary refuge, and are unable to return home. Our aim is to render visible these spaces in which these refugees dwell, highlight their stories in places off the newsworthy maps of ‘emergencies,’ and at the same time critically analyze the geopolitics of their displacement in relation to state strategies that keep them in place (1)

Ironically, refugees tend to register with governments, media, and civil societies who consume global messaging only when they are either at risk of death in an emergency situation, or a potential threat, especially to state security. Once the emergency is over and people-at-risk have been fed, and mortality rates decline, world attention wanes and the displaced disappear from the world stage (12-13) ...

.....refugees are categorized, counted, and managed as a mass of humanity that is not quite human. Invoking ontological security aims to unsettle the dominant framing of security in international relations, scaling it to the settlements, households, and actual people living in conditions of protracted displacement on a daily basis (14) ...

In their edited volume, *Forced Migration: Current Issues and Debates (2019)*, edited by Alice Bloch and Giorgia Donà present a collection of papers highly relevant to workshop discussions. As will be summarized below, Roger Zetter’s contributed chapter, ‘Conceptualising forced migration: Praxis, scholarship and empirics,’ is essential reading for purposes of informing social demographic research. To set the stage, Zetter states:

Although neither ‘forced migrant’ nor ‘forced displacement’ is a ‘term of art’ in the same way as ‘refugee’, this more familiar label decreasingly fits the substantially growing numbers of people needing some form of protection and other forms of assistance, but are not subject to persecution – the determining criterion of refugee status and protection under the terms of the 1951 Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees and 1967 Protocol Despite the lack of global consensus, the widespread use of labels such as ‘forced migrant’, ‘forced displacement’ and ‘forcibly displaced person’, and their increasing institutionalization, counter to the more prescriptive and circumscribed international legal and normative meaning of the label ‘refugee.’ In the search for more all-encompassing definitions these newer labels seek to capture the complex drivers, processes, impacts and consequences and the multiplicity of categories ... which characterise contemporary and emerging forced displacement dynamics.

However, like any new label, the emergence of forced migrant and terms such as forced displacement has been uncertain, problematic and contentious (19-20).

Taking the 1951 Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees and 1967 Protocol as points of departure Zetter proceeds to trace the evolution of concepts – and categories – of refugees and forced migration – in

praxis –that is, inherent in international convention and regional protocols, specifically the 1969 (O)AU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa, the 1984 Cartagena Declaration on Refugees, and the 2009 Kampala Convention. Each of these initiatives in governance recognizes and illustrates geographic specificity in need(s) for protections and assistance and as well as revealing the lack of coherence in legal frameworks, International and regional response to migration ‘crises’ provoked broadening, in a practical if not legal sense, concepts of forced displacement in the operations of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) Migration Crisis Operational Framework and the Migrants in Countries in Crisis initiative. Narratives framing the 2016 United Nations Summit for Refugees and Migrants and the 2018 Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration include a range of terms concerning forced migration and displacement, beyond the specificity of the status of refugee and internally displaced persons (Zetter 2019; see also UNGA 2019).

Recognition and response to environmental change and environmental events at global, regional and local scales have given focus to broadening of the bases for protection, human security and risk reduction, and engaging dimensions of vulnerability – and resilience – of population and communities to displacement and forced mobility. These concepts are inherent in the Nansen Initiative and the Sendai Framework, as well as other international and regional efforts at effective and response environmentally induced migration within the context of global environmental change. Relatively more recent efforts at responsibility sharing regarding migrants and refugees, including the United Nations (UN) High-level Meeting on Addressing Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants and the resulting Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, similarly include broader language, hence, concepts, of forced migration and displacement. In the end, Zetter observes, international migration and refugee policy regimes continue to fail in reconfiguring legal definitions and protocols regarding refugees and internationally and internally displaced persons to reflect the changing geographic dimensions and complexity of the drivers and characteristics of forced displacement and mobilities in this current period of global change.

Turning to the domain of *research*, Zetter poses the question of whether scholarship and social science has met the ‘analytic challenge’ of conceptualization of forced migration and refugees. In undertaking his critical review of the literature, Zetter provides an essential service to the advancement of both theoretical and empirical research concerning forced migration and population displacement. The move to embed forced migration studies within contexts of structural change at different scales of analysis has yielded perspectives which embrace multiple, interrelated drivers of migration, including forced migration and displacement. The result follows that legal concepts, categories and state-driven frames for protection, assistance and critically, containment are inconsistent with current and emerging patterns of forced migration and displacement. Zetter and also Black et al (2011) underscore the analytic heft of perspectives on social structure and migrant agency contributing to conceptual, and empirical advancement of forced migration studies, as well as the role of the migration-asylum nexus in contributing to conceptualization and analysis mixed-migration flows. In outlining the development of the field, Zetter recognizes the significance of the seminal work of Kunz (1979. 1981) in raising the significance of motivations within the study of refugee and ‘involuntary’ migrations, and also the importance of considering changes in characteristics of cohorts of refugees over time. In the end, again, Zetter questions the degree to which rigorous specification of concepts of forced migration has been realized in extant scholarship challenging social scientific as well as practical analysis to embrace:

.... a far more comprehensive understanding of the complexity and the multiple and mixed drivers of forced migration and a continuum of processes rather than simpler ‘cause-and-effect’ explanations. It also provides an important entry point into distinguishing the diversity of protection needs and rights. These conceptual challenges have been profoundly problematic for government policy makers and humanitarian and development actors. A more rigorous conceptualisation also recognises that forced migration paradoxically incorporates compulsion *and* choice as well as agency *and* constraints, as Colson, Castles and Kunz amongst others understood (28).

By setting out dimensions of forced migration, for example, ‘multiple and mixed drivers,’ migrant agency, choice and motivation, this last quote provides a transition to a consideration of the conceptual content of forced migration and issues in research design.

iii. Specification of dimensions of concepts of forced and refugee migration, and displacement

Continuing, Roger Zetter (2019) argues that the conceptualization of forced migration must reflect the multivariate nature of multiple drivers of persecution, a core dimension of forced migration, and vulnerability to the risk of persecution. He presents a typological framework of six causal/correlational scenarios in relationship to vulnerability, flight and displacement: existential threats of (i) socio-economic and (ii) state fragility; (iii) nexus of armed conflict, other situations of violence and human rights violations; (iv) environmental degradation and climate change; (v) development-induced displacement; and (vi) natural disasters. Furthermore, these drivers of forced displacement are not independent of one another but can be observed, and hypothesized to interact (see also Black et al. 2011). Zetter’s discussion of the ‘existential threats’ of poverty and insecure livelihoods, and political insecurities is a most effective contribution to the conceptualization of forced migration. Zetter proceeds to relate these existential, structural and episodic processes to the temporal and spatial tendencies of population displacement. He specifies the ‘continuum of displacement through space and over time, emphasizing the diversity of patterns of mobility decision-making and resulting patterns of ‘mixed migration flows’ likely to be observed at any one point in time. Cumulative causation is an important thread in Zetter’s analysis as he notes the dynamic dimensions of forced migration over time and through space: “Onward trajectories and global mobility are a direct consequence of the complex multiple drivers of forced displacement which inevitably create the ‘need’ for new channels and patterns of mobility (37).”

The conceptual model of ‘drivers of migration’ developed by Richard Black and his colleagues (2011, S5) lines up well with the recent analytic contributions of Zetter described above. Black and his colleagues embed their analysis of the interrelationships between environmental change and human migration within prior theories of human migration and population mobilities to underscore the need to consider forced migration and displacement emanating from multiple and interrelated causes/correlates as one of several potential outcomes in human mobility behavior and decision-making. This critically important paper is followed by specific focus on the relationship between natural disasters and mobility and immobility outcomes in the 2012 paper by Black et al. While the particular ‘case’ is that of natural disasters and to an extent, likelihood of a population being ‘trapped’, the model holds relevance and significant value for general conceptualization of dimensions of forced displacement and mobilities, and patterns of variations in vulnerability, exposure, resilience and recovery.

Through the specification of concepts of vulnerability, exposure and risk, as well as resilience, agency and identity, theory and empirical research on forced migration and displacement underscore the centrality of diversity of experiences among persons, households and communities facing persecution, social, economic and environmental insecurities and hazards – the drivers of forced migration and displacement. Disaggregation of forced migration patterns, processes, and lived experiences of migrants by social demographic characteristics derives increasing from social theory as well as formal and social demographic analysis. Answers to the critical questions of ‘why gender?’ ‘why race?’ are now answered in theoretical and conceptual understandings of power, class, and patriarchy in migration scholarship, well framed by general perspectives on structure and agency. The critical roles of gender and age, race and ethnicity and economic welfare, class, and poverty are well established as critical axes of difference processes of forced migration (see Hyndman and Giles 2011; Giles and Hyndman 2004; Martin 2004; Kraly 2018). The potential new chapter in international cooperation for migrants and refugees emanating from consultation processes in advance of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration

witnessed the recognition of the importance of disaggregated data by social and demographic characteristics. Stakeholders, including Member States and civil society organizations articulated specific needs for rigorous analysis of social demographic, economic and cultural dimensions of persecution, insecurity and exposure to hazards (Kraly and Hovy, in preparation).

Well in addition to their critical analysis of legal and operational concepts of refugees and displaced persons, Crawley and Skleparis (2017) similarly recognize the complex interactions among the conditions and drivers of forced migration. Migrant participants in their research provide descriptions of the multi-faceted nature of their own decision-making in undertaking the risks of the Mediterranean journey, and critically, articulate the ways in which ‘reasons’ for migration shift over time and through the process of movement and spaces of immobility, as migrants deal with the ‘in between’ spaces of flight. Crawley and Skleparis observe “[i]t is, however, impossible to fully appreciate the drivers of migration without examining the ways in which political and economic factors come together to shape the experiences of those living in times of war. The longer the conflict, the more complicated – and difficult to unpack - the relationship becomes” (53, and see Crawley et al 2016b). While the reference here is war, the analytic implications are general for analysis (and the experience) of drivers of migration and motivations for mobility. Moreover, this lack of analytic attention to the ‘in between’ holds profound implications for policy response to migrants and hence to persons who are in these recognized spaces: “Whilst there is generally no interest in the policy implications of the ‘in between’, the shifting experiences of those on the move over space and time are increasingly used strategically to exclude refugees from access to protection and rights” (58).

The consideration of persons living in extended exile by Jennifer Hyndman and Winona Giles (2016; see also Hyndman and Giles 2011; Giles and Hyndman 2004) is complementary to the analysis of Crawley and Skleparis concerning temporary and spatial processes of the search for safety and security. Hyndman and Giles argue for understanding, and appreciation, of the ways in which refugees and displaced persons who, in a state of “permanent temporariness” (Bailey et al 2002; see also Bose and Lunstrom 2019 in relationship to environmental displacement) and hence without political identity (or, as argued, political significance) live, and make homes, for themselves, their families and households. And how, within the context of both their spaces of exiles and within their experience, do they foster ‘ontological security’? This conceptual dimension of the forced migration and displacement is explained as “... a lived sense of safety with a degree of certainty underwriting it. It is demarcated as much by its absence as its presence among people caught in conditions of extended exile. The ongoing search for belonging, livelihoods, and a place to call home in conditions of protracted displacement produces conditions of insecurity” (15). The implications for health and well-being are specified with empathy thus: “[b]uilding a future from a present that often includes anxiety and chaos is an extreme challenge” (15-16).

iv. Conceptual analysis of forced migration and displacement: implications for research design, measurement, and data collection

Several directions for research design, and social demographic measurement, data collection and analysis derive from the brief and selective review presented above. Presented below is an incomplete discussion of analytic aspirations that might be considered during the course of the workshop and beyond.

a. An overarching analytic theme inherent in existing scholarship on the conceptualization of forced migration, refugees and displacement, expressed particularly in the work of Zetter, Crawley and Skleparis, and in the critical work of the scholars from which they draw, is significance of change in the dynamics of international and forced migration and the emergence of new processes and patterns. Changes in the interrelationships among the drivers of migration generally and in forced migration and

displacement in particular, as well as the emergence of new causes and correlates pose analytic challenge, and opportunities, to internal and external validity in research. If legal concepts concerning refugees and asylum are bound by historical and administrative legacies, population information systems will serve knowledge generation, including generation of policy relevant knowledge, will be served well by the collection of data that facilitates measurement of concepts of forced migration and displacement falling outside of these boundaries (cf. Bakewell 2008; Van Hear 2011; Jones 2009). Accordingly, population and migration researchers should build analytic flexibility and responsiveness into population information systems to adapt to changing parameters of migration, and emerging processes and patterns in the relationships between social and environmental, broadly conceived, and human mobilities, migration and displacement. Collection of detailed data on length of stay, reasons for moving and staying, and personal and household mobility dynamics, etc., can foster analytic flexibility in measurement of concepts of forced migration and displacement. Migration and mobility histories serve this purpose and are made more meaningful performed within the framework of ethnosurveys.

b. A second analytic theme that emerges from theoretical frames inherent in forced migration scholarship is the important of historical-structural and environmental context(s) of human mobility. Likely it goes without saying that rigorous and relevant migration research conducted at any scale (global, regional, local, the body) requires the envelope of relevant context for understanding emerging processes and patterns at a given scale/location within the given frame of time. Migration studies adopting political ecological framework serve as good models of the operationalization of context in explaining patterns and processes of refugee and forced migration as well as other social outcomes (see, for example, Kalipeni and Oppong 1998). Moreover, layered research designs, working across scales of analysis are effective strategies for empirically-driven contextual analysis. Integration of survey data with interviews and other sources of subjective data on migrants and refugees (ethnography, biography, textual analysis, etc.) are effective strategies for generating meaningful understandings of migration processes that aid in the interpretation of results beyond specified models (see, for example, Carling 2014).

c. Interactions between and among drivers of migration and mobility decision-making and behaviors are also reflect social and cultural structures and processes of difference. Vulnerability and resilience, risk and exposure to the drivers of forced migration will vary by social demographic characteristics – age, gender, economic status, health, household characteristics, etc. that should be mainstreamed within population data systems and research. Forced migration scholarship – and feminist theory - also directs us to consider those dimensions of difference for which theory, research, and policy and programs, have yet to bear witness. Ongoing exploratory research is warranted to maintain openness to new patterns of persecution, insecurity and risk at the level of social groups, households, individuals and bodies.

d. In developing their ‘new conceptual framework’ for the role of environmental factors, including environmental disasters, in migration and displacement, Black and his colleagues inherently caution against research focusing on migrants and displaced persons only, akin to sampling on the dependent variable. Research seeking to move beyond cause-and-effect analysis to understandings of patterns of relationships among and between drivers of should consider the diversity of outcomes, that is, the full range of (im)mobility motivations and behaviors. Specification and measurement of concepts of vulnerability, exposure and resilience are instructive in guiding valid conceptualization and measurement of geographic mobilities. Environmental hazards research, research on diffusion of ideas, behaviors, even disease through time and space may serve as analytic models in forced migration research.

e. Recent forced migration scholarship gives clear focus to the critical importance of changes in mobility motivations and behaviors and how these change over time and across place and space. Empirical research on ‘mixed migration’ flows reveal the implications – and constraints – of cross-sectional research on forced migration and displacement. Longitudinal research on forced migration,

displacement and also the experience of extended exile is clearly warranted. Recalling the importance of temporal and spatial contexts of migration and displacement, assessment of period effects on processes, patterns and experience of forced migration and displacement is consistent with the analytic tool-kit of social demography. Similarly, life course perspectives on human development and security – the cohort effects of forced migration, displacement and protracted containment on other social demographic outcomes, including health, fertility and family formation, and dimensions of integration among persons experiencing different forms and durations of mobility will similarly align with demographic perspective and analysis. Multi-sited research designs have emerged as valuable strategies to observe patterns of mobility through time and space, and potentially consider processes of mobility in relationship to social changes at multiple scales of analysis.

References:

- Apostolova, R. 2015. “Of refugees and migrants: Stigma, politics, and boundary work at the borders of Europe.” *American Sociological Association Newsletter*, September 14. [https:// asaculturesection.org/2015/09/14/of-refugees-and-migrants-stigma-politics-and-boundary-work- at-the-borders-of-europe/](https://asaculturesection.org/2015/09/14/of-refugees-and-migrants-stigma-politics-and-boundary-work-at-the-borders-of-europe/).
- Bakewell, O. 2008. Research Beyond the categories: The importance of policy irrelevant research into forced migration. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21 (4): 432–453.
- Black, R. et al. 2012. Migration, immobility and displacement outcomes following extreme events. *Environmental Science and Policy* 27S: S32-43.
- Black, R. et al. 2011. The effect of environmental change on human migration. *Global Environmental Change* 21S: S3-S11.
- Bloch, A. and G. Dona. 2019. *Forced Migration: Current Issues and Debates*. London: Routledge.
- Bose, P. and E. Lunstrom. 2019. What Constitutes Environmental Displacement? Challenges and Opportunities of Exploring Connections Across Thematically Diverse Areas. Chapter 11 in *Ethical Networking for Research and Practice: Reflections on the Refugee Research Network*. S. McGrath and J. E. E. Young, Eds. Alberta: University of Calgary.
- Carling, Jorgen. 2014. Scripting Remittances: Making Sense of Money Transfers in Transnational Relationships. *International Migration Review* 48: 218-262.
- Crawley, H. F. and D. Skleparis. 2017. Refugees, migrants, neither, both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe’s ‘migration crisis.’ *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44: 48-64.
- Crawley, H., F. Düvell, K. Jones, S. McMahon, and N. Sigona. 2016a. “Destination Europe? Understanding the Dynamics and Drivers of Mediterranean Migration in 2015.” MEDMIG Final Report. www.medmig.info/research-brief-destination-europe.pdf.
- Crawley, H., F. Düvell, K. Jones, and D. Skleparis. 2016b. “Understanding the Dynamics of Migration to Greece and the EU: Drivers, Decisions and Destinations.” MEDMIG Research Brief No. 2. <http://www.medmig.info/research-brief-02-Understanding-the-dynamics-of-migration-to-Greece-and-the-EU.pdf>.
- Giles, W. and J. Hyndman, Eds. 2004. *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Hyndman, J., 2005. Migration wars: refuge or refusal? *Geoforum* 36: 3–6.

- Hyndman J. and W. Giles. 2016. Invisible lives and silent disasters in *Living on the Edge: Refugees in Extended Exile*. London: Routledge.
- Hyndman J. and W. Giles. 2011. Waiting for what? The feminization of asylum in protracted situations. *Gender, Place and Culture*. 18: 361-379.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM). 2019. *Glossary on Migration*. International Migration Law, No. 25. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Kalipeni, E. and J. Opong. 1998. The refugee crisis in Africa and implications for health and disease: A political ecology approach. *Social Science and Medicine* 46: 1637-1653.
- Keely, C. B., and E. P. Kraly. 2018. Concepts of Refugee and Forced Migration: Considerations for Demographic Analysis. Pp 21-37 In *Demography of Refugee and Forced Migration*, edited by Graeme Hugo, Mohammed Jalal Abbasi-Shavazi, and Ellen Percy Kraly. The Netherlands: Springer.
- Kraly, E. P. 2018. Behind and Beyond Disaggregation by Sex: Forced Migration, Gender and the Place of Demography.” In *Demography of Refugee and Forced Migration*, edited by Graeme Hugo, Mohammed Jalal Abbasi-Shavazi, and Ellen Percy Kraly, 125–53. The Netherlands: Springer.
- Kraly, E. P. and B. Hovy. In preparation. Migration data and research for informed policies: inputs to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.
- Kunz E. 1973 The refugee in flight: Kinetic models and forms of displacement. *International Migration Review* 7: 125–146.
- Kunz E. 1981. Exile and resettlement: Refugee theory. *International Migration Review* 15: 42–51.
- Mainwaring, C., and M. Brigden. 2016. Beyond the border: Clandestine migration journeys. *Geopolitics* 21: 243–262.
- United Nations (UN) Statistics Division. 2019. UNdata. (<http://data.un.org/Glossary>)
- United Nations (UN) Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1998. *Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration*. Series M, No. 58, Rev. 1. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). 2019. <https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 2018. *Global Trends in Forced Displacement in 2017*. New York: United Nations.
- van Hear, N. 2012. Forcing the issue: Migration crises and the uneasy dialogue between refugee research and policy. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25: 2–24.
- Zetter, R. 2019. Conceptualising forced migration: praxis, scholarship and empirics. Pp 19-43 in *Forced Migration: Current Issues and Debates*. Edited by A. Bloch and G. Donà. London: Routledge.
- Zetter, R. 2015. *Protection in Crisis: Forced Migration in a Global Era*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/protection-crisis-forced-migration-and-protection-global-era>.
- Zetter, R. 2007. More labels, fewer refugees: Remaking the refugee label in an era of globalization. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20: 172–192.