Unequal knowledge production and circulation in migration studies

Unequal knowledge production and circulation in migration studies: feminist perspectives

Tanja Bastia and Eleonore Kofman

*****

Abstract

Knowledge production and knowledge circulation within the broader field of migration studies are highly unequal. In this chapter, we address the uneven (e)valuation of knowledge and probe more deeply into the institutional dimensions of the uneven production and circulation of knowledge, including, the ability to conduct research and its funding, the hegemony of English and its implications for research and teaching. We illustrate these problems by drawing on our own engagement with research on gender and migration, as well as a broader reflection on how gender and migration research produced in East Asia, Latin America and Western Europe is taken into account (or not) in some of the key gender and migration discussions. We discuss what we believe are some of the reasons behind the unequal production and circulation of knowledge within gender and migration and provide examples of different ways in which some of the key concepts used extensively in the gender and migration literature, such as gender, care or the family, have different meanings in different contexts. We conclude with some reflections on how we might effectively challenge this uneven knowledge production.

Introduction

Knowledge production and knowledge circulation within the broader field of migration studies are highly unequal as illustrated by two recently published articles (Levy et al. 2020; Pisarevskaya et al. 2020). These two articles mapped the academic landscape of more than 30 years of migration studies as an epistemic community and its internationalisation through a bibliometric analysis of journal articles and books, tracing the changes over time and the extent to which authors refer to or cite one another. The results demonstrated that whilst the volume of studies in the field of migration grew very rapidly after 2000, its internationalisation only increased slowly and that 'English became the lingua-franca for academic research on migration in a rather organic manner' (Pisarevskaya et al 2020). Both because of the language restriction of the algorithm to the English language (see Schmoll this volume) and because of the Global North's dominance in the field, there is likely to be an under-representation of scholarship from the Global South[1]. Other reviews of major names in migration studies (Carling 2015) or of places of authors in a leading journal, such as the review in *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (King et al. 2011), also revealed a restricted number of countries of recognised scholars.

With the increasing attention being paid to the significance of colonialism and the call to decolonise the curriculum, including in migration studies (Mayblin and Turner 2021; Tudor 2018), some scholars have posed questions about the geopolitics of knowledge production beyond the centres of knowledge production in migration studies, what decolonising means and how we might re-center the South (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2020; Halvorsen 2018). Others have highlighted the marginalisation of important theoretical and empirical research from non-western regions (Asis et al. 2019; Chan 2021). Many of these critical studies have highlighted the power relations underpinning the relegation of the South to the production of data and the marginalisation of Southern theory in the geopolitics of knowledge production and citation (Connell 2014a, b). In this chapter, we address the uneven (e)valuation of knowledge, which is related both to how knowledge is produced as well as how it circulates, the two aspects being closely related. We seek to probe more deeply into the institutional dimensions of the uneven production and circulation of knowledge, and in particular, the ability to conduct research and its funding, the hegemony of English and its implications for research and teaching, and some reflections on how we might effectively challenge it.

We illustrate these problems by drawing on our own engagement with research on gender and migration, as well as a broader reflection on how gender and migration research produced in East Asia, Latin America and Western Europe is taken into account (or not) in some of the key gender and migration discussions. We discuss what we believe are some of the reasons behind the unequal production and circulation of knowledge within gender and migration and provide examples of different ways in which some of the key concepts used extensively in the gender and migration literature, such as gender, care or the family, have different meanings in different contexts. We also suggest that decolonial (Lugones 2010, Falquet and Flores Espínola 2019) and Southern knowledge (Connell 2014a.b) perspectives in knowledge production and circulation might help build a more level playing field, though we suggest that real change is unlikely to come about only as a result of new or different knowledge production and suggest that strategic alliances and institutional change are both needed for change to take place. To do this, we reflect on the role that feminist theory has played in shaping this field, acknowledging its contributions but also the fact that it suffers from the same weaknesses as migration studies

---

[1] Although it has become common to speak of the Global North versus a Global South, we wish to highlight the heterogeneity of both of these broad categories in terms of economic levels, migration patterns and regimes, cultural practices, gender regimes and relationships to colonialism.

itself: it is largely Eurocentric, disregards the rich contributions from Africa, Asia and Latin America, and is yet to fully integrate a decolonial definition of itself.

We then move to discuss decolonial perspectives more broadly and include a reflection of how this perspective might both broaden the field of gender and migration as well as contribute to building more equal knowledge production practices. Following Rivera Cusicanqui (2012), a decolonial perspective would include not just knowledge production but also active engagement with migrant women's networks and action to improve the substantive conditions of women migrants. A decolonial perspective would also shift our curriculum to include non-academic work, art and other interventions. Finally, it would also embed a higher degree of reflexivity in relation to both our positionality as well as how our research contributes towards challenging existing intersectional inequalities or, rather, their reproduction.

Unequal Knowledge Production

We recognise that the politics of knowledge production is highly unequal and has privileged the issues raised in the core countries of the Global North, especially in the past two decades as the focus has shifted to receiving countries where migration research has massively expanded, especially in Europe. For example, in the initial period of studies on gender and migration in the 1980s and 1990s, in some reviews of the emerging field, different regions were given relatively equal status (Willis and Yeoh 2000). Theoretical perspectives, such as social reproduction and labour migrations in South East Asia (Truong 1996) or structuration perspectives in Southern Africa (Wright 1995), were also seen to draw upon migrations in regions beyond Europe and North America. Latin America, with a majority of female migrants, produced a notable literature, often in Spanish, emphasising the diversity of contexts and types of rural-urban, regional and international migrations (Cerrutti 2017; Cerrutti and Parrado 2015; Staab 2004). With the expansion of labour migration, especially in female-dominated sectors in the wealthy regions of the Global North, migration studies tended to focus on South to North migrations. So too did theorisations of the transfer of labour emphasise its international dimension (Hochschild 2000; Sassen 2000) and reinforce the preoccupation with the implications for the Global North (Kofman 2014) with lesser attention paid to concerns or contexts that continued to orient migrations flows within the diverse regions of the Global South.

We start with the example of internal migration, which in the North has been largely consigned to the past, while in many societies in the South, it remained at the end of the 20th century a significant vector of labour migration (Bunster and Chaney 1985; Chant 1992) and continues to be pertinent today (more so in Africa and parts of Asia than in Latin America). Migration in the context of urbanisation remains particularly important in countries such as China, with 286 million rural workers in cities in 2020. It is particularly significant since the right to the city (including the right to work and entitlements to pensions, housing, medical care and so on) is denied to rural migrant workers, who do not benefit from the formal resources of the city as a result of the application of the household registration system (*hukou*) though this has been relaxed in recent years (Kofman et al.2021). Internal and international migration, however, are generally treated as two separate and disconnected literatures with internal migration often neglected due to its seeming irrelevance for the North (King and Skeldon 2010). Thus, the complexities and articulations between different types of migration are often omitted in Africa and Latin America, where multi-scalar migrations comprising rural-urban, cross-border to neighbouring countries and longer-distance international migrations co-exist (Bastia 2019).

While in many European countries, domestic and care work has been represented as international migrants' work (though this too is a simplification because it overlooks the diversities of labour markets and prioritises the metropolitan (see Glick Schiller and Caglar 2009). Even in many wealthy countries, such as France and UK, the use of migrant labour is highly uneven with many working class women undertaking these jobs in poorer regions (Howard and Kofman 2020) and for domestic work and certain kinds of care (Avril and Cartier 2014). In many countries of the Global South, these jobs are usually taken up by internal migrants who often work informally. In Brazil, the country with the largest number of domestic workers with 10 million households employing domestic workers and 6 million employed as domestic workers, many are internal migrants. The gendered and racial composition of domestic workers reflects the country's colonial history and slavery, as it does in Colombia (Marchetti et al. 2021). In Brazil, 60% of domestic workers are Black (Acciari 2019). In India too, the country with the second largest number of domestic workers, urban middle class and elite families draw on those from rural areas (Palriwala and Neetha 2011). The vast majority of domestic workers are first generation rural migrants. Indeed international migrants may be placed at the top of a stratified system of (migrant) domestic and care work, given that those in Singapore, Hong Kong or the Gulf Cooperation countries actually receive a contract and payment in foreign currency, which is more valued than the national currency. Domestic workers working in their own countries, on the other hand, are paid in the national currency and often work informally, without labour contracts. This is the case especially where migrant domestic workers do not dominate the sector, as in Pakistan, and local workers provide the bulk of labour, unlike for example in the Gulf countries or South East Asia.

An extensive theoretical and empirical literature has emerged around the circulation and transfer of care labour between the South and the North (Hochschild 2001; Parreñas 2001; Lutz and Mollenbeck 2012). However, as Raghuram (2012) has noted, care is adopted somewhat unquestioningly as the lens through which to make sense of the social reproduction of households, communities and economies in different, even dissimilar, parts of the world. Such an approach does not reflect adequately on what might be locationally specific about care in diverse geographical contexts. As noted, the analysis of the transfer of care labour globally tended initially to focus on the Global North, although more recent studies of the transfer, circulation and transnationalisation of care activities and practices have begun to take into account the implications for countries of origin (Williams 2018).

These earlier studies of sending societies assumed that care activities had to be redistributed amongst nuclear families (Raghuram 2012), but comparative studies of transnational families have recognised the diversity of family forms and the relationships between family members and wider kin (Mazzucato and Dito 2018). Extended families may be common in many countries, for example, in India about a fifth are composed of more than two married adults (Palriwala and Neetha 2011). In Andean countries, it is common to have extended 'fictive kin' family members (Gray-Molina et al. 1999; Van Vleet 2008). At the same time the broader context in which families operate may not be acknowledged, thereby marginalising the ways in which families relate to a wider institutional set of actors and where care is framed and mobilized under specific normative contexts in different countries (Mazzucato and Dito 2018; Williams 2010).

Much of the existing literature on international migration and care sometimes also places too much emphasis on the international move as the originator of care reorganisation in families and communities of origin, without acknowledging that migration itself is part of broader processes of change. The reorganisation of family forms often pre-dates the international move and may have been common as a strategy, particularly in lower-income families, where the main carer migrated internally or just sought work locally and had to rely on her extended

family, usually the maternal grandmother, for raising young children and taking care of cooking and cleaning (Bastia 2019). In the Latin American context, the reorganisation of care in communities of origin is not necessarily seen as a 'burden' or as 'care loss', because care arrangements have always been much more fluid and responsive, than is acknowledged in some of the literature on global care chains, for example (Herrera 2020).

Although thus far we have discussed differences in how international migration is viewed in relation to other forms of migration and its place as a catalyst of family restructuring and the reorganisation of care in places of origin, we also wanted to draw attention to a more fundamental tension in some of the key concepts used in the literature on gender and migration.

In the English-speaking literature, the commonly accepted definition of gender refers to the socially constructed difference between men and women. It is a concept that is always relational, with gender *relations,* referring to the (usually unequal) power relations between men and women, and gender *roles*, as the different activities that men and women carry out. Gender *ideology,* on the other hand, refers to the broader ideas that define gender norms and what it means to be a woman or a man in a given context.

Already within Europe itself, there are tensions related to some of the basic concepts used in feminist theory. Blindon (2018) for example, in relation to her discussion of the reception of the concept of intersectionality in French feminist circles, refers to the rejection by French feminists of the concepts of gender and gender roles, and their preference for the use of sex and 'social sexual relations' (p. 592). She explains that:

"Feminist materialist scholars like the sociologist Christine Delphy or the anthropologist Nicole Claude Mathieu, deemed that the scope of the notion of gender was depoliticized with respect to more radical and critical notions of *sex class* (*classe de sexe* in French), *sexing* (*sexage*) or *social sexual relations* (*relations sociales de sexe*). Gender, as a concept, thus had difficult beginnings in French geography, and researchers who wanted to work in this area had to struggle to impart its legitimacy and relevance to their colleagues. Gender geography has since developed but remains confined to a group of specialists without being fully integrated into the social or human geography; it is the same in social sciences (Blindon, 2018: 592).

Clearly, with Europe being a multi-lingual and multi-cultural region, there are many other tensions and different understandings of both gender and intersectionality, that we do not have the space to explore further. If we expand our view to Africa and the Americas, the tensions become even more obvious. For example, Ifi Amadiume already in 1987 made the point that notions of gender were very different in Africa before colonialism. In her book, *Male Daughters, Female Husbands: Gender and Sex in an African Society* she argued that colonial powers imposed a dichotomous notion of female and male, as we know of today, over a much more fluid system of identities in which roles were not so rigidly tied to women or men. Walter L. Williams (1992) made a very similar point regarding Native American indigenous groups, in which gender identity also included a third gender, the 'two spirit person', who had both feminine and masculine attributes and identified with both and neither at the same time (Williams, 1992). Further South in the Americas, Silverblatt (1985) showed that gender relations were complementary and more equitable before colonisation. This is a debate that continues to this day between anthropologists wishing to recognise the complementarity of gender relations in current Andean indigenous communities, which stems from indigenous cosmovisions that go beyond the human and include the natural world, and Western feminist framings of the same relations as being unequal (Burman 2011; Pape 2008). Radcliffe with Pequeño (2010) have written how the lack of an intersectional perspective in both gender and development programmes and ethnodevelopment policies continue to disadvantage indigenous women.

Yet, despite this diversity and disagreements in our understanding of the very basic concepts we use in the feminist literature on migration, most of the English-speaking (and much of the literature in other languages), and here we include our own work, continues to be based on dichotomous understandings of gender as relating to men and women, albeit with some but limited acknowledgement of diverse sexual orientations and the implications of these, as well as sexuality itself, for migration (Cantú 2009; Carrillo, 2018; Manalansalan 2006).

Intersectionality is now viewed as a major contribution of feminist theory and widely used in gender and migration analyses. Intersectionality has travelled (Davis 2020), interacted and been adopted in distinct ways (Amelina and Lutz 2019). Within the US itself, black women active in the civil rights movement were already making intersectional-like arguments in the 19th century (e.g. Cooper 1886 cited in Eaves and Falconer Al-Hindi, 2020). Although it was Crenshaw (1989; 1991) who coined the term, other black and anti-racist feminists also laid the groundwork earlier (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1983; Glenn 1985; see Bastia et al. forthcoming for a fuller discussion). In France, for example, the analysis of the relationship of sexism and racism has a history going back to the 1970s within a materialist feminist approach (Guillaumin 1992/1995), which has been translated into English but largely ignored.

In feminist geography, a number of publications put forward arguments for greater attention needed on the intersections of gender and race inequalities (Kobayashi and Peake 1994; Radcliffe and Westwood 1996; Ruddick 1996). Around the same time, Alison MacEwan Scott also published her monograph on *Divisions and Solidarities: Gender, Class and Employment in Latin America* (1994). It is interesting, therefore, that while many authors had been making similar arguments around the same time, the idea of intersectionality really took off only after about a decade after it was given a name by Crenshaw.

Whilst the term intersectionality may not be used so commonly in countries in the South, and especially not by women's organisations, this does not mean that multiple systems of oppression experienced by migrant women are not discussed (Marchetti et al. 2021). As Marchetti et al. (2021:9) argue, migrant women's organisations raise such problems that they encounter by invoking the concept as a 'form of critical praxis' and consciousness without necessarily using the term.

As we have highlighted, the dominant literature on gender and migration, ie. that which is published in English, often lacks awareness of different traditions, such as the Latin American, largely published in Spanish. For example, the Argentinean sociologist Ana Inés Mallimaci (2009) argued over ten years ago that most scholarship on gender and migration in the Latin American region uses concepts derived from women's migration as it was experienced in Europe and the US. In her view, this literature does not reflect the experiences of women in Latin American regional migration, where migration is usually seen as more related to the family, that is, undertaken by women within the context of family-wide strategies and not necessarily individually or for gaining greater autonomy. Such a framing could be read as non- or anti-feminist. However, more fundamentally it relates to the tension between a more liberal feminist view of women's migration, in which migration is seen as potentially emancipatory, freeing and liberating; versus a more communitarian view of women's interests, which are sometimes better looked after in family settings; although some, such as Morokvasic (2007) have also highlighted the complex relationships between exploitation and emancipation (see also Tyldum 2015).

Undertaking Research

The ability to carry out research depends on institutional funding as well as the type of incentives that researchers need to negotiate within a context where the global hierarchy of higher education and geographical distribution of resources are concentrated in the North (King et al 2011), especially Western Europe, the United States, Australia and East Asia (see QS Ranking of Universities). Prestigious institutions in these countries attract research funding and international PhD students, enable staff to pursue research as part of their employment, and generate high levels of citations of staff. In some countries, there are consistent and stable avenues that support research engagement and provide academics with support/ resources for protecting their research time. In other countries, however, such institutional and/or core funding does not exist so academic staff at university have to be heavily involved in either teaching or consultancy work (which might be research-based, but is by definition more short-term and defined by the interests of the funders), often preferably both.

Another key issue is that English dominates recognised knowledge production in migration studies, as the mapping mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, indicates. In most disciplines, there is no requirement to speak the 'local' language and most English speakers work with translators. This leads to only partial engagements not just with 'informants' and research participants but also local research institutions and the wider community. The domination of the English language also leads to partial reviews of the existing literature. For example, Jorgen Carling (2015) in his listing of the most significant migration scholars, relied exclusively on 8 English-language journals so it is not surprising that its 107 names are dominated by the US (31), UK (23) and Australia (9). The 107 people listed here have all published at least 5 articles in the leading migration journals over the past 20 years (1995-2014). Their articles have appeared in at least two of the journals, and at least one of their articles has been published during the past decade. No scholars are cited from Africa or Latin America. There is also no reference to journals published in other major languages, such as the *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, *Migrations et Sociétés*, founded in France in 1985 and 1989 respectively, and *Hommes et Migrations* with even a longer history going back to the 1950s at a time of North African immigration to the country. It adopted its present name in 1965. And unsurprisingly no French scholars are named despite the country's long tradition of migration studies (see Schmoll this volume), impact on Francophone scholars in Africa and Canada and connections with a number of Latin American countries, which have led to dialogues around concepts of intersectionality and decolonial feminism (Falquet and Flores Espínola 2019).

While the call to 'decolonise' knowledge production, including migration studies, is appealing, it also means different things to different people. We recognise that our position is privileged, and that to truly decolonise knowledge production, there needs to be a systemic change in power relations so that those that have thus far been marginalised and oppressed – colonised – can speak / write for themselves. There are inherent ethical and political problems in 'speaking for' others (Spivak 1988). So this is not what we set out to do. Our approach to decolonising gender and migration studies begins with paying greater attention to how knowledge is produced, which knowledge is taken into account/ read/ cited/ listened to, with the aim of beginning a critical discussion about these questions. Hand in hand, goes a wish to also begin to open up spaces for critical engagements, strategic solidarities and more horizontal engagements within the field of migration studies; as well as giving people space by giving up the spaces that we might be taking up.

Intellectually, we take this call as an invitation to pay greater attention to the key concepts we use in our research and writing, and how and whether these concepts might resonate in other

regions of the world and to be attentive to theoretical and political developments in other contexts not just in the Global South but other regions, such as East/South-East Asia, whose voices and contributions are not adequately recognised (Asis et al.. 2019; Yeoh 2014)). This was our aim in relation to intersectionality, for example, to provide a more complex history and genealogy of the term, including a recognition of the key role that social movements – feminist, grassroots women's, anti-racist etc. – have played in creating the ideas that then led to the coining of the term (see also Bastia et al. forthcoming).

In terms of research practice, we have explored this through two UK Research Initiatives projects we are each working on, the South-South migration and the Gender, Justice and Security Hubs (https://thegenderhub.com/ and https://www.mideq.org/en/). We collaborated with a range of countries in terms of their wealth, research infrastructure and relationship with Western theory. In the South-South migration hub, Tanja co-leads the Work Package on gender inequalities. She has been working with the other co-leads as well as colleagues from the country corridors (China-Ghana, Haiti-Brazil and Nepal-Malaysia) since the inception of the project, exploring whether the concept of intersectionality resonates in the contexts in which her colleagues are carrying out their research. While the concept is indeed appealing to colleagues in most contexts, the uptake is not straightforward, including because it is difficult to find a direct translation of some of the underlying concepts embedded within intersectionality (e.g. race in Mandarin); while issues of sexuality were seldom addressed in the literature on South-South migration (Izaguirre and Walsham 2021).

Overall, there has been relatively little reflection on the implications of Anglo linguistic hegemony for intellectual agendas and traditions in migration studies. And, as we have noted, this is not just an issue of colonial legacies. In contrast, the dominance of English in the production and circulation of knowledge was problematised by scholars of gender and geography following concerns raised in the 1990s about the different interests and access to prestigious journals between those from the Global North and the South[2]. Maria Dolors Garcia Ramon (2003), who was active in the Gender and Geography Commission at the time, commented that:

The growing hegemony of English as a global language privileges the geographical discourse of the Anglophone world. Linguistic hegemony is a form of power that empowers some while disempowering others … that for those writing and speaking in languages other than English, access to a wider audience is much more restricted… access to these journals means power to set the guidelines of the intellectual debate in geography in many regions of the world".

She also concluded by asking how one might engage and overcome the closures produced by the hegemonic power of English?

Scholars in institutions in non-Anglophone countries may be strongly encouraged to teach and publish in English under the pressure to internationalize academic research. For example, Sirijit Sunanta (Mahidol University, Thailand) does research on gender and migration and works at a Thai university, where the medium of writing and teaching is mostly in English. As a result, students are largely given materials to read in English, even when the topic is focused on Thailand and carried out by people proficient in the Thai language. This may negatively affect the development of the nationally located knowledge communities. In her intervention at a recent migration conference, Sirijit Sunanta emphasised how the field of gender studies could have been further developed in Thailand. The availability of more material in Thai language would benefit Thai scholars, especially graduate students and early-career researchers.

---

[2] Eleonore Kofman's background discipline is geography. Eleonore was an original member of the Geography and Gender Commission from 1992 as the UK representative.

Currently, gender concepts from the North are used to teach Thai students, although the contexts in which they are developed are very different. The knowledge of Thai gender concepts, on the other hand, is rather limited and conceptualized often by non-Thai anthropologists who study Thai society. The undesired effect of privileging English is to obscure existing research which, because of the language in which it is presented, is not sufficiently acknowledged in international academic communities with relatively greater access to social and economic capital.

While writing and presenting in English is seen as an advantage as it provides opportunities for participating at international conferences, in some countries there may be considerable pressure to do so. However, it poses obvious problems for scholars who may not have been trained in an Anglophone country. It can create a two-tier system for those who have studied abroad and who have written in English and those who undertook their PhD in their native language, as has been the case of Masako Kudo (Rikkyo University Tokyo, JP). In the case of Japan with a large population and numerous universities, unlike in many other countries, there are a substantial literature and publishing outlets in the native language. Furthermore, writing and presenting in English does not come easy to somebody who generally works in another language. This is not just about the language *per se*, but also about the different ways in which arguments are presented and developed and how articles are structured in different ways in different languages.

Unequal Knowledge Circulation

Migration studies is further distorted by the very unequal way in which knowledge circulates. As we have highlighted, many concepts have emanated from different linguistic zones and intellectual traditions but while concepts in English travel, they do not do so in the opposite direction. Drawing on developments in post-wall Europe and a critique of the concept of transnationalism that had become popular in Anglo settler societies in the 1990s, Morokvasic-Müller (2003) argued that many of those moving from Eastern and Central Europe could be better captured through notions of circulation reflecting the changing realities of the European migratory landscape. The focus on the durability and sustainability of transnationalism, even if as permanent temporariness, could not deal with the more ephemeral and constant mobilities of those who settle in mobility. While EU enlargement in 2004 would have reduced short-term cross-border movements, it has not dismantled them, especially in relation to female care workers in Austria and Germany who constantly circulate between countries. As Morokvasic comments, notions of circulation evoked by Tarrius (1992) in France, were immobilised by language barriers. However, she also notes that it is not language alone that matters, since discussions have also been ignored even when published in English. In fact, many leading French journals have come to publish articles in English and have translated whole issues into English, including those on gender and migration (Borgeaud-Garciandía and Georges 2014).

Language, prestige and citation practices are quite distinct processes, albeit interlinked in who gets cited and which research is deemed 'world class'. Many English-speaking universities actively dis-incentivise publications in languages other than English, because Anglo-American journals are considered the top journals to publish in (disciplines such as anthropology or area studies might be an exception to this) (Carling 2015). As a result, in some countries there exists a two-tiered system in which those who have studied abroad are privileged in responding to the intellectual requirements of publishing in such journals. This includes presenting a coherent and logical argument in a specific way, within a particular sequence, that is largely determined by how this is done in the English language, with little recognition that thought and argument are structured differently in different languages and national contexts. Language is only part of

the problem, however, given that even when research is published in English, it might not be cited, because it is not published in a 'top journal' or because the author does not come from a 'top institution'. In some regions of the South, such as India, there is substantial publishing in English (LIDC Migration Leadership Team 2018).

Clearly, labels such as the 'Global South' cease to be useful in this context, given significant intra-regional differences. A number of upper middle-income countries, such as Turkey (Ceren Eren-Benlisoy and Tuncer 2020; İçduygu and Aksel 2012; Williams et al. 2020) and Argentina (Cerrutti 2017), have also attracted large numbers of migrants from neighbouring countries. In the past 20 years, Turkey has evolved from a country of emigration to one of transit and settlement, including some from wealthier countries in Europe and North America (Kofman and Tuncer 2021; Tuncer and Ceren Benlisoy 2021) who are often escaping precarious employment, financial insecurity or lack of opportunities in the North and seek to achieve social mobility following their migration. Hayes and Perez-Gañan (2017) have termed this process geographic arbitrage or the use of North-South migration as a cross-border social maintenance or advancement strategy.

These upper middle-income countries now have highly developed research institutes and research councils (CONICET in Argentina and Tubitak in Turkey) with notable migration research compared to poorer countries such as Bolivia. This leads to a very unequal field in which some researchers are able to have dedicated time, like the authors do, to focus on writing projects, while others need to engage in significant teaching loads and consultancies in order to support themselves and carry out research either in their 'spare time' or through short-term consultancies. Bolivia is an interesting example of a country where migration research has been supported through the PIEB Strategic Research Programme of Bolivia, funded through the Netherlands' cooperation, and which produced a significant number of publications on Bolivian migrations throughout the 2000s (Hinojosa 2009a, b; de la Torre 2006; Roncken et al. 2009, among others). However, while the outputs were prolific, there was no way of sustaining this level of research production, despite the continued importance of international migrations for Bolivia.

The flow of funding shapes both production and circulation. Existing funding sources as well as logistical frameworks tend to give preference to South-North collaborations. In her intervention at a recent IMISCOE conference in 2021, the Ecuadorean sociologist Gioconda Herrera, highlighted how existing funding sources as well as logistical frameworks, tend to give preference to South-North collaborations. Northern institutions have greater access to funding for conferences and workshops, so they tend to initiate invitations to events for scholars based in the Global South. Such funding is generally lacking in Latin America, where, in addition, regional travel is expensive and often prohibitive, while distances are significant. This leads to a situation where even when there is a will and interest to initiate regional, South-South collaborations, there is little or no funding available, thereby limiting knowledge circulating and being created regionally.

Publishing

The issue of publishing is crucial when talking about uneven knowledge circulation. As we have noted, Northern institutions put so much emphasis on top journals (which by definition, are those, which are published in the English language), discourage co-production and lead to more extractive forms of knowledge production. Early career scholars are particularly vulnerable to having to make choices about which language and where to publish their research, giving preference to English language journals, even when this means that those who

participated in the research will not be able to read its key findings. The favouring of top-ranked, Anglophone journals among academics (especially in the Global North), has clear implications for which empirical research is visible. As these metrics are adopted more widely now, giving preference to English-language journals reproduces the systemic inequalities we have highlighted above. As soon as such metrics and requirements to publish in English are introduced, this devalues any knowledge that is disseminated in the local or national language. While such a strategy might make it more widely accessible, it also cements a system in which English language dominates, and as a result, so does knowledge produced in the centres in which the language is spoken and written.

The bulk of the literature on gender and migration focuses on South-North or peripheral North (e.g. East-West Europe) migration flows. In doing so, it omits the complexities and articulations between different types of migration where multi-scalar migrations comprising rural-urban, cross-border to neighbouring countries and longer-distance international migrations co-exist. The pressure to publish in top-ranked international journals has further implications for knowledge circulation. The costs to publish in Open Access and to access articles, which are behind pay-walls, are prohibitive for scholars based in low- and middle-income countries. These fees further hamper a more equitable knowledge circulation, to the advantage of a few number of institutions. In trying to respond to the challenge of publishing, it is important to consider alternative research outlets, which might enable scholars to share knowledge more widely. Possible strategies include bilingual co-writing practices, bilingual publishing, organising multilingual conferences, negotiating retaining translation rights with publishers, and the importance of publishing in open access formats (GenSem IMISCOE blog, see https://www.imiscoe.org/research/standing-committees/gender-and-sexuality-in-migration-research).

Conclusion

In recent years, there has been growing discussion about valuing the knowledge produced in countries of the Global South and decolonising that emanating from the Global North. In this chapter we have taken one of the newer epistemic communities within migration studies, that of gender and migration, to explore issues of knowledge production and circulation within what is clearly a very uneven internationalisation of the field. Indeed, we would argue that in the past two decades gender and migration has become more focussed on theoretical and empirical developments in a small number of receiving countries without adequately considering the variations in meanings of key concepts and range of mobilities. Moreover, it is not just Southern knowledge, which sits at the margins but also non-Western studies that are often not adequately recognised. In this process, English has become the hegemonic language of publication, circulation and valuation of knowledge.

So what steps might we take to mitigate the prevailing power relations privileging theoretical developments in the Global North and the hegemony of English as the language of production and circulation of knowledge? Discussions of decolonial and intersectional analyses highlight inequalities in knowledge production but on their own will be unable to shift this imbalance. We also need to develop solidarities between academics and activists to decolonise knowledge production and make it relevant to those pushing for progressive social demand Some steps towards reducing inequality in the circulation of production knowledge and allowing voices to be heard are more easily achievable through targeted initiatives. For example, we need to reflect on how we engage in academic production, including across language barriers, with researchers in different regions to discuss more openly issues of collaboration. We should work with our international professional organisations, such as IMISCOE, to give a diversity of scholars the

opportunity to present in high profile spaces, such as plenaries, to express their perspectives. It may well require more resources being devoted to interpreting and translation to capture the richness of theoretical insights and empirical research. Too often associations only present publications in English when members might well be interested in knowing about a wider range of output and possibly reading them. In our involvement with journals, we could also solicit articles from around the world. However, addressing more broadly the hegemony of English is far more intractable and be difficult since, as we have highlighted, the direction of travel has been to reinforce its position through international academic networks and national institutions encouraging and favouring its use in the insertion of students and scholars into an international terrain.

References

Acciari, L. (2019) Decolonising Labour, Reclaiming Subaltern Epistemologies: Brazilian Domestic Workers and the International Struggle for Labour Rights. *Contexto Internacional* 41(1) http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-8529.2019410100003

Amadiume, Ifi (1987) *Male Daughters, Female Husbands: Gender and Sex in an African Society,* Zed, London.

Amelina, A. and Lutz, H. (2019) *Gender and migration: Transnational and intersectional prospects*. Routledge, Abingdon.

Anthias, F. and Yuval-Davis, N. (1983) Contextualising feminism: gender, ethnic and class divisions. *Feminist Review* 14: 62-75.

Asis, M., N. Piper and P. Raghuram (2019) 'From Asia to the World: "Regional" Contributions to Global Migration Research. *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* 35(1-2) pp. 13–37.

Avril, C. and Cartier, M. (2014) Subordination in home service jobs comparing providers of home-based child care, elder care and cleaning in France. *Gender and Society* 28(4): 609-630.

Bastia, T. (2019) *Gender, Migration and Social Transformation: Intersectionality in Bolivian itinerant migrations*, Routledge, Abingdon.

Bastia, T., Datta, K., Hujo, K. Piper, N. and Walsham, M. (forthcoming) Reflections on intersectionality: a journey through the worlds of migration research, policy and advocacy, *Gender, Place and Culture*

Blidon, M. (2018) Reception and use of intersectionality. A reading from French perspective. *Gender, Place and Culture, 25*(4), 591-602.

Borgeaud-Garciandía, N. and Georges, I. (2014) Travail, femmes et migrations dans les Suds. *Revue Tiers Monde* no. 217, 7-24.

Bunster, X., & Chaney, L. (1985) *Sellers and servants: Working women in Lima Peru*. New York: Praeger.

Burman, A (2011) *Chachawarmi:* silence and rival voices on decolonisation and gender politics in Andean Bolivia, *Journal of Latin American Studies,* 43(1): 65-91.

Cantú, L. (2009) *The Sexuality of Migration: Border Crossings and Mexican Immigrant Men*, New York University Press, New York.

Carling, J. (2015) Who is who in migration studies: 107 names worth knowing https://jorgencarling.org/2015/06/01/who-is-who-in-migration-studies-108-names-worth-knowing/

Carrillo, H. (2018) *Pathways of Desire: The Sexual Migration of Mexican Gay Men*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Ceren Eren Benlisoy, Z. and Tuncer, E. (2020) *Literature Review Turkey*, Gender Dynamics of International Labour Migration, Gender, Justice and Security Hub.

Cerrutti, M. (2017) "Untying Knots: Gender, Family and Migration in Argentina, in E. Faur (Comp*.) Mujeres y varones en la Argentina de hoy. Géneros en movimiento*. Siglo XXI and Fundación OSDE, Buenos Aires.

Cerrutti, M. and Parrado, E. (2015) Intraregional migration in South America: trends and research agenda. *Annual Review of Sociology* 41: 399-421.Chan, Y.W. (2020) Asian perspectives of migration: a commentary. *CMS* 8, 33. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00190-5

Chant, S. (Ed.) (1992) *Gender and Migration in Developing Countries.* John Wiley and Sons, Belhaven.

Connell, R. (2014a) Rethinking gender from the South *Feminist Studies* 40(3): 518-39.

Connell, R. (2014b) Using southern theory: Decolonizing social thought in theory, research and application. *Planning Theory* 13(2): 210-33.

Cooper, A. J. (2017 [1892]) *A Voice from the South by a Black Woman of the South*. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill.

Crenshaw, K. (1989) Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1*, 139–67.

Crenshaw, K. (1991) Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color, *Stanford Law Review, 43*, 1241-1299.

Davis, K. (2020). Who owns intersectionality? Some reflections on feminist debates on how theories travel. *European Journal of Women's Studies, 27*(2), 113-127.

de la Torre, L. (2006). *No llores, prenda, pronto volveré. Migración, movilidad social, herida familiar y desarrollo*. La Paz: PIEB.

Eaves L, Al-Hindi KF. (2020). Intersectional geographies and COVID-19. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10(2):132-136.

Falquet, J. and A. Flores Espínola (2019) Épistémologies féministes décoloniales. Controverses et dialogues transatlantiques. Introduction. *Cahiers du Cedref* 23.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E. (2020) Introduction Recentering the South in studies of migration. *Migration and Society: Advances in Research* 3: 1–18.

Garcia-Ramon M-D. (2003) Globalization and international geography: the questions of languages and scholarly traditions. *Progress in Human Geography*. 27(1):1-5.

Glenn, E. N. (1985) Racial ethnic women's labor: the intersection of race, gender and class oppression. *Review of Radical Political Economics* 17(3): 86-108.

Glick Schiller, N. and Çağlar, A. (2009) Towards a comparative theory of locality in migration studies: Migrant incorporation and city scale, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35:2, 177-202.

Gray-Molina, G., W. Jiménez, E.P. de Rada and E. Yáñez (1999) Pobreza y activos en Bolivia ¿Qué papel desempeña el capital social? *El Trimestre Económico* 66(3): 365–417.Guillaumin C. (1992) *Sexe, race et pratique du pouvoir*. Côté Femmes (English translation of collection of her writings *Racism, sexism, power, and ideology*, 1995, Routledge)

Halvorsen, S. (2018). Cartographies of epistemic expropriation: Critical reflections on learning from the south, *Geoforum*, 95, 11–20.

Hayes, M and and R. Perez-Ganán. (2017) North–South Migrations and the Asymmetric Expulsions of Late Capitalism: Global Inequality, Arbitrage, and New Dynamics of North–South Transnationalism, *Migration Studies* 5(1): 116–135.

Herrera, G. (2020) Care, social reproduction and migration, in Bastia, T. and R. Skeldon (2020) *Routledge Handbook of Migration and Development,* RoutledgeAbingdon, pp.232-241

Hinojosa Gordonava, A. (2009b) *Migración Transnacional y sus Efectos en Bolivia*, PIEB Bolivia.

Hinojosa Gordonava, A. 2009a. *Buscando la vida: Familias bolivianas transnacionales en España. Estado de situación*. La Paz: CLACSO / Fundación PIEB.

Hochschild, AR. (2001) Global Care Chains and Emotional Surplus Value, in Hutton, W. and Giddens, A. (eds) *On The Edge: Living with Global Capitalism*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Howard, E. and Kofman, E. (2020) *PHS Quality, Job Quality and Industrial Relations in the Personal and Household Services Sector VS/2018/0041* DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion UK Report.

İçduygu, A. and Aksel, D. B. (2012) Irregular Migration in Turkey. International Organization for Migration. Ankara: https://mirekoc.ku.edu.tr/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2017/01/Irregular-Migration-in-Turkey.pdf.

Izaguirre, L. and M. Walsham (2021) *South-South Migration from a gender and intersectional perspective: an overview*, Working Paper MIDEQ.

King, R. and R. Skeldon (2010) 'Mind the Gap!' Integrating Approaches to Internal and International Migration, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36:10, 1619-1646.

King, R., J. Money & M. Murawska (2011) Twenty years of *JEMS*: A geographical content analysis, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37:9, 1539-1550.

Kofman, E. (2014) Reviewing theories of gender and migration: perspectives from Europe and North America. In G. Battistella (ed) *Global and Asian Perspectives on International Migration*, Springer, pp.119-38.

Kobayashi, A and L Peake (1994) Unnatural discourse. 'Race' and gender in geography, *Gender, Place & Culture*, 1:2, 225-243.

Kofman, E. Lee, M. and Tse, T. (2021) China and the Internationalisation of the Sociology of Contemporary Work and Employment, *Work, Employment and Society* https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170211059420

Kofman, E. and E. Tuncer (2021) North to South: resetting the compass of gendered labour migrations. *New Dynamics of East–West Migration and Migrant Integration Within Europe and Beyond*, 15-16 November, MIRNET, Sussex University.

Levy, N., Pisarevskaya, A., & Scholten, P. (2020). Between fragmentation and institutionalization: The rise of migration studies as a research field. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00180-7.

LIDC Migration Leadership Team 2018

Lugones, M. (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia* 25 (4): 742–59.

Lutz, H. E. Palenga-Möllenbeck, (2012) Care Workers, Care Drain, and Care Chains: Reflections on Care, Migration, and Citizenship, *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 19, 1: 15–37

MacEwan Scott, A. (1994) *Divisions and solidarities: gender, class and employment in Latin America,* Routledge, Abingdon.

Mallimaci A. I. (2009) Migraciones y género. Las formas de la visibilidad femenina, in M.J. Magliano and A. I. Mallimaci Eds., *Las mujeres latinoamericanas y sus migraciones*, Villa María, Eduvim, pp. 11-25.

Manalansan, M. F. (2006). Queer intersections: sexuality and gender in migration studies, *The International Migration Review*, *40*(1), 224–249.

Marchetti, S., Cherubini, D. and Garofalo Geymonat (2021) *Global Domestic Domestic Workers. Intersectional Inequalities and Struggles for Rights*, Bristol University Press.

Mayblin, L. and J. Turner (2021) *Migration Studies and Colonialism,* Polity, Cambridge.

Mazzucato, V. and Dito, B. (2018) Transnational families: Cross-country comparative perspectives. *Population, Space and Place* 24:e2165.

Morokvasic, M. (2007) Migration, gender, empowerment. In I. Lenz, C. Ulrich and B. Fersch (eds) *Gender Orders Unbound? Globalisation, Restructuring and Reciprocity*, Barbara Budrich Publishers, pp. 69-97.

Morokvasic-Müller, M. et al. (2003) *Crossing Borders and Shifting Boundaries. Vol 1 Gender on the Move*, Leske + Budrich, Opladen

Palriwala, R. and Neetha, N. (2011) Stratified familialism: the care regime in India through the lens of childcare, *Development and Change* 42 (4), 1049–78.

Pape, ISR (2008) "This is not a meeting for women": the sociocultural dynamics of rural women's political participation in the Bolivian Andes. *Latin American Perspectives,* 35(6): 41-62 https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X08325949

Parreñas, R. (2001) *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration, and Domestic Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pisarevskaya, A., Levy, N., Scholten, P., & Jansen, J. (2020). Mapping migration studies: An empirical analysis of the coming of age of a research field. *Migration Studies* 8(3): 455–481 https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnz031.

Radcliffe, S. and Pequeño, A. (2010), Ethnicity, Development and Gender: Tsáchila Indigenous Women in Ecuador. Development and Change, 41: 983-1016.

Radcliffe, S. and S. Westwood (1996) *Remaking the Nation: Identity and Politics in Latin America,* Routledge, Abingdon.

Raghuram, P. (2012) Global care, local configurations- challenges to conceptualizations of care. *Global Networks* 12(2):155-174.

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. (2012) Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: a Reflection on the practices and discourses of Decolonization, *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 111(1):95-109

Roncken, T. et al. (2009) *La vecindad que no viajó: Migración internacional y desarrollo comunitario en zonas periurbanas de Cochabamba*, PIEB, Bolivia

Sassen, S. (2000). Women's Burden: Counter-geographies of Globalization and the Feminization of Survival. *Journal of International Affairs*, *53*(2), 503–524.

Silverblatt, Irene Marsha (1985) *Moon, Sun and witches: Gender Ideologies and Class in Inka and Colonial Peru,* Princeton University Press.

Spivak, S. (1988) Can the Subaltern Speak?" in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg, eds. *Marxism and the interpretation of Culture*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271-313.Staab, S. (2004) I*n search of work. International migration of women in Latin America and the Caribbean. Selected bibliography*. UN ECLAC, Chile.

Tarrius, A. (1992*) Les fourmis d'Europe : Migrants riches, migrants pauvres et nouvelles villes internationales* , L'Harmattan: Paris**.**

Truong, T. D. (1996) Gender, International Migration and Social Reproduction: Implications for Theory, Policy, Research and Networking. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 5(1): 27-52.

Tudor, A. (2018) Cross fadings of racialisation and migratisation: the postcolonial turn in Western European gender and migration studies. *Gender, Place and Culture* 25(7):1057-72.

Tuncer, E and Ceren Eren Benlisoy, Z. (2021) *Gendered Experiences of Migration and Urban Life of High-Skilled Female Migrants in Istanbul,* Gender, Justice and Security Paper.

Tyldum, G. (2015). Motherhood, agency and sacrifice in narratives on female migration for care work. *Sociology*, 49: 56–71.

Van Vleet, K.E. (2008) *Performing Kinship: Narrative, Gender, and the Intimacies of Power in the Andes*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Williams, F. (2010) Themes and concepts in migration, gender and care. *Social Policy and Society.* 9(3): 385-396

Williams, F. (2018) Care: Intersections of scales, inequalities and crises. *Current Sociology* 66(4): 547-561.

Williams, L. et al. (eds.) (2020) *Women, Migration and Asylum in Turkey, Migration, Diasporas and Citizenship*, Routledge, Abingdon.

Williams, W. L. (1992) *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture,* Beacon Press.

Willis, K. and B. Yeoh, eds. (2000) *Gender and Migration,* Edward Elgar.

Wright, C. (1995) 'Gender Awareness in Migration Theory: Synthesizing Actor and Structure in Southern Africa' In Willis, K. and B. Yeoh, eds. (2000) *Gender and Migration,* Edward Elgar,

Yeoh, B. (2014) Engendering international migration: perspectives from within Asia. In G. Battistella (ed) *Global and Asian Perspectives on International Migration*, Springer, pp. 139-52.