UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY
Press

MOBILIZING GLOBAL KNOWLEDGE: REFUGEE RESEARCH IN AN AGE OF DISPLACEMENT
Edited by Susan McGrath and Julie E. E. Young

ISBN 978-1-77385-086-3

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY
Press

press.ucalgary.ca

Introduction: Mobilizing Global Knowledge in Forced Migration Studies and Practice

Susan McGrath and Julie E. E. Young

> *Scholars from other societies and traditions of inquiry could bring to this debate their own ideas about what counts as new knowledge and what communities of judgement and accountability they might judge to be central in the pursuit of such knowledge.*
>
> Arjun Appadurai

Reflecting on more than ten years of work in conceptualizing and building a network for refugee research, we pose the challenge—to ourselves and others—of "ethical networking" for research and practice. Research partnerships and collaborations have become the standard for funded research in recent years (Bradley 2007; McGrath et al. 2011; Landau 2012). A key question driving our work on the Refugee Research Network (RRN) was how to collaborate ethically—or at least how to think ethically when building a research network. Moreover, through our work together, we sought to generate and disseminate knowledge in ways that are accessible to multiple audiences and that would improve the well-being of refugees.

We recognize, and share concerns about, the politics of knowledge production in forced migration contexts. The global nature of the RRN means that partners are across the so-called north/south divide, with different resources and capacities. It is an environment where people in the more marginal regions of the world risk being "simply producers of data for the theory mills of the North," as Appadurai (2000, 5) has warned, and where donors, primarily from the north, are setting forced migration research agendas—often with the primacy of "policy relevant" research (Bradley 2007; Landau 2012). We have aspired to bring disparate cultures of knowledge production into effective relation with one another, which Jazeel and McFarlane (2007) describe as "responsible learning"—along the lines of the "strong internationalization" that Appadurai (2000) describes in the epigraph, in which scholars from a broad range of societies and traditions of inquiry determine what counts as new knowledge.

This edited volume reflects on the lessons learned through our work as the RRN, a global network of academics, practitioners, and policymakers built around relationships among refugee research centres across the global south and north in Bogotá, Cairo, Chicago, Johannesburg, Kampala, Kolkata, London, Melbourne, Oxford, Sydney, Tehran, Toronto, and Washington. The RRN emerged out of a vision to establish a collaborative network that has a wide-ranging and progressive impact on refugee research and policy in Canada and globally. This volume seeks to capture and reflect on how we tried to build networks for knowledge production and mobilization and what we were able to accomplish together, as well as the challenges of bridging silos, sectors, and regions and engaging across global north-south tensions. The RRN guided the formation of eight multidisciplinary research clusters addressing major questions in the field, three regional networks (Canada, Latin America, and Asia Pacific), and two issue-specific networks (emerging scholars and global refugee policy). These "networks within the network" have functioned relatively independently to generate new knowledge on key issues facing refugees and those who work to protect them.

The key question motivating this collection is: what are the contributions of a research network to thinking about the broader ethical, methodological, and practical questions in the field of refugee studies? Contributors reflect on the process of building networks in the context of research on refugees, displacement, and forced migration. Thus the book bridges

SUSAN MCGRATH AND JULIE E. E. YOUNG

scholarship on the practice of building networks for knowledge production and dissemination and scholarship on the process of doing research with and about refugees (including questions of ethics and methodologies). In this introduction, we identify and examine some of the ethical questions raised by networks and partnerships in the field of refugee studies, which is already fraught with (neo)colonial relationships and power dynamics.

Our RRN work has highlighted how knowledge production and dissemination are contingent on human relationships. It has shown us that building equitable and interactive learning and sharing experiences requires mutual trust, respect, and reciprocity within the community of practice. What is more, supportive relationships in turn promote healthy networks capable of adapting and responding to shifting cultural and political terrains. It reminds us that effective and useful research and advocacy must also be combined with a conscious and directed commitment to the democratization of knowledge production within and beyond the community. This is especially relevant in the context of a research community and field of research that has traditionally been dominated by scholars in the global north while the questions and issues raised in research and practice are most acutely experienced and addressed by actors in the global south.

In this book we review the vision that guided us, the practices that we believed were ethically grounded, the outcomes of the network, and the challenges and barriers to full success. These reflections incorporate two evaluations conducted with our partners. One was completed at about year three and covered in Hynie et al. (2014); another was a mapping of the knowledge activities, strategies, and needs of our regional networks and partners that was conducted in 2014 with interviews of eleven of our thirteen institutional partners (Oakes 2015).

The Vision and Practice of Ethical Networking and Knowledge Making

Our goal was to build a "network of networks" that would promote fair and equitable connections throughout the field of refugee and forced migration studies. We envisioned a dynamic web of global connections and relationships that would stimulate the development of new research partnerships and projects and encourage the sharing of findings with

policymakers, practitioners, and advocates who work as part of the international refugee regime. We adopted a dialogical and participatory approach that would: 1) expand our awareness of the global knowledge regime on refugee and forced migration issues; 2) improve communication concerning this knowledge across academic, policymaking, and practice sectors in the global south and north; and 3) build alliances and active involvement in the development of national and international policy frameworks and humanitarian practices affecting refugees and forced migrants. A belief in public entitlement to knowledge, as well as the centrality of knowledge mobilization and translation of academic scholarship in that process, inspired our partnership approach. Our guiding principles included the notion that knowledge should be accessible and available in different forms and formats with an emphasis on open source and open access, as well as the conviction that knowledge should not remain within academic institutions, behind pay walls—especially in places where universities are public institutions (as in Canada). While national and global policies are a key factor in how forced migration and refugee situations are addressed, there are also differences in the willingness of researchers to share knowledge with policymakers. Part of our aim with the RRN was to promote engagement across sectors that would also facilitate the active participation of our partners in the global south in setting the agenda for the field. This approach acknowledged the geopolitics of forced migration, in the sense that it is actors in the global north that dominate the field of study, while also confronting the perceived "myth of difference" in the nature and study of asylum between the global north and south (Chimni 1998). This volume captures and reflects on how we tried to build networks for knowledge mobilization and what we were able to accomplish together as well as the challenges of bridging silos, sectors, and regions.

We sought to practice *networking* in an ethical manner consistent with our vision. We tried to be transparent in our processes, with a clear governance model and participatory decision-making. We convened all institutional members of the network in person annually, alternating between Toronto and the sites of the biennial meeting of the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) that were typically organized at the site of one of the partners, e.g., in Cairo, Kampala, Kolkata, and Bogotá. During the year, between the annual in-person meetings, we held video conferences. These processes did not always run smoothly,

e.g., Egyptian officials refused entry to our Iranian colleague to attend the Cairo conference, the timing of the meetings did not fit everyone's schedule, the technology was not always adequate to support everyone's participation, and time differences meant that some people were asked to stay up late and/or get up early in the morning for these virtual meetings. The in-person connections and ongoing virtual contacts, although often difficult to maintain, were important in building trusting relationships that have endured among many of the partners.

We also needed to be aware of the social and economic inequities within the hierarchies of our institutions, across our disciplines, and among academic institutions globally. We sought to engage and support students to participate in the research and attend conferences where they could begin to build their own networks. While most of the research assistants were York University students or at least Canadian, we did transfer some funds to centres in the south (Cairo, Johannesburg, Kolkata) to fund students to support local research initiatives such as literature reviews, conference organizing, and digitizing of reports. One of the most successful networks of the RRN has been that developed and led by early career scholars and practitioners, the Emerging Scholars and Practitioners on Migration Issues (ESPMI) network (see chapter 10). Despite a paucity of resources they have maintained strong leadership and have been highly productive, e.g., founding and producing the open access journal *Refugee Review*.

Sustainability over the longer term is an important aspect of an ethical practice. We hope such sustainability can be achieved through IASFM with some support from the Centre for Refugee Studies at York University. IASFM has agreed to offer seed funding for emerging research clusters and to continue to support the travel of students—particularly students from the south—to attend the biennial conferences. The conferences provide an opportunity for research centre directors to meet, share recent research projects and practices, and explore possible collaborations. CRS will continue to maintain the RRN website and social media tools, including the very active Facebook group (discussed in chapter 9).

We sought to *generate knowledge ethically* with the formation of research clusters that addressed key issues including one that studied ethical research methods in forced migration (see chapter 13). Criteria for the clusters were created in consultation with the RRN institutional members

and based in discussions of emerging and pressing research issues. Modest amounts of funding (typically CAD $7,000–10,000 each) were allocated as seed money to support the development of research clusters of academics and students (see chapter 11 on the importance of this initial funding support). Applications were reviewed and approved by the executive committee. Consistent with funded research projects, priority was given to the co-applicants of the original proposal who were primarily Canadian academics. This domination of the research by scholars based in Canada was an ongoing tension, despite our efforts to involve a broader range of academics in the research clusters and networks.

The multidisciplinary research clusters have generated new knowledge on key issues facing refugees and the global refugee regime. Beyond the contributions outlined in this volume, several other clusters engaged with substantive issues of research, policy, and practice. For example, the Age & Generation in Migration Contexts cluster (led by Christina Clark-Kazak) developed the concept of social age in migration, recognizing the different impacts that migration has on different populations, while the Detention & Asylum cluster (led by Jennifer Hyndman and Stephanie Silverman) documented the increase in the detention of refugees with a view to supporting the development of policy and practice interventions that eliminate or ameliorate this practice. Partners also made contributions in three areas of refugee law research: comparative research on safe country of origin policies (led by Delphine Nakache and Idil Atak); a series of workshops on critical issues in international refugee law (organized by James Simeon); and comparative research on refugee status determination systems (led by Donald Galloway). The latter helped to launch the Canadian Association of Refugee Lawyers (CARL), and produced a report on Canada-US border policy and the politics of refugee exclusion (Arbel and Brenner 2013). Finally, the Gender & Sexuality cluster (led by Jennifer Hyndman) produced an annotated bibliography of scholarship that addresses claims for asylum based on persecution related to gender and sexuality. This cluster's collaboration has included colleagues from the Refugee Law Project (RLP) at Makerere University, Kampala (Uganda), whose research takes place in a highly discriminatory state with many sexual minority claimants. The second phase (guided by Wenona Giles) focused more broadly on advancing gender equity, including access to university programs by women.

Beyond the focus on forming research clusters that are networked locally and globally, a parallel strategy pursued by the RRN has been the *dissemination of the knowledge* in multiple forms and formats. We sought to use the best forms to reach different populations including academics, practitioners, policy actors, and refugees. Online tools were identified early on as important mechanisms, and one of our primary strategies was producing a website accessible in five languages.[1] Social media tools are also providing opportunities and potential for dialogue. Chapter 9 explores the perils and possibilities of social media as a forum for engagement within and between multiple sectors, particularly for academics who seek to make their research available to all who might benefit from it. As a vehicle for dissemination and information sharing, the primary website has been successful, with 120,699 unique users and 402,171 page views between the inception of the site in 2010 and October 2018. The website provides access to: a database of academic and grey material, a search engine, broadcasts of current events and education programs, and space for moderated group discussions—both public and private. As of October 2018, the RRN Facebook group had 38,813 participants and the RRN Twitter feed 3,312 followers. Dissemination also takes place through other electronic formats such as listservs and e-blasts. When an item is broadcast, it can reach between 50,000 and 60,000 people globally.

Contributions to the Field of Refugee Studies

One of the most noteworthy accomplishments of the RRN was its development of a model of individual and institutional partnership that strives to bridge the social and economic inequities inherent in "south/north" relationships. The goal was to establish fair and equitable partnerships that promote engaged and participatory knowledge generation in a context rife with unequal capacities and inequitable access to resources. RRN's model of research partnership is based on respectful interpersonal relationships—with person-to-person contacts, and open and transparent communications—because we recognize the structural inequalities among researchers in low and high-income countries. This model guided the formation of the thematic clusters and regional and thematic networks that have achieved relative independence. RRN member institutions indicate that they value the way in which the project opened "spaces

of encounter" and networking, and call for the RRN to become more decentralized and to work from a more regional perspective—to have fewer roots and more branches.

The RRN was supported by a short-lived, and since reframed, funding program called the Strategic Knowledge Research Cluster—now called Partnership Grants—operated by Canada's Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). In a sense our project was unique, in that during its funding cycle the RRN was the only project with partners outside of Canada. In addition, the grant was explicitly to support networking as opposed to the traditional research agenda; in other words, the funding was meant to be put towards generating knowledge through the formation of research clusters with an emphasis on connectivity. Despite a funding program based on supporting networking, there was an expectation of traditional research outputs. This disconnect between how the funding stream was framed and what the funder expected from this funding raised important questions about how to evaluate networks and how to demonstrate effective networking. In their study of the transnational partnerships of African universities, Koehn and Obamba (2014) recommend that evaluations of partnerships include consideration of issues such as shared vision, relationship dynamics, mutual capacity building, and sustainability rather than merely the current quantitative and qualitative metrics.

While traditional metrics of academic impact focus on publications, we feel the building of a network is itself an impact. The challenge is to demonstrate effective networking. Our approach through the RRN was to bring people together around key research areas: across issues, research methodologies, and regions. The resultant "network of networks" coalesced around shared thematic or regional interests and continues to evolve, expand, and regroup. Key to the emergence of these networks was creating spaces—for personal contacts and relationships to be formed, for research questions to emerge, for connections to be made. Moreover there had to be different kinds of spaces—from regular face-to-face meetings, to virtual spaces, to smaller workshops, to larger conferences. One of our colleagues suggested that the RRN could be viewed as having two major roles: one concerned with knowledge dissemination and the other aiming to provide leading researchers in the field with a space to connect and collaborate. To this participant, it is the second role that makes the RRN unique and necessary. As they put it: "What RRN does for me and for the

centre, which would not be as easily replicated, is having a venue and a process through which we can talk with our peers and colleagues to form the kind of relationships that allow us to move from 'it's nice seeing you' to 'let's collaborate,' 'let's actually do a full partnership.'"

Similarly, another colleague underscored that the role of the RRN should be to help sustain personal and professional relationships by also providing a space where researchers and practitioners can meet face-to-face and discuss joint work opportunities. As they explained: "So I think to me it's more about can you create the right spaces in which people can find one another rather than can you orchestrate collaborations kind of as a starting point." The project sought to work through shared knowledge areas of interest that built upon different motivations for creating knowledge as well as different uses of the knowledge produced. A key area of contribution of the RRN was its role as connector of research clusters. As one of our colleagues put it:

> It is important to show [through the RRN and IASFM] that different centres are saying that these are important topics and that they can't be researched independently . . . and a way to actually do more collaborative research is through maybe linking up multiple grants so that I have a grant and someone else has a grant, then the RRN can be the connector of these grants. And so, if you're working on, for example, refugee protection outside of the legal framework, I don't have to imagine I am doing the whole ball of wax. But if that is something we all agree is a topic of relevance, then there could be ways to show, look there is a topic and this institution is holding this grant to address it and this institution is holding this grant . . . so that at some level we can show that we are mutually reinforcing our work and not imagining that one centre is the source of that big research.

The RRN has been a place where Canadian and international researchers working on issues of forced migration could turn for current research and new ideas. It has been lauded as a learning community that provided researchers in early and middle career stages with opportunities for personal and professional growth (see chapters 10 and 11). Colleagues from

less established and more geographically isolated research centres found that the RRN helped to broaden their exposure and strengthened their ties with institutions, NGOs, and peers in other disciplines and regions (see, for example, chapter 12). The RRN's ability to create networking opportunities was repeatedly cited as its greatest strength. What seemed to work best was not only the kind of peer-to-peer encounters that the RRN created but also the way that it opened these spaces of encounter: the RRN created an informal and stimulating atmosphere that allowed members to network at their own pace and through their own interests. It provided partners the space in which to feel out the research landscape and exercise agency and agility in choosing the topics and peers with whom they wished to collaborate. This informal atmosphere relied on a degree of improvisation, engendering unexpected partnerships and collaborations (see, for example, chapter 11 on how the spaces created for networking led to contributions in reconceptualizing environmental displacement).

When reflecting on the trajectory of the field of refugee studies, one of our RRN colleagues highlighted that an important part of deepening and expanding the field has been the work of scholars from the south in critiquing the dominance of scholars and researchers in the north. Not only did this critique provide room for new perspectives and the re-evaluation of key concepts, it also marked an important shift in critical forced migration discourse. As one of our RRN colleagues explained: "The post-1989 political situation also contributed to these developments. Focus on terror brought to the forefront the critique of the role of the global north in producing forced migrants in the south in the name of anti-terror operations. Pakistan and Iraq are burning instances of this."

Although our focus is on the impacts of the networks, the RRN did produce significant research products: forty-one workshops and conferences, six books, six special journal issues, forty-six separate journal articles, eleven reports, four annotated bibliographies, a new online journal, and five conference presentations on the RRN research process. Training and mentoring students has been a priority throughout the project. Since 2009, the RRN project has directly funded 132 students (117 graduate and fifteen undergraduate; eighty-eight Canadian and forty-four foreign students) from across disciplines to work under the supervision of leading scholars on emerging research issues and attend the IASFM conferences.

In summary, the impacts of the RRN can be measured in five areas: 1) expansion of the field with new networks of researchers, practitioners, and policy actors created both regionally and globally; 2) generation of new knowledge on major issues in the field; 3) global mobilization of new and existing knowledge in accessible forms and formats; 4) training and mentoring of students to provide future leadership in the field; and 5) advancement of the practices of global research and knowledge generation.

Mapping the Challenges

The RRN has experienced significant barriers and challenges, some alluded to above. The difficulties are very much linked to the achievements. The broader political, intellectual, cultural, and institutional contexts continue to shape how researchers in the north and south encounter and conduct research (see chapter 1). The relationships among the RRN and its partners are never outside the historical continuities that shape north-south relations—and the sense that for many years, knowledge has been "trafficked" out of the south to the benefit of scholars, institutions, and funders in the north. As one of our colleagues frames it: "For a long time, the research agenda of forced migration was dominated by the scholars and thinkers from the global north. Researchers of the global south were expected to work on case studies that would support the meta-narratives produced in the north. However, with the influx of a new group of scholars from the global south in the last two decades that picture changed substantially . . . They pointed out that categorization of forced migrants into rigid groups of refugees, IDPs, forced migrants, economic migrants, etc. is unhelpful to say the least. They also pointed out that forced migrants were always vulnerable people irrespective of whether the particular vulnerability came from poverty or a political situation within a society." This context pushed some of our colleagues to focus their resources on intra-regional collaboration rather than on the north-south collaborations that research funders have been pushing for the past decade. They argued not only that intra-regional collaborations tended to be more productive and more mutually respectful, but also that such collaborations ensured that northern researchers would not continue to dominate knowledge production in the field of forced migration. Two of the chapters here focus on the formation of regional networks (see chapters 3 and 12).

While there was a general sense that the RRN could do more to democratize and decentralize the production of knowledge in the field of forced migration, it was also acknowledged that the RRN's global platform did create room for southern partners to connect and collaborate with one another. As one of our colleagues based at an institution in the global south explained, the RRN has been central to their regional network's ability to strengthen dialogue with other southern partners beyond the region: "One of the good outcomes of the RRN is that it allowed us to enter in contact with other southern partners like ourselves, in fact, it's thanks to RRN that last week I was in India meeting with a partner there . . . RRN provided the possibility to develop south-south dialogues."

Structural and bureaucratic barriers have inhibited the full participation of some partners, especially those in the south whose access to funding is significantly more limited. Differential access to funding remains a major challenge in how research thinking, agendas, and collaborations are developed and taken up. What is more, it speaks to how vastly different the RRN experience has been for individual members of the network even at the institutional level (i.e., the network of research centres). Funding was flagged by most participants in our mapping of the network, particularly those in the global south and newly established centres in the north, as a major factor affecting their research agendas and collaborations. With most available funding distributed by agencies and foundations in the global north, there are limited pathways and structures for joint funding with institutions in the south. The problem of funding is tied to the fact that funding sources in the north for forced migration research are increasingly difficult to access, disproportionately focused on issues in the north, and as such largely out of reach for research institutions in the south (Chimni 1998; Landau 2012; Oakes 2015). This inaccessibility of resources places enormous pressure on institutions in the south and affects their ability to develop and influence research agendas of their own. At the same time, as one colleague noted, influencing policy requires building local legitimacy: "If they (local grassroots organizations) want to have a policy influence, they cannot let anyone know they have been funded (from institutions in the north) otherwise it will look like foreign agents are meddling in domestic affairs. It's not to say that your work (i.e., RRN) isn't important and couldn't be used here but disseminating through the RRN might be counter-productive (for local grassroots organizations). We also need to

be thinking though, who is it that you want to influence and how can you get a local voice to be saying these things because that is what is going to be heard; not a voice with a Canadian accent." Southern colleagues were not only dissatisfied with the dearth of joint funding opportunities but also keen to highlight that the RRN's Canadian and international focus, and its focus to date on speaking to a global audience, did not do much for them regionally. There was a clearly articulated desire for the network to become more decentralized and to work from a more regional perspective. This raises a crucial question about how to be relevant and responsive to regional needs and contexts while at the same time functioning as a global platform for research, collaboration, and dissemination. It is a question that has broader application to research, policy, and practice in the field of refugee studies given that there are global and regional/local interests and contexts to consider.

Overview of Sections and Contributions

This edited volume asks RRN members to think about their work in a slightly different way than they are perhaps used to: it does not merely present a summary of what they did in their clusters and networks but rather showcases the lessons they have learned about the practice of networking and the value of working across disciplines, sectors, and regions—as well as the tensions involved in such partnerships. The book is organized into three sections: 1) Power and Politics in Refugee Research; 2) Emerging and Developing Research Approaches and Tools; and 3) Knowledge Production and the Ethics of Network Formation.

Power and Politics in Refugee Research

This section of the book focuses on the geopolitical contexts of refugee researchers and how those contexts influence the practice and understanding of research on forced migration. The relationships among researchers, civil society actors, and policymakers are considered, particularly the challenges that researchers face in the negotiations of these relationships across sectors. The murky process of influencing public policy through research and advocacy is addressed. Colleagues in the global south experience unique difficulties in conducting their research and navigating the power imbalances and resource questions. They are also demonstrating

new approaches to generating knowledge on forced migration and the importance of drawing distinct areas of work into the conversation.

In his chapter "Capacity, Complicity, and Subversion: Revisiting Collaborative Refugee Research in an Era of Containment," Loren B. Landau documents the challenges of conducting refugee research in Africa. He argues that the cross-continental research partnerships most researchers in the south rely upon to fund their work come with substantial risks of heightening inequality and of becoming complicit in the prevailing global strategies of migrant containment. Landau warns us that international research partnerships can simultaneously expose and (re)enact the inequalities, structural constraints, and historically conditioned power relations implicit in the production of knowledge; they can risk entrenching the very north-south dichotomies they seek to overcome.

In "Rethinking Displacement: Transitional Justice and Forced Migration Studies," Nergis Canefe argues for the necessity of bringing the study of forced migration together with the study of transitional justice, especially in the global south where the majority of the world's dispossessed populations strive to survive. She insists on the need to build upon the knowledge of collaborative networks, scholarly and activist organizations, and practitioners in select locales in order to contribute to the study of human suffering induced by mass political violence in the hands of states turned against their own peoples. This includes examining the underlying social disenfranchisement, socio-economic predicaments, normative challenges, and rights of the displaced in the context of transitional justice projects enacted in postcolonial landscapes of nationhood. As such, establishing connections of documentation and research that attend to the ethics of witnessing is essential. Her chapter provides a conceptual debate and an interdisciplinary foundation for such a framework to be established within the larger context of forced migration studies.

Susan Kneebone documents the challenges and impacts of the Asia Pacific Forced Migration Connection (APFMC), which was launched with the support of the RRN in November 2013. She organized APFMC as a hub to bring together scholars of forced migration in Australia and the Asia Pacific region, which she describes as a contested and contentious space. Her chapter "The Asia Pacific Forced Migration Connection: Linking Activists, Advocates, and Academics" presents the political context of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and how the researchers

of APFMC have navigated the troubled geopolitical waters of the region. The chapter demonstrates the importance of researcher independence as well as the freedom to network widely and engage political and civil society actors through invited participation in roundtables, publications, and conference papers.

The Borderless Higher Education for Refugees (BHER) project is an international partnership of Kenyan and Canadian universities and a Kenyan non-governmental organization that, with the support of the UN-HCR, provides post-secondary opportunities to students in the Dadaab refugee camp in northeastern Kenya. Dadaab is one of the largest and most insecure refugee camps in the world. Hyndman and Giles (2017) have documented refugees' educational needs in these situations, and the plan to develop a response was in the original RRN proposal. In their thoughtful chapter, "Transitions from Knowledge Networked to Knowledge Engaged: Ethical Tensions and Dilemmas from the Global to the Local," Wenona Giles and Don Dippo—the leaders of BHER—document the challenges and opportunities for educators attempting to work within and across the social, political, economic, and cultural differences of the camps and the local communities. Drawing from the work of Hannah Arendt and postcolonial theory, the chapter presents a transformative model of education guided by ongoing efforts to enter into ethical student-teacher encounters.

Finally, Paula Banerjee and Ranabir Samaddar dissect the discourse of security/insecurity in terms of migration, which they argue is the most contentious issue in the life of a nation. In their chapter "Insecure Nation, Insecure Migrant: Postcolonial Echoes from India's Northeast," they study the historical conditions that saw migration emerge as a matter of nationalized security marked by collective violence and collective politics. Their case study is the region of Assam in northeast India and the complexity of forced migration across the borders in that area, where mobile populations are perceived as dangerous. The chapter demonstrates the deep colonial roots of violence in the region and how discourses of the military, social and physical insecurity, and the contentious politics of nationhood all combined to ensure security against mobile populations with women being particularly vulnerable.

Emerging and Developing Research Approaches and Tools

The second section focuses on the development of research approaches and tools to enhance the study of situations of forced migration. From its inception in 2008, the RRN has been committed to finding equitable and accessible means and forms of knowledge mobilization, dissemination, and translation. Members were interested not only in how to collaborate on research but also how to share and communicate knowledge. We also debated what our collective contributions to the field of refugee studies might be, including interventions on the ethics and politics of knowledge production and how to teach forced migration and refugee issues. The chapters in this section focus on ethical, methodological, and practical questions related to the production and dissemination of knowledge in this field that raises pressing global concerns for policymakers, practitioners, and educators.

Since 2013 an interdisciplinary team of social and computer scientists with NGO advisors based at Georgetown University and its Institute for the Study of International Migration (an RRN institutional partner) has been working on developing a simulation tool that could act as an early warning system to enable governments and international humanitarian organizations to formulate contingency plans, establish appropriate policies, and deliver shelter, food, medicines and other supplies to areas likely to receive large numbers of refugees and displaced persons. In their chapter "Big Data and Early Warning of Displacement," social scientist Susan F. Martin and computer scientist Lisa Singh review their research methodologies (including state-of-the-art information retrieval techniques) and identify the challenges (including the ethical issues) that need to be addressed in order to develop more timely and reliable evidence-based systems for detecting and forecasting forced migration.

One of the regional networks supported by the RRN is the Canadian Association for Refugee and Forced Migration Studies (CARFMS). Since its launch with its first conference in 2008, CARFMS has been continually growing and developing its contributions to refugee research beyond the annual meetings. In the chapter "Building and Sustaining a Web Platform for Researchers, Teachers, Students, and Practitioners in the Field of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies," former CARFMS President James C. Simeon documents the development of CARFMS' Online Research and

Teaching Tools and Practitioners Forum (ORTT&PF), a multi-functional online tool designed as a resource for the field of refugee and forced migration studies. A work in progress, it is an open access website that strives to provide information on the key terms, concepts, methods, and theories relevant to the field. A Practitioners' Forum is intended to provide a private online space where members can engage in conversations and debates.

Documents leading up to the 2018 Global Compact on Refugees called for "better data about migration" (Guterres 2017, 4), data that is "reliable, comparable, and timely" (UNHCR 2018, 5). Demographers have long advocated for a greater role in the scientific study of refugee and forced migration; two of the world's leading demographers, Ellen Percy Kraly and Mohammad Jalal Abbasi-Shavazi, make important contributions to this discussion in their chapter "The Promise and Potential of the Demography of Refugee and Forced Migration." They demonstrate how demography can contribute toward a better understanding of refugees and forced migration by focusing on levels and trends of displacement, characteristics of refugees, and pathways by which refugees and forced migrants adapt and are integrated into host societies. Demographic theory and population modelling are valuable tools to better understand the vulnerabilities and resiliencies of refugees and to inform the current debate by states about their mutual roles and responsibilities to refugees, migrants, and host communities.

In their chapter "Disseminating Knowledge in the Digital Age: The Case of the Refugee Research Network," William J. Payne and Michele Millard document the evolution of the RRN's knowledge mobilization strategies and particularly the use of social media tools in reaching out to different groups and disseminating research findings. When the RRN was formed in 2008, the website was envisioned as the main vehicle for dissemination; as new technologies emerged in the interim, the website came to exist in a dynamic relationship with the network's social media presence. The authors provide a guide to developing an engaged social media audience with commentaries on the utility of the different tools including some dos and don'ts. Drawing on the ten years of experience with the RRN, they offer insights into the opportunities and limitations of social media as a forum for engagement across multiple sectors.

Knowledge Production and the Ethics of Network Formation

This section of the book examines the different kinds of partnerships that emerged within the broader RRN: global, cross-cultural, interdisciplinary. Contributions focus on the process of building these networks within the network and offer unique lessons learned from each case. Contributors reflect on: what networking and partnership mean; the difference that networking made to their research; how networking builds capacity; and the importance of different contexts to how partnerships and networks are built. It also examines the approach of working through clusters of researchers and assesses to what extent and in what ways this form of collaboration influenced the ability to see connections. A key organizing principle for the project was to connect seemingly disparate research interests, questions, and agendas—to draw from individual research programs and link together those scholars who were doing work that was related either quite directly or more implicitly. Contributions to this section reflect on the value of working as a research cluster and how to think about research as a network or unit.

In their chapter "New, Emerging, Emerged? Navigating Agency, Technology, and Organization in Developing the Emerging Scholars and Practitioners on Migration Issues (ESPMI) Network," Brittany Lauren Wheeler and Petra Molnar provide an overview of ESPMI's trajectory as a working group and network. They document the challenges and successes of: weaving together in-person and social media-based engagement; identifying and critiquing the network's mission; weighing the utility of institutional support and traditional funding sources; and maintaining momentum in endeavours that rely upon the contributions of a network of volunteers. ESPMI members felt a strong commitment to the field of refugee studies and sought a meaningful place to contribute. They focused primarily on initiatives that encouraged intergenerational, interdisciplinary, and other cross-boundary engagements. By identifying project-based work, establishing a network of professional connections, and developing the opportunity to publish and access research and initiatives, ESPMI has charted a largely grassroots course toward creating a space for scholarly and professional support, especially regarding knowledge production by its members.

In their chapter "What Constitutes Environmental Displacement? Challenges and Opportunities of Exploring Connections across Thematically

Diverse Areas," Pablo Bose and Elizabeth Lunstrum explore the successes and challenges of the RRN's Environmental Displacement cluster. This collaborative cluster brought together researchers from diverse locations and at different points of their academic careers to work on issues of common interest. Their reflections focus on four areas in particular: 1) the origins and structure of the networking model; 2) making the case for "environmentally induced displacement" as a substantive conceptual field, and their main organizing concept; 3) how the cluster enabled other interventions into knowledge production concerning this main organizing concept; and 4) reflections on what has worked in this model and what remain as challenges moving forward.

In her chapter "Bittersweet Symphony: Challenges and Lessons Learned from Network Building in Latin America," Beatriz Eugenia Sánchez-Mojica traces both the development and the demise of the Latin American Network for Forced Migration (LANFM)/*Red latino americana de migración forzada*, reflecting on the "lights and the shadows" of the unfinished process. In 2010, at a workshop hosted by Roberto Vidal (Javeriana University) and Sánchez-Mojica (Los Andes University) in Bogotá, thirty academic and community researchers agreed to form the first ever network focused on forced migration in Latin America. The chapter documents four highly productive workshops and the successful hosting of the 2014 conference of the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration in Bogotá. However, in the absence of crucial resources, the network could not be sustained. Sánchez-Mojica suggests that the current context in Latin America is more propitious for collaborative research than it was in 2010 and sets out guidelines for the possible resumption of LANFM.

Christina Clark-Kazak explores lessons learned in developing an international network on research methodologies and knowledge production in forced migration. Her chapter "Partnering on Research Methodologies in Forced Migration: Challenges, Opportunities and Lessons Learned" describes both the successes and challenges of this network, with a view to contributing to more sustainable partnerships in the future. It highlights the importance of developing specific, concrete initiatives around which network members can rally and the need to take advantage of opportunities that present themselves, including by adding methodology activities into existing initiatives and events. The group also learned about the

challenges of funding projects *about* methodology, in contrast to more traditional, empirically driven research collaborations. Moreover, despite an explicit focus on power and attempts to decolonize forced migration, the network still reflected and reproduced knowledge asymmetries that privileged participation from those in the global north.

We are deeply grateful to our RRN colleagues for their thoughtful reflections on their work and for the guidance they provide to the field of forced migration studies as it continues to negotiate partnerships of knowledge production in a geopolitical context of immense inequality. Their contributions guide us through valuable lessons learned as they managed significant challenges in striving to achieve ethical practices in research and networking. These colleagues offer strategies and tools to those researchers and practitioners who share our commitment to the fair and equitable generation of knowledge in Appadurai's (2000) tradition of "strong internationalization."

Notes

We are indebted to Wesley Oakes, a former doctoral student at York University, who conducted the research and wrote the *RRN Mapping Report* (2015) upon which we are drawing here.

1   www.refugeeresearch.net.

References

Appadurai, Arjun. 2000. "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination." *Public Culture* 12, no. 1: 1–19.

Arbel, Efrat, and Alletta Brenner. 2013. *Bordering on Failure: Canada-US Border Policy and the Politics of Refugee Exclusion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Immigration and Refugee Law Clinical Program, Harvard Law School.

Bradley, Megan. 2008. "On the Agenda: North-South Research Partnerships and Agenda Setting Processes." *Development in Practice* 18, no. 6: 673–85.

Chimni, B. S. 1998. "The Geopolitics of Refugee Studies: A View from the South." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 11, no. 4: 350–74.

Currie, Melissa, Gillian King, Peter Rosenbaum, Mary Law, Marilyn Kertoy, and Jacqueline Specht. 2005. "A Model of Impacts of Research Partnerships in Health and Social Services." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 28, no. 4: 400–412.

Hyndman, Jennifer, and Wenona Giles. 2017. *Refugees in Extended Exile: Living on the Edge*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.

Hynie, Michaela, Susan McGrath, Julie E. E. Young, and Paula Banerjee. 2014. "Negotiations of Engaged Scholarship and Equity through a Global Network of Refugee Scholars." *Scholarly and Research Communication* 5, no. 3: 1–16.

Jazeel, Tariq, and Colin McFarlane. 2007. "Responsible Learning: Cultures of Knowledge Production and the North-South Divide." *Antipode* 39, no. 5: 781–9.

Jentsch, Birgit. 2004. "Making Southern Realities Count: Research Agendas and Design in North-South Collaborations." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 7, no. 3: 259–69.

Koehn, Peter, and Milton Obamba. 2014. *The Transnationally Partnered University: Insight from Research and Sustainable Development Collaborations in Africa*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Landau, Loren B. 2012. "Communities of Knowledge or Tyrannies of Partnership: Reflections on North-South Research Networks and the Dual Imperative." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25, no. 4: 555–70.

Nakabugo, Mary G., Eimear Barrett, Peter McEvoy, and Ronaldo Munck. 2010. "Best Practice in North-South Research Relationships in Higher Education: The Irish African Partnership Model." *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review* 10 (Spring): 89–98.

Oakes, Wesley J. 2015. *RRN Mapping Report*. Toronto, ON: Refugee Research Network, York University.

Shantz, Elizabeth. 2012. *Knowledge Translation Challenges and Solutions Described by Researchers*. Waterloo: Canadian Water Network.