

[Christopher T. Husbands](#)

Ethnic and Racial Studies: an outline history of forty years of publishing the research agenda on ethnic and racial issues

**Article (Accepted version)
(Refereed)**

Original citation:

Husbands, Christopher T. (2018) *Ethnic and Racial Studies: an outline history of forty years of publishing the research agenda on ethnic and racial issues*. [Ethnic and Racial Studies](#), 41 (6). pp. 1014-1033. ISSN 0141-9870 (In Press)
DOI: [10.1080/01419870.2018.1435898](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2018.1435898)

© 2018 Taylor & Francis

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/87757/>
Available in LSE Research Online: May 2018

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Ethnic and Racial Studies: an outline history of forty years of publishing the research agenda on ethnic and racial issues

Christopher T. Husbands

Emeritus Reader in Sociology, London School of Economics and Political Science

CONTACT Christopher T. Husbands c.husbands@lse.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Ethnic and Racial Studies [ERS] began publishing in 1978. Over the following forty years it developed in terms of its editorial arrangements, its format, the types of contribution published, the characteristics of its author contributors, the characteristics and methodologies of its articles, the topics that they described, and the countries whose circumstances they covered. The article describes these developments, mostly analysed by quinquennia; one issue of particular salience has been the increased feminization of the Editorial Board and of the corpus of authors. The article also discusses how book reviewing has been an important part of the journal's history, leading to the establishment in 2014 of *Ethnic and Racial Studies Review*.

KEYWORDS Ethnicity; race; gender; countries; methodologies; authors; topics; concepts

When in January 1978 the first issue of *Ethnic and Racial Studies* [hereinafter *ERS*] was published by Routledge & Kegan Paul, it did not quite hit the newsstands with any éclat, but it did provide the first major academic journal in the United Kingdom that was devoted from an international and cross-national perspective specifically to the issues described in its title. True, there were already two journals covering the same general subject matter. *New Community*, the journal of the then-existing Commission for Racial Equality (formerly of the Community Relations Commission) had existed since 1971, but this was devoted far more to domestic issues and had largely UK contributors. *Race and Class* (formerly *Race* as founded in 1959) was produced from 1974 by the Institute of Race Relations but, since the earlier change of character of this organization, this had an explicitly Marxist emphasis (Mullard 1985). January 1978 was certainly a sensitive time in the UK in terms of the intended themes of the journal: the National Front, though by then well past its prime, was still capable of having an effect on domestic politics. The arrival of displaced Kenyan Asians in 1976, after the arrival of Ugandan Asians in 1972 and 1973, had certainly heightened inter-ethnic tensions, aggravated by Margaret Thatcher's now infamous 'swamping' metaphor, delivered in a television interview that was given, coincidentally, in January 1978.

Over the course of the full forty years *ERS* published 262 individual issues, including in this figure also the eleven *Ethnic and Racial Studies Reviews* since April 2014 and counting as two issues the two bound into one hard-copy volume since 2016. From 1978 to 1997 there were four issues per year, from 1998 to 2007 six per year, then eight in 2008, nine in 2009, ten in 2010, twelve from 2011 to 2013, fourteen in 2014, and fifteen from 2015 to 2017. The ability to sustain this momentum must reflect both the centrality of the journal in its field and its ability to attract authors, but also the growth of academic interest in the topics that it covers.

For the record, 1,815 standard articles were published in the forty years from 1978 to 2017, to which should be added forty-eight introductions to Special Issues/Sections and one introduction to a Themed Issue that were of a length and content sufficient for their qualification as articles.¹ Also published were twenty-one research notes and twenty-one research reports, though in both cases almost wholly before 1998. Including the eleven issues of the *ERS Review* published since 2014,

there have to date been 3,048 book reviews and eighty review articles, reviewing between them 3,406 individual books. There have also been twenty-five published discussion or debate articles.

ERS's life had begun with John Stone, then of St Anthony's College Oxford, as its Chief Editor, Norman Fainstein of the Department of Urban Affairs and Policy Analysis of the New School for Social Research in New York City as its American Editor, and Henri Giordan of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris as its French Editor. By the second issue the editors were listed as equals and the journal had acquired an additional American editor, Susan Fainstein of the Department of Urban Planning at Livingston College, Rutgers University in New Jersey, and also a board of so-called editorial advisors of thirty-one persons. This board was disproportionately American with fifteen members from the USA, and there were nine from the UK, three from France, and one each from Australia, Canada, The Netherlands and South Africa. There was just one woman among the thirty-one; by 1981 a further member was added – another man.²

The first issue's editorial statement said that the journal's purpose would be to discuss 'the relationship between ethnic and "racial" groups in Western, Communist and Third World societies'. It was to be an international forum and the editorial invited correspondence and debates. A Routledge & Kegan Paul publicity document in 1977 was similarly descriptive: 'a journal of ethnic, cultural and race relations providing an international forum for the publication of articles dealing with significant problems in this general area'.

The honour of the first article in the first issue of *ERS* went to Anthony H. Richmond of York University Ontario with an article entitled 'Migration, Ethnicity and Race Relations', setting an interest in the delineation of the subject that, as will be seen, has been a continuous later theme. Even so, as is to be expected and as a full content analysis of articles reveals, there have been interesting changes of emphasis over the forty years, seen in essence in the titles of the journal's Special Issues and issues with Special Sections. A first point to note is their increasing frequency. A Special Issue is seen as one where contributions on a single defined subject are solicited from particular authors or, occasionally, derived from papers at a previous conference with a special theme; these issues have usually had one or more external editors, but there are examples where the normal editors have done the soliciting of authors to contribute on a predetermined theme.³ Between 1978 and 1987 there were

five Special Issues of the forty issues in that decade (13 per cent); between 1988 and 1997 there were seven of forty (18 per cent); between 1998 and 2007 there were eighteen of sixty (30 per cent); and between 2008 and 2017 there were thirty-nine of 111 (35 per cent). The first Special Issue was as early as July 1979 on the topic of ‘Internal Colonialism in Comparative Perspective’. There was no external editor, John Stone having written the introductory article. However, it qualifies as a Special Issue by being on a single named theme and, crucially, by Stone’s use of that phrase in his introduction. The first example of a Special Issue with an external editor was in January 1984, again from Anthony Richmond, on ‘The Future of Ethnic Nationalism’. During the 1990s there were special issues on some topics dominating the news agenda of that time: for example, Eastern Europe in January 1991 and Northern Ireland in October 1995. All these subjects reflect issues dominant at their time and still relevant but are now accompanied by topics with different intellectual origins and even, in some cases, a different vocabulary. Thus, alongside long-standing–topic subjects such as ‘The first and second generations compared: generational change in Britain’ (January 2014) and ‘Immigrant incorporation in political parties: exploring the diversity gap’ (April 2017) are ‘Books, bodies, and bronzes: comparing sites of global citizenship creation’ (October 2014) and ‘Comparing super-diversity’ (March 2015).

The *ERS* editorial composition

The editorial arrangement described as established from the second issue lasted till 1986. Evidence for 1987 is missing but by 1988 John Stone was the sole editor and was by then keen to pass on responsibility for the journal. During 1988 the publisher, Routledge, was negotiating for a new editorial team, which was based at the London School of Economics and Political Science. From July 1989 the new editor, Anthony Smith, was formally in post, with Christopher Husbands as Associate Editor, and as Book Review Editor Martin Bulmer, who for more than a year previously had been the named addressee for receiving books for review. Some changes were immediate: articles were now preceded by an abstract; affiliation details were placed at the end of each article; and, to complete a major makeover, the journal’s cover was redesigned to its current red and black with globe motif and the title itself in upper case in the

distinctive angular-serif Cortez font.⁴ The effect of Bulmer's appointment was particularly noticeable: the journal went from publishing per issue a mean of 5.8 ordinary book reviews and covering a mean of 7.2 books (also including those in Review Articles) from 1978 to April 1989 to 12.2 and 17.2 respectively from July 1989 to January 1992, the period when Bulmer was Book Review Editor. Bulmer also introduced a regular 'Books received' listing and a review feature in some issues of 'Classics Revisited', though this latter did not survive beyond 2000. Under three subsequent Book Review Assistants or Editors from April 1993 to May 1998, Alison Palmer, Jessica Jacobson and Chris Smaje (the last after the journal's move from LSE to the University of Surrey), the practice of reviewing large numbers of books continued even more enthusiastically with a per-issue mean of 22.1 reviews covering 26.4 books (also including Review Articles) to May 1998, the last issue for which there was formally a Book Review Editor; one issue in this last period contained fifty-seven book reviews and a review article, covering between them sixty-three books. Another high review-total for a single issue was fifty-one reviews covering fifty-three books.

Smith continued as sole Editor to January 1992, from April of that year being joined by Bulmer also as a full Editor. During 1993 and 1994 Smith increasingly withdrew to set up the Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism and in 1995 its house journal, *Nations and Nationalism*. During that period Smith was billed honorifically as General Editor, although the bulk of editorial work was being done by Bulmer. Through the entire period from 1989 Husbands remained Associate Editor, but John Solomos joined Bulmer as Associate Editor at the end of 1995. He retained that title formally till as late as 2008, though principally by oversight or insouciance as to nomenclature, for he had long since become a full co-editor with Bulmer, an editorial duality that continues to the present.

On the academic side of editorial arrangements, it is interesting to note the variations about the composition of the Editorial Board, which went under a variety of different names and combinations. As described above, the original group at the start of John Stone's era was thirty-one so-called Editorial Advisors. The next regime purged this list and in 1989 constituted an Editorial Board of fifteen members plus a smaller supplementary Editorial Committee of initially ten members, the latter largely composed of LSE staff from various departments. At this distance of time the rationale of this arrangement is unclear. The Editorial Committee may perhaps have

met but, if so, its meetings were infrequent; if any minutes of such meetings were taken (which is unlikely), these have surely not survived. The reason for this set-up was probably part of a plan to develop a multidisciplinary base of potential article referees, for the new team – when it took over – had to build up this base from scratch before there was the internet for seeking academic specialists and easing the task. Certainly, the Editorial Board has gone through a number of iterations till the present so-called International Editorial Board. In 1996, by when the journal was based at the University of Surrey, the Editorial Board expanded to twenty-nine members, also with a nine-member Editorial Committee. The number on the Board crept up over the next couple of years but later, in 1998, both this Board and the Editorial Committee were consolidated to a single fifty-two-member Editorial Board. At least the new arrangements had the virtue of a degree of gender diversity as compared with the situation in the 1970s and 1980s, and the Board and Committee from 1989 were significantly feminized. In 1998, at the end of the bifurcated Board/Committee arrangement, fourteen of the thirty-three members of the Board were women (42 per cent), as were three of the eight members of the Committee (38 per cent). The membership of the consolidated Board crept up slightly over the years and in 2009 the journal, not wanting to be left out of the fashionable vocabulary of globalization, added ‘International’ to its title, although with no immediately discernible consequence except for a change of font styles in the listing; there were the same fifty-seven members both before and after the change. Six months later, however, there was an enlargement to sixty-five members with a substantial churn of membership. Eighteen of the original membership were retired, nine from the UK and nine from overseas, and there were twenty-six additions, with the changed title of the Board being justified by the fact that twenty of these were from non-UK institutions. However, a degree of gender imbalance persisted – only twenty-three (35 per cent) were women. The Board’s membership later increased to its current seventy-one. As back in the 1970s, those from American institutions dominate its composition. Just over a half at the end of 2017 were based in the United States and just 21 per cent in the UK. The remainder came from a smattering of other countries: Canada (4), Australia (2), and one each for Belgium, Brazil, France, Germany, Hong Kong, India, Israel, Mexico, The Netherlands, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, and Trinidad & Tobago. In one respect this Board has indeed diversified since the 1970s

and 1980s, though only to a degree. Still only 38 per cent of the 2018 Board membership are women, about the same percentage as in 1998.

The journal has long been heavily reliant on the skill and efforts of its office management personnel. There were doubtless staff during the era of John Stone's editorship who were important in the production of the journal, but their identity seems now lost in the oblivion of history. However, the LSE team were quick to realize that there was a need for assistance in managing the journal's affairs, and they were then lucky to acquire the services of Guida Crowley, who had been de facto Managing Editor in charge of the production of *New Community* when it was published by the Commission for Racial Equality with Sheila Patterson as Editor. Guida began in 1990 with the slightly demeaning title of Editorial Assistant but little more than a year later she was titled, more prestigiously, as Managing Editor; she continued with this title till 2008, with a transition period from 2006. It was in 2008 when Guida finally retired from *ERS*, aged ninety-two, and she died three years later (Bulmer 2011). Amanda Eastell-Bleakley came to the journal office in 2002 and then in 2006 joined the editorial team as Journal Manager as recognized on the journal's end-cover. Amanda continued with that title from 2008 till mid-2016, when her post was regraded as Managing Editor. Celia Boggust had joined the office staff in 2001 with a responsibility for organizing book reviews and from 2009 was formally awarded the title of Book Review Officer on the journal's end-cover. Her title was later upgraded to Assistant Journal Manager and a role assumed even more importance with the production from April 2014 of the *Ethnic and Racial Studies Review* devoted solely to book reviews and symposia; this added per year at first two and later three extra issues of the journal as part of the main numerical sequence of each year's issues.

The format and content of *ERS*

Format of the journal

Table 1 presents some of the data given earlier in aggregate, but here decomposed according to the eight quinquennia since 1978. Certain changes over the forty years are immediately apparent. The mean number of articles per issue has increased slowly over the period; in the early days the number was just above six, but in recent years it

has exceeded nine. The trajectory for book reviews, mentioned above, reveals the massive amount of book reviewing between 1993 and 2007, after which there was a small decline till the appearance in 2014 of the *Review*. What is perhaps more startling is the decline almost to nothingness of the research note and the research report. All but two of forty-two examples of these were published in 1997 or earlier. The decline in this style of contribution in the second half of the journal's lifetime – very few such potential examples are now submitted to the journal – doubtless reflects the current higher status of the 'article' when research outputs are being assessed for the purpose of conferring tenure and promotion. On the other hand, discussion and debate contributions have become more popular, with all but three of twenty-two examples being since 1998, albeit boosted by a distinctive enthusiasm for these in the 2008-12 quinquennium. Special issues or sections, themed issues or sections, and symposia have all become relatively more frequent in recent years, further boosted in the case of symposia by the contents of the *Review*. The increase in the number of issues prepared as Special Issues, for which – as noted above – appointed issue editors may choose their contributors, may have cut the relative chance of publication by free-standing submissions, though openings for these of course increased absolutely as the journal published more issues per annum. About a third or so of issues in the last decade were Special Issues.

Characteristics of individual authors and articles

The authorship of articles was widely dispersed and *ERS* has not been the preserve of small coterie of favoured authors. The great majority of authors had only one included article; there were, of course, some exceptions, the most notable being Michael Banton and Alejandro Portes with ten and eleven respectively. The data about individual authors may be analysed according to a number of dimensions and one of the most interesting in reviewing the development of the journal is the gender composition of the corpus of authors and the countries where they were based.⁵

i. Gender composition of authors

The gender composition of authorships of articles may be compared with that of their contemporaneous Editorial Board. Authorships were always more feminized than the membership of the Editorial Board, though this is less of an issue now than it might earlier have been. The trend of first-authorship genders given in Table 2i. is clear – a

more or less steady rise over the forty years, with significant jumps from 1998 and again from 2003, after which a majority of first authorships were by women.⁶ Over the forty-year period 41 per cent of articles were first-authored by women. This pattern doubtless reflects the increased feminization of the international academic labour force, self-evidently among those who research on race and ethnicity. However, within these data are slightly variant patterns. Looking only at articles that appeared in Special Issues, overall 47 per cent of first authorships were by women, boosted by percentages between 2003 and 2012 that were significantly higher than those for their contemporaneous non-Special Issue articles. Looking only at articles with two or more co-authors, the first co-author compared with the second co-author was much likely to be male than female before 1993, but thereafter the percentage difference was much less. Among articles with at least two co-authors and looking at the first-listed two where one was male and the other female, the first-listed one was male in 71 per cent of such cases before 1993 but in only a minority, 45 per cent, from that year. These are a tentative basis for strong inference, but they do suggest an enhanced female empowerment in the subject in the past couple of decades.

ii. Countries of authors' institutions⁷

Over the course of forty years *ERS* has attracted authorships from sixty countries – some no longer existing (e.g., Southern Rhodesia, the USSR) and others whose existence some would not recognize (e.g., Northern Cyprus, Taiwan in the eyes of the People's Republic of China's view) or whose national status has changed in that period (e.g., Hong Kong). However, the great majority of authorships were from European countries and from the few non-European ones given in Table 2ii. Africa, South America and even Asia provided just a few further examples.

Table 2ii. gives, in the case of the most significant examples, the country location of the institution of articles' first-named authors, listed by continent. What emerges from this is that there are basically two categories of country – those whose contributions have been relatively steady, pace the occasional fluctuation, throughout the forty years, and those that have 'come on stream' particularly since the mid-1990s. The pre-1992 UK universities have throughout provided almost a quarter of first authorships, albeit with some variations around that fraction. Perhaps surprisingly, the post-1992 UK institutions, for the most part polytechnics before 1992, have made a steady, if smaller, contribution. First authorships from institutions

in The Netherlands have been relatively steady throughout at around 4 per cent. Contributions from Israel, Canada and Australia have also been steady at about 4 or 5 per cent each, though with the suggestion of a small recent falling-off in all these cases. The contribution from United States' first authorships has been the greatest throughout, steady at slightly more than a third, with a smaller further percentage spike between 1998 and 2012. Two examples, however, offer something other than a steady-state percentage offering. Authorships from the Federal Republic of Germany were nugatory until about 2007 before offering a small but noticeable increase. The four Scandinavian countries have a similar, slightly higher trajectory, though their take-off was in the 1993-98 quinquennium; Sweden has been the Scandinavian country offering most such authorships. Dutch academics have long had a facility to publish in English and, for the purpose of research dissemination and personal academic promotion, Scandinavian and then German academic pressures have now moved in the same direction, though many Scandinavian academics would long since have been fully proficient in writing in English; the changes in the latter two cases are certainly not because their own countries have belatedly provided topics for them to write about.

iii. Methodological style and substantive content

Table 2iii. gives summary data about the methodologies and two matters of content over the forty years. The basic methodological distinction drawn is the traditional one between quantitative and qualitative styles. 'Quantitative' covers large-scale surveys analysed by statistical methods, which in recent years have often been complex logit modelling; it also includes a few examples that employed formal mathematical modelling. 'Qualitative' covers ethnographic participation observation, the use of semi-structured interviewing of a small number of cases, or, for example, the use of focus groups. However, the basic distinction between the two types does not preclude the possibility that an individual article might qualify under both categories, as indeed some do. Also, these categories are far from being mutually exhaustive; especially in recent years there have been a number of examples of other and different methodologies, including mass media analyses, conversational analyses, analyses of internet websites, and image analyses. Some articles, especially historical ones in the early years, were essentially long essays reviewing a major literature and drawing particular conclusions from this, and these usually defied any easy methodological

classification. Having entered these caveats, the data on methodologies in Table 2iii. paint a very clear picture. The use of quantitative methodologies has been fairly steady throughout the lifetime of the journal, albeit with a slight decline in recent years – with 35 per cent of articles so classified up to the caesura year of 1993 and 27 per cent thereafter. On the other hand, the use of the various qualitative methods, rare in the first half of the journal's life, increased markedly in popularity from 1998, from 6 to 34 per cent of articles. This change was an undoubted consequence of the increased feminization of the corpus of authorships. It is not so much that women authors avoided quantitative approaches, though there is a small decrement – 31 per cent of male first-authored articles were classified as quantitative as opposed to 25 per cent of female first-authored ones. The difference is seen in the qualitative category – only 16 per cent of male first-authored articles were classified as qualitative as opposed to 42 per cent of female first-authored ones.⁸

The content of the journal has changed in at least two other ways – the decline of articles that treat, or include extensive treatment of, a historical subject or period⁹ and also of those that might be defined as 'theoretical'. The caesura for the first is again the 1990s – again using 1993 as the break-point, 39 per cent of articles before this were classified as historical as against only 15 per cent afterwards. The reason for this is clear and might be inferred from the much higher number of earlier articles that could not be classified as either quantitative or qualitative – the style of earlier articles was more likely to take the form of an historical essay. That also accounts for the fact that, though 88 per cent of all articles were classified as on a 'contemporary' subject, that was the case only for 66 per cent of articles up to 1993 and 94 per cent of those thereafter. The same explanation may also be part of the reason for the decline of the theoretical contribution, though a break-point is less clear-cut; however, the decline for the most recent decade is incontrovertible.¹⁰

Subject and country coverage of *ERS*

Subject coverage

It will come as little surprise that a journal dedicated to ethnic and racial studies publishes a lot of articles that may be coded as about 'race', 'ethnicity', 'race relations', 'ethnic relations', and the like. However, in order to provide a better review

of subject coverage, a more specific approach and more refined categories are needed. The coding for this study began with a subject coding scheme that had been developed from a preview of a sample of issues from throughout the whole period of publication. However, the coding scheme produced from that exercise quickly showed itself hopelessly inadequate for the full analysis; in the end, something like 800 subject codes were created, covering not just refinements and types of race and ethnicity and types of ethnic contact, but particular ethnic groups, types of media, political issues, and numerous other factors.

Each article was given up to three codes (occasionally only two were needed) based on a scan of content, title, abstract (after these were included) and keywords after their introduction in the second issue of 1995 at the top of journal articles.¹¹ Keywords became the primary basis for many, but not all, coding decisions, but there was no hierarchy of importance in the ordering of codes – thus, that entered as first code has the same status in describing the character of an article as that entered as third. Having so many individual subject codes permits a considerable number of potential content analyses, although having only up to three coding options for each article did mean that some codes that might otherwise have been used for a particular article were excluded by the three that were used.

Making sense of so many original raw codes for the purpose of accessible presentation has required sharp focusing and some definitional decisions about collapsing: thus are presented here summaries of the appearance of a limited number of issues and a limited number of currently vogueish concepts. The issues and concepts are ‘immigration, migration and migrants’, ‘ethnic hostility, conflict and persecution’, ‘nationalism and associated issues’, ‘religion, non-Muslim groups and associated issues’, ‘Islam, Muslim groups and associated issues’, ‘transnationalism and globalization’, ‘“colour”-ness’, and ‘refugees and asylum-seekers’. The approach used means that it is possible for the same article to appear in more than one of these summary categories, as indeed some do. Clearly, with so many original codes, presenting a large number of other issues and concepts would have been equally possible. Some were predictable, if not considered worthy of any detailed consideration; ‘multiculturalism’, for example, featured at or around 5 per cent in almost all quinquennia. The non-inclusion of others such as the labour market and employment or assimilation and acculturation, for example, is not to deny their relevance to the subject; it is merely that their trajectories over the forty-year period

were also seen after preliminary analysis as less worthy of immediate comment.¹² The results for the chosen issues and concepts are presented in Table 3.

Reassuringly perhaps, immigration, migration and migrants – issues that in contemporary circumstances almost always have a strong ethnic dimension – have featured over forty years as much or more than other topics in *ERS*. The percentage was rather lower in the earlier years but has now settled down as about a fifth of all articles. ‘Ethnic hostility, conflict and persecution’ is a wide-ranging category from racism or ethnic prejudice through to genocide, though most components of the category are not at the extreme level. Again, the appearance of these in the journal has been relatively steady over the years, with a modest spike for 1993-97. It is tempting to see this as a consequence of that period, when ex-Yugoslavia, for example, was in the grip of violent ethnic conflict; there is only small merit in this perception as ex-Yugoslavia and its ethnic conflicts did feature in just a couple of articles published in that quinquennium, but a larger contribution was made by a number of articles in that period in a Special Issue analysing the ‘troubles’ in Northern Ireland. The appearance of issues about nationalism was particularly a feature of the years from 1988 to 2002. During the earlier years of that period Anthony Smith edited the journal and one supposition may be that his reputation as particularly a specialist on nationalism stimulated submissions on that topic, with a continuation of that influence into the following few years; the decline after 2002 may, it is suggested, have resulted from articles that might previously have been submitted to *ERS* being now sent to the journal that Smith founded, *Nations and Nationalism*. Non-Muslim religious groups and issues featured steadily throughout much of the forty years, with relatively few such articles in the earlier years and a drop-off most recently. On the other hand, the trajectory for Islam and issues associated with Muslims is very different, exhibiting – with the exception of one quinquennium – a rise from nothing or near-nothing in the earlier years to the most recent period, when as many as 10 per cent of articles were classifiable on this theme; the contents of these articles reflect a general rise in recent years in scholarly interest in Islam and Muslims but they also include analyses of the moral panic represented by present-day Islamophobia.

Transnationalism and globalization are two terms of interest for the currency that each has developed in recent years as concepts to describe particular phenomena. Neither coding was used for the first fifteen years of *ERS*’s publication and their real take-off quinquennium was 1998-2002; until a recent drop-off, around 10 per cent or

so of articles were so coded. ‘Colour’-ness – mostly the concept of ‘whiteness’ but covering ‘skin colour’, ‘whitening’ and one single example of ‘blackness’ – is also a category with a late take-off, with no examples till 1998-2002 and a steady 5 per cent or so of articles thereafter. It may be thought be that articles published in the earlier years might have attracted these codes if coding decisions had been sensitive to them – in particular, some might argue, that these findings are simply or largely the result of ‘keyword bias’. However, in defence against any such claim, it can be pointed out that the first codings for ‘transnationalism’, ‘globalization’ and ‘whiteness’ were respectively in the second issue of 1999 (which was a Special Issue), in the last issue of 1996, and in the first issue of 1998; keywords were being used from early 1995. Transnationalism as a concept has a particular relevance to issues of international migration, the concept of globalization was already in general use, and whiteness achieved wider currency from the influence of the writings of authors such as Roediger (e.g., 1991; 1994); indeed, all these concepts may have come a little belatedly to the journal.

The final category included in Table 3 perhaps produces a surprise. Given how ethnicity and race have impinged upon the particular circumstances of refugees and asylum-seekers, one might have expected the greater presence in the journal of articles about them. The slow take-off may well have been expected but in no later quinquennium did articles about this group, as coded for this study, exceed 4 per cent of the respective total.

Country coverage

Having set out some major findings of *ERS*’s subject coverage, what has been its country coverage? This, with respect to authorships, has already been shown as impressively cosmopolitan, and the country coverage of subject matter is necessarily even more diverse. Over the course of forty years *ERS* has published articles on about 125 individual countries. This number includes a few that no longer exist (e.g., Yugoslavia before and after its break-up, the USSR), some that are relatively new in their current form (e.g., Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Czech Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Slovakia), some that were renamed after liberation (e.g., Namibia), and some whose independent status is not universally accepted (e.g., Abkhazia). In addition and not included in the total of countries are numerous

territories that in their own right have been the subject of articles; these include regions with greater or lesser urgings for independence and with varying degrees of autonomy (e.g., Alsace, the Basque Country, Brittany, Catalonia, Chechnya, Flanders, Hong Kong, Kashmir, Quebec, Xinjiang Uygur), and separate overseas territories of varying statuses (e.g., French Polynesia, Hawaii, Puerto Rico). Analyses of multiple countries, some of them large-scale cross-national comparisons, had to be coded as simply ‘Several’, while certain articles were coded for geographical region (e.g., South-East Asia, Latin America).

Tables 4a and 4b demonstrate two self-evident truths. Articles about ethnic and racial issues are particularly likely to be generated in countries that have such issues in their domestic politics and it also helps to have resident academics willing to write about these. However, the latter factor is not an absolute one – these issues in some countries do attract academic researchers based in other countries. Table 4a gives data on the coverage of eleven individual countries whose affairs have featured in *ERS* sufficiently significantly to be worthy of comment. The United Kingdom, of course, has been a steady supplier of articles – albeit that there has been some ebbing and flowing but no linear trajectory; more than four-fifths of these articles were written by UK-based authors. There has been a reasonable representation of articles about France, albeit assisted in 1988-92 by a Special Issue of Migration and Migrants in France; however, only a quarter of these were contributed by first authors based in France, reflecting a French reluctance not to publish in their own language. The Federal Republic of Germany is similarly represented, though the higher percentage (41 per cent) of these articles from Germany-based authors reflects the recent willingness to write and publish in English. Similarly and showing the Dutch facility in English, The Netherlands has featured altogether in about 3 per cent of all articles, nearly 70 per cent of which were written by Dutch academics. Israel has featured in *ERS* throughout the forty years, offering about 4 per cent of all articles (albeit boosted in 1998-2002 by a Special Issue on Aspects of Ethnic Division in Contemporary Israel); Israeli academics first-authored almost three quarters of these articles. Canada offers an interesting case of declining representation: the pattern in Table 4a is quite clear and, in summary, 8 per cent of articles up to 1993 were about Canada, as were only 3 per cent thereafter, a decline attributable in part to Quebec becoming less a generator of articles; 64 per cent of these were written by Canada-based first authors. Unsurprisingly, the United States has been the country most represented in terms of

articles; in only one quinquennium was it below the United Kingdom as second-highest overall. Otherwise, the American pattern is steady, with relatively few non-American authors, mostly a few from the UK, venturing to write articles on the USA; as many as 88 per cent of articles on America were written by America-based authors. South Africa has provided a modest representation, though slightly more during its apartheid era than later, and only 39 per cent overall were written by domestically based first authors. Australia was always a venue providing a regular supply of articles, with little variation over the forty years, and more than four-fifths of these had Australian academics as first authors. Two other countries, Brazil and the People's Republic of China, are included less for the number of articles about each and more for their relevance as contemporary arenas for the occurrence of ethnicity-related issues; both had most authors who were writing about them not based in the respective countries – only 10 per cent of them in the case of Brazil and 14 per cent for China.

Although both Latin America and Africa contributed few first authorships, they both, as large regional areas, contributed more significantly in terms of article coverage. Latin American countries or the region had regular coverage with about 5 per cent of articles throughout. Five per cent of articles were about Africa or African countries, 7 per cent up to 1993 and 4 per cent thereafter. Also, about 7 per cent were about Asia or Asian countries, with a slightly higher percentage after 1993.

Conclusion

Some interesting results have been revealed by this analysis and they are worth summarizing. The journal and, one assumes the sub-discipline itself, clearly saw in several respects a significant caesura during the 1990s decade. Authorships were increasingly feminized, methodologies were significantly diversified by the influx of more ethnographic and ethnographic-type methodologies, and some new topic emphases emerged in the light of the changing political and intellectual circumstances of the period.

The editorial team that took over at the beginning of the 1990s introduced a number of noticeable changes of content and format and their perspectives may have had just a little to do with these substantive changes, though one suspects not much. It

would be unfair to imply that the pre-1990s character of the journal, with respect to female participation for example, was due to the curmudgeonly male chauvinism of the earlier editorial team. The increased feminization was reflected rather in the emergence of more women into the relevant academic categories, a phenomenon that was occurring internationally and in other disciplines. Part of the reason for the changes of focus and of methodologies, and one can debate how much, may have been due to the increased popularity in the discipline of cultural perspectives, a development not wholly welcomed by every *ERS* contributor – and sometimes aggressively criticized by at least one (e.g., Banton 2003).

The analysis had also shown that the history of *ERS*, probably like that of most academic journals, may be described by the corny cliché of ‘stability and change’. Some topics have unsurprisingly made a steady and sometimes increasing contribution throughout, whereas others such as Islam and Muslims, as well as certain now-current concepts, have experienced increased prominence. The same observation may be made about country coverage, where some countries and areas of the world have contributed subject matter to the journal more or less steadily throughout its forty years, the UK, Israel and the United States being obvious examples; Canada, on the other hand, is one whose presence has rather fallen away, whilst others have increased their representation, though not usually spectacularly.

For the future, it may or may not be a pleasing thought that there is little likelihood that the sort of subject matter on which *ERS* has been committed to reporting for forty years shows little sign of any immediate diminution or loss of relevance. There will surely long be a subject matter about which the journal can report, and doubtless many excellent authors to supply the material for this. Much of this is likely to be depressing – codes such as ‘ethnic conflict’, ‘hate crime’, ‘racism’, ‘racial discrimination’, ‘racial harassment’, ‘xenophobia’, and even ‘genocide’, are not likely soon to be unnecessary in a classification of the journal’s content. However, the cultural diversity that comes from the ethnic variety of modern societies is welcome to all but racists and the more rabid current-day nationalists. Difference, as long as combined with mutual tolerance, could be a desideratum for every thinking citizen. Multiculturalism is a concept more contested now than it once was, but the right-wing alternative of condemning diversity – perhaps exemplified by the historical example of Theodore Roosevelt’s complaint against ‘hyphenated Americanism’ – is surely much worse.

Notes

1. The decision of what to count as an ‘article’ for the purpose of the following analyses was not wholly straightforward. The basic rule of thumb, perhaps somewhat generous on occasion, was that an Introduction to a Special Issue/Section or Themed Issue that equalled or exceeded ten pages was deemed for this purpose ‘an article’. This removed the obviously minimalist Introductions but allowed others, some long and containing extensive analyses of their own, to be included.
2. Not that there were no women working in the subject area. Sixteen per cent (not high but far from negligible) of authors/first authors of *ERS* articles published between 1978 and April 1989 were women.
3. This definition is to distinguish Special Issues from Themed Issues or issues with Themed Sections, where the normal editors have brought together in a single issue or section papers on the same theme that were unsolicited and independently submitted by the normal submission process. There have been eight of these themed issues or sections in the period since 2009.
4. Till 2015 the journal was printed in a Times New Roman font. A switch by the publisher in 2016 to the uglier sans serif Myriad Pro typeface was with a view to facilitating word recognition in on-screen reading and also because it is deemed more suitable for readers with dyslexia.
5. In all but a tiny number of cases it was possible to give a gender attribution, a task greatly assisted in recent years by the availability of the internet. Those few without an attribution usually had androgynous forenames and were not elsewhere gender-described.
6. Note that, rather than introduce the complication of a further sub-analysis, ‘first author’ also includes ‘only author’. Seventy-one per cent of articles were sole-authored; 21 per cent were double-authored; 6 per cent were triple-authored; just 2 per cent were quadruple-authored. A tiny handful had more than four co-authors; four had five, two had six, and one truly exceptional one listed nine, enough to make up a rowing eight plus cox! Seventy-three per cent of first

authors were based in the same country as their second author, as were 76 per cent of first compared with their third authors.

7. Some authors were identified with more than one institution, each in a different country; they were coded according to the one that was their principal institution of employment.
8. This is not really the place to enter the controversial territory of whether women have a gender-based preference for 'softer' methodologies and, if so, why – a topic on which there is an existing literature. This may be true, it is agreed, for explicitly feminist articles, though such articles are not usually the sort for *ERS*. For authors pointing out that this particular type of subject matter may attract qualitative methodologies, see, for example, Cohen, Hughes, and Lampard (2011), and for an author pointing out the female authors are not necessarily averse to quantitative methodologies, see Platt (2007), who is always a reliable debunker of the more extreme versions of any stereotype. There may, however, be an argument that the nature of ethnic and racial studies, as practised in present-period circumstances, is particularly suited to ethnographic and associated methodologies.
9. Articles were deemed to qualify as 'historical' if dealing with issues or events usually around thirty or more years earlier, as well as those analysing events of earlier eras. Thus, an article in 2015 discussing events and issues of the 1960s would be classified as 'historical'. Of course, an article being classified as 'historical' did not preclude the possibility of its also being classified as 'contemporary'; some articles discussed both 'historical' and 'contemporary' events and so were classified as both.
10. I am in any case less happy about the validity of this classification than I am for the others. Attempts at such matters as the definition of race, an ethnic group, racism, etc., were regarded as 'theoretical', but some authors arrogated this description to their contributions that I personally should not have regarded as 'theory'. The coding gave them the benefit of their arrogation, not that of my scepticism.
11. It may be thought that the introduction of keywords could have had a biasing effect, sensitizing the coding to concepts that might perhaps have been used to describe earlier articles but were not; however, reasons are adduced in particular cases to argue that there was no such bias.

12. It is intended to deposit the dataset in the Data Archive of the University of Essex, where it will be available for further analysis by anyone who wants to undertake the task.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest from the publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no funding for the production of this article.

References

- Banton, Michael. 2003. 'Discarding Park's Axiom'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26 (3): 546–550. doi: 10.1080/0141987032000067372.
- Bulmer, Martin. 2011. 'Guida Mary Crowley, 1915–2011'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34 (6), 897–901, doi: 10.1080/01419870.2011.575620.
- Cohen, Rachel Lara, Hughes, Christina, and Lampard, Richard. 2011. 'The Methodological Impact of Feminism: A Troubling Issue for Sociology?'. *Sociology* 45 (4): 570–586. doi: 10.1177/0038038511406599.
- Mullard, Chris. 1985. *Race, Power and Resistance*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Platt, Jennifer. 2007. 'The Women's Movement and British Journal Articles, 1950–2004' *Sociology* 41 (5), 961–975. doi:10.1177/0038038507080448.
- Roediger, David R. 1991. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso.
- Roediger, David R. 1994. *Towards the Abolition of Whiteness: Essays on Race, Politics and Working Class History*. London: Verso.

Table 1. Data on developments in **ERS** format, eight quinquennia since 1978

	1978-82	1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-2002	2003-07	2008-12	2013-17	1978-2017
Number of individual issues ¹	20	20	20	20	30	30	51	60	251
Mean and (Number) of articles per issue	6.35 (127)	6.35 (127)	5.80 (116)	7.00 (140)	6.57 (197)	6.80 (204)	7.84 (400)	9.22 (553)	7.43 (1,864)
Mean and (Number) of book reviews per issue	6.45 (129)	5.40 (108)	9.75 (195)	23.05 (461)	20.67 (620)	17.43 (523)	10.73 (547)	Not applicable ³	10.54 (2,646)
Mean and (Number) of books reviewed per issue ²	7.75 (155)	6.75 (135)	14.05 (281)	27.50 (550)	22.47 (674)	18.80 (564)	11.12 (567)	Not applicable ³	11.91 (2,990)
Number of research notes	4	10	1	5	1	0	0	0	21
Number of research reports	7	8	5	0	0	0	0	1	21
Number of review articles	10	12	16	18	10	7	6	0	79
Number of discussion/debate articles	0	1	1	1	3	3	12	1	22
Special issues and as %age of all issues ⁵	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	2 (10%)	5 (25%)	7 (23%)	11 (37%)	17 (33%)	22 (37%)	69 (27%)
Themed	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	3	10

issues/issues with themed section									
Symposia	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	6 ⁴

¹ Recent issues bound in pairs within a single journal product are regarded as two separate issues.

² This includes books reviewed in Review Articles.

³ Eleven issues from April 2014 to October 2017 of *ERS Review* contained a further 402 ordinary book reviews, 3 book review articles, and have reviewed a total of 454 books, including those reviewed in the Review Articles and Symposia. Issues in 2013 till the first appearance of *ERS Review* contained 63 book reviews and reviewed 64 books; these 63 and 64 are respectively included in the calculations for the forty-year figures.

⁴ The eleven issues of *ERS Review* to October 2017 contained a further 30 symposia.

⁵ This includes some issues with Special Sections.

Table 2. Characteristics of individual authors and articles in **ERS**, eight quinquennia since 1978, in percentages

	1978-82	1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-2002	2003-07	2008-12	2013-17	1978-2017
--	---------	---------	---------	---------	-----------	---------	---------	---------	-----------

i. Gender of first-listed author

% Female First Authors	15%	18%	15%	22%	37%	52%	52%	51%	41%
------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

ii. Country of institution of first-listed author

UK–pre-1992 University	22%	28%	27%	28%	24%	31%	13%	20%	22%
UK–post-1992 University	4%	1%	3%	4%	7%	4%	5%	5%	4%
Federal Republic of Germany	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	3%	3%	2%
The Netherlands	2%	5%	5%	3%	3%	2%	3%	6%	4%
Four Scandinavian countries	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	6%	5%	4%
Israel	6%	5%	3%	4%	6%	3%	4%	3%	4%
Canada	6%	10%	6%	9%	5%	1%	5%	5%	5%
USA	35%	35%	36%	36%	38%	38%	39%	31%	35%
Australia	9%	6%	8%	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%

(Ns)	(127)	(127)	(116)	(140)	(197)	(204)	(400)	(553)	(1864)
------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------

iii. Methodological style and substantive content

% Quantitative in style	31%	37%	35%	31%	18%	23%	32%	28%	29%
% Qualitative in style	5%	5%	7%	7%	19%	34%	35%	38%	26%
% Historical in content	28%	46%	44%	34%	24%	15%	8%	11%	20%
% Theoretical in content	35%	24%	10%	14%	21%	12%	6%	6%	12%