Knowledge production for whom? Doing migrations, colonialities and standpoints in non-hegemonic migration research

Anna Amelina

Published online: 25 Apr 2022.

Submit your article to this journal ⬚

Article views: 73

View related articles ⬚

View Crossmark data ⬚

Knowledge production for whom? Doing migrations, colonialities and standpoints in non-hegemonic migration research

Anna Amelina

Institute for Philosophy and Social Sciences, Brandenburg University Cottbus-Senftenberg, Cottbus, Germany

ABSTRACT
Building on the representation problem of migration studies, this article identifies current alternative knowledge production strategies in social scientific migration research. After reviewing calls for denaturalization, demigranticization and decolonization, it elaborates on an integrated "umbrella" perspective – the doing-migration approach – for implementing these alternative strategies. First, building on the socioconstructivist and performativist accounts, the article pleads for studying the institutional and non-institutional sayings and doings about "migration" that generate historic-specific and changeable migranticized societal orders. Second, the article synthesizes the doing-migration approach and coloniality/ies-sensitive approaches to explicitly study long-term, large-scale power asymmetries and patterns of inequalities in the context of the postcolonial, postsocialist and neo-colonial dynamics. Finally, in addressing the question "Who has the power of definition within migration studies?", this article differentiates between the concepts of standpoint and positionality.

Introduction

Current debates in European migration research have increasingly been characterized by multiple waves of criticism that question, among many other topics, the xenophobic narratives within national migration policies, the securitized forms of the European Union's migration governance, and the migrant-related forms of discursive othering that appear in the dominant media (e.g. De Genova and Tazzioli 2021). The common denominator among these multiple critical voices is their attempt to examine the central premises on which academic knowledge production in (social scientific and

interdisciplinary) migration studies is based (Nieswand and Drotbohm 2014), as well as their increasing call for alternative strategies of knowledge production (cf. Raghuram 2021). Accordingly, this article aims to identify the analytical potential of these emerging strategies, specifically those related to the *denaturalization* (Amelina and Faist 2012)*, demigranticization* (Dahinden 2016) *decolonization* (Mayblin and Turner 2021) of knowledge production. In essence, it strives to synthesize the most promising elements of these strategies while offering the performativist "doing-migration" approach (Amelina 2021) and combining it with transnational (Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer 2013), multiscalar (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011) and colonialities-sensitive (Mayblin and Turner 2021) concepts, as well as with accounts of standpoint theory (Harding 2004). Of particular importance in this regard is the (re)discovery of the eminent social-anthropological representation debate of the 1980s that critically examined the hegemonic role of scientists in academic and non-academic othering discourses of the populations studied (Clifford and Marcus 1986). In the current framework of migration studies, the problem of inadequate representation consists of (at least) three components.

The first component of the representation challenge relates to the fact that academic knowledge production in migration studies to some extent reproduces the "figure of the migrant" (Nail 2020), which originated from the dominant political (state- and EU-led) discourses. To be more precise, politically defined categories such as "migration crisis", "poverty migration" and the like become transformed into analytical categories within the context of the political requirements of third-party funding (at both the state and EU scales). In other words, even those scholars who seek to include alternative, non-mainstream paradigmatic voices in the production of academic knowledge run the danger of (sometimes unintentionally) equating "categories of political practice" with "categories of scientific analysis" (for a critique, see Brubaker 2013; Dahinden 2016).

The second component of the representation challenge relates to the fact that knowledge production in (West) European migration research is generated mainly from the point of view of the dominant institutions of (im)migration governance in the countries of the "Global North" (Grosfoguel, Oso, and Christou 2014). Consequently, we need to ask: What concepts would be appropriate for extending the established transnational studies in migration (Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer 2013; Levitt and Schiller 2004) in a way that addresses more explicitly the global and cross-border power asymmetries, including those created by the (post)colonial, postsocialist and neo-colonial relations?

Finally, the third component of the representation problem is rooted in the core logics of mainstream European migration studies, which assert that their own knowledge production is neutral (for a critique, see De Genova and Tazzioli 2021). To give an example, quantitative studies related to forced and/or

voluntary migration, settlement and labour market integration use statistical accounts as a way of objectifying the difference between "migrants" and "non-migrants" (for a critique, see Scheel 2021), thus appearing to be formulated from a neutral point of view. However, as I will show later, distinguishing between "objective" and "political" knowledge in itself can be seen to be problematic. Instead, migration studies that explicitly reflect both collective standpoints (Harding 2004) and individual researchers' positionality (Berger 2015) could serve to broaden the mainstream view.

This article builds on these three facets of the representation problem to addressing the demands for alternative forms of knowledge production in migration research. In the first section, it examines the critical calls for the denaturalization (e.g. Amelina and Faist 2012), demigranticization (Dahinden 2016) and decolonization (Mayblin and Turner 2021) of migration studies. Next, it elaborates on the main elements of the doing-migration approach (Amelina 2021), which denaturalizes the category of migration itself and offers a vocabulary for differentiating between the categories of (political) practice and those of social scientific analyses while including transnational and multiscalar optics. The third section discusses an appropriate societal contextualization of doing-migration processes by paying attention to multiple entangled types of colonialities. The fourth and final section returns to the subject of migration studies' alleged neutrality and addresses the question "Who speaks for the 'migrant'?" by proposing to analytically differentiate between the concepts of (collective) standpoints and (individual) positionality.

Alternative knowledge production strategies in migration studies: denaturalization, demigranticization and decolonization

What dominant forms of knowledge have been contested in the recent critical calls for denaturalization, demigranticization and decolonization in migration research? And what differences and similarities do these critical approaches imply?

Calls for the denaturalization of the main concepts and vocabulary of migration research (particularly within the context of integration, assimilation and push–pull approaches) go back to the mid-1990s, when academic knowledge production in this field began to face certain criticisms. Such calls were articulated in the transnational approaches to migration (Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer 2013; Levitt and Schiller 2004), the autonomy of migration approaches (Scheel 2019), critical border regime studies (Tsianos and Karakayali 2010) and Deleuzean readings of the "figure of the migrant" (Nail 2020). One of the most important critiques, however, was the questioning of the concept of methodological nationalism, which viewed "the limits of

society as conterminous with the nation-state, rarely questioning the nationalist ideology embedded in such a founding assumption" (Wimmer and Schiller 2003, 579). In response to this critique, a variety of approaches emerged that aimed to "denaturalize the national" in theories of migration (especially in transnational migration studies), in social theory (Beck and Sznaider 2006) and in social scientific research methodologies (Amelina and Faist 2012). Moreover, by paying particular attention to the transnational linkages of movers and stayers, these approaches questioned whether the epistemology of migration studies should be rooted in the idea of the "natural congruence of society, the institutional arrangements of the nation-state and the related territorial framework" (Amelina and Faist 2012, 3).

Similar to the calls for denaturalization, the objective of the eminent *calls for demigranticization* is to "critically (question) a-priori naturalizing categorizations as they are used by migration and integration scholars" (Dahinden 2016, 2208). In other words, scholars calling for demigranticization contest the position that "migration-related difference is naturally given" (Dahinden 2016). Instead, the distinction between "migrant" and "citizen" can be seen as the result of the hegemonic project of national(ism), which forged the production of academic knowledge in migration studies: "Migration and integration research itself originated within a nation-state migration and normalization apparatus" (Dahinden 2016, 2208, see also Anderson 2019). As the "national container" continues to be the most crucial "reference system for empirical research and theories" (Dahinden 2016, 2209), the congruence that emerged with the formation of the nation-states "between national, territorial, political, cultural and social boundaries" was replicated within migration and integration studies (Dahinden 2016). In the Foucauldian sense, this modern nation-state formation happened alongside the development of an institutional "state migration apparatus" consisting of various laws, institutional frameworks and discourses: "The idea of migrants as different from citizens and the perceived need for nation states to manage this difference were institutionalized" (Dahinden 2016, 2209; see also Gellner 1983). As a consequence, this infrastructure regulates mobility and "creates the label 'migration' and other migration-related categories" (Dahinden 2016, 2209). In other words, the calls for both denaturalization (as above) and demigranticization invite us to inspect the (naturalized) ways of producing academic knowledge around "migration".

Building on the mix of poststructuralist (Foucault 1972) and reflexive (Bourdieu 2001) thought and its application to migration studies, the call for demigranticization proposes three strategies to disentangle our academic knowledge production from the governance apparatus of migration and integration. The first strategy would be *to open migration studies to the wider field of social theories* while also including mobility approaches (Büscher and Urry 2009) and critical race theory (Anderson 2019), boundary-making approaches

(Barglowski 2019) and the methodologies applied in social network analysis (Bilecen 2013). A second strategy relates to *critical reflection on the practices of naming* and, in particular, differentiating between common-sense/political (emic) and analytical (etic) categories in migration studies (see also Dahinden, Fischer, and Menet 2020; Brubaker 2013). A third strategy involves a methodological reversal of the empirical analysis in migration studies, which includes "the proposition (…) *to move away from treating the migrant population as the unit of analysis* and investigation and instead direct the focus on parts of the whole population, which obviously includes migrants" (Dahinden 2016, 2217; emphasis by the author). Once again, both the call for denaturalization and the call for demigranticization urge us to pay attention to academic naming practices and their societal consequences and allow us to relate to the first facet of the representation challenge mentioned earlier – that is, migration scholars' frequent non-reflexive use of the "categories of social practice" instead of "categories of analysis".

To complement the above overview, the following paragraphs introduce *decolonial optics to migration research*, which also disclose migration sciences as a co-producer of hegemonic knowledge around migration, mobility, flight and the like. Decolonial approaches (e.g. Mayblin and Turner 2021) constitute an important body of knowledge that pays special attention to large-scale societal interdependencies of power, knowledge and inequality that cross the borders of nation states and regions (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2018). Thus, this body of literature can add a critical facet to the transnational studies in migration mentioned above (Wimmer and Schiller 2003; Levitt and Schiller 2004).

One of the key principles of decolonial thinking[1] is a critical reflection of coloniality as a founding societal principle of Western modernity (Quijano 2007). Thus, according to Tlostanova and Mignolo (2009) European modernity/ies should be approached as colonial enterprises, while modern (migration) sciences consequently also appear to be a part of the (neo)colonial projects. Building on both Marxist and critical realist assumptions (Wallerstein 1984), scholars of decolonialism who work in the field of migration studies invite us to recognize patterns of coloniality/ies as co-organizing the academic knowledge production (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2018, 2021).

Transferring these ideas to migration studies, coloniality-attentive thinkers (e.g. Mayblin and Turner 2021) invite us to recognize large-scale diachronic forms of entanglements between movements in the context of settler colonialism and the current large-scale movements from the Global South to the Global North (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2018, 2021). By doing so, coloniality/ies can be approached (in a very broad way) as a predominant type of global condition, which not only is relevant for the power relations between the former colonized regions and colonizer-actors, but also includes the global processes of geopolitical asymmetries cemented

by the workings of multinational corporations and supported by recent ideologies of neoliberalism (Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nişancıoğlu 2018). From this point of view, many current forms of "migration" (labour, intellectual, care, family and others) from the "peripheries" to the "centres" are seen to be embedded in specific forms of coloniality/ies, which presupposes an economic, political and intellectual superiority of "centres" over "peripheries" (see also Myrdal 1957).

The thought-providing quality of the call for decolonization lies in its explicit attention to the nexus between collective patterns of spatial relocation and colonially coined power relations. This optic makes it possible for us to consider the second facet of migration studies' representation problem, namely the "Northern-ness" of knowledge production in migration studies (Mignolo 2002). One consequence of the call for "decolonization" is an invitation to decentre the epistemic privilege of "Northern" knowledge in migration sciences.

Last but not least, all three calls for alternative knowledge production strategies speak to the third facet of migration studies' representation challenge, which is the question of "Who has the power of definition within migration studies?" While denaturalization and demigranticization address migration and integration research as "entangled with a particular migration apparatus and a discourse that normalize migration – and ethnicity-related difference" (Dahinden 2016, 2208), decolonization optics invite us to "delink" migration studies from the "Western epistemologies" (De Sousa Santos 2016, 19).

What umbrella perspective will allow us to bring together these various optics within the framework of alternative knowledge strategies? The following sections facilitate such a conceptualization, which includes three main elements: First, in order to address the first representation challenge of frequently equating "categories of social practice" and "categories of scientific analysis", I will elaborate on the doing-migration approach that studies social transformation of individuals into "migrants". The key argument of this approach is that, from an ontological standpoint, the constructs of "migration", "mobility", "integration" and "flight" are not naturally given. Building on the social-constructivist lens expressed by Niklas Luhmann (1990), it suggests that the "figure of a migrant" is socially generated by (institutional and non-institutional) "social sayings and doings" around migration. Moreover, relying on the performativist optic (Butler 1993), this argument specifically emphasizes the powerful (colonially coined) practices of naming and signification. At the same time, the doing-migration concept focuses on the denaturalizing strategies of scientific vocabulary, the importance of which have been outlined in the calls for denaturalization and demigranticization. In addition, this concept shares the decolonial scholars' assumption that European migration studies appear to some extent a "Northern" project.

Subsequently, for approaching the second facet of the representation challenge (namely Global North–coined knowledge production in migration research), this article offers insights into how the doing-migration perspective can be complemented by the coloniality-sensitive optic, the significance of which was outlined above. And, finally, in addressing the third facet of the representation problem, which relates to the question of who counts as an eligible speaker in the framework of migration studies, the paper pleads for an analytical differentiation between the conceptual notion of collective standpoints and individual researchers' positionality.

The "Doing-migration" approach: studying categories of practice through denaturalized categories of analysis

The main thrust of the doing-migration approach is its focus on institutional and everyday processes that, on a daily basis, transform individuals into "migrants" and that coin some practices of spatial relocation as "migration" and others as "mobility" and/or "flight". While to some extent sharing an intellectual kinship with the "doing gender" approach (West and Zimmerman 1987),[2] the notion of "doing migration" is alluded to the above mentioned transnational migration studies' intention to "denaturize" key categories of migration research (Wimmer and Schiller 2003), including the notion of "migration" itself. In addition, and in extending the above critical calls, the concept of doing migration invites us not only to reflect migration studies' *academic knowledge production tools*, but also to analyse *non-academic (institutional and everyday) knowledge production* around "migration", "integration", "flight" and "mobility" via conceptual synthesis of various elements.

Becoming a migrant: socio-constructivist and performativity-sensetive arguments

What are the conventional societal ways to transform individuals into "migrants"? For example, under what conditions do the movers from the current war in Ukraine count as "migrants", "refugees" or potential "European citizens"? The doing-migration approach starts with the argument that the construct of "migration" is *socially created according to categorical distinctions and classifications* that differentiate between "migrants" and "non-migrants". In this *social-constructivist and performativity-sensitive reading* (Luhmann 1990; Butler 1993), "migration" is socially produced within everyday contexts by social *categorizations* that classify individuals based on their language, place of birth, physical appearance and/or possibly other attributes (Amelina 2021). Those persons socially defined as "migrants" might also be socially differentiated in some administrative and/or publicly relevant subcategories. Such categorical subdifferentiations often relate to legal status (e.g.

long-term resident or asylum seeker) and the dominant public conceptions of deservingness with regard to some migranticized groups (e.g. highly skilled) as opposed to others (e.g. unskilled or forced movers). In other words, dominant social constructions of migration, integration, mobility and flight are the outcomes of *performative references* to certain (context- and historic-specific) classifications, sets of categories and narratives (e.g. Crawley and Skleparis 2018), with "performativity" defined as a surplus of meaning with related social power effects (Butler 1993). A good example from recent debates would be the public media and administrative articulations of the category "refugeeness" – while the media often equate the term "refugee" with "migrant" (Sigona 2018), individuals officially considered to be recognized asylum seekers are offered certain rights that are quite limited in scope. In other words, when we consider alternative ways of producing knowledge in migration research, we are invited to "follow" certain classifications, sets of categories and narratives and to provide their "thick descriptions". A specific benefit of this approach is its focus on the multiple, sometimes contradictory or overlapping, performativities of narrations and categorizations around "migration", "integration", "mobility" and "flight". To give an example, a mover from Poland is now approached as a migrant in the UK, as a mobile EU citizen, if he or she resides in Germany and as a forced migrant in both countries, if he/she/them is a queer person (because of current anti-LGBTIQNA+ politics of Poland).

Doing migration as a repetitive process

The explanatory value attached to the notion of performativity should not be equated with relativism or arbitrariness, since the doing-migration approach is also based on *praxeological assumptions* that call for an examination of the concrete (embodied) routines of the social production of migration (Bourdieu 2020). It suggests that we *study the repetitive routines of doing-migration* (those which transform individuals into migrants) as *performative naming strategies*[3] *at various levels of societal organization*, such as the macro-level of large-scale institutions, the meso-level of organizations and networks, and the micro-level of face-to-face interactions. At the macro-level, studying institutional (naming) routines of migration and citizenship governance will allow us to better understand the principles, narratives and practices that regulate access to political and economic activities and to various types of rights, including the right of spatial movement (e.g. Carmel and Paul 2013 for the European Union). At the meso-level, an analysis of organizational (naming) routines can reveal how organizations such as schools, hospitals, private companies and border control "discipline" persons into migrants (e.g. regarding EU border security, see Léonard 2010). In this way, we would be able to reconstruct the organizational strategies and premises

that channel an (unequal) distribution of relevant resources according to migration-related categorizations (e.g. Tissot 2018). Finally, at the micro-level, studying face-to-face encounters and interactions makes it possible to disclose the tacit ascriptions and attributions concerning "migration" that take place (often incidentally) at daily places of work, in neighbourhoods or during kinship gatherings (Ryan 2010).

Thus, a further benefit of the doing-migration approach is that despite its focus on complex performativities, it pays attention to a structural/material dimension of migration-making. Building on the cultural-sociological accounts of Pierre Bourdieu (2020) and Andreas Reckwitz (2002), it also emphasizes that the daily repetitive routines (of doing migration) are based on narratives of belonging, membership and deservingness that have immediate direct power effects in terms of the formation of hierarchical social stances. To give an example: while "permanent residents" in the EU member states can freely move within the EU (for tourist purposes), those categorized as "asylum seekers" do not have such a privilege. Such outcomes of performative power, cemented in concrete (e.g. administrative or every-day) routines, are evident in the differential educational, labour market or welfare biographies of those categorized in several ways as migrants, refugees or asylum seekers.

Doing migration as a process that is based on gendered, racialized and classed knowledge

It goes without saying that these analyses to detect differences in the way individuals are transformed into migrants at various levels of the social organization need to be *sensitive to intersectional forms of knowledge* (Collins 1986). Such intersectional knowledge patterns are visible in the hierarchies created between actors who are labelled "migrants" in (historically specific and changeable) gendered, ethnicized/racialized and classed ways and those who are not (Amelina 2017). A prominent example relates to public representations of the gendered vulnerability of mobile women (e.g. in the context of the current movements from Ukraine to Europe), whereas male movers (particularly those racialized as "Muslims") are frequently presented in the media as undeserving, aggressive or oversexualized "refugees".

The interest in knowledge orders surrounding "migration" suggests that we bring together elements of the sociology of knowledge (Foucault 1972) *and* the performativity-sensitive reading of intersectional theory (Butler 1993). With the sociology of knowledge perspective, we can study (historic specific and changeable) discursive formation of non-academic knowledge patterns around "migration", while the intersectional perspective highlights the idea that social naming practices with regard to belonging, membership and deservingness are formed along with multiple (overlapping)

classifications around gender, race/ethnicity, class, space and other axes of unequal social relations.

A specific benefit of this lens is that it points to a multiperspectivity of performativities around "migration" depending on which actors apply migration-related categorizations ("oppressors" or "oppressed") and how they are applied (i.e. in gendered, racialized or classed ways) in the institutional (border-control, educational or labour market institutions) or non-institutional context (i.e. neighbourhoods, kinship or diasporic networks). Potentially, the same categories can be used as a resource for either oppression or self-empowerment by migranticized individuals (see also, Dahinden, Fischer, and Menet 2020).

Studying "doing migration" using a transnational and multiscalar optics

The doing-migration approach, because of its intellectual proximity to transnational studies' criticism of methodological nationalism (Wimmer and Schiller 2003), remains sensitive to the multiplicity of sociospatial settings in which the "sayings and doings" around "migration" occur. Thus, let me first outline the academic knowledge production strategies that result from the synthesis of the doing-migration approach with transnational studies (Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer 2013). Let me, second, sketch the utilization of this approach in the context of multiscalar spatial analysis (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011).

Originally, transnationally oriented migration studies focused on the various sets of ties that movers and stayers maintain between the sending and receiving countries, while also paying attention to multiple temporary destinations, chain mobilities and re-migrations (Levitt and Schiller 2004). Many of these studies have dealt with analyses of the spatial reorganization of social relations in multilocal settings (Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer 2013) and new, non-national forms of social inequalities, applying and reinterpreting theories of social mobility (Weiß 2005), social and symbolic boundaries (Barglowski 2019), intersectionality (Amelina 2017) and postcolonial relations (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2021).

Relating the doing-migration approach to transnational settings (that are generated by the practices of movers and stayers) means going beyond the analysis of sending/receiving countries' governance, regulation frameworks and diaspora organizations' structure, and beyond the research that quantifies multiple types of transnational practices maintained by movers and stayers. Instead, and this is an option for the alternative knowledge production strategies, the doing-migration approach involves studying performative naming strategies around "migration" by actors, organizations or institutions both in the "context of origin" or "context of destination" with regard to the studied populations. In a nutshell, the analytical focus on

"doing migration" within the framework of transnational studies means paying attention to the ways in which individuals are migranticized in some settings (usually the receiving contexts) and de- or re-migranticized in others (usually the sending contexts) (cf. Barglowski 2019).

However, transnational perspectives have been extended by the multiscalar spatial approaches that emphasize the relevance of multiple sociospatial scales (i.e. local, national, transnational, global [and sometimes also regional and supranational]) for theoretical and empirical analyses of cross-border relations and practices (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011).[4] These studies build on the premise that each scale is produced by the nexus of the material elements, social practices and discursive narratives; thus, in an interconnected world, many arenas of transnationalized social life (such as patterns of employment [Pries 2013], family life and care [Baldassar and Merla 2013], but also of religious life [Levitt 2007]) become organized in a multiscalar manner (i.e. in a way that presupposes the nested or intersected entanglements of the various sociospatial scales).

From a doing-migration approach point of view, such a multiscalar perspective has two important consequences for revising academic knowledge production strategies. The *first consequence* makes it analytically possible to study separately the social production processes of migration (e.g. performative naming strategies and related social routines, involved actors and institutions) at each sociospatial scale. On the global scale, for example, UN-related bodies adopted the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in 2018 by which social reality is migranticized by reproducing the narrative of current "disorderly migration" (Pécoud 2021, 29) and picturing "migrants" as those subjects who "should provide the flexible and mobile labour necessary to the global economy" (Pécoud 2021, 30). Simultaneously, at the local scale (city, locality or neighbourhood), many different facets of "migration" are articulated in specific urban narratives of city districts, local myths around accommodation centres or urban memories of movements from the previous historic periods (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009).

The *second consequence* of applying "doing migration" here suggests that more attention can be paid to how various sociospatial (global, local, national, transnational) "doings of migration" (e.g. performative naming strategies and related social routines, involved actors and institutions) overlap, amplify or contradict each other, thus generating a certain dissonance in the case of contradictions. For example, far-right narratives of "migration" at the global scale (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2018) may encounter anti-racist solidarity projects on the local scale that try to demigranticize the local social relations (Jørgensen and Schierup 2020).

Wrapping up, the core benefit of the doing-migration approach is that it is reflexive towards both non-academic knowledge production around "migration" *and* academic knowledge constructions of the migration

sciences. Focusing on non-academic repetitive performative categorizations around "migration", this approach suggests paying attention to the multiperspectivity of naming that depends on the actors and (institutional) contexts of categorization practices, because this analytical approach is explicitly interested in analysing the (historic-specific) social knowledge patterns that coin the repetitive "doings of migration". At the same time, this concept is also reflexive about its own academic knowledge production. It allows us to analytically differentiate between categories of practice (i.e. "migration", "integration", "flight", "mobility" etc.) and categories of analysis (i.e. "*doing* migration", "*doing* integration", "*doing* flight", "*doing* mobility" etc.). In the next section, I will outline how the concept of "doing migration" benefits from the coloniality-sensitive extension of the transnational optic in addressing the second facet of the representation challenge.

Deconstructing the "Northern" lens by focusing on the multiple entangled colonialities of "doing migration"

The research agendas of European migration studies are linked to the interests of the dominant institutions that govern (im)migration in the countries of the "Global North" through the mechanism of third-party funding (Mayblin and Turner 2021; Mignolo 2002). There are at least two reasons for using coloniality-sensitive vocabulary in addressing this second facet of the representation challenge. First, the focus on coloniality allows us to perform the analysis of doing-migration(s) while considering the large-scale, long-term societal relations of (colonially coined) power and domination. Second, this vocabulary simultaneously provides a sound basis for enriching the transnational studies in migration introduced above (Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer 2013) by studying how the transnational ties of movers and stayers (between the sending and receiving countries) are embedded in the entangled power asymmetries created by (post)colonial or postsocialist and/or neo-colonial relations. Such a coloniality-sensitive focus calls us to pay attention to how groups of mobile individuals (to some extent) simultaneously experience specific patterns of coloniality associated with the sending context and (the possible) different coloniality-patterns associated with the receiving context of "migration".

When we think about multiple intersecting colonialities that emerge in the context of cross-border movements and entanglements, one of the starting points would be to look at the concept of power described by Anibal Quijano (2007). In brief, Quijano approaches the coloniality of power as a "global cultural order revolving around European or Western hegemony" (Quijano 2007) and equates coloniality with the societal formation of Western modernity (the colonial essence of capitalist modernity) – "modernity(ies)" as a universalizing project of racialized hierarchization

(Quijano 2007). Despite the inspirational quality of the "coloniality of power" concept, we should avoid the uniform and homogenizing way of thinking that privileges analysis of a single form of coloniality (and thus unintentionally reproduces Cartesian notions of the consistency and homogeneity of the social). Approaching colonialities as a multiplicity will allow us to avoid assigning epistemic primacy to a single form of coloniality and thus reduce overgeneralizing ways of social scientific thinking (Gandarilla Salgado, García-Bravo, and Benzi 2021). Based on the state of the art (Maldonado-Torres 2016; Tlostanova 2012), we can heuristically distinguish among three different types of coloniality (although this overview is by definition not exhaustive).

The first type of pattern, coloniality/ies in the context of Western/European colonial expansion, has been based on the European project of racialized inequality (Bhambra 2007; Go 2013). Multiple capitalist modernities have been embedded in a "system of colonial racial differentiation" and a "hierarchical system of the control of labour" (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2018, 20). The "colonial matrix" is characterized by narratives of progress (i.e. from the early missionary claims in the colonized, non-European regions from the sixteenth century onwards to the International Monetary Fund's development politics in the second half of the twentieth century up to the present) and respective universalist distinctions (e.g. "progressive" vs. "backward", "civilized" vs. "not civilized").

The second type of coloniality/ies pattern relates to postsocialist (including post-Soviet) relations (Boatcă and Parvulescu 2020; Tlostanova 2012). This context-sensitive application analyses the ways in which the narratives of progress and missionizing Marxist ideologies have been reproduced in socialist project(s) of an (imagined) socialist justice. In translating Morozov's concept of the Soviet Union as a subaltern empire (Morozov 2015) to (post)-socialist (imperial) relations, we can approach socialist coloniality/ies as a subaltern (in relation to the "West"), anti-Western materialist project of (class) equality and progress (of state socialism). In the context of current postsocialist relations, coloniality/ies continue to be articulated in the superiority and missionizing claims of former socialist societies (towards themselves and other regions) that still function as an essential source for individual and collective belonging (Tlostanova 2012).

The third pattern of coloniality, the conceptual notion of neo-colonialism, describes a practice of exploitation that is not solely related to settler colonialism but is mediated economically, epistemologically, legally and politically (Maldonado-Torres 2016). Current writings often associate neo-colonialism with neoliberal economic models and exploitation (Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nişancıoğlu 2018). Thus, we need to "recognize modes of neocolonialism in the present, for example, in the form of land grabs, the appropriation of mineral wealth, the denial of recourse to public funds on the part of refugees

and migrants, or new justifications for unfree labour in the management of global inequality" (Bhambra 2021, 80).

If we build on the assumption that "migration" is a socially generated, historic-specific and changeable phenomenon, there are two important reasons for paying attention to the entanglements of various forms of coloniality while studying the social routines of "doing migration". First, by paying attention to the intersection of multiple colonialities, we can *avoid the overgeneralization* that some theories tend to reproduce. In other words, migration studies based on teleological ideas and the related notion of uniform global power dynamics (e.g. early world-systems approaches [Frank 1966]) tend (in part) to interpret early and very early historic forms of spatial movement (transregional, interimperial) as "migration" without reconstructing the historic-specific political, religious and everyday forms of knowledge that accompanied such movements. However, such a reconstruction of knowledge patterns related to those movements would be extremely important, because labelling the settlement of individuals from the UK in Australia in the nineteenth century as "migration", for example, ahistorically migranticizes movements that were originally coined in a different way, namely as "settler colonialism".

Second, analysing only one form of coloniality in the context of migration research (i.e. only postsocialist or only neo-colonial) would risk overlooking the much more complex processes of the *intersection of colonial rationalities* in the social production of (transnational) "migration". The proposed focus on entangled colonialities fruitfully extends the transnational optic in way that allows us to consider (cross-border) entanglements between the various types of coloniality (i.e. postcolonial, postsocialist and neo-colonial) and the impact of such entangled societal frameworks on the complex "sayings" and "doings" of migration. To give an example, a Ukrainian worker from the eastern part of Ukraine who moves to Poland to work in the agricultural sector may be othered in the neo-colonial manner within the context of the EU but may also be labelled as a "fellow country-men" within the postsocialist and (post)imperial context of current Russia. Thus, focusing on the impact of multiple intersecting colonialities when analysing migranticized realities makes it possible to consider a potential simultaneity of the (colonially coined) superiority and inferiority positionings of (some) mobile individuals that becomes evident only if we set the analysis within a wider cross-border realm.

The proposed focus on multiple intersecting colonialities in analysing the societal generation of "migration", "integration", "mobility", "flight" and the like has two interrelated methodological implications, particularly in relation to the "decolonization" of academic knowledge production and the formation of alternative academic knowledge strategies (Lutz and Anna Amelina 2021).

The *first implication* is the invitation to scholars to detect colonial forms of power relations and related narratives in the institutional settings (e.g. in migration and citizenship governance), the organizational settings (e.g. disciplining techniques of "migrants" by administrators and at workplaces) and the everyday settings (e.g. regarding neighbourhood activities, kinship settings) of "doing migration" – not only in the receiving context but also in the sending contexts and within the framework of multiscalar configurations. In other words, disclosing the "coloniality/[ies] of migranti[ci]zation" (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2018) will allow us to identify the continuities in the complex colonial narratives of "migration" and "migrants". Such continuities can then be reproduced in multiple ways. One prominent example would be the (colonial) figure of a "migrant stranger" that is characterized by an essential inferiority in relation to the visible non-migrant majority, particularly in terms of the integration and assimilation (Schinkel 2018). Deconstructing this figure from the (classical) Westernized (post)colonial point of view would require identifying occidentalist colonial traces of knowledges about migrant inferiority that were prominently reconstructed by postcolonial thinkers (Go 2013). Employing a neo-colonial perspective, on the other hand, would suggest the need to interpret the colonial narratives evident in EU-European and national(ist) integration rhetoric as being a neo-colonial project (Schinkel 2018). Finally, postsocialist patterns of coloniality can be traced by examining processes of migranticization within wider postsocialist contexts, such as from Ukraine to Poland, from Russia to Finland, from Vietnam to East Germany, or from China to the US. Here we can reconstruct the peculiarities of postsocialist forms of movers' (self-)othering (e.g. decisions to move based migranticized subjects' imagined notions about the civilized "West" [Krivonos and Näre 2019]) and/or movers' perceptions of socialist superiority.

Concomitantly, the *second implication* pleads for radical reflection on the key approaches that have served for decades as the basis for both social scientific research in general (e.g. theories of modernity, rationality or agency) and migration research in particular (e.g. assimilation, integration and participation approaches) (Anderson 2019). This optic aims not only to question colonially coined knowledge patterns inscribed in migration research, but also, in an ideal case, to reconstruct alternative epistemologies that were hidden by colonial once. The Epistemologies of the South as a mode of reflection is quite thought-provoking in this regard, since, in reference to the writings of Frantz Fanon (2016), they suggest a way of focusing on the intellectual justice projects of those (migranticized) social actors who are humiliated, devalued, disregarded, disavowed and dealing with the "colonial wound" (Tlostanova and Mignolo 2009, 143). Furthermore, the task of decolonizing academic knowledge production is even more challenging if we consider the multiple intersecting colonialities, since

"decolonizing" our theories and research strategies to critically deconstruct a specific type of coloniality (e.g. a "Western imperial project) might (potentially) end up strengthening other types of coloniality, such as knowledge formed within the framework of the postsocialist setting (the imperial project of Putin's Russia or postsocialist China) or the neo-coloniality of the EU.

Who speaks for the "migrant"? Towards the multiplicity of standpoints in migration research

By emphasizing the "Northern-ness" of (European) migration research, the coloniality-sensitive perspective implies that the analysis of "sayings an doings" around migration does not take place from a neutral point of view. The idea of critically disclosing the supposed neutrality of migration studies' academic knowledge production relates to the third facet of the representation challenge, namely to the question "Who should be the eligible speaker in the framework of European migration studies?" Heated debates concerning this topic often urge approaches in which migranticized subjects would participate in the production of academic knowledge (Mata-Codesal, Kloetzer, and Maiztegui-Oñate 2020). Participatory methods have become very fashionable in this regard (e.g. Kaptani et al. 2021), and in part they echo the so-called dialogical turn that has taken place in social anthropology (Smith 1989), in which ("white" "male") researchers in postcolonial contexts would include the experiences of their ("non-white" "non-male") counterparts into the research process on an equal basis (in whatever way the term "equal" was defined). Should we, consequently, suggest revolutionary change and replace the figure of the "non-migrant" researcher with the figure of the "migrant researcher" in order to enhance alternative and counterhegemonic knowledge production? This question is of particular relevance if the figure of the non-migrant researcher is associated with the interests of state-led institutions and their hegemonic agendas.

However, such a radical devaluation of the non-migrant researcher's legitimacy in producing knowledge about how "migration" is done, raises the risk of essentialization, since calls like these may lead to the respective researchers' biographies being inspected and to the delegitimization of their research accounts on the basis of non-scientific standards or standards based on non-scientific/everyday assumptions (Nowicka and Ryan 2015). In this reading, the essentialization of researchers' traits or biographies (i.e. "migrant" vs. "non-migrant") may reduce their scientific accounts to a collection of (self-)ascribed individual traits that are deemed to be the essence of the person.

To avoid the danger of essentialization of researchers' biographies, but still to be able to address power asymmetries in academic knowledge production regarding "migration realities", I suggest that the concepts of *positionality* and

standpoint be differentiated. While feminist and Marxist theories of "standpoint" relate to the collective intellectual projects (that are ideally inspired by social justice movements) (Harding 2004; Haraway 1988), the notion of positionality is linked to "the process of a continual internal dialogue and critical self-evaluation of a researcher's positionality as well as active acknowledgement and explicit recognition that this position may affect the research process and outcome" (Berger 2015, 220). So, in contrast to the notion of positionality, the standpoint-related perspectives are interested in deconstructing the nexus between the (academic) production of knowledge and the *societal power structures* (Collins 1986). Thus, standpoint theories question the assumption that the politicization of theory is detrimental to scientific knowledge (Ibid.). Rather than pretending that academic knowledge is universal and neutral, scholars are urged to disclose the politicized projects to which their academic knowledge accounts are related. The "idea of positional reflexivity [echoes standpoint theories insofar as it] challenges the view of knowledge production as independent of the researcher who produces it and of knowledge as objective" (Berger 2015, 220). Indeed, self-reflection regarding individual researchers' positionality has become a standard procedure in many subfields of migration studies and should remain one of the important tools in migration sciences (Kaptani et al. 2021).

Consequently, in addressing the representation challenge of who should be the eligible speaker in (European) migration studies, this article argues that we can benefit from the views of the standpoint theorists and their invitation to scholars to disclose *collective* academic standpoints. The greatest benefit afforded by (originally Marxist – and feminist-inspired) standpoint theories when it comes to alternative forms of knowledge production is their emphasis on the "historical and social locatedness of knowledge projects" and "on the way collective political and intellectual work can transform a source of oppression into a source of knowledge and potential liberation" on the basis of "social justice projects" (Harding 2004, 10). Translating these ideas into the field of (European) migration studies, we can argue that the latter (with some exceptions) still implicitly assert that their own knowledge production is neutral. However, such self-proclaimed neutrality hides both the multiplicity of standpoints and the potential hierarchies of standpoints in migration studies' academic knowledge production (e.g. "majority" vs. "minority", "non-migranticized" vs. "migranticized", "a critical vs. an uncritical view of the migration-integration apparatus") (see also, Grosfoguel, Oso, and Christou 2014; Mählck 2013). This optic has two methodological implications when it comes to adopting alternative academic knowledge strategies.

The first (basic) implication is the invitation to disclose and map the multiple standpoints within migration research that are currently still implicit. Disclosing standpoints to the academic audience (and beyond) is extremely

important, since the standard (seemingly neutral) forms of knowledge pro-duction (i.e. rational choice approaches or integration theories, etc.) often carry implicit assumptions that benefit the interests of the "power apparatus" and contradict the social justice claims of those individuals who are affected by (European) border regimes. The disclosure and mapping of standpoints can be realized by asking questions such as "Who is the audience for the gen-erated knowledge?" and "Does this knowledge promote interest in and the (biopolitical) disciplining techniques of the dominant institutions of migration governance?"

As for the second methodological implication, one way of disclosing standpoint multiplicity is to include the (collective) "figure of a migrant" as a *legitimate* holder of academic power (without replacing or cancelling the figure of the "non-migrant" researcher). This implication hints at the fact that until very recently (collective) "migrant figure" was rarely seen as a legit-imate speaker in academic migration studies' standard knowledge pro-duction, owing to the general assumption that research from the particularist standpoint "does not fit" in the "standard research norms" of social scientific writing (Harding 2004, 4). At the same time, this recognition of the "figure of a migrant" should not go hand in hand with the equalization of (collective) standpoints with the (individual) researchers' positionality, nor should it contribute to the homogenizing of views on the (multivocal) stand-point(s) of the migranticized subjects.

In sum, the acknowledgement of academic knowledge production as being standpoint-related discloses the fact that the analysis of institutional, organizational and everyday routines of "doing migration" is channelled by collective (academic) standpoints, some of which imagine themselves to be neutral, while others are conscious of their political implications.

Concluding thoughts

Self-reflexivity in migration studies is by definition an unfinished project. The aim of this article was not to provide a prefabricated and fixed conceptual tool for performing critical migration research, but rather to offer several con-ceptual elements for addressing the representation challenges that migration studies currently face.

First, in order to question the frequent analytical slippage between "cat-egories of scientific analysis" and "categories of social practice" (the first element of the representation challenge), this paper invites the reader to analyse the repetitive performative namings with regard to "migration", "inte-gration", "flight" and "mobility" at the various levels of societal organization (i.e. macro, meso, micro). The multiperspectivity of such performative "migration" narratives has to be taken into account in order study how they are routinely applied to generate "migration realities" (e.g. in a gendered

or racialized way), in what contexts (institutional or not) and at what sociospatial scales (global, local, national or transnational).

Second, such an analysis requires disclosure of the "Northern-ness" of migration studies' knowledge production (the second element of the representation challenge). Thus, as a set of alternative knowledge production strategies, the "decolonization" of migration research invites us to carefully question the colonially coined knowledge patterns inscribed in migration research *and* to consider the potentially multiple patterns of coloniality/ies within empirical "migration realities". In an ideal case, while researching the "doings of migration", we could try to reconstruct alternative epistemologies of movement and stasis that are/were hidden by colonial knowledge projects.

Finally, we can respond to the question of "Who speaks for the migrant" (the third element of the representation challenge) by referring to the standpoint theorists' invitation to map the *collective (usually politicized) standpoints* that we, as migration scholars, rely on in our research. By doing so, we will finally be able to address questions such as "To what extent does the knowledge we produce have the potential to harm the (self-)migranticized individual?" And, most importantly, "Does the standpoint disclosed allow (self-)migranticized individuals themselves to understand the powerful naming practices of the migration-integration apparatus?"

Notes

1. Concomitantly, decolonially oriented scholars differentiate between notions of decolonization and decoloniality. While 'decolonization' is conventionally associated with the political process of independence after the end of colonialism in the second half of 20th century, 'decoloniality' (as proposed by Annibal Quijano and developed further by Walter Mignolo and others) aims to disclose the Occidentalist 'matrix' in the epistemic foundations of capitalist global power relations and invites researchers to think in terms of multiple temporal prospects toward 'cultures' and 'civilizations'.
2. However, as I will outline below, the 'doing-migration' approach relies on praxeological assumptions (Bourdieu 2020), while the 'doing gender' approach builds on Harold Garfinkel's ethno-methodological accounts.
3. Expressions such as 'categorizations', 'performative references to classifications, categories and narratives' and 'performative naming strategies' are used in this article interchangeably.
4. According to their socioconstructivist origins [Brenner 2004]), multi-scalar theories study the historic-specific production and mutual shaping of various sociospatial scales (Amelina 2017).

Disclosure statement

References

Amelina, Anna. 2017. *Transnationalizing Inequalities in Europe*. Routledge: London.

Amelina, Anna. 2021. "After the Reflexive Turn in Migration Studies: Towards the Doing Migration Approach." *Population, Space and Place* 27 (1): e2368.

Amelina, Anna, and Thomas Faist. 2012. "De-Naturalizing the National in Research Methodologies: Key Concepts of Transnational Studies in Migration." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (10): 1707–1724.

Anderson, Bridget. 2019. "New Directions in Migration Studies: Towards Methodological De-Nationalism." *Comparative Migration Studies* 7, Art. 36.

Baldassar, Loretta, and Laura Merla, eds. 2013. *Transnational Families, Migration and the Circulation of Care: Understanding Mobility and Absence in Family Life*. London: Routledge.

Barglowski, Karolina. 2019. *Cultures of Transnationality in European Migration: Subjectivity, Family and Inequality*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Beck, Ulrich, and Natan Sznaider. 2006. "Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda." *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 1–23.

Berger, Roni. 2015. "Now I See It, Now I Don't: Researcher's Position and Reflexivity in Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Research* 15 (2): 219–234.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2007. *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2021. "Decolonizing Critical Theory? Epistemological Justice, Progress, Reparations." *Critical Times* 4 (1): 73–89.

Bhambra, Gurminder K., Dalia Gebrial, and Kerem Nişancıoğlu, eds. 2018. *Decolonising the University*. London: Pluto Press.

Bilecen, Başak. 2013. "Analyzing Informal Social Protection Across Borders: Synthesizing Social Network Analysis with Qualitative Interviews." SFB 882 Working Paper No. 19. Bielefeld: DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities.

Boatcă, Manuela, and Anca Parvulescu. 2020. "Creolizing Transylvania: Notes on Coloniality and Inter-Imperiality." *History of the Present* 10 (1): 9–27.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. *Science de la science et réflexivité: Cours du collège de France, 2000–2001*. Paris: Les Éditions Raisons d'Agir.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2020. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. London: Routledge.

Brenner, Neil. 2004. *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2013. "Categories of Analysis and Categories of Practice: A Note on the Study of Muslims in European Countries of Immigration." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (1): 1–8.

Büscher, Monika, and John Urry. 2009. "Mobile Methods and the Empirical." *European Journal of Social Theory* 12 (1): 99–116.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Carmel, Emma, and Regine Paul. 2013. "Complex Stratification: Understanding European Union Governance of Migrant Rights." *Regions and Cohesion* 3 (3): 56–85.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1986. "Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought." *Social Problems* 33 (6): S14–S32.

Crawley, Heaven, and Dimitris Skleparis. 2018. "Refugees, Migrants, Neither, Both: Categorical Fetishism and the Politics of Bounding in Europe's 'Migration Crisis'." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (1): 48–64.

Dahinden, Janine. 2016. "A Plea for the 'De-Migranticization' of Research on Migration and Integration." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (13): 2207–2225.

Dahinden, Janine, Carolin Fischer, and Joanna Menet. 2020. "Knowledge Production, Reflexivity, and the Use of Categories in Migration Studies: Tackling Challenges in the Field." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 44 (4): 535–554.

De Genova, Nicholas, and Martina Tazzioli, eds. Co-authored by Claudia Aradau, … , and William Walters. 2021. "Minor Keywords of Political Theory: Migration as a Critical Standpoint." *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*. doi:10.1177/2399654420988563

De Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 2016. "Epistemologies of the South and the Future." *From the European South* 1: 17–29.

Faist, Thomas, Margit Fauser, and Eveline Reisenauer. 2013. *Transnational Migration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fanon, F. 2016. *Les Damnés de la Terre*. Paris: A verba futuroruM.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge: And The Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon.

Frank, Andre G. 1966. "The Underdevelopment of Development." *Monthly Review* 18 (4): 17–31.

Gandarilla Salgado, José G., Mariá H. García-Bravo, and Daniele Benzi. 2021. "Two Decades of Aníbal Quijano's Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America." *Contexto Internacional* 43: 199–222.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayşe Çağlar. 2009. "Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies: Migrant Incorporation and City Scale." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (2): 177–202.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayşe Çağlar, eds. 2011. *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Go, Julian. 2013. "For a Postcolonial Sociology." *Theory and Society* 42 (1): 25–55.

Grosfoguel, Ramon, Laura Oso, and Anastasia Christou. 2014. "'Racism', Intersectionality and Migration Studies: Framing Some Theoretical Reflections." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 22 (6): 635–652.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación. 2018. "The Coloniality of Migration and the "Refugee Crisis": On the Asylum-Migration Nexus, the Transatlantic White European Settler Colonialism-Migration and Racial Capitalism." *Refuge* 34 (1): 16–28.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación. 2021. "Entangled Migrations: The Coloniality of Migration and Creolizing Conviviality." Mecila Working Paper No. 35. São Paulo: Mecila.

Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–599.

Harding, Sandra, ed. 2004. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York: Routledge.

Jørgensen, Martin B., and Carl-Ulrik Schierup. 2020. "Transversal Solidarities and the City: An Introduction to the Special Issue." *Critical Sociology* 47 (6): 845–855.

Kaptani, Erene, Umut Erel, Maggie O'Neill, and Tracey Reynolds. 2021. "Methodological Innovation in Research: Participatory Theater with Migrant Families on Conflicts and Transformations Over the Politics of Belonging." *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 19 (1): 68–81.

Krivonos, Daria, and Lena Näre. 2019. "Imagining the 'West' in the Context of Global Coloniality: The Case of Post-Soviet Youth Migration to Finland." *Sociology* 53 (6): 1177.

Léonard, Sarah. 2010. "EU Border Security and Migration Into the European Union: Frontex and Securitisation Through Practices." *European Security* 19 (2): 231–254.

Levitt, Peggy. 2007. *God Needs No Passport: Immigrants and the Changing American Religious Landscape*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Levitt, Peggy, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2004. "Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society." *The International Migration Review* 38 (3): 1002–1039.

Luhmann, Niklas. 1990. "Das Erkenntnisprogramm des Konstruktivismus und die unbekannt bleibende Realität." Soziologische Aufklärung 5. Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden: 31–58.

Lutz, Helma, and A. Anna Amelina. 2021. "Gender in Migration Studies: From Feminist Legacies to Intersectional, Post-and Decolonial Prospects." *Zeitschrift für Migrationsforschung* 1 (1): 55–73.

Mählck, Paula. 2013. "Academic Women with Migrant Background in the Global Knowledge Economy: Bodies, Hierarchies and Resistance." *Women's Studies International Forum* 36: 65–74.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2016. "Colonialism, Neocolonial, Internal Colonialism, the Postcolonial, Coloniality, and Decoloniality." In *Critical Terms in Caribbean and Latin American Thought: Historical and Institutional Trajectories*, edited by Yolanda Martínez-San Miguel, Ben Sifuentes-Jáuregui, and Marisa Belausteguigoitia, 67–78. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mata-Codesal, Diana, Laure Kloetzer, and Concepción Maiztegui-Oñate. 2020. "Strengths, Risks and Limits of Doing Participatory Research in Migration Studies." *Migration Letters* 17 (2): 201–210.

Mayblin, Lucy, and Joe Turner. 2021. *Migration Studies and Colonialism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2002. "The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 101 (1): 57–96.

Morozov, Viatcheslav. 2015. *Russia's Postcolonial Identity: A Subaltern Empire in a Eurocentric World*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Myrdal, Gunnar. 1957. *Rich Lands and Poor: The Road to World Prosperity*. New York: Harper & Row.

Nail, Thomas. 2020. *The Figure of the Migrant*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Nieswand, Boris, and Heike Drotbohm. 2014. "Einleitung: Die reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung." In *Kultur, Gesellschaft, Migration: Die reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung*, edited by Boris Nieswand, and Heike Drotbohm, 1–37. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Nowicka, Magdalena, and Louise Ryan. 2015. "Beyond Insiders and Outsiders in Migration Research: Rejecting A Priori Commonalities: Introduction to the FQS Thematic Section on 'Researcher, Migrant, Woman: Methodological Implications of Multiple Positionalities in Migration Studies'." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Qualitative Social Research* 16 (2), Art. 18.

Pécoud, Antoine. 2021. "Narrating an Ideal Migration World? An Analysis of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration." *Third World Quarterly* 42 (1): 16–33.

Pries, Ludger. 2013. *New Transnational Social Spaces: International Migration and Transnational Companies in the Early Twenty-First Century*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Quijano, Aníbal. 2007. "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2/3): 168–178.

Raghuram, Parvati. 2021. "Democratizing, Stretching, Entangling, Transversing: Four Moves for Reshaping Migration Categories." *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 19 (1): 9–24.

Reckwitz, Andreas. 2002. "Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (2): 243–263.

Ryan, Louise. 2010. "Becoming Polish in London: Negotiating Ethnicity Through Migration." *Social Identities* 16 (3): 359–376.

Scheel, Stephan. 2019. *Autonomy of Migration? Appropriating Mobility Within Biometric Border Regimes*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Scheel, Stephan. 2021. "The Politics of (Non)Knowledge in the (Un)Making of Migration." *Zeitschrift für Migrationsforschung* 1 (2): 39–71.

Schinkel, Willem. 2018. "Against 'Immigrant Integration': For an End to Neocolonial Knowledge Production." *Comparative Migration Studies* 6: 1–17.

Sigona, Nando. 2018. "The Contested Politics of Naming in Europe's 'Refugee Crisis'." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41 (3): 456–460.

Smith, Paul. 1989. "Writing, General Knowledge, and Postmodern Anthropology." *Discourse* 11 (2): 158–171.

Tissot, Florian. 2018. "A Migration Industry for Skilled Migrants: The Case of Relocation Services." *Migration Letters* 15 (4): 545–560.

Tlostanova, Madina V. 2012. "Postsocialist ≠ Postcolonial? On Post-Soviet Imaginary and Global Coloniality." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 48 (2): 130–142.

Tlostanova, M., and W. Mignolo. 2009. "Global Coloniality and the Decolonial Option." *Kult* 6 (Special Issue): 130–147.

Tsianos, Vassilis, and Serhat Karakayali. 2010. "Transnational Migration and the Emergence of the European Border Regime: An Ethnographic Analysis." *European Journal of Social Theory* 13 (3): 373–387.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1984. *The Politics of the World-Economy: The States, the Movements and the Civilizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weiß, Anja. 2005. "The Transnationalization of Social Inequality: Conceptualizing Social Positions on a World Scale." *Current Sociology* 53 (4): 707–728.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1 (2): 125–151.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2003. "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology." *The International Migration Review* 37 (3): 576–610.