Heike Drotbohm

Shake it, stretch it, share it.
Moving Reflexivities beyond
Migration

JG|U

JOHANNES GUTENBERG
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

Drotbohm, Heike: Shake it, stretch it, share it. Moving Reflexivities beyond Migration

Abstract

For about ten years, the so-called 'reflexive turn' has been shaping migration studies, especially in the European social sciences. This paper takes the state-of-the-art as an opportunity to tackle chances, risks and challenges of the most recent standards established through this 'turn'. It concentrates on three aspects: First, it discusses the pros and cons of concentrating migration studies on certain migration categories, i.e. sedimented forms of knowledge and classification. In this way, it invites to push the research perspective beyond established power domains for discovering additional fields in which both subversiveness and the ordinariness of the everyday are articulated. Second, it problematizes the reduction of migration studies to contemporary contexts and processes and invites to stretch our knowledge production deeper in the histories of the respective contexts or actor biographies in order to recognize how mobility-related categories and classifications have come into being. Third, this paper deals with the not yet fully explored opportunities of collaborative work, which also pose new hurdles and challenges, especially regarding the reflection of positionalities and normativities. With these three new axes of reflexivity, this chapter outlines ways in which the central paradigm of the reflexive turn of migration studies can be made fruitful for adjacent research fields, in which people are likewise sorted and ranked into different kinds, such as gender and race studies, humanitarian studies or global health studies.

Die Autoren / Der Autor / Die Autorin

Heike Drotbohm is Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology at the Department of Anthropology and African Studies of JGU Mainz. Doing research at locations along the Atlantic Rim (Cape Verde, Haiti, Brazil), she focuses on the fields of care and mobility, kinship and care, humanitarian aid and solidarity.

E-Mail: drotbohm@uni-mainz.de

JG|U

JOHANNES GUTENBERG
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

SHAKE IT, STRETCH IT, SHARE IT.
MOVING REFLEXITIES BEYOND MIGRATION

Heike Drotbohm, Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

Introduction

We are now both qualified and obliged to take stock. For almost twenty years, migration research has concerned itself with the central epistemological, methodological, and ethical challenge of escaping the uncomfortable entanglement (or complicity, even) with our object of research. In their seminal 2002 article, Wimmer and Glick Schiller problematized the extent to which a certain nationalist thinking shapes migration studies, reifying distinctions between legitimate citizens and immigrants, who are perceived, framed, and reified as outsiders and support-seekers. This foundation provided fertile ground for what the volume I edited with Boris Nieswand in 2014 proclaimed as the "reflexive turn in migration research".[1] That perspective crystallized in conjunction with a series of publications appearing around that same time (Dahinden 2016, Glick Schiller and Caglar 2013) and precipitated a veritable boom in research and consequent publications that responded from a wide innovative range of perspectives, adopted an array of research approaches, and asked poignant new questions (Amelina 2020, Dahinden et al. 2020, Lang et al. 2021, Moret et al. 2021, Shinozaki 2021, to name but a few). The installation of the standing committee "Reflexivities in Migration Studies" within the IMISCOE network in 2020 and the focus of the network's annual conference in 2024 on "Migration as a Social Construction: A Reflexive Turn" also testify to the popularization of this critical approach.

In fact, reflexivity is nothing new to the social sciences. Numerous scholars have used the term, often referring to classics such as Bourdieu or Latour to clarify the contours of a required or (rather) unavoidable component of qualitative methodologies. Reflexivity represents a mandatory exercise that reveals the standpoint-bound nature of research by explicating who is (re)searching (what subject position do(es) the researcher(s) occupy?), how (with what means, tools, questions, and perspectives), why (with what interests, goals, and theoretical or political underpinnings?), for whom (who benefits from this research?), and on what (how is the object of research constituted and what positions are involved in its determination?). It also means

---

[1] "Kultur, Gesellschaft, Migration. Die reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung", Nieswand and Drotbohm 2014.

asking what consequences this position has for research and life beyond research. Biases – understood as unreasoned judgment or preconceived inclination – cannot be avoided. Nor should they be; instead, they should be considered productively and made explicit. In the introduction to a recently published special issue on "Reflexivity Between Science and Society", Marguin and colleagues (2021) assert that reflexivity permeates (or should permeate) the entire research process, from constructing the object of investigation to choosing methods, handling and processing data, and interpreting and managing findings (Marguin et al. 2021. However, for Unger (2021). Theoretical and methodological reflections should be coupled with an ethical reflexivity that not only anticipates tensions and conflicts but also harnesses them in response to unequal positionings in the research process *for analytic purposes*. Similarly, Dean's *Doing Reflexivity* (2017) demonstrates that however the concept is understood, practicing reflexivity often invokes one's positioning within an extended field of dilemmas whose tensions cannot be fully resolved. That is, it is completely insufficient to merely problematize one's privileged position as a kind of admission of guilt. Instead of making research easier and removing obstacles, reflexivity should be understood as a "tool [for gathering] more accurate and insightful research data" (Dean 2021: 183).

That the demand for reflexivity has so reverberated (especially) in migration research in recent years relates to the frequently problematized risk of the nature of research reproducing the authoritative contours between self and other and the binary between citizens and migrants. The plea to decenter migration in migration studies (Römhild 2014, Dahinden 2016) means avoiding a possible epistemological and political alliance with those forces that follow the logic of the nation-state by segregating, controlling, enclosing, and normatively demarcating migration from the implied normal state. Avoiding this kind of complicity is a political, ethical, and intellectual problem to be taken seriously. Most migration researchers would certainly recognize that research itself shall always remain an uncomfortable and challenging endeavor in a highly unequal, unjust, and, in many ways, violent global society. Resolving these asymmetries entirely within the context of the research process remains – at least at this point – an unrealistic agenda. Hence, comparable to Peter Pels' perspective on the aim, or attempt, to decolonize the discipline of anthropology (2018), reflexivity can be understood less as an achievable status quo than an always unmet ideal that we should, nonetheless, persistently strive to attain.

The following considerations should be understood as part of the necessary consolidation of reflexivities, which, from the first moment of critical awareness of a given problem constellation, aims at an epistemologically egalitarian, historically informed, and collaborative practice of interdisciplinary knowledge generation.

"Shake it!" Disrupting the contours of mobility-related categories

For a long time, the labels and categorizations that particularly determine the lives of migrants by reifying and underpinning social inequalities constituted the locus of migration studies. In this vein, Zetter's work proved groundbreaking, providing a guide to articulating the transformations of the refugee label in the context of globalized processes of forced migration within which, for example, new distinctions have been repeatedly made between labels such as "spontaneous asylum seekers", "bogus asylum seekers", "economic migrants", "trafficked migrants", and "overstayers" (Zetter 1991, 2007). The power of such labels is undeniable. As Menjívar recently articulated in her presidential address to the American Sociological Association, these categories translate state power into stratified entitlement to care and support, rendering them critical to understanding normative assumptions about social groups (Menjivar 2023). Independent of this focus on state-generated and used categories, the question of how people are labelled, differentiated, and hierarchized within the governance of migration constitutes a central research concern. In conjunction with gender, sexuality, religion, and age, mobility- and space-related categories have been brought into the field to justify or reject the legitimacy of migration concerns, claims to support, and rights to stay (Korteweg & Triadafilopoulos 2013, Fischer & Dahinden 2017, Pott 2018, Van Houtum & Lacy 2020, Bialas 2023, Drotbohm 2024).

Surprisingly, all of this fails to sufficiently capture those variants of mobility-related distinctions not directly and explicitly mapped via categorization processes. Recent scholarship around the notion of "human differentiation" (Hirschauer 2023, see also Dizdar et al. 2021)[2] acknowledges that knowledge production in the social sciences is always simultaneously part of societies' 'ethnosociologies'. In order to get rid of those preconstituted meaningful distinctions, Hirschauer (2023) suggests to systematically separate 'distinction', 'typification', 'categorization', 'classification', 'differentiation', 'discrimination', 'stigmatization' and 'alterization'. Regarding the particularity of 'categories', Hirschauer writes: "Categories make

---

[2] This paper's argument profited considerably from being part of the Collaborative Research Consortium 1482 "Studies in Human Differentiation" at Johannes Gutenberg-University Mainz and fruitful discussions with my colleagues involved therein.

difference out of distinctions: They convert the initial act of differentiation into a feature of the differentiated. Categories collate objects and transform them into exemplars" (Hirschauer 2023: 5). What I consider particularly relevant to migration research here: as migration scholars we also have to deal with those processes of differentiation that take place outside, below or beyond categories.

Already in 2008, Bakewell lamented the limited scope of research that remains within policy-relevant frameworks, calling for migration research to move beyond the frames of reference of regulating and controlling practitioners. Several researchers have built on Urry and Sheller's work on mobility (2006) to include those experiences and articulations of mobility-related distinctions that are not (or not yet) reflected, problematized, and regulated by governmental control. For Wyss and Dahinden (2022), this approach helps us use specific localities, sites, and places as the starting point of research by asking what kinds of mobilities unfold within the respective context, divorcing the notion of mobilities from the crossing of nation-state borders. Reiffen's work (2024) in an Argentine shopping mall exemplifies this kind of research, focusing on how people with completely different mobility experiences and biographies come together in their everyday lives and how they negotiate their positions, whether in terms of mobility or other forms of difference. This methodological levelling of mobility and migration also allows us to include the pre- and post-mobilities of persons who do not (yet) migrate or no longer migrate but who nevertheless participate in transnational life worlds. Consider, for example, those members of transnational networks who support the migration of their relatives with information, money, and moral support, along with hands-on care for those staying behind, or the position of deported migrants or other involuntary returnees who face international mobility restrictions but still understand themselves as part of the society that deported them and (try to) participate in lives extending across national borders. In both cases, the act of claiming membership and contributing to the transnational entanglement of societies is essential for understanding the logics of cross-border lives (Drotbohm 2009, 2012).

Building on these ideas, I would like to emphasize that migration, understood as human mobility across national borders, does not take place (as we have long known) within containers of systematic and seemingly unambiguous classification into categories. Instead, if we configure migration as a form of encounter between actors differently endowed with power, in the social "project" of migration, cognitive and affective perspectives intertwine with varying processes of knowledge generation at different levels of perception and articulation. For

example, instances of bureaucratic interaction with authorities of visa application, border control, or the welfare state are flanked by encounters with numerous other actors who also distinguish (il)legitimate positions of entitlement and deservingness. Often very messy, diffuse, and opaque while also extremely powerful, these forms of differentiation warrant more attention in the future.

Reflexive approaches also need to consider how the act of categorization crosses over from the side of the classifying agents: Mobile actors also distinguish, evaluate, and classify different dimensions of mobility (Drotbohm 2024). If we understand, as stated above, migration not only as spatial movement but also and firstly as knowledge production from differently positioned standpoints, we should also include the knowledge production of mobile actors, the movers, border-crossers, and travelers who distinguish between possible routes, modalities, and destinations of migration, between different actors with positions charged with different dimensions or degrees of power, between policies that can be interpreted or applied permissively or restrictively, and between possible variants of support, both en route and in the destination countries that may later become starting points for renewed migration. In the end, what kind of mobility corresponds to a normal everyday reality, a desirable goal, a burden, or a constraint is not only perceptible to and in flux for the researching observer.

"Shake it!" represents a plea to avoid understanding the contours of migration categories as given and fixed and instead focus on the emerging character of distinctions from the perspective of interactive, reciprocal negotiation between and among multiple actors. Shaking categories means examining exactly in which contexts social differences are thematized and when they become salient or effective at the psychological, social, and political level. This means asking how distinctions reinforce themselves in intersectional terms when mobility-related categories intersect with other categories – whether race, class, gender, sexuality, age, or physical ability – and when these distinctions mutually reinforce or weaken each other. It also requires contemplating what signs of dissolution we can identify. A dissolution, or undoing, of categorization can occur at the level of social policies, such as when a seemingly consolidated form of classification stops being considered relevant. This can happen for political reasons. For instance, the terms "Volksdeutsche" or "Reichsdeutsche", which had been used in the context of large-scale resettlement programs during National Socialist rule in Germany, were administratively invalidated after 1945. The fact that terms such as "Aussiedler", "Russlanddeutsche", "Fremdarbeiter", or "Gastarbeiter" are now part of history also concerns

the ethical sensitization that developed over time. Furthermore, the dissolution or disappearance of terms can take place at the level of social interaction, namely, when those categorized resist certain forms of classification or question and contest the meaning of categories. Examples include generic but pejorative terminologies such as "alien", "unauthorized", or "illegal" (Aivazishvili-Gehne 2023, Hamlin 2022, Panagiotidis 2022, Zeppenfeld 2022)

To refuse complicity with state assumptions also requires a focus beyond the crossings of spatial and nation-state borders. We must establish research perspectives that consider the everyday, banal, and entirely self-evident movements of people within their respective social spaces and the social interactions that result from those movements. A suitable example comes from a text by Cecilia McCallum (2005), in which she traces the spatial movement of a person within the Brazilian city of Salvador da Bahia, making it clear how that individual's classification changes depending on the context and type of social interaction. When subjects move through space and time, not only their racialization but also the mutual constitution of whiteness and blackness as well as class-related perceptions shift. Knowledge of the moving body is produced by multiple actors who classify themselves and others through the performance and perception of differently layered mobilities. By zooming into the particularities of the category by tracing its complexities under different and complementary perspectives, we can contribute to de-exceptionalizing migration (Hui 2016, Dahinden 2016).

"Stretch it!" Moving beyond the confines of the contemporary
My second criticism here concerns the reduction of migration studies to contemporary contexts and processes. Historical research considers the specifics of the historical circumstances, thus pointing to the historically particular nature of spatial movements, the mechanisms of recording and control, and the experiences of migration in a given historical context. However, we still lack research that focuses on the temporal developments and processual emergence of mobility-related thinking, labelling, and classification. Again, I begin my reflections with the prominent role of migration-related categories, which have long supported but also (at times) limited research on mobilities. The problem that remains underexplored is the fact that these categories have not always existed, quasi-naturally, but that they have come into the world iteratively, adapted repeatedly over the course of history, with meanings shifting with historical circumstances. It is precisely these deeper layers of time, the genealogies of taxonomic change in the course of history, that make apparent why the category – as a time- and place-specific

form of thinking – has assumed the contours, connotations, (un)contestedness, and political significance that it has today.

Of course, I am not the first to identify the historical processuality and emerging quality of migration-related social categories. The work of Mayblin and Turner, *Migration Studies and Colonialism* (2021), represents probably the most comprehensive contribution to the intersection of the historical sciences and migration studies, addressing the entanglement of migration studies with not only colonial perspectives but also inherent and enduring forms of colonial differentiation observed in the practical fields of refugee settlement, forced migration, and asylum. Several years earlier, Nail already challenged us to conceptualize the historical conditions that allowed "The Figure of the Migrant" (2015) to emerge. For Nail, these migration-targeting historical processes result from different types and degrees of social expulsion (2015: 5), leading us to differentiate between, for instance, the tourist, the vagabond, the businessperson, and the explorer. Nail's work convincingly interrogates the territorial, political, juridical, and economic underpinnings that have contributed to the sedimentation of these forms of differentiation. Applying a comparable historicizing perspective, Tazzioli (2020) digs deep into the notion of "the mob", a category with particularly negative connotations that has been used since the seventeenth century to think about marginalized popular collectivities. Over time, the notion travelled from associations with the "Lumpenproletariat", the working class, criminals, and other types of "outlaws" to "migrant multiplicities", that is, constellations grouped and partitioned by migration agencies and states attempting to downplay the political dimension of migration movements and migration control (Tazzioli 2020: 35). Finally, the question of how categories travel in both time *and* space becomes clear in Besteman's "Making Refuge. Somali Bantu Refugees and Lewiston, Maine" (2016), which carefully traces how the contours of the category "Somali Bantus" came into being over time through contact between, first, jareer refugees and Italian colonists, then Somali militias, and later humanitarian workers in various African countries. After their resettlement to the US state of Maine, the bureaucratic apparatus of the international refugee regime provided a new language for group recognition, leading the label Somali Bantus to again acquire new meanings (Besteman 2016).

These and several other works (e.g., Boatcă 2021, Fassin & Rechtman 2009, Reinecke 2018, Schinkel 2018, Wyss & Dahinden 2022) remind us that *all* (i.e., not only migration-related) forms of social order are historically grounded, demanding that these layers of meaning remain the target of scholarly exploration. From my perspective, the importance of concepts that do

not relate directly to mobility but do pertain to a specific (post)colonial entanglement that contributes to the differentiation between different types of social actors has yet to receive sufficient attention within migration studies. Of course, the idea has been reconciled with categories of gender and sexuality (Stoler 2016, Lugones 2020) as well as with notions of "family" and "marriage" (Drotbohm 2009, 2018, Moret et al. 2021). However, the historical foundations of various other socially powerful social categories can also be interrogated in cross-border contexts. For example, the category of age has been studied in terms of its particular agency in the transition from the nebulous category of adolescence to the bureaucratic category of adulthood, especially in contexts of cross-border movements and the assessment of "truth" (Bialas 2023, Drotbohm 2024). Nonetheless, most migration studies follow the bureaucratic logic of age, ignoring that different world regions and actors may classify age (or "childhood", "youth", or "the old") differently and that perceptions and classifications of age also transform over historical time.

Surprisingly enough, a similar situation occurs for the category of race. Although the perception of phenotypic differences, the racialized differentiation of different migrant groups, and racism in the destination countries of migration could eventually already be called over-researched, additional understandings of colorism, racialization, and other forms of stereotyping, stigmatization, and exoticization (beyond race) in countries of origin and the question of how body-related differentiation and hierarchization have changed over time have received far less attention. Furthermore, beyond this binarism, transnational dimensions of racialization and colorism can also be identified, again as part of specific histories of (trans)national and postcolonial entanglements. For instance, while anti-Black racism is widespread across Europe, mechanisms of exoticization, discrimination, and racism in Germany still refer to a *particular* intellectual project of European enlightenment and layers of Afro-German histories, struggles for social justice, and the normativity of German whiteness. The multiple entanglements of German capitalism with other world regions beyond its former colonies also distinguish the country from other post-imperial powers, in which othering terms, depictions, and labels eventually refer to other places and racializing processes. Such history-sensitive insights that capture the nuances of human differentiation would be especially revealing in transnational settings that see people's physical appearances valorized or stigmatized differently at different times and in different localities (Hirschauer 2023, Hohl 2022, Lukate and Foster 2022).

Finally, it is critical to return to my plea to include the classifications produced by mobile actors, which also have a history. We can address the temporal transformation of migration-related labels and categories by using historical sources to ask how migrating subjects have engaged with, appropriated, protested, or possibly rejected categories that were sometimes a burden, sometimes apparently banal and sometimes a promise of freedom. Biographical methods can also be used to understand how migrants relate to the changing dimensions and circumstances of categories over time (Drotbohm & Winter 2021, Wyss & Dahinden 2022). A key example is the refugee label. Under certain conditions of suffering, especially the administrative dimensions of the refugee label can be perceived as a promise, in reference to international policies of protection and the provision of humanitarian care. However, as humanitarian studies have repeatedly recognized, following shifting complexities of renegotiating belonging, the refugee category also emerged as part of a politics of (mis)representation, alienation, and victimization (Drotbohm 2024, Kumsa 2006, Zetter 2007). Against this backdrop, "stretch it" should be understood as a plea to employ flexible perspectives of knowledge production to extend the (spatial and temporal) boundaries of assumed categorical confines.

"Share it!" Involving new types of actors in the postcolonial research agenda

It is unnecessary to reproduce the extensive literature that has emerged over the last decade from the call for decolonial approaches to research. What becomes clear is that we remain entangled in a transitional or test phase that sees criticism of outdated research procedures being formulated with increasing clarity while empirical implementation continues to be limited. A call for reflexive, participatory, self-critical, and empowering research that shares, gives back, steps back, and practices humility may seem radical. However, such a programmatic contribution mainly articulates how fundamental the reforms of academic structures and ways of working would need to be to truly reduce complicity with colonial relations of power.

As a particularly positive example from collaborative research-based practice, I would like to draw attention to the highly accessible book *Decolonizing Ethnography. Undocumented Immigrants and New Directions in Social Science* (2019), which sees Bejarano, López Juárez, Mijangos García and Goldstein, researchers with very different biographic backgrounds and learning trajectories collaborate to use ethnography as a tool for self-empowerment, public advocacy, and "personal transformation" (ibid 11). That the members of this research team not only identify with different genders, generations, and education and income levels but also different milieus, migrant backgrounds, and political attitudes provides ample space to reflect

on blind spots, obstacles, the apparent failure of certain research processes, and the need for readjustment. Furthermore, their articulation of the very different consequences of their shared research for their private and professional lives offers the opportunity to reflect on the challenges of academic-activist engagement.

Above all, truly sharing requires a radically different kind of research practice. Such an endeavor should act differently – in an egalitarian, participatory, decentered, and self-critical sense – from the first instance of a critical engagement with what should become a reflexive research process. Meanwhile, the requirement to share research can be spread across many more shoulders. The call to share more fairly also (evidently) refers to our neighboring disciplines, whose bodies of knowledge can provide significant impulses for the implementation of reflexive research, highlighting the challenges of close collaboration between policy and research. At the same time, we should not ignore the fact that this type of sharing represents an ideal with ethical and psychological limits, especially in the context of research about and with actors whose political values we do not share and whose epistemologies correspond to a political practice that we want to resolve as part of the collaboration. For example, from my perspective, we have yet to resolve the challenges of collaborative knowledge generation by hegemonic or even violent actors, whose views could provide valuable insights into these domains from within power structures (Shoshan 2021, Zenker and Vonderau 2023).

We should consider questioning the dominance of English as the language of science and adopt the everyday languages of our collaborative partners. This should also be reflected in the curricula of study programs because the biographical phase of student learning lends itself particularly well to language learning. Second, we must expand the act of publication far beyond citing Black and female academics to also consider how we might include migrant voices in the acknowledgements and co-authorships of our publications. Conducting research with migrants and 'studying up' or 'sideways' to involve different sets of actors implies making knowledge practice the object of migration research. This requires both personal involvement and analytical distance to recognize our own positions and impacts within the worlds we study.

Finally, there is an evident need for a completely new kind of collaboration with funding institutions. To integrate the ideas, theoretical perspectives and practical aims of multiple actors into our research projects from the very beginning, we need funding to organize exploratory workshops that enable the development of research ideas and methodologies to be collaborative

from the very beginning. Conducting research in an appropriately equitable manner demands sincerely addressing, from the outset, questions of who is who, who wants what, who contributes what, and what our limits are. This requires sensitizing our funding institutions to the fact that the demands of such collaborative approaches necessitate much slower progress, with set deadlines often producing unreasonable and damaging temporal pressures that negatively affect our collaborative relationships. Acknowledging not only the unequal tools and speed of scientific reflection and production but also the fact that differently gendered, classed, aged, or racialized researchers are challenged differently in and through their everyday lives means recognizing that shared science will always mean slow science.

We can almost certainly improve not only the quality and legitimacy but also the impact of social research if this multiplication and levelling of actors' perspectives becomes part of our future epistemological and methodological innovations. In this sense, "share it" implies the endeavor to transcend the binary between the researcher and researched to better understand who or what actually contributes to a given agenda or form of problematization and understanding. In the end, sharing questions – rather than (only) data and results – involves acknowledging that all participating actors are (in their own specific ways) mobile, differently positioned, and (re)searching.

Concluding thoughts

Although this essay's title may come across as light-hearted, migration is by no means an ebullient affair, and neither is migration research. The longstanding engagement with the ethical dilemmas and conundrums in this research field testify to the deep identification with the political challenges inherent in stratified mobilities and the governance of transnational migration. Indeed, understanding reflexivity as a warm-up for the serious business of conducting research will ultimately only serve the cultural capital of the researcher and legitimize a mode of knowledge (re)production that reifies and cements an unequal, asymmetrical, and, therefore, violent relationship. The willingness to render migration studies reflexive, to shake, stretch, and share it, must certainly not degenerate into a monstrance of ethical consciousness that we carry before us to ward off critical questions. On the contrary, reflexive research should always extend beyond the comfort zone of assumed knowledge and established procedures, also involving those actors whose political positions and values we do not necessarily share (e.g. those affirming a protectionist stance towards the state and border control, or who represent xenophobic or reactionary opinions).

Before I end, I would like to warn against throwing out the baby with the bathwater when dealing critically with mobility-related categorization processes, but rather to make explicit the sometimes unequal power relations between migration – as a particularly central form of knowledge production about human mobility and belonging – and other socially powerful categories. Not all categories are equally meaningful everywhere, in all political contexts and social interactions. That migration (or neighboring categories such as forced migration and asylum) sometimes represents the crucial, most powerful form of classification, which trumps or eliminates others by separating, segregating and stigmatizing, should not be forgotten, even if we try to move beyond the confines of classical migration studies.

Some authors articulate a deep and certainly justified skepticism about the superficial and rather performative character of the reflexive turn in migration studies. However, we can also protest that a reflexive mode is far from established in all phases and areas of research, including fields outside of migration research. This implies the need to sustain the development of two central pillars. On the one hand, we must continue to work on the standardization of a categorical-critical, historically grounded and truly decolonial, egalitarian research practice. On the other hand, the demands of the reflexive turn should also be carried over to neighboring research fields, not only 'humanitarian studies', 'ethnic studies' or 'diversity studies', but also fields that assume no relation with migration or mobilities. Recognizing and acknowledging (im)mobilities in all dimensions of a normal but at the same time continuously transforming everyday life will remain an artful practice in the future. Beyond reflexivity, this process should see creativity, determination, and humility towards any research(ed) subject emerge as the standards of social and intellectual encounters. This implies the possibility of implementing the demand for a stronger standardization of reflexivity in all those domains of knowledge production in which people powerfully sort other people into different kinds.

References

Aivazishvili-Gehne, Nino. 2023. "Hoping for Others. Entangled Emotional States of ‚Russian Germans' and the Multifaceted Aspects of 'Successful Migration.'" *Zeitschrift für Migrationsforschung – Journal for Migration Studies*. https://doi.org/10.48439/zmf.186.

Amelina, Anna. 2020. "After the Reflexive Turn in Migration Studies: Towards the Doing Migration Approach." *Population, Space, and Place* 27:e2368. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2368

Amelina, Anna. 2022. "Knowledge Production for Whom? Doing Migrations, Colonialities and Standpoints in Non-Hegemonic Migration Research." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (13): 2393-2415. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2022.2064717

Bakewell, Oliver. 2008. Research Beyond the Categories: The Importance of Policy Irrelevant Research into Forced Migration, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21 (4): 432-453, https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fen042

Bejarano, Carolina Alonso, Lucia López Juárez, Mirian A. Mijangos García, and Daniel M. Goldstein. 2019. *Decolonizing Ethnography. Undocumented Immigrants and New Directions in Social Science*. Durham, London: Duke.

Besteman, Cathrine. 2016. *Making Refuge. Somali Bantu Refugees and Lewiston*, *Maine*. Durham, London: Duke.

Bialas, Ulrike. 2023. "Ambiguous Ages, Ambivalent Youths: How Asylum Seekers in Germany Navigate Age Categorization." *Mig. Pol.* 2 (003). https://doi.org/10.21468/MigPol.2.1.003

Boatcă, Manuela. 2021. "Unequal Institutions in the Longue Durée: Citizenship Through a Southern Lens." *Third World Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2021.1923398

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*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2020.1752926

Dean, Jon. 2021. "Reflexivity and Its Limits in the Study of Social Inequalities." *Historical Social Research* 46 (2): 178-185. https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.46.2021.2.177-185

Dean, Jon. 2017. *Doing Reflexivity: An Introduction*. Policy Press.

Dizdar, Dilek, Stefan Hirschauer, Johannes Paulmann and Gabriele Schabacher 2021: *Humandifferenzierung. Disziplinäre Perspektiven und empirische Sondierungen*. Weilerswist: Velbrück.

Drotbohm, Heike. 2009. "Horizons of Long-Distance Intimacies. Reciprocity, Contribution and Disjuncture in Cape Verde." *The History of the Family. An International Quarterly* 14 (2): 132-149.

Drotbohm, Heike. 2012: "'It's Like Belonging to a Place That Has Never Been Yours.' Deportees Negotiating Involuntary Immobility and Conditions of Return in Cape Verde." In: Schröder, Reneé and Ruth Wodak (eds.): *Migrations: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Wien: New York: Springer. 129-140.

Drotbohm, Heike. 2018. "Care and Reunification in a Cape Verdean Family: Changing Articulations of Family and Legal Ties." *Ethnography* 21 (1): 48-70.

Drotbohm, Heike. 2024. "Categories as Learning Practice: Navigating Contested Belonging Along Transatlantic Migrant Trajectories." Ethnic and Racial Studies, https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2024.2404481

Drotbohm, Heike, and Nanneke Winters. 2021. "The Event in Migrant Categorization: Exploring Eventfulness across the Americas." *Vibrant: Virtual Brazilian Anthropology* 17. https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-43412020v17d650

Fassin, Didier and Richard Rechtman. 2009. *The Empire of Trauma: An Inquiry into the Condition of Victimhood*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fischer, Caroline, and Janine Dahinden. 2017. "Gender Representations in Politics of Belonging: An Analysis of Swiss Immigration Regulation from the 19th Century Until Today." *Ethnicities 17* (4): 445-468. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796816676844

Friedrichs, Anne, and Bettina Severin-Barboutie. 2021. "Mobilités, catégorisation et appartenance: un défi de réflexivité. " *Annales HSS* 76 (3): 445-455.

Gemignani, Marco, Yolanda Hernández-Abújar, and Jana Sládková. 2024. *Migrant Scholars Researching Migration. Reflexivity, Subjectivity, and Biography in Research*. London, New York: Routledge.

Hamlin, Rebecca 2022. "'Migrants'? 'Refugees'? Terminology Is Contested, Powerful, and Evolving." Migrationpolicy.org https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/terminology-migrants-refugees-illegal-undocumented-evolving

Hirschauer, Stefan. 2023. "Telling People Apart: Outline of a Theory of Human Differentiation." *Sociological Theory*. https://doi.org/10.1177/073527512312064

Hohl, Christopher. 2022. "Cultural Representations of Albinism in Africa. Narratives of Change." In Charlotte Baker and Elvis Imafidon (eds.): *Cultural Representations of Albinism in Africa: Narratives of Change*. Oxford et al.: Peter Lang. 89-114.

Hui, Allison. 2016. "The Boundaries of Interdisciplinary Fields: Temporalities Shaping the Past and Future of Dialogue between Migration and Mobilities Research." *Mobilities*, 11 (1), 66-82.

Jegen, Leonie Felicitas. 2023. "'Migratising' Mobility: Coloniality of Knowledge and Externally Funded Migration Capacity Building Projects in Niger." *Geoforum* 146 103862.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayse Çağlar. 2013. "Locating Migrant Pathways of Economic Emplacement: Thinking Beyond the Ethnic Lens. *Ethnicities*, 13(4), 494-514. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796813483733

Korteweg, Anna, and Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos. 2013. "Gender, Religion, and Ethnicity: Intersections and Boundaries in Immigrant Integration Policy Making." *Social Politics* 20 (1): 109-136. https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxs027

Lang, Christine, Andreas Pott, and Kyoko Shinozaki. 2021. "Organisations and the Production of Migration and In/Exclusion." *Comparative Migration Studies* 9 (60) https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00274-w

Lugones, María. 2020. "Revisiting Gender: A Decolonial Approach." In Andrea Pitts, Mariana Ortega, and José Medina (eds.): *Theories of the Flesh: Latinx and Latin American Feminisms, Transformation, and Resistance*. Oxford University Press. 29-37.

Lukate, Johanna, and Juliet L. Foster 2023: 'Depending on where I am…' Hair, Travelling and the Performance of Identity Among Black and Mixed-Race Women. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 62 (1): 342-358.

Marguin, Séverine, Juliane Haus, Anna Juliane Heinrich, Antje Kahl, Cornelia Schendzielorz, and Ajit Singh. 2021. "Positionality Reloaded. Debating the Dimensions of Reflexivity in the Relationship Between Science and Society: An Editorial." *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung* 46 (2): 7-34.

Mayblin, Lucy, and John Turner 2021. *Migration Studies and Colonialism.* Hoboken: Wiley.

McCallum, Cecilia. 2005. "Racialized Bodies, Naturalized Classes: Moving Through the City of Salvador da Bahia." *American Ethnologist* 32 (1): 100-117

Menjivar, Cecilia. 2023. "State Categories, Bureaucracies of Displacement, and Possibilities from the Margins." *American Sociological Review* 88 (1): 1-23

Moret, Joëlle, Apostolos Andrikopoulos, and Janine Dahinden. 2021. "Contesting Categories: Cross-Border Marriages from the Perspectives of the State, Spouses and Researchers." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47 (2): 325-342. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1625124

Nail, Thomas. 2015. *The Figure of the Migrant*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Nieswand, Boris, and Heike Drotbohm. 2014. *Kultur, Gesellschaft, Migration. Die Reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Panagiotidis, Jannis. 2022. "Aussiedler/Spätaussiedler." In Inken Bartels, Isabella Löhr, Christiane Reinecke, Philipp Schäfer, and Laura Stielike (eds.): *Inventar der Migrationsbegriffe*. http://www.migrationsbegriffe.de/spaetaussiedler.

Pels, Peter. 2018. "Anthropology Should Never Be Fully Decolonized." *Etnofoor*, 30 (2): 71-76.

Pott, Andreas. 2018. "Migrationsregime und ihre Räume." In Andreas Pott, Christoph Rass, and Frank Wolff (eds.): *Was ist ein Migrationsregime? [What Is a Migration Regime?]*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 107-135.

Reiffen, Franziska 2024. *The Social Life of the Mall. Working and Dwelling in a Popular Mall in Argentina*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Reinecke, Christiane. 2018. "Producing the 'Undocumented Migrant.' Registration and Deportation in Early 20th Century London and Berlin." In Hilde Greefs und Anne Winter (eds.): *Migration, Regulation and Materialities of Identification in European Cities: Papers and Gates*, 1500–1930s. London: Routledge. 248-264.

Schinkel, Willem. 2018. "Against 'Immigrant Integration': For an End to Neocolonial Knowledge Production." *Comparative Migration Studies* 6: 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1

Shinozaki, Kyoko. 2021. "Reflexivity and its Enactment Potential in Gender and Migration Research." In Claudia Mora and Nicola Piper (eds.): *The Palgrave Handbook of Gender and Migration*. Palgrave Macmillan Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63347-9_6

Shoshan, Nitzan. 2021. "Under a Different Name. Secrecy, Complicity, Ethnography." *Journal of Social and Cultural Anthropology / Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (ZFE), 146.

Tazzioli, Martina. 2020. *The Making of Migration. The Biopolitics of Mobility at Europe's Borders*. Los Angeles, London: Sage.

Urry, John and Mimi Sheller. 2006. The New Mobilities Paradigm. *Environment and Planning A* 38: 207-22. https://doi.org/10.1068/a37268

van Houtum, Henk, and Rodrigo Bueno Lacy. 2020. "The Migration Map Trap. On the Invasion Arrows in the Cartography of Migration." *Mobilities* 15 (2), 196-219.

von Unger, Hella. 2021. "Ethical Reflexivity as Research Practice." *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung* 46 (2): 186-204.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2002. "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences." *Global Networks* 2 (4): 301-334.

Wyss, Anna, and Janine Dahinden. 2022. "Disentangling Entangled Mobilities: Reflections on Forms of Knowledge Production Within Migration Studies." *Comparative Migration Studies* 10 (1): 33. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00309-w

Zeppenfeld, Stefan 2023. "Gastarbeiter." In Inken Bartels, Isabella Löhr, Christiane Reinecke, Philipp Schäfer, Laura Stielike, and Maurice Stierl (eds.): *Inventar der Migrationsbegriffe*. http://www.migrationsbegriffe.de/gastarbeiter.

Zenker, Olaf, and Asta Vonderau. 2023. "Collaborations and Contestations in Publicly Engaged Anthropologies: An Exposition." *Public Anthropologist* 5 (2): 129-152

Zetter, Roger. 1991. "Labelling Refugees: Forming and Transforming a Bureaucratic Identity." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4 (1): 39-62.

Zetter, Roger. 2007. "More Labels, Fewer Refugees: Remaking the Refugee Label in an Era of Globalization." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20 (2): 172-192.