Comparative Migration Studies

EDITORIAL Open Access

Critical transitions in migration studies: Comparative Migration Studies' 10th anniversary issue

Sanam Roohi[1], Peter Scholten[2*], Martin Bak Jorgensen[3], Thais Franca[4], Andreas Pott[5], Tabea Scharrer[6] and Zana Vathi[7]

*Correspondence:
Peter Scholten
p.scholten@essb.eur.nl

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

Keywords Migration studies, Transitions, Crisis, Mobility, Comparative method, Decolonization

In the past decade, dynamic geopolitical events have led to major migration movements worldwide. The launching of Comparative Migration Studies (CMS) in 2013 to promote comparative research in the field of migration studies (Saharso and Scholten, 2013) coincided with some of these major migration developments. The journal emerged at a time when the field was undergoing rapid transformation, incorporating newer methods, geographies and theories to study migration. The comparative approach was becoming increasingly more prominent, outgrowing the national paradigms that had been the norm in the field (Thränhardt and Bommes, 2010; Favell, 2001). As the academic field of migration studies broadened to reflect the emergent diversities, CMS also underwent a rapid expansion during this period, becoming not only more international but also more interdisciplinary and multi-method in its orientation (see Pisarevskaya et al., 2020; Levy et al. 2020).

The field of migration studies has experienced and reacted to many critical developments and transitions, some of which have been addressed in CMS' publications on the theme. These include the disaggregation of the taken for granted categories used in the field (Dahinden and Pott, 2025); the internationalization and diversification of the field itself, decolonization of knowledge production within the field (Raghuram and Sondhi, 2025), the relation between the field and its broader political and societal environment (Geddes and Scholten 2020), and developing a more reflexive relationship between knowledge production and the field of migration studies (Scholten, 2020; Dahinden et al., 2021). On the one hand, transitional periods like these show that migration studies constitute a field in full swing, sometimes struggling while simultaneously trying to innovate and respond to new challenges. On the other hand, such transitions suggest that migration studies benefit from its interdisciplinary character.

Springer Open

© The Author(s) 2025. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

Comparative Migration Studies is one of the journals that has played, and continues to play, a central role in the field's development. It was the first journal in the field that was committed to full Open Access publishing. First published by Amsterdam University Press, the journal became associated to the IMISCOE Research Network in 2015, and moved to Springer. Over the years the journal established itself, with inclusion in Scopus and currently a journal impact score of 4.3. The journal has always been led by a duo-team of editors in chief, currently Sanam Roohi and Peter Scholten, and a multidisciplinary and increasingly globally composed editorial team. Furthermore, the journal has innovated new publication formats, such as a commentary series in which academics enter dialogue with each other around key themes in migration studies in short commentary articles (of which this issue is an example as well).

In the process of development, the journal has critically confronted some of the challenges in the development of the broader field of migration studies. This asks for more reflection on the role that CMS plays, has failed to play or could and should potentially play in the future. This is precisely the purpose of this special anniversary special issue: to critically reflect on the role that CMS has performed so far, and the role it could and should take on in the future.

Defining which critical transitions to focus on in the development of the field of migration is particularly difficult. First, migration studies is a broad and fragmented field in which people active in specific strands of migration studies may experience very different transitions. Second, experiencing or defining these transitional moments is a matter of positionality as well. What some scholars may experience as a critical transition may not be experienced as such at all by others. Or, what will turn out central in the years to come, may not show or be as manifest at the moment. For instance, the term 'integration' was still considered to be rather unproblematic at the start of this journal and is now hardly used anymore. Also, the seemingly self-explanatory terms 'migration', 'migrant' or 'refugee' have also been put under critical scrutiny in parts of our research field, as terms that no longer reflect adequately the fluid or 'liquid' nature of mobilities and the political conditions under which such mobilities occur and are being reproduced (Crawley and Skleparis, 2018; Scheel and Tazzioli, 2022).

Despite these challenges, our editorial board has selected what we believe to be critical transitional moments for our field in which our journal has either already played a role, or has the firm commitment to play a bigger role in the future. We define critical transitional moments here as any transformative development in conceptualization, theorization or methodological innovation in the research field but also in its underlying structures and its entanglements with society. It is not only about what we study but also by whom and in what ways. We define 'critical' here as developments that push the boundaries of the field in profound ways, not only in terms of substantive focus but also in terms of the structures of knowledge production in migration studies and the positioning of the field in wider society.

We have identified and selected the following critical transitions in the field of migration studies for further examination in this anniversary issue:

- The comparative method and methodological differentiation
- Categorization
- Globalization
- Decolonization and the geopolitics of knowledge production

- Crises and human mobility
- Migration, space and place
- Migration-mobility linkages
- A new global migration paradigm

For each of these themes, we have curated and reprinted one original contribution from CMS that contributed to the identified transitions in the field, together with a commentary reflecting on the selected challenge. This commentary can come from the original author who then reflects further on what has happened since the publication of the original article (in case CMS contributed to the transition in the past 10 years), or from another author who is specifically invited for a broader reflection (in case CMS aims to contribute more to the development in question in the coming years).

In the following, we will discuss the selected critical transitions in more detail.

The comparative method and methodological differentiation

A first critical development that we discuss further involves the rise of the comparative method in migration research. The journal CMS was launched in 2013 with an explicit orientation on comparative research, from the belief that it will 'promote the theoretical development of migration research as only through comparison can we discover what is specific to a case' (Saharso and Scholten, 2013). This comparative orientation was defined broadly, so not only internationally comparative, but also comparing across levels, periods, groups or fields of study. This also addressed some of the promises and pitfalls of comparative research that were discussed by Bloemraad (2013); comparative research can be a key motor of theory development, as long as it is not confined to just comparing nation-states.

As a part of this endeavour, we seek to develop further the methodological differentiation in the field. As a sign of maturity of the field, there is hardly any method that is not used in the field of migration studies. In CMS we try to balance attention to this broad variety of methods, ranging from research with a more quantitative orientation (Careja and Andress 2018) to more ethnographic work (Böhme and Schmitz 2022). However, as journal we are very interested in providing a platform for reflection on various methodological developments as a priority for the journal in the coming years.

Various articles in the journal have over the years contributed to developing the comparative method in migration studies. This has involved a broad variety of comparisons; besides cross-national, we have seen comparisons across levels (Campomori and Ambrosini, 2020), across school systems (Crul et al., 2019), organisations (Lang et al., 2021), groups (Nimführ and Sesay, 2019) and many other units of analysis.

One article in particular has reflected on how comparisons play a role in helping the field of migration studies reach towards 'methodological de-nationalism'. This is the article "*New directions in migration studies: towards methodological de-nationalism*" by Bridget Anderson, published in CMS in 2019. In her commentary, 'The Nation and its Others', Bridget Anderson reflects on this further in this anniversary issue.

Categorization in migration studies

Another key topic in migration studies to which CMS has contributed is the discussion on categorizations. These discussions concern on the one hand the question how to categorize the field of research and on the other how to examine migration-related categorizations and differentiations, including the questions how to compare different migrant categories.

Since the origins of migration studies, there has been a deep concern for how to define the object of study, and for the impact that such categorizations may have on social reality. Defining what migration studies is about, hence what 'migration' means and who can be considered 'a migrant' almost inevitably invokes fundamental questions and problems of 'othering'. A commentary by Russel King (2020) to an article on the rise of migration studies as a research field by Nathan Levy, Asya Pisarevskaya and Peter Scholten (2020) shows the difficulties of such a delimitation. While the current field of migration studies seems to focus on international migration as well as integration, King laments a narrowing of the field, which ignores internal migration, and shows a parallel broadening of the field by also analysing post-migration situations.

The field has struggled in general with finding concepts that enable to understand migration in ways that do neither contain nor reify problematic assumptions and power relations. This also concerns terms related to migration, such as (super) diversity or transnationalism. One such concept that was scrutinized in this journal is'integration.' The journal featured a much-discussed commentary series on' who needs integration?', including both critical views on integration and defenses of the term (a.o. Saharso, 2019; Schinkel, 2018; Favell, 2019; Hadj Abdou, 2019).

Elsewhere, Janine Dahinden (2016) argued for a more reflexive use of categories and categorizations by stepping away from the category of the migrant in order to promote a 'demigranticization' of migration studies. Building on that argument, Raghuram et al. (2024) asked what categories to use instead and proposed to rethink migration studies through a shift in perspectives towards immobility and liminality. In a similar vein, Valentina Mazzucato (2024) suggested to diversify analytical categories for studying youth with and without migration background by developing mobility-based categories. And Bridget Anderson (2019) proposed the approach of 'methodological de-nationalism' to 'migrantize' the citizen, taking as a starting point the migrant/citizen distinction. Following a similar line of thought, one could ask how the categorization of movement impacts on how this movement is perceived in academic and public discourse. Also the approach by Hein de Haas (2021) builds on the critique of migrant categories and especially the idea that both movements and non-movements need to be considered. As part of the proposed aspirations-capabilities framework, he describes different mobility ideal-types and migration categories which also include forms of immobility.

Questions of categorization also concern the debate of how to make sense of differences between migrants, in terms of forms of migration, different legal categories of migrants, or migration experiences. This speaks to a broader debate in migration studies on the use of intersectional categories, such as 'class', 'gender', 'race' or 'ethnicity'. In a highly cited article by Miri Song from 2020a (republished in this anniversary edition), she discusses the complexities surrounding notions of race and minority regarding visibility for multiracial persons. Building on that debate, Comparative Migration Studies featured another commentary series on the question whether it is possible or desirable

to go 'beyond race?' (Saharso and Scharrer, 2022). The comments showed that the term was used in two different and contradictory ways – as a concept to disentangle racism and racialisation (what Amade M'charek 2022 called the 'work race actually does') and as a way of categorization and social classification, in which case it might create the very essentialised hierarchies 'race' as a critical concept tries to disentangle (Scharrer and Saharso, 2023).

The question of how to categorize differences between migrants was also discussed for the field of quantitative research. Milena Chimienti et al. (2021) asked how it was possible to categorise 'nationality' and 'second generation' in surveys without (re)producing stigmatisation, arguing that the deductive process of quantitative research was more at risk of replicating existing categories used in the political field without taking into account the fluidity and subjectivity of these categories. They propose to develop questionnaires through participative and bottom-up processes and to include both more flexibility in the possibilities for answers and more open questions concerning the definition of the self.

Another strand of research focuses on how the nation state categorizes migrants and how these different legal categories of migrants matter. Alessio Cangiano (2014), for instance, compared how the immigration status on arrival influences access to the labour market in EU countries. He showed that especially the categories of 'family migrants' and 'refugees' retained a significant unemployment disadvantage in almost all European destinations. Jussi Tervola (2020) followed in a likewise quantitative paper a similar question, demonstrating that the different selection processes matter for how asylum refugees, resettled refugees and their reunited family members enter the labor market in Finland, even if the differences between the admission categories were relatively small. And Çetin Çelik (2023) describes the differing migration experiences of people staying as short-term immigrants or as refugees respectively in Turkey.

In this anniversary issue, Janine Dahinden reflects further on categorization in migration research. She does so in reference to the 2020 article by Miri Song in CMS on 'Rethinking minority status and visibility'. In her contribution, Dahinden reflects on the category 'migration.'

Globalization and migration studies

Another critical development in migration studies where CMS has played a small yet growing role is reaching beyond a Europe and US centric focus (Chan, 2020; Shivakoti et al., 2021; Bhanye et al., 2025). The evolution of migration studies is clearly rooted in literature from Europe and North-America, with a specific Anglo-American bias (Pisarevskaya et al., 2020). Reaching beyond this bias has been a particular motivation for the foundation of the journal; nonetheless, this means a long way to go and the globalization of this journal and the field in general has remained uneven.

Over the years, Comparative Migration Studies has seen a variety of studies to cover other world regions of migration, including for instance studies into labour migration in East Asia, migrant workers in India (Khan and Arokkiaraj, 2021), work migrants in the Gulf states, such as Sri-Lankan migrants in Qatar (Ekanayake and Amirthalingam, 2021), or on African migration (Flahaux and De Haas, 2016). There have also been a number of special issues on topics such as migration and diversifications in Japan and the UK (Phillimore et al., 2021) or on responses to migration policies from the global

south (Stock et al., 2019). In her article on 'rethinking immigration policy theory beyond western liberal democracies', Kathrine Natter (2018) argues how essential the globalization of the field is to strengthen knowledge production in migration studies.

The most referred to article ever published by CMS is the one by Flahaux and De Haas (2016) on African migration, signalling the interest in and relevance of studies focussing on areas beyond Europe and North America. This article very adequately shows what migration studies can learn from studying trends, patterns and drivers of migration in Africa.

But globalisation is more than bringing in the perspectives from various global regions. It is also about acknowledging the connectivity of migration to broader societal transitions that are part of the process of globalization, such digitisation and datafication. One of the key developments in that regard is the rise of artificial intelligence, on which Nalbandian (2022) has reflected in CMS in her article *'An eye for an I'*, reprinted here.

In this anniversary issue, we have invited Anna Triandafyllidou to reflect on the enormous challenges that globalization and global migration entail for migration studies.

Triandafyllidou's commentary calls for a de-centring of our understanding of migration and migration governance in a globalising and digitalising world. To this end, she explores the close interrelationship between socio-economic and political contexts of globalisation, the dynamics of migration, the rise of innovative digital technologies and migration governance. The growing datafication of migration as well as the intertwining of digital capitalism and migration governance, appear to deserve much more attention in the future.

Decolonization and the geopolitics of knowledge production

The transition towards globalization is essentially related to another critical transition in or rather of our field, towards decolonization of knowledge production. The field has struggled not only to reach beyond concepts and assumptions that reflect coloniality and postcolonial power structures, but also to reach beyond such structures within the field itself. This goes beyond topics of inclusion and diversity, but asks for a much deeper reflection on our responsibility to deconstruct the existing epistemic coloniality and power asymmetries in academic dynamics and to create spaces where minoritized scholars and marginalized knowledge can be properly recognized (Ramirez, 2020).

Migration studies has proven to be highly vulnerable for the use of concepts with a clear geopolitical value. The tendency to minimize the links between colonialism and migration (Mayblin and Turner, 2021), and the generally high levels of political contestation around migration have legitimised securitised borders and migration regimes. Migration and geopolitics are intricately intertwined, forming a complex nexus between border regimes, political alliance building, economic interests, and security apparatuses.

There is a strongly developed body of literature on selective Eurocentric knowledge utilization from migration studies (such as Boswell, 2009), as well as on how policies influence research and knowledge production in the migration field (such as Favell, 2001), how academic knowledge has failed to engage with migrant activists and communities in co-creating knowledge, and how it has overlooked their forms of cultural and political resistance and recreation (Ramirez, 2020). For instance, national governments have been major players in the origins of the national models that defined migration research for a long period (Thränhardt and Bommes, 2010), and in the 'invention' of the

term integration more generally (Saharso, 2019, Schinkel, 2018). Meanwhile, community practices that challenge the state's control and categorization over migrants continue to be absent from the mainstream research agenda (Garcés and Domingo 2020, Castro, 2021).

As an international journal positioned in the Global North, we continue to grapple with colonial legacies embedded in academia, such as publication language, ranking and impact factor imperatives, and a limited network of non-European peer reviewers. Despite these challenges, we are dedicated to rethink the knowledge production dynamics within the migration field. To this end, dwelling on decolonizing knowledge production has been a key theme in some of our articles and special issues in which authors question the categories usually taken for granted in migration studies, such as race, racism, diversity, immigrant background, immobility, nation-state, integration. Together, they invite our community to reflect on how our framing, methodological and citation practices reproduce colonial inheritance (such as Saharso and Scharrer, 2022, Song 2020b; Anderson, 2019). Moreover, the contributions to CMS have also provided insights into migration dynamics that extend beyond the usual South-North paradigm, shedding light on the particularities of different regions and giving visibility to actors beyond the European context. Lastly, the globalization and diversification of the board and its editorship, which the journal has pursued since its foundation, along with the current expansion of our editorial board beyond the Global North, attest to our commitment to contributing to the process of "unlearning and re-learning" in knowledge-making dynamics (Raghuram and Sondhi, 2025). However, this is a transition that has not been concluded; we are perhaps not even at the end of the beginning of this transition.

Therefore, we choose to put this transition central stage in this anniversary issue as well, as one of the themes on which Comparative Migration Studies seeks to develop itself further. We revisit an article by Astolfo and Allsopp from 2023 who discuss 'The coloniality of migration and integration', and we include a commentary by Beatriz Padilla on 'Decolonizing migration studies', pointing a way forward for our journal.

Crises and human mobility

Migration crises and the 'crisis of/in migration' have been central themes in several of CMS' past publications (Devitt, 2014; Estevens, 2018, Hagelund, 2020; Kraly and Hovy, 2020; Sahin-Mencutek et al., 2022). The trope of a migration crisis has frequently been employed by migrant receiving nations to reinforce securitized border control narratives and the migration governance frameworks. This rhetoric has in turn fueled anti-immigration discourses in these countries. At CMS, we reflect on how the term 'crisis' has been increasingly used in the past decade to describe European migration, often in an uncritical way and without sufficient scrutiny.

The recent COVID-19 pandemic and the ongoing ecological crisis and the crisis of democracy have forced scholars of migration studies to shift their gaze of enquiry to crises that are agnostic to the sending/receiving countries dichotomy. During the pandemic, migration studies was suddenly forced to reckon with the fragility of human existence beyond the usual motif of shifting demographics or geopolitical tensions. As countries rushed to prevent the spread of the virus with harsh lockdowns and closing of borders, the field had to contend with the renewed concentration of power in the hands of the nation-state – that earlier theories of globalization failed to account for. CMS

responded to the pandemic by bringing out a special issue on the topic between 2021 and 2022 (Arias Cubas et al., 2022).

The pandemic coincided with the widespread recognition of the far-reaching effects of ecological crisis and crisis of democracy that is affecting the globe as a whole. Scholars suggest that such changes may alter the patterns of migration in contradictory ways. The interdisciplinary field of migration studies must confront the multifaceted and at times unpredictable challenges like the COVID-19 pandemic or the ecological calamities while charting a course for the future and without falling into the trap of statist definitions of crisis.

In this anniversary issue we choose to further reflect on the widespread use of the notion of 'crisis' in migration studies. We 'curate' an article by Sahin-Mencutek, Barthoma, Gokalp-Aras and Triandafyllidou on 'A crisis mode in migration governance'. Furthermore, we have asked Nir Cohen and Tatiana Fogelman to reflect further on how to move CMS beyond the use of the concept of crisis, which they do in their commentary on 'Crisology no more'.

Migration, space and place

The spatial turn (Sheller, 2017) in migration studies represents a paradigm shift that emphasizes the significance of space and place in understanding migration processes and experiences. Traditionally, migration research focused primarily on economic, demographic, and policy aspects, often overlooking the spatial dimensions of migration, a feature of migration studies that CMS has paid little attention to so far (for an exception see King, 2020). The spatial turn redirected this attention to how migrants interact with and transform spaces and places, and how these, in turn, shape migration flows and experiences. Migrants actively engage in creating and redefining places through their cultural practices, social networks, and economic and communal lives. They link their places of origin and settlement by maintaining transnational connections and inhabit more than one space-time (Glick Schiller and Caglar, 2011). Many of the categories previously used to describe processes of accommodation and inclusion were related to space and place (Datta and Brickell, 2011).

Mobility encompasses migration as well as other forms of travel, including studying abroad, vacations, gap years, and family visits (Mazzucato, 2024). A spatial lens brings out the complexity of mobility where not just the physical acts of relocation but also the barriers and facilitators to mobility, such as immigration policies, social networks, and economic resources inflect migrant (im)mobilities. Space is also geo-politically mediated in and through migration regimes with its borders, checkpoints, and detention centers regulating and controlling movement. Space can also alert us to the production and reproduction of social inequalities. Migrants may face spatial segregation, limited access to resources, and discriminatory practices based on their spatial location.

To discuss the critical transition towards a spatial turn, we curate Russell King's article *On Migration, Geography and Epistemic Communities*, originally published in the journal in 2020, to engage with the issues of migration, space and place. Furthermore, we have asked Ilse van Liempt to reflect on this article in a commentary on 'migration, space and place.'

Migration-mobility linkages

Major debates on migration-mobility linkages focus on the enduring significance of the nation-state, despite the erosion of its boundaries. Closely related to this is the role of rights in determining who is labeled as mobile and who is considered a migrant. Additionally, discussions address the mobility/immobility dichotomy in relation to the aspiration-capabilities model, which encompasses both the desire to migrate and the ability to be mobile, even in non-physical ways (Maru et al., 2022; Mazzucato, 2024).

CMS publications in the past have contributed to the deepening of our understanding of migration-mobility linkages quite meaningfully, and in different ways. Anderson (2019) article on an intersection of methodological nationalism and mobility critiqued some of the fallacies of the categories we use in our day-to-day work was instumental in theorising this linkage. CMS has engaged with the mobility/immobility debate by destabilising sedantariness (Maru et al., 2022) or calling for a radical 'demigrantised' lens (Raghuram et al., 2024). CMS has also addressed the impasse in return migration literature to see embedding as a lens that disrupts the impasse between settlement and constant move (Grabowska and Ryan, 2024).

The global differences between migration and mobility is not just an issue with CMS, but with migration journals in general, linked to its over-politicisation in the Global North as vis-à-vis the Global South where transborder movements are indeed within the realm of mobilities than migration. Comparative Migration Studies can utilise the comparative method for dismantling and remaking the global inequalities as expressed in migration but also as constantly reworked through as encapsulated by the entangled mobilities lens (Wyss and Dahinden, 2022).

Post-pandemic, a subtle yet significant shift has emerged in migration dynamics. Previously, migrants often aspired to assimilate into mainstream society, integrating into local networks, lifestyles, and labor markets. Now, there is a more decentralized approach to migration-one that prioritizes individual flexibility and the ability to navigate multiple social and economic spaces. Concepts such as *digital nomadism*, *neoliberal order*, and *flexible citizenship* (Mancinelli & Germann Molz, 2023) have gained prominence in academic research, reflecting this evolving landscape of migration and mobility.

For this anniversary issue, we curate Anderson's article from 2019 on 'Methodological de-nationalism.' Furthermore, we asked Mazzucato and Schapendonk to reflect on the spatial turn, which they do in their commentary on 'Migration through a mobilities lens.'

A new global migration paradigm

Our final interjection is about the new development in the field of migration studies which calls for a new global paradigm because traditional models, particularly the "push-pull" framework, oversimplify the complexities of human mobility and reinforce outdated, Western-centric perspectives. Migration flows are dynamic, multifaceted, and ever-evolving, contrasted with the emerging global migration governance paradigm that aims to establish clarity, consistency, predictability, and order (Maru et al., 2022). These models fail to explain why migration is not solely driven by poverty, why the poorest countries often have the lowest emigration rates, and why migration increases as societies develop. Additionally, they tend to portray migrants as passive actors responding to economic or environmental pressures rather than as individuals with agency, aspirations, and varying capabilities (Carling and Collins, 2020).

To address this mismatch, we invited Hein de Haas' for a reflection on the theme and his commentary "Towards a Global Migration Paradigm and the imperative of ridding ourselves of the "push-pull" model" offers a fresh perspective for a paradigm shift in the field of migration studies. Here, he contends that we need to move beyond the rigid South-North dichotomy and integrate migration into broader processes of economic development, social transformation, and global change.

Conclusion

Scholars grapple with understanding the complex dynamics of migration, including its economic, social, and cultural implications, while navigating political landscapes increasingly marked by polarization and xenophobia. However, amidst these challenges lie opportunities for innovation and collaboration. By embracing diverse perspectives, incorporating emerging methodologies, and fostering dialogue across disciplines, migration studies can play a vital role in shaping policies and narratives that promote equity, justice, and solidarity in an interconnected world.

In this anniversary issue we reflect on the past of the journal Comparative Migration Studies in order to better understand the journal's present and to shape the future of the journal. The journal has clearly positioned itself in the heart of the field of migration studies, and has contributed to theoretical development and methodological innovation, in particular establishing the comparative method. The journal's contribution has been particularly strong in using comparative research to move the field beyond methodological nationalism but also beyond an 'ethnic lens.' Furthermore, the journal has paved the path for Open Access publishing in the field, and has become a platform for interdisciplinary and international collaborations.

However, the journal will have to continue repositioning itself in relation to some of today's critical transitions in the field. Methodological innovation within and beyond the comparative method requires further attention. What will further reflection on categorization mean to the journal, such as to its focus on 'migration'? How can the journal genuinely globalize, both in terms of editorial work and in terms of authorship and impact? How can it enhance its efforts in decolonizing the work it publishes? How can we move beyond the "crisology" that has increasingly dominated the field, reflecting broader societal and political trends of today? How can the journal navigate the various 'turns' that are taking place in the field, such as the spatial turn and the mobility turn?

Reflexivity is not just an abstract concept. The journal maintains a key position in reflexive knowledge production in the field of migration studies, which is an important and heavy responsibility. This responsibility has to be treated with constant and great care. The journal is firmly committed to this reflexivity; in the end, reflexivity is more important to the real scientific and societal impact of the journal than what can be expressed in a journal's impact score.

Finally, CMS was established to provide a service to scholars wishing to share their work on migration and migration-related diversities. We now look back proudly on the first ten years of service to the migration scholarly community. We look forward to continuing to provide scholars from all career levels, all regions and all disciplines the opportunity to share their work. It is to all these authors who trusted us with the fruits of their hard academic work and to all the reviewers and editors who sustained the quality

of the journal, that we owe the success of the journal. Therefore we end this editorial with a BIG THANK YOU!

Author contributions
Sanam Roohi; main editor of the special issue and editor of the part on crises and migration studies. Peter Scholten: main editor of the special issue and editor of the part on comparative method. Martin Bak Jorgensen: editor of the part on migration-mobility linkages. Thais Franca: editor of the part on decolonization and geopolitics of knowledge production. Andreas Pott: editor of the part on globalization and migration studies. Tabea Scharrer: editor of the part on categorization. Zana Vathi: editor of the part on migration, space and place.

Declarations

Competing interests
The authors declare no competing interests.

Author details
[1]University of Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany
[2]Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, Netherlands
[3]Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark
[4]ISCTE – Instituto Universitátio de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal
[5]University of Osnabrück, Osnabrück, Germany
[6]Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle, Germany
[7]Edge Hill University, Lancashire, UK

Published online: 19 November 2025

References

Anderson, B. (2019). New directions in migration studies: Towards methodological de-nationalism. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*(1), 1–13.
Anderson, B. New directions in migration studies: Towards methodological de-nationalism. *CMS*, *7*(36(2019). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0140-8
Arias Cubas, M., Paul, A. M., Ramírez, J., Roohi, S., & Scholten, P. (2022). Comparative perspectives on migration, diversities and the pandemic. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *10*(1), 38.
Astolfo, G., & Allsopp, H. The coloniality of migration and integration: Continuing the discussion. *CMS*, *11*(19) 2023. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-023-00343-2
Bhanye, J., Matamanda, A., & Shayamunda, R. (2025). 'This settlement is just a launch pad to move to better city spaces': Radical sense of place and migration aspirations among youth migrants in the diaspora. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *13*(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-025-00423-5
Bloemraad, I. (2013). The promise and pitfalls of comparative research design in the study of migration. *Migration Studies*, *1*(1), 27–46.
Böhme, C., & Schmitz, A. Refugee's agency and coping strategies in refugee camps during the coronavirus pandemic: Ethnographic perspectives. *CMS*, *10*(34) 2022. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00302-3
Boswell, C. (2009). *The political uses of expert knowledge: Immigration policy and social research*. Cambridge University Press.
Campomori, F., & Ambrosini, M. (2020). Multilevel governance in trouble: The implementation of asylum seekers' reception in Italy as a battleground. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*(1), 22.
Cangiano, A. (2014). Migration policies and migrant employment outcomes. *CMS*, *2*, 417–443. https://doi.org/10.5117/CMS2014.4.CANG
Careja, R., & Andreß, H. J. In search of a frame: Challenges and opportunities for sampling immigrant minorities. *CMS*, *6*(37) 2018.
Carling, J., & Collins, F. (2020). Introduction: Aspiration, desire and drivers of migration. In *Aspiration, desire and the drivers of migration* (pp. 1–18). Routledge.
Castro Garcés, A. P., & Castro Domingo, P. (2020). *La 72, Hogar-refugio para personas migrantes: La sociedad civil organizada en la atención de la agenda de los transmigrantes en la frontera México-Guatemala*. Revista pueblos y fronteras digital, 15. https://doi.org/10.22201/cimsur.18704115e.2020.v15.502
Castro, M. D. A. (2021). Venezuelanas/os em Boa Vista: Práticas comunitárias, resistências e novas territorialidades na Ocupação Ka Ubanoko. *Périplos: Revista de Estudos sobre Migrações*, *5*(1), Article 1. https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/obmigra_periplos/article/view/34735
Çelik, Ç. (2023). Immigrants and refugees, tourists and vagabonds: Why and how they integrate differently. *CMS*, *11*, 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-023-00339-y
Chan, Y. W. (2020). Asian perspectives of migration: A commentary. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00190-5
Chimienti, M., Guichard, E., & Bolzman, C., et al. How can we categorise 'nationality' and 'second generation' in surveys without (re)producing stigmatisation? *CMS*, *9*(29) 2021. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00237-1
Crawley, H., & Skleparis, D. (2018). Refugees, migrants, neither, both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's 'migration crisis'. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*, *44*(1), 48–64.
Crul, M., Lelie, F., Biner, Ö., Bunar, N., Keskiner, E., Kokkali, I.Shuayb, M. … Shuayb, M. (2019). How the different policies and school systems affect the inclusion of Syrian refugee children in Sweden, Germany, Greece, Lebanon and Turkey. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*(1), 1–20.

Dahinden, J. (2016). A plea for the 'de-migranticization' of research on migration and integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *39*(13), 2207–2225.
Dahinden, J., Fischer, C., & Menet, J. (2021). Knowledge production, reflexivity, and the use of categories in migration studies: Tackling challenges in the field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *44*(4), 535–554.
Dahinden, Janine / Pott, Andreas (eds.) (2025), Reflexivities and knowledge production in migration studies. *IMISCOE research* series (in print).
Datta, A., & Brickell, K. (2011). *Translocal geographies. Spaces, places, connections*. London: Routledge.
de Haas, H. (2021). A theory of migration: The aspirations-capabilities framework. *CMS*, *9*, 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00210-4
Devitt, C. (2014). Government responses to foreign worker demand during economic crises: The cases of Britain and France 2008-2013. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *2*, 445–467. https://doi.org/10.5117/CMS2014.4.DEVI
Ekanayake, A., & Amirthalingam, K. (2021). The economic impact of the covid-19 pandemic on Sri Lankan migrants in Qatar. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *9*, 1–20.
Estevens, J. (2018). Migration crisis in the EU: Developing a framework for analysis of national security and defence strategies. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *6*(1), 28. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0093-3
Favell, A. (2001). Integration policy and integration research in Europe: A review and critique. *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, *349*, 351–352
Favell, A. (2019). Integration: Twelve propositions after Schinkel. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*(1), 1–10.
Flahaux, M. L., & De Haas, H. (2016). African migration: Trends, patterns, drivers. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *4*, 1–25.
Geddes, A., & Scholten, P. (2020). Policy analysis and europeanization: an analysis of EU migrant integration policymaking. In *Policy sectors in comparative policy analysis studies* (pp. 335–353). Routledge.
Glick Schiller, N., & Caglar, A. (2011). *Locating migration. Rescaling cities and migrants*. London: Cornell University Press.
Grabowska, I., & Ryan, L. (2024). Return migration and embedding: through the lens of Brexit as an unsettling event. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *12*(1), 6.
Hadj Abdou, L. (2019). Immigrant integration: the governance of ethno-cultural differences. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*.
Hagelund, A. (2020). After the refugee crisis: public discourse and policy change in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*(1), 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0169-8
Khan, A., & Arokkiaraj, H. (2021). Challenges of reverse migration in India: a comparative study of internal and international migrant workers in the post-COVID economy. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *9*(1), 49.
King, R. (2020). On migration, geography, and epistemic communities. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*(1), 35. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00193-2
King, R. On migration, geography, and epistemic communities. *CMS*, *8*(35) 2020. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00193-2
Kraly, E. P., & Hovy, B. (2020). Data and research to inform global policy: the global compact for safe, orderly and regular migration. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*(1), 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0166-y
Lang, C., Pott, A., & Shinozaki, K. (2021). Organisations and the production of migration and in/exclusion. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *9*(1), 60.
Levy, N., Pisarevskaya, A., & Scholten, P. (2020). Between fragmentation and institutionalisation: the rise of migration studies as a research field. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00180-7
M'charek, A. Race and sameness: On the limits of beyond race and the art of staying with the trouble. *CMS*, *10*(13(2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00287-z
Mancinelli, F., & Germann Molz, J. (2023). Moving with and against the state: digital nomads and frictional mobility regimes. *Mobilities*, *19*(2), 189–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2023.2209825
Maru, N., Nori, M., Scoones, I., Semplici, G., & Triandafyllidou, A. (2022). Embracing uncertainty: rethinking migration policy through pastoralists' experiences. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *10*(1), 5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00277-1
Mayblin, L., & Turner, J. (2021). *Migration studies and colonialism* (1st ed.). Polity.
Mazzucato, V. (2024). Diversifying analytical categories for studying youth with and without migration background: an example of mobility-based categories. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *12*(1), 27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-024-00385-0
Nalbandian, L. An eye for an 'I:' a critical assessment of artificial intelligence tools in migration and asylum management. *CMS*, *10*(32) 2022. 10.1186/s40878-022-00305-0.
Natter, K. (2018). Rethinking immigration policy theory beyond 'Western liberal democracies'. *CMS*, *6*(4).
Nimführ, S., & Sesay, B. (2019). Lost in limbo? Navigating (im) mobilities and practices of appropriation of non-deportable refugees in the Mediterranean area. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*, 1–19.
Phillimore, J., Liu-Farrer, G., & Sigona, N. (2021). Migrations and diversifications in the UK and Japan. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *9*(1), 54.
Pisarevskaya, A., Levy, N., Scholten, P., & Jansen, J. (2020). Mapping migration studies: an empirical analysis of the coming of age of a research field. *Migration Studies*, *8*(3), 455–481.
Raghuram, P., Breines, M. R., & Gunter, A. (2024). De-migranticizing as methodology: rethinking migration studies through immobility and liminality. *CMS*, *12*, 24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-024-00382-3
Raghuram, P., & Sondhi, G. (2025). Decolonising this, decolonising that: beyond rhetorical decolonisation in migration studies. In J. Dahinden & A. Pott (Eds.), *Reflexivities and knowledge production in migration Studies, IMISCOE research series (in print)*.
Ramirez, C. (2020). Decolonizing migration studies: A Chicanx studies perspective and critique of colonial sociological origins. *Río Bravo: a Journal of the Borderlands*, *24*, 1–15
Saharso, S. (2019). Who needs integration? Debating a central, yet increasingly contested concept in migration studies. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*(1), 1–3.
Saharso, S., & Scharrer, T. (2022). Beyond race? *Comparative Migration Studies*, *10*, 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00272-y
Saharso, S., & Scholten, P. (2013). Comparative migration studies: an introduction. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *1*, 1–6.
Sahin-Mencutek, Z., Barthoma, S., & Gökalp-Aras, N. E., et al. A crisis mode in migration governance: comparative and analytical insights. *CMS*, *10*(12(2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00284-2
Sahin-Mencutek, Z., Barthoma, S., Gökalp-Aras, N. E., & Triandafyllidou, A. (2022). A crisis mode in migration governance: comparative and analytical insights. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *10*(1), 12.
Scharrer, T., & Saharso, S. (2023). Beyond 'race'?: a rejoinder. *CMS*, *11*, 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-023-00330-7

Scheel, S., & Tazzioli, M. (2022). Who is a migrant? Abandoning the nation-state point of view in the study of migration. *Migration Politics*, *1*(1), 002.
Schinkel, W. (2018). Against 'immigrant integration': for an end to neocolonial knowledge production. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *6*(1), 31
Scholten, P. (2020). *Mainstreaming versus alienation*. Cham: palgrave Macmillan.
Sheller, M. (2017). From spatial turn to mobilities turn. *Current Sociology*, *65*(4), 623–639. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392117697463
Shivakoti, R., Henderson, S., & Withers, M. (2021). The migration ban policy cycle: a comparative analysis of restrictions on the emigration of women domestic workers. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *9*(1), 36. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00250-4
Song, M. (2020a). Rethinking minority status and 'visibility'. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*(1), 5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0162-2
Song, M. (2020b). Rethinking minority status and 'visibility'. *CMS*, *8*(5). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0162-2
Stock, I., Üstübici, A., & Schultz, S. U. (2019). Externalization at work: Responses to migration policies from the global south. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*, 1–9.
Tervola, J. Different selection processes, different outcomes? Comparing labor market integration of asylum refugees, resettled refugees and their reunited family members in Finland. *CMS*, *8*(28) 2020. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00183-4
Thränhardt, D., & Bommes, M. (Eds.). (2010). *National paradigms of migration research*. V & amp;r Unipress.
Wyss, A., & Dahinden, J. (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

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.