

Review of: "Choosing to Stay: A New Perspective on Immobility Amidst Adversity"

Sıtkı Karadeniz¹

¹ Mardin Artuklu University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I've been doing research on migration for a while, but I don't have any research on those who cannot migrate or those who choose not to migrate. To be honest, the topic of the article was quite interesting to me, and I learned a lot from it. I have read both the article and the critiques, so I will not repeat some of what I have to say as other commentators have already mentioned it. I just want to address a few points.

First of all, for a study theoretically positioned within the field of "migration studies," is "immobility" the correct term for the concept of "those who prefer not to migrate"? Certainly, we can define "migration" as mobility and its opposite as immobility. But in this case, "immobility" would be so broad that it surrounds everyone except those who migrate or intend to migrate, thus the concept would become dysfunctional. How, then, should we define those in this second group?

Second, in common with other critiques, the methodology of the article is not sufficiently defined, and it seems unclear whether it is a field study or a theoretical text. The field data is very limited and unsatisfactory.

Another point is that there is too much theoretical fringing in the text, and it has a scattered appearance. As such, it does not present an all-encompassing theoretical start-off point or point of view. It becomes difficult to place the issue anywhere on the global plane.

In other words, what factors are involved in the decision or action "to stay and/or go" on a global scale? Therefore, perhaps at this point, we should also take into account the relationship of "connectivity".

Finally, I am glad that I had the opportunity to read and evaluate this article.