

Daryl Gordon, Jennifer Long, Melissa Fellin

Editorial: Education for National Belonging: Imposing Borders and Boundaries on Citizenship

Keywords

Citizenship education, immigrant identities, immigration policies, multiculturalism, diversity

1 Introduction

This special issue explores the everyday experiences of individuals taking part in citizenship education, as they cross national borders and boundaries. The articles, some of which were originally presented at the 2012 American Anthropological Association's Annual Meeting, provoke discussion about anthropology's role, unique contributions, and limitations in understanding how processes of citizenship education define who belongs and who does not belong within the nation-state. Responding to the need for anthropologists of education to bridge the separation between academic discourses of multiculturalism and citizenship and to "reengage the discourse of citizenship with difference" (Levinson 2005, p.330), authors in this special issue investigate the ways citizenship education both engages and impedes the participation of immigrants and refugees as full, democratic citizens in Canada, the United States, and the Netherlands.

According to Levinson, democratic citizenship education has proliferated over the last 20 years into a "curious amalgamation of programs and activities", highlighting the countless interpretations of important civic concepts and values such as "freedom" or civic "participation" (2011, p.290). This proliferation developed through the implementation of diverse citizenship education projects that range from school-based programs to civil society activism. The articles in this special issue exemplify this diverse understanding of citizenship education using empirical research in a variety of contexts. Citizenship education activities can be described as those efforts to educate members of a democratic public for the purpose of "imagin(ing) their social belonging and exercis(ing) their participation as democratic citizens" (Levinson 2011, p.282). The articles

in this special issue use ethnographic methods to investigate first-hand experiences of citizenship education in its various forms.

Four main themes are explored in this special issue. First, each study questions whether citizenship education acts as an inclusive or exclusive force in society. Second, the authors explore citizenship formation during a time marked by a retreat from multiculturalism and growing concerns about national security and social integration. Third, the articles focus on the infrastructure of immigration. Specifically, the ways immigration agencies, educators (i.e. front line workers, service providers, teachers, and volunteers) conceptualize and enact citizenship education are explored. Finally, the authors examine the negotiation of immigrant identities and languages within the processes of migration and citizenship.

2 Citizenship education as transformative or homogenizing

According to Banks (2009), citizens in multicultural nations can be defined as those who endorse, maintain, and work to close the gap between the ideals of the nation-state, such as equality or justice, and the state's everyday practices, i.e., violations of these ideals. From this perspective, citizenship education needs to develop the kind of knowledge, attitudes, and skills that would allow students to make decisions and act in a way that recognize and perpetuate nation-state ideals, while limiting the perceived injustices against their fellow citizens and the nation-state. Banks (2009) further notes that multicultural societies need to teach tolerance and recognize cultural differences among its diverse citizens. However, there is an inherent contradiction within this citizen-making project; how can one teach would-be-citizens about nation-state ideals and proper citizen behavior (an inherently mono-cultural project), and still account for the difference found within multicultural societies?

The project of citizenship education becomes even more complicated when one looks at the everyday practices of those students and teachers involved in this process at the local level. It is here that hegemonic discourses of this nation-state and the diversity of its participants come into sharp focus. The authors in this special issue examine multicultural nations of Canada, the US, and the Netherlands to explore inherent tensions found within nation-states with diverse citizenry.

Scholars, such as Ong (1999), identify cultural citizenship as an important term and describe it as the negotiation of cultural groups' relations with the state and hegemonic national identities. Ong defines citizen-making as a two-way process of "self-making and being made" that is affected by power relations and systems within the nation-state and civil society (1999, p.264). Ong (1999) refers to the importance of one's unique perspective and perceived/ascribed identity as an

Daryl Gordon is Associate Professor at the Ruth S. Ammon School of Education, Adelphi University Harvey Hall, Garden City, NY 11530, USA

Email: dgordon@adelphi.edu

Jennifer Long is a researcher and adjunct faculty member at Wilfrid Laurier University, Brantford campus.

*103 Darling St, Brantford, ON N3T 2K8
Wilfrid Laurier University, 75 University Avenue West,
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3C5*

Email: jelong@wlu.ca

Melissa Fellin is a part-time Assistant Professor in the Youth and Children's Studies Program at Wilfrid Laurier University. 103 Darling St, Brantford, ON N3T 2K8

Email: mfellin@wlu.ca

important factor in this process. Ong's (1999) argument aligns with Murphy-Shigematsu's findings, in his study of Japanese citizenship practices. In this study, he argues that one's "racial, cultural, linguistic, and religious characteristics often significantly influence whether she is viewed as a citizen in her nation" (as cited in Banks, 2009, p.12). Therefore, in order to examine the interaction and negotiation between those affected by the practices and policies of citizenship education and the purveyors of nation-state ideals, i.e. the educators, the authors in this special issue explore first-hand experiences of citizenship education from the bottom-up, or from the perspective of students and educators.

Diverse citizenship educational spaces are explored in this issue, and include both formal and informal educational settings, discussed below. Each setting has a set of discourses about membership and their own processes of inclusion and exclusion. Many of the authors focus on how the state's civic interests are represented by the infrastructure of immigration, including multiple non-state actors, such as second language volunteer teachers (Zhu; Mosher) or educators of parenting classes for refugee parents (Fellin). In this way, the authors are able to explore the influence of the Foucauldian concept of "biopower" in which control of subjects of the nation-state is maintained through rules that regulate the conduct of individuals and produce consent (Foucault 1991). Yet, these studies also address the critique of Foucault's lack of recognition of personal agency by exploring the way new citizens engage in the process of "self-making" with regards to their individual and community identities as well as resist those rules and regulations that seek to control their behavior.

Levinson has recently called for anthropologists "to pay close attention...to the educational forms and practices that comprise a spectrum from authoritarian to democratic citizenship" (2011, p.281). In response, these studies encompass a wide range of citizenship educational spaces that include an elementary classroom for immigrant students in a Canadian Francophone school (Farmer, Cepen, and Breton-Carbonneau), a Canadian parenting class for Somali refugees (Fellin), a Canadian government-funded settlement agency for Chinese immigrants (Zhu), a volunteer program in which Dutch language tutors work with Muslim immigrants seeking citizenship in the Netherlands (Mosher), a bicycling program designed to promote the integration of Muslim women in the Netherlands (Long), a summer educational program attended by adolescent children of Southeast Asian American migrant agricultural workers in the US (McGinnis), and adult citizenship classes for adult newcomers to the US (Loring). In so doing, these investigations interrogate how immigrants, refugees and state-actors each engage in processes of identity formation.

While citizenship education has the potential to be a transformative force, inviting immigrants into a dialogue about their social belonging and participation within the nation-state, it often falls short of this ideal. Banks (2008) writes that mainstream citizenship education reinforces, rather than challenges, the systematic

discrimination in society. Similarly Abu El-Haj (2009) voices concern about dominant frameworks of citizenship education which ignore the importance of diversity within education and the impact of such exclusion on students' perceptions of inclusion within the imagined community of the nation (Anderson, 1983). These authors envision transformative citizenship education, which engages students in developing critical thinking skills to identify social problems within their communities and involves them in taking thoughtful civic action to make change (Banks, 2008).

Many of the articles in this special issue explore missed opportunities for transformative citizenship education; instead, they demonstrate how the educational process restricts immigrants and refugees' opportunities to imagine their social belonging by inviting them into a dialogue about their relationship with their new nation. What categories are left available for these citizens-in-waiting (Banks, 2009), are periphery to the imagined community of the nation. This periphery status can be seen, for example, in Mosher's (this issue) exploration of what constitutes a "good citizen" in the Dutch context and McGinnis' (this issue) "model minority" discourse in the context of the US. Hence, the title of this special issue, which highlights how citizenship education can impose borders and boundaries on the potential for citizenship with difference.

3 Citizenship education and the retreat from multiculturalism

Canada, the US, and the Netherlands each hold dramatically different stances toward multiculturalism. Canada is the only one of the three countries that holds multiculturalism as an official state policy enacted through the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988). Multiculturalism and citizenship education are important concepts to investigate together because citizenship education programs in a multicultural society should support a pluralistic conception of who belongs to the nation.

Modood (2011) argued, however, that new immigrant and refugee groups experience difficulty in "writing themselves into a national narrative" (p. 32). Calling attention to the manner in which multicultural governing models do not equally embrace all members of the nation-state, he asserts that nations risk alienating immigrant communities if they do not engage new citizens in revising and reshaping the national narrative (Modood 2011; Meer & Modood 2013). Commenting on this tension in Canada, Fleras (2012) writes that Canada's official multiculturalism "embraces the principle of an inclusive Canada by making society safe for differences, yet safe from differences" (p. 388).

Since the September 11, 2001 attacks on the US, countries have shifted their stance toward multiculturalism (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). Meer and Modood (2013) have described a recent, large-scale retreat from multiculturalism in which European leaders, including Cameron (UK), Merkel (Germany), Sarkozy (France), have declared the death of multiculturalism. It

is in this context that integration agendas have increasingly shifted away from liberal models of civic citizenship that, in theory, promote diversity, pluralism, and multiculturalism and are instead, moving toward a more mono-cultural and assimilationist understanding of national identity and belonging. Meer and Modood (2013) urge investigation into the ways in which “this rhetorical ‘retreat of multiculturalism’ corresponds to public policy developments in different countries” (p. 68). This special issue offers a forum through which to explore the differences in citizenship education across three countries that have responded very differently to this movement away from multiculturalism.

Canada and the Netherlands have historically used multicultural governance models to respond to the increasing diversity within their borders. Multiculturalism has been a strong presence in Canada through-out the 20th century and remains an important identity and policy for Canadians to this day (Mackey, 1999). In recent years, however, Canada has shifted their stance toward multiculturalism. While maintaining a nominally multicultural position, it has adopted increasingly controversial immigration policies, which belie a commitment toward integration and full national belonging of immigrant and refugee groups. In 2012, Canada adopted new policies which favor temporary over permanent employment for newcomers, limited refugee access to healthcare and the ability to sponsor family members, and intensified the focus on language abilities for economic migrants (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2013).

In the Netherlands, Dutch politicians have retracted any multicultural-style policies for immigrant integration and now regularly blame their past “multicultural approach” for the nation’s socio-economic, political and cultural failings (Doomernik, 2005). Their current approach to immigrant integration can be categorized as assimilatory, especially with respect to policies concerning the adoption of Dutch culture while in the public sphere. Meer and Modood (2013) describe Netherland’s “drastic break with multiculturalism” as the most comprehensive retreat from multiculturalism among all northern European countries.

While lacking an explicit multicultural policy on immigration like the Netherlands or Canada, the US has historically advocated a public discourse of acceptance of immigrants. Since 9/11, however, US immigration policy has been defined by a focus on national security, which has led to enhance border security and visa controls on international travellers and immigrants, as well as the utilization of state and local law enforcement agencies to supplement national immigration enforcement (Chishti & Bergeron, 2011).

Winter (2014) calls attention to the fact that many countries, including Canada, the US, and the Netherlands, have tightened naturalization and citizenship policies since 2001. While these changes may be introduced under the guise of enhancing the value of national citizenship or making the citizenship process more meaningful, such changes are often driven by anxiety about national security, the economy, and social

cohesion. Echoing Modood, she suggests that these changes represent a wide-scale retreat from a multicultural society toward a “renationalization”, in which rigid, nation-specific definitions of citizenship predominate (Winter, 2014). Razack (2008) calls attention to the particular impact of this renationalization on Muslim citizens, who are categorically treated differently on the basis of their Muslim identity. These shifts also speak the importance of such an investigation not just to the scholarship on national-building citizenship education but also discussions of global citizenship education. From an international perspective, these “renationalization” trends continue to privilege those traditionally in power worldwide, that is, those White, Christian, Anglophone (even in the Dutch context, see Mosher this issue) citizens of the Western world. Given these recent shifts, Winter (2014) underscores the need to monitor developments that may impede the full integration and participation of diverse immigrants.

The ramifications of these changes have impacted citizenship education practices in these countries. The context of citizenship education at this precise historical moment of economic instability, heightened fears of terrorism, and a hardened stance toward acceptance of communities perceived as different raises important questions for social science education and civic integration.

4 The infrastructure of immigration

In this issue, we use the term ‘infrastructure of immigration’ to designate the relationship and structure that connects formal citizenship and integration practices on the federal level to the organizations that seek funding and hire educators, whether they are service providers, teachers, front-line workers or immigration officials that deliver the curriculum and interact with those students of citizenship education, either inside or outside classrooms. While organizations funded by federal funding schemes develop rules of access to such education and share responsibility in regulating citizenship curriculum, the actual practice of citizenship education is much more nuanced. The more complicated nature of this relationship is demonstrated in this special issue by Loring’s exploration of citizenship curriculum as it is practiced in Sacramento, US and Zhu’s exploration of first-hand experiences of the infrastructure of Canadian based language program. This issue also explores the importance of funding schemes at the organizational level and their effects on the provision of these educational practices. As funding diminishes from immigration and refugee settlement services across the US, Canada and the Netherlands (Kennelly & Llewellyn, 2011), volunteerism in the social service sector will play an increasing role in immigrant integration in the Netherlands, as demonstrated by Mosher (this issue), and around the world. Therefore, significant changes to the infrastructure of immigrant and refugee integration and settlement will proliferate and the role of the nation-state in citizenship education will be an important and timely area for scholarly attention.

Citizenship educators who not only enact the bureaucratic business of naturalization, but also act as agents to translate the nation's immigration policies to newcomer citizens, shape citizen subjects into the categories considered most desirable to the receiving nation (Ong, 2003). Rather than an overarching program, citizenship education is the combined influence of these bureaucratic figures whose goal is "to produce subjects who can be induced, nudged, and empowered to become self-sufficient and goal-oriented citizens" (Ong, 2003, p.17). The authors in this issue underscore the ways in which immigrants complicate and resist citizenship practices which define and regulate them, reflecting Foucault's assertion that regulatory programs never have a totalitarian effect as subjects resist and negate systems of classification (Foucault, 1977). In this way, this special issue investigates what Miller and Rose (2008) call the acts of 'minor figures', as explored in Long's contribution or, what Ilcan and Basok (2004) have termed the "community as a means of government" as outlined by Fellin (this issue). In this way, contributions to this special issue examine first-hand experiences of citizenship education from the perspective of immigrants (Farmer, Cepin, and Breton-Carbonneau; Zhu), refugees (Fellin; McGinnis), or educators and volunteers (Long; Loring; Mosher).

Immigration officials, front-line service providers, language and citizenship instructors, and educational volunteers conceptualize, enact, and teach about citizenship in everyday life. Zhu's argument with regard to settlement services for Chinese immigrants in Canada aptly describes the experience of citizenship education for many of the immigrants in these articles. She writes of a one-way communication of the government's project of civic education, rather than a hybrid interaction process informed by new immigrants. Long's article about bicycling classes as a civic education tool in the Netherlands demonstrates that citizenship education is not limited to policy makers or curriculum specialists, but includes native Dutch settlement workers and volunteers involved in the integration process, who bring their own strongly held beliefs about what constitutes Dutch citizenship. Fellin explores the role of social workers and settlement workers in positioning Somali immigrant women as trauma-survivors in need of protection by the host country, rather than drawing on the women's abundant strengths and resourcefulness, which has enabled them to rescue their families from Somalia's traumatic past. Farmer, Cepin, and Breton-Carbonneau explore the influence of elementary school education on children's complex conceptions of identity, belonging, and mobility. Mosher's work focuses on the ways in which Dutch volunteer language tutors, who participate in federally funded programs act as "gatekeepers of Dutchness", defining what constitutes "good citizenship". McGinnis explores the ways in which a citizenship education program focuses on "fixing" perceived deficiencies of immigrant youth, rather than responding to their need for a sense of belonging and full citizenship. Loring investigates how citizenship education is discursively

framed by teachers and volunteers engaged in the local citizenship enterprise for adult newcomers.

5 Negotiation of immigrant identities and languages

Global immigration and increasing diversity within nation-states raise complex questions about how nation-states can create "civic communities that reflect and incorporate the diversity of citizens and yet have an overarching set of shared values, ideals, and goals to which all of the citizens of a nation-state are committed" (Banks, 2008, p.130). Throughout North America and Europe, citizenship education has historically attempted to integrate immigrants and refugees into the larger national fabric. Yet, such integrating processes often conceal immigrants and refugees' histories and force them to hide their differences and emphasize their similarities to be more like the imagined national community (Phillips, 2000; see also Bannerji, 2000). These processes result in certain worldviews being deemed normative, while others are defined as aberrant (Mackey, 1999; Thobani, 2007). This unbalanced relationship is often glossed over in official multicultural policies which tend to highlight the multiplicity of national residents but ignore the manner in which each of these worldviews are valued.

Fellin's article explores how the perception of refugees as helpless and vulnerable in psycho-educational interventions in North America contribute to a prevailing notion that refugees are not only victims of war, but also victims of their 'traditions' and backward cultures. The focus on the pathology of refugees (Harrell-Bond 1999, Summerfield 1999) further obfuscates the discrimination, poverty, and unequal access to power that is a reality of their lives in Canada. Refugee status is also a theme explored in McGinnis' exploration of Khmer youth in the Cambodian-American context.

The intersections of religious, gender and ethnic identities are explored in the articles. Fellin explores the ways that racial, gender, and "refugee" identities influence the perception of Somali mothers within a parenting course; facilitators adopt a discourse that Muslim Somali women need to be "modernized" and "civilized", portraying women as victims of trauma, rather than focusing on their strengths and agency. Long demonstrates how racial and gender identity influence the perception of toward the Muslim women in the Netherlands, where bicycling courses are designed with the explicit intent to emancipate "imperiled Muslim women" from overbearing husbands and fathers.

Together, the contributors to this special issue examine the cost of belonging to the new national state. Urcioli (1998) has referred to this concept as the "homogenization of difference" which prescribes that newcomer ethnic groups can only differ in narrowly defined ways that enhance national productivity. Many of the articles underscore the interconnections between language, identity, and citizenship education in the creation of this homogenized society and demonstrate how teachers, volunteers and administrators of integration policies reinforce these policies. For example, Long finds Dutch language used as a marker of citizenship, as citizenship

volunteers enact local language policies to speak only Dutch during bicycling lessons. Chinese immigrants in Zhu's study find that their native language is devalued in Canada. Mosher's work focuses most closely on language, exploring how Dutch language use by immigrants is a marker of social belonging. Mosher posits that Dutch language learning has increasingly come to be viewed as the solution to a complex set of social problems that are associated with immigrants.

Two of the authors demonstrate the potential for language to resist this homogenizing tendency. Fellin's work explores how the preservation of the Somali language maintains national and cultural identity. Farmer, Cepin, and Breton-Carbonneau examine how elementary immigrant students reshape the linguistic ideology of French, which has been related to Canadian politics and social values. The students in this mainly immigrant school use French as a lingua franca, which represents their connections to their native francophone countries.

6 Conclusion

These articles contribute to the body of empirical knowledge concerning first-hand experiences of citizenship education as they are based on long-term, richly descriptive ethnographic research with immigrants and refugees in Canada, the US, and the Netherlands, all countries with large and growing newcomer populations.

This special issue contributes to scholarship in the area of national belonging of immigrant and refugee groups (Abu El Haj, 2002, 2007, 2009; Banks, 2008; Buck, 2008; Castles & Davidson, 2000; Clarke, 2013; Friedman 2010; González & Rubinstein-Avila, 2009; Gordon, 2009, 2010; Hall, 2002; Ong, 1999, 2003, 2006; Ramanathan, 2013; Suarez-Orozco 2001; Warriner, 2007). It extends the scholarly conversation about citizenship education during a historical period marked by anxieties about social integration and national security, which has fueled an already controversial debate about the future of multicultural citizenship education.

References

Abu El Haj, T. R. (2002). Contesting the politics of culture, rewriting the boundaries of inclusion: Working for social justice within Muslim and Arab communities. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 308-316. doi: 10.1525/aeq.2002.33.3.308

Abu El Haj, T. R. (2007). "I was born here, but my home, it's not here": Educating for democratic citizenship in an era of transnational migration and global conflict. *Harvard Educational Review*, 77(3), 285-316. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.77.3.412l7m737q114h5m>

Abu El-Haj, T. (2009). Becoming citizens in an era of globalization and transnational migration: Re-imagining citizenship as critical practice. *Theory Into Practice*, 48, 274-282. doi: 10.1080/00405840903192714

Anderson, B.R.O. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, England: Verso Editions and NLB

Banks, J.A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129-139. doi: 10.3102/0013189X08317501

Banks, J.A. (2009). Diversity and citizenship education in multicultural nations. *Multicultural Education Review*, 1(1), 1-28. doi: [10.1080/23770031.2009.11102861](https://doi.org/10.1080/23770031.2009.11102861)

Bannerji, H. (2000). *The dark side of the nation: Essays on multiculturalism, nationalism and gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Buck, P. & Silver, R. (2008) Becoming American in time?: The educational implications of binary discourse on immigration. In D. Stevick & B. Levinson, (Eds.), *Advancing democracy through education?: U.S. influence abroad and domestic practices* (29-54). NC: Information Age Publishing.

Canadian Council for Refugees (2013). Year in Review: Changes in 2012 for refugees and other newcomers to Canada. *Online Report*. Available at: ccrweb.ca/en/2012_review

Castles, S. & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. New York: Routledge.

Chishti, M. & Bergeron, C. (2011). Post-9/11 policies dramatically alter the US immigration landscape. *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved <http://www.migrationpolicy.org> on 9/21/14

Clarke, K.M. (2013). Notes on cultural citizenship in the black Atlantic world. *Cultural Anthropology*, 28(3), 464-474. doi: 10.1111/cuan.12014

Doomernik, J. (2005). *The state of multiculturalism in the Netherlands*. Retrieved from: <http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/imes/books/doomernik2005.pdf>

Fleras, A. (2012). *Unequal relations: An introduction to race, ethnic, and Aboriginal dynamics in Canada* (7th ed.). Toronto: Pearson.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (1st American ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1991). On governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.) *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault* (87-104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Friedman, D. (2010). Becoming national: Classroom language socialization and political identities in the age

- of globalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 193-210. doi:10.1017/S0267190510000061
- González, N. & Rubinstein-Avila, A. (2009). Special Issue: The policies of immigrant education: Multinational perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, 48(4), 245. doi:10.1080/00405840903188068
- Gordon, D. (2009). "She's American now, I don't like that": Gendered language ideologies in a Laotian American community. *Journal of Southeast Asian American Education & Advancement*, 4, 1-19.
- Gordon, D. (2010). Disrupting the master narrative: Global politics, historical memory, and the implications for naturalization education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1492.2010.01064.x>
- Government of the Netherlands (N.d.). *Immigration*. Webpage. Accessed on: March 20, 2013. Available at: <http://www.government.nl/issues/asylum-policy-and-immigration/immigration>
- Hall, K. (2002). *Lives in translation: Sikh youth as British citizens*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Harrell-Bond, B.E. (1999). The experiences of refugees as recipients of aid. In Alistair Ager, (Ed.) *Refugees: Perspectives on the Experiences of Forced Migration* (136-168). London and New York: Pinter.
- Ilcan, S. & Basok, T. (2004). Community government: Voluntary agencies, social justice, and the responsabilization of citizens. *Citizenship Studies*, 8(2), 129-144. doi: 10.1080/1362102042000214714
- Kennelly, J. & Llewellyn, K. R. (2011). Educating for Active Compliance: Discursive Constructions in Citizenship Education. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6-7), 897-914. doi: 10.1080/13621025.2011.600103
- Levinson, B. (2005). Citizenship, identity, democracy: Engaging the political in the anthropology of education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 36(4), 329-340. doi: 10.1525/aeq.2005.36.4.329
- Levinson, B. (2011). Toward an anthropology of (democratic) citizenship education. In B. Levinson & M. Pollock, (Eds.) *A companion to the anthropology of education* (279-298). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Mackey, E. (1999). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. New York; London: Routledge.
- Meer, N. and Modood, T. (2013). Diversity and nationality: Contemporary developments in five European citizenship regimes. In D. Kiwan, (Ed.) *Naturalization Policies, Education and Citizenship: Multicultural and Multi-nation Societies in International Perspective* (67-94). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miller, P. & Rose, N. (2008). *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity.
- Modood, T. (2011, February 7). Multiculturalism: not a minority problem. *The Guardian*, Retrieved November 6, 2013 from www.theguardian.com
- Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible Citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ong, A. (2003). *Buddha is hiding: Refugees, citizenship, the new America*. (No. 5). Berkeley; London: University of California Press.
- Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Philips, A. (2000). Second Class Citizenship. In N. Pearce & J. Hallgarten, (Eds.) *Tomorrow's citizens: critical debates in citizenship and education* (36-42). London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Ramanathan, V., Ed. (2013). Special Issue: Special Forum: Language Policies and (Dis)Citizenship: Who Belongs? Who Is a Guest? Who Is Deported? *Journal of Language Identity, and Education*, 12(3), 161-213. doi: 10.1080/15348458.2013.816543
- Razack, S. H. (2008). *Casting out: The eviction of Muslims from western law & politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. doi:10.3138/9781442687554
- Suarez-Orozco, M. (2001). Globalization, immigration and education: The research agenda. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(3), 345-365. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.71.3.7521rl25282t3637>
- Summerfield, D. (1999). Sociocultural dimensions of war, conflict and displacement. In Alistair Ager, (Ed.) *Refugees: Perspectives on the Experience of Forced Migration* (111-135). London and New York: Pinter.
- Thobani, S. (2007). Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. doi:10.3138/9781442685666
- Urcioli, B. (1998). Acceptable difference: The cultural evolution of the model ethnic American citizen. In C. J. Greenhouse, (Ed.) *Democracy and ethnography: Constructing identities in multicultural liberal states*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Vertovec, S., & Wessendorf, S. (2010). *The multiculturalism backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. New York; London: Routledge.
- Warriner, D. S. (2007). Language learning and the politics of belonging: Sudanese women refugees becoming and being "American". *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 38(4), 343-359. doi: 10.1525/aeq.2007.38.4.343

Winter, E. (2014). Becoming Canadian: Making sense of recent changes to citizenship rules. *Institute for Research on Public Policy*. Accessed October 8, 2014.
<http://irpp.org/research-studies/study-no44/>

