



ANNUAL REVIEWS **Further**

Click [here](#) for quick links to Annual Reviews content online, including:

- Other articles in this volume
- Top cited articles
- Top downloaded articles
- Our comprehensive search

Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State

Irene Bloemraad,^{1,*} Anna Korteweg,^{2,*}
and Gökçe Yurdakul^{3,*}

¹Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720-1980, United States; email: bloemr@berkeley.edu

²Department of Sociology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2J4, Canada; email: anna.korteweg@utoronto.ca

³Department of Sociology, Trinity College, University of Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland; email: gokce.yurdakul@tcd.ie

Annu. Rev. Sociol. 2008. 34:153–79

First published online as a Review in Advance on April 3, 2008

The *Annual Review of Sociology* is online at soc.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:
10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134608

Copyright © 2008 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

0360-0572/08/0811-0153\$20.00

*The authors' names are listed in alphabetical order; they are equal coauthors.

Key Words

integration, rights, transnationalism, postnational citizenship, dual citizenship, participation

Abstract

Citizenship encompasses legal status, rights, participation, and belonging. Traditionally anchored in a particular geographic and political community, citizenship evokes notions of national identity, sovereignty, and state control, but these relationships are challenged by the scope and diversity of international migration. This review considers normative and empirical debates over citizenship and bridges an informal divide between European and North American literatures. We focus on citizenship within nation-states by discussing ethnic versus civic citizenship, multiculturalism, and assimilation. Going beyond nation-state boundaries, we also look at transnational, postnational, and dual citizenships. Throughout, we identify methodological and theoretical challenges in this field, noting the need for a more dynamic and comprehensive understanding of the inter-relationships between the dimensions of citizenship and immigration.

The large number and diverse origins of international migrants increasingly challenge long-held notions of citizenship within nation-state borders. The United Nations estimates that, in 2005, 191 million people lived outside their country of birth, a figure that has doubled since 1975 and continues to rise (UN Popul. Div. 2006). At the dawn of the twenty-first century, about one in four or five residents in countries such as Australia (24%), Switzerland (24%), New Zealand (19%), and Canada (18%) were foreign-born, as were one in eight in Germany (13%), the United States (13%), and Sweden (12%) (OECD 2007).¹ What happens to citizenship, as a potential force of justice, equality, and national cohesion, when large numbers of people from diverse linguistic, ethnic, racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds cross state boundaries? How do they affect citizenship in the country to which they move and, if their attachments and activities span borders, what are the consequences for the meaning and substance of citizenship?

Citizenship is usually defined as a form of membership in a political and geographic community. It can be disaggregated into four dimensions: legal status, rights, political and other forms of participation in society, and a sense of belonging. The concept of citizenship allows us to analyze the extent to which immigrants and their descendants are incorporated into receiving societies.

Immigration challenges—and in some cases reaffirms—notions of national identity, sovereignty, and state control that have historically been linked to citizenship. These challenges can be studied at two levels of inquiry: one as citizenship within national borders, and the second placing those borders into question. From the within-borders per-

spective, we examine three literatures. One studies the foundations of citizenship, linking particular conceptions of national belonging or institutional configurations to conceptions of citizenship as legal status or rights. A second, largely from normative political theory, debates the advisability of multiculturalism and links group rights to citizenship. A third literature, on immigrant integration, investigates equality of participation in a host country's economy, society, and political system. To some degree, these literatures consider how one dimension of citizenship might affect others, but future work needs to examine more deeply how all dimensions of citizenship interact. We suggest that a more integrated approach can show, for example, that the presumed chasm separating multicultural and assimilatory accounts of citizenship might be overdrawn.

The presence and activities of migrants have led some scholars to call into question the relevance of a single, state-centered notion of citizenship, instead conceptualizing citizenship beyond or across borders. One approach relocates the source of citizenship rights from the state to personhood, giving rise to a cosmopolitan or postnational citizenship that transcends borders. A second literature focuses on citizenship across borders, either as a legal status in the form of dual citizenship or as participatory citizenship based on transnational practices and attachments. Our review suggests that globalization challenges simple understandings of citizenship as state-centered and state-controlled. However, nation-states continue to hold substantial power over the formal rules and rights of citizenship and to shape the institutions that provide differentiated access to participation and belonging, with important consequences for immigrants' incorporation and equality.

Throughout this review, we try to bridge an informal divide between scholarship on citizenship in Europe with parallel literatures in North America, especially the United States. For example, debates over postnational citizenship are more prevalent in Europe, whereas the transnational perspective predominates in the United States. It is unclear whether

¹Migration across international borders usually means the movement of people with one citizenship to a country of a different citizenship, but this is not necessarily the case. For example, migration from former colonies to the colonizing country is international, but these migrants might hold the citizenship of the destination country. Alternatively, birth in a country does not necessarily guarantee citizenship in that country.

differences in orientation reflect empirical differences in immigrants' experiences or the need for greater academic exchange between European and North American scholars. We also seek to generate a dialogue between the political theory of citizenship—often presented as normative theory—and the sociology of immigration and integration—often presented as an analysis of empirical conditions.

Finally, some caveats. We focus on immigrants in industrialized states, in particular in North America and Western Europe, leaving citizenship and immigration within the global South outside our purview. We use the words “immigration” and “immigrant” because they are common in U.S. studies of migration, but we recognize that these terms connote a sense of permanent settlement that might not occur. They also obscure the motivations of migration (political upheaval, economic needs, family reunification, etc.) and immigrants' particular status (undocumented, temporary or permanent legal resident, refugee, asylum seeker, etc.). We touch on some possible repercussions of status differences, but space constraints limit our ability to flesh out fully the impact of large numbers of undocumented economic migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees in North America and Europe on the meaning and practices of citizenship. We further limit ourselves by concentrating on international rather than internal migration, but theories of citizenship might apply to certain types of internal migration, such as rural to urban migration in China. Similarly, although ethnicity is a recurrent theme in the literature on citizenship and immigration, it is not the only axis of difference. More work is needed on the relationship between citizenship and immigrants' gender, race, sexuality, class, legal status, and religion because the lens of citizenship reveals not only the legal borders of nation-states, but also their social boundaries.

In what follows, we first discuss the four theoretical dimensions of citizenship. We then turn to literature that centers on citizenship within national borders, followed by literature that puts those borders into question. Through-

out, we outline the methodological and theoretical challenges confronting sociologists in this field.

THEORIZING CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship entails a tension between inclusion and exclusion. In the Western tradition, citizenship was born in the Athenian city-state, a participatory model in which political engagement in a male-only public sphere was the highest form of activity (Aristotle 1992, Dynneson 2001, Heater 2004). This conception of citizenship restricted participation, excluding women, those without property, slaves, and newcomers to Athens (Heater 2004, Pocock 1995).

An alternate Western tradition, developed from Romans' need to incorporate disparate peoples within the empire, resulted in citizenship as a juridical concept of legal status, in which the citizen is a subject of a state (Dynneson 2001). During the Enlightenment, justification of subjecthood led to Lockean notions of consent and contract, opening the way to liberalism's language of individual rights, a central part of contemporary citizenship. The extension of rights language in the twentieth century produced ideals of inalienable human rights, although as Arendt's (1979 [1951]) examination of stateless individuals makes clear, only the state has the power and institutional apparatus to guarantee the right to have rights (see also Somers 2006).

Citizenship debates today continue to reflect tensions between citizenship as participation, political or otherwise, and citizenship as legal status, with or without accompanying rights and obligations. These debates also reflect a continuing struggle with the exclusionary aspects of citizenship, particularly those based on gender, sexuality, class, race, ethnicity, and religion.

The Four Dimensions of Contemporary Citizenship

The evolution of different Western definitions of citizenship has led to a conception of

citizenship that includes four different dimensions: legal status, rights, (political) participation, and a sense of belonging (Bloemraad 2000, Bosniak 2000). These dimensions can complement or stand in tension with each other.

Scholars of citizenship as legal status examine who is entitled to hold the status of citizen. Citizenship can be based on place of birth (*jus soli*) or parental origins (*jus sanguinis*), or both. For residents who cannot access citizenship through birth—as is the case with the overwhelming majority of international migrants—citizenship must be acquired through naturalization. Countries differ in their naturalization requirements, but at a minimum these usually involve a period of legal residency and a demonstration of some knowledge about the country and its dominant language(s) (Bauböck 2001, Bloemraad 2006, Odmalm 2005).

A more expanded understanding of legal citizenship focuses on the rights that accompany citizenship. This perspective, dominant in much theorizing on citizenship, resonates with liberalism's understanding of the relationship between individuals and the state as a contract in which both sides have rights and obligations (Bauböck 1994, Janoski 1998, Somers 2006, Tilly 1996, Yuval-Davis 1997). To maintain the citizenship contract, the state guarantees basic rights to individuals, while the individual has the obligation to pay taxes, complete compulsory education, and obey the laws of the country (Janoski 1998). The rights approach holds out the promise of full equality before the law for all members of a state but leaves unresolved how to transform formal into substantive equality.

Citizenship can also be understood as political participation in the governing of people within a territory (Bauböck 2005, Somers 2005). This privilege has historically been exclusionary by gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and class (Pocock 1995, Magnette 2005, Smith 1997, Yuval-Davis 1997). With time, such barriers were torn down, at least formally. In practice, old exclusions continue to affect political

participation. In struggles against such exclusions, participatory and liberal orientations to citizenship converge as political participation is increasingly seen as an individual right and, in some cases, a human right that should be detached from legal status (Brysk & Shafir 2004, Hayduk 2006). Some expand the participatory dimension of citizenship further, underscoring that the capacity to participate politically depends in part on social and economic inclusion (Marshall 1950, Somers 2005, Yuval-Davis 1999).

A final dimension of citizenship, that of belonging, spans literatures ranging from philosophies of republican citizenship and communitarianism to the study of nation building. Notions of belonging inherently have exclusionary tendencies; some must fall outside the community in order for a “we” to exist (Bosniak 2001). Such exclusions are often justified by the need for social cohesion, leading to the question of what sort of social cohesion is required for contemporary societies (Brubaker 1992, Calhoun 2007, Joppke 1999). John Stuart Mill (1993 [1859]) advocated a citizenship joined with “nationality” because a sense of shared political history would lead to a “desire to be under the same government, . . . [a] government by themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively” (p. 391). The link between nationalism and citizenship influences citizenship theory and practice to this day (Brubaker 2004, Koopmans et al. 2005, Miller 2000), signaling that states are not solely legal and political institutions, but that they also impart cultural or social meaning (Benhabib 2002).

The four dimensions of citizenship cut across each other, reinforcing or undermining the boundaries and content of citizenship. For example, exclusionary notions of citizenship as belonging might restrict the allocation of status and rights to immigrants and affect their participation in a society. Conversely, if rights are understood broadly and guaranteed regardless of foreign birth, immigrants' legal equality and participation might challenge existing understandings of belonging. We now turn to

one attempt to integrate the four dimensions of citizenship.

The Promise and Limits of Marshall's View of Citizenship

The four dimensions of citizenship—legal status, rights, political participation, and even belonging—are reflected in T.H. Marshall's (1950) classic "Citizenship and Social Class," which much sociological work on citizenship takes as its starting point (Somers 2005). Marshall begins with a definition of citizenship as "a claim to be accepted as full members of the society" (p. 8) and asks whether market economies, with their inherent inequalities, can be reconciled with a notion of full membership.

Sketching out a historical evolution of rights, Marshall suggests that economic changes led to the extension of civil rights, then political rights, and finally, using their political rights, the British working class won social rights. Social rights—which Marshall (1950, p. 11) defines as ranging from the right to "a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society"—would, Marshall hoped, ensure formal and substantive equality (Lister 2003, Somers 2005).

Marshall's notion of full membership views rights not only as valuable in themselves, but also as the means to ensure the solidarity necessary for the functioning of a social democratic welfare state. In this way, citizenship rights and legal status promote participation and a sense of belonging, which in turn facilitate social cohesion and common political projects.

How applicable is Marshall's approach to the study of immigration? Critics argue that Marshall's definition of citizenship is derived from "deeply middle-class, English, male and white" cultural values (Smith 1999, p. 214) that do not take individual subjectivities and cultural differences into account, particularly those of women, children, and racialized minorities (Benhabib 2002, Brysk 2004, Maher

2004, Mann 2001, Yuval-Davis 1997). Early studies of "new" post-World War II migration perceived immigrants in class terms and focused on social inequality (e.g., Castles 1986, Castles & Kosack 1973, Portes & Bach 1985), but today immigrants are often identified by their ethnic and racial differences and, increasingly, by religion (Alba 2005, Kastoryano 2002, Waters 1999). Among other consequences, Marshall's focus on the native-born working class prevents him from seeing cultural rights as a distinct prerequisite to full societal participation (Bauböck 2001). These critiques highlight sources of inequality beyond class position and suggest that other inequalities might require differential group rights.

Considering inequalities beyond class also reveals that the extension of civil, political, and social rights did not uniformly happen according to Marshall's historical progression. In Britain and many other countries, women received social rights before political rights (Lister 2003, Skocpol 1992). Similarly, immigrants without the legal status of citizen can be accorded social rights (Bauböck 2005, Hansen & Koehler 2005, Soysal 1994) or participate in political decision making (Hayduk 2006, Leitner & Ehrkamp 2003).

Despite problems with Marshall's view of citizenship, his concerns with rights, substantive equality, political as well as social and economic participation, membership in community, and social solidarity are relevant to academic studies and public debate about citizenship and immigration. Can his expanded rights-based approach ensure immigrants' full citizenship, or does it result in only partial equalities? Is Marshall correct in presuming that a certain degree of social solidarity is needed to ensure full citizenship for everyone, and if so, can such solidarity be fostered in the context of large-scale immigration? What are the implications of ethnic, religious, and racial pluralism for citizenship's promise of equality? Questions like these return in literatures that situate citizenship within the nation-state and those that transcend nation-state borders.

CITIZENSHIP WITHIN NATION-STATE BORDERS: DEALING WITH DIFFERENCE

We identify three areas of inquiry that provide theoretical or empirical purchase on citizenship and immigration within the context of the nation-state. First, large-scale migration led political sociologists to research the civic versus ethnic bases of citizenship and the implications of different notions of belonging for immigrants' legal status, rights, and participation. Second, the relationship between rights and community membership is also at the core of theoretical debates on multiculturalism, which ask to what degree rights should inhere in individuals or be granted to ethnic, religious, or other culturally differentiated groups within the nation-state. Finally, Marshall's concerns with social equality are reflected in a literature that discusses economic, social, and political participation in terms of "second-class" citizenship. This research focuses on immigrant assimilation, integration, and incorporation, probing the barriers and pathways to participatory citizenship and social cohesion.

Classifying Countries of Reception: Ethnic versus Civic Bases of Citizenship

In the late 1980s and through the 1990s, questions about when and where immigrants gained citizenship led to an empirical literature that linked national models or trajectories of nationhood to states' willingness to incorporate immigrants as part of the citizenry. Ethnic nationalism is associated with belonging to a nation rooted in descent, a view that usually excludes migrants, as in Germany (pre-2000). Civic nationalism ties belonging to rights and a universalist, voluntary political membership, and thus arguably offers immigrants a greater chance of inclusion, as in France. Nationalism influences immigrants' membership because it structures formal legal rules regarding the acquisition of citizenship and the discourses that shape citizenship as participation

and belonging (Brubaker 1992, Koopmans et al. 2005).

The ethnic/civic distinction has spawned a large literature, mostly European, that examines states' responses to immigration through comparative analysis. The majority of such studies use a case-oriented method in which countries as a whole are placed into a typology. Such studies ask how cultural, institutional, or ideological differences create different opportunity structures for migrants' subsequent incorporation and citizenship (Bloemraad 2006, Castles & Miller 1993, Favell 2001b, Ireland 1994, Joppke 1999, Kastoryano 2002, Koopmans et al. 2005).

One line of research has focused on citizenship as legal status. Here, the ethnic/civic distinction offers a cultural or historical-institutional argument for why states have particular citizenship-granting practices (Brubaker 1992, Koopmans et al. 2005, Odmalm 2005). Ethnic nationalism matches up with a *jus sanguinis* descent principle of citizenship and more difficult naturalization procedures. Well-known countries in this category are Germany (pre-2000), Austria, Greece, and Switzerland. Civic understandings of nationhood coincide with greater access to formal membership for immigrants and their descendants through *jus soli* birthright citizenship and easier naturalization.² Countries in this category include Australia, Canada, France, and the United States.

The ethnic/civic distinction leaves, however, a large gray zone of practices hard to categorize under one label. For example, asking that immigrants learn the majority language can be seen as reinforcing an ethnic sense of nationhood or as promoting civic participation in the political process (Brubaker 2004, pp. 139–40). Inclusive and exclusionary tendencies can exist

²The civic/ethnic distinction does not necessarily match up with dual citizenship laws, as civic countries like the United States tend to view dual citizenship suspiciously, whereas ethnic countries like Switzerland extend dual citizenship to Swiss citizens who move abroad and acquire another nationality (Hansen & Weil 2002, Faist 2007b).

within the same state (Kastoryano 2002). Post-war Germany adopted both ethnic citizenship laws and liberal refugee policies (Herbert 2001, Joppke 1998), whereas countries of civic citizenship increasingly define the integration of Muslim immigrants as a cultural problem, spawning courses designed to alter immigrants' beliefs and practices in the name of civic integration (Entzinger 2003, Joppke & Morawska 2003).

One response to such criticisms has been to combine an ethnic/civic categorization with other factors posited to affect immigrant citizenship. For example, Koopmans and colleagues (2005, pp. 8–16) distinguish between immigrants' access to political and legal citizenship (presented as an ethnic/civic continuum) and states' orientations to group rights (a spectrum from cultural monism to pluralism). Their analysis of laws and policies indicates that, between 1980 and 2002, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland all moved to a more civic orientation in their treatment of immigrants. However, variation in these countries' orientation to cultural pluralism means that scholars need to distinguish the civic, republican universalism of France from the civic multiculturalism of the Netherlands because these two civic models lead immigrants to make quite different membership claims.

The use of civic/ethnic distinctions, and their variants, is predicated on a relatively stable, perhaps deterministic view of societies as fettered in their response to immigration by long-standing cultural understandings and institutional arrangements. Future research will have to consider how and why countries' past practices change in the face of immigration. Some scholars have come to question the "national models" approach altogether, arguing that it artificially elevates the nation-state as the unit of analysis. Thus, Favell (2001a) calls for a reorientation of migration studies away from nation-states to cities and metropolitan areas (see also Penninx et al. 2004, Sassen 2006). One study that examines the relative effect of interstate versus intrastate differences concludes that the nation-state context still dominates over in-

ternal variation (Koopmans 2004), but more research is needed. Finally, some recent scholarship appears to be moving away from a typology approach and more towards a variable-oriented methodology. Countries are evaluated on the rigidity or permeability of particular social boundaries faced by immigrants (Alba 2005, Zolberg & Long 1999) or, using an index, on the degree to which they exhibit a particular characteristic, such as multiculturalism (Banting et al. 2006). As we discuss in the next section, the latter effort, in particular, seeks to bridge a divide between normative political theory on immigrant citizenship and empirical social science.

Group Rights and Multiculturalism

A second set of debates over citizenship within nation-state boundaries centers on the promise and pitfalls of multiculturalism, a concept whose meaning varies by context and writer. The term can be used as a demographic description of a society (e.g., the United States is a more multicultural society than Japan); it can refer to an ideology on the part of individuals or government that ethnic, racial, cultural, and religious diversity should be celebrated; it can refer to particular policies or programs undertaken by governments or institutions (e.g., multicultural curricula); or it can refer to a specific normative political theory that lays out principles for governing diverse societies (Abu-Laban 1994, Bloemraad 2007a, Faist 2000, Fleras & Elliott 1992, Kallen 1982, Joppke 1999, Roberts & Clifton 1990).

As political theory, multiculturalism challenges a liberal philosophy of universalism that views humans as freely choosing agents who deserve identical, individual protections. Various commentators point out that liberalism's emphasis on the individual perpetuates or even exacerbates inequalities. Communitarian critiques claim that individual agency is embedded in particular social and cultural collectives that provide individuals with meaning. This legitimates the interests of the group over the individual at certain times and requires a politics of

recognition in which the political community accommodates cultural groups (Miller 2000, p. 99; Taylor 1994). Others challenge liberalism as a Western cultural construct, imposed on people with different traditions (Parekh 2006), or contend that cultural neutrality is a myth—all countries have a “societal culture” that places minority groups in a position of cultural inequality vis-à-vis the majority (Kymlicka 1995, 2001; Schachar 2000, 2001). Whereas traditional liberalism demands that states be neutral or blind to cultural diversity, critics argue that such blindness is impossible and instead leads to inequality in rights, belonging, and participation in the public sphere. In Young’s (2000, p. 81) words, theory and practice must acknowledge “differences of social position, structured power, and cultural affiliation in political discussion and decision-making that aims to promote justice.” A traditional liberal approach to citizenship, according to these critics, would deny immigrants full membership and equality.

Theories of multiculturalism consequently call for the recognition and accommodation of cultural minorities, including immigrants, and require states to create policies or laws that allow minority groups to root their participation in society within their cultural communities (Kymlicka 1995, 2001; Kymlicka & Norman 1994; Parekh 2006; Taylor 1994).³ Kymlicka, a leading multicultural theorist, attempts to incorporate collective rights within liberalism’s individualistic framework. He argues that minority groups may protect their culture and language against majority practices and laws on the grounds that cultural membership is integral to individual freedom and self-respect. Kymlicka’s liberalism also requires that groups not con-

strain individual members’ actions, including the right to alter certain practices or to exit the group.

The explosion of scholarly interest in multiculturalism during the 1990s largely revolved around normative theory, with few empirical studies analyzing specific policies and their consequences. Yet abstract debates hold real-life salience when governments and policy makers draft legislation or fund programs according to principles of multiculturalism or universal liberalism (Abu-Laban 2002). Political controversies erupt, for example, over whether religious dress such as headscarves or kirpans may be worn in public institutions such as schools. In the 1990s, numerous countries appeared to embrace multiculturalism, but by the end of the decade, observers noted governments’ “retreat” from multiculturalism (Brubaker 2001, Entzinger 2003, Joppke 2004, Korteweg 2006b). Future research needs to address the gap between philosophy and practice because the paucity of empirical studies allows political actors on all sides to make strong claims based on little evidence.

Theories of multiculturalism imply that multicultural citizenship will foster allegiance to and participation in the state through civic and political attachments. Taylor (1993) talks about a context of “deep diversity,” in which individuals’ primary allegiance lies with a community of culture and fate, and secondary identification lies with the larger political unit within which the community of fate resides. Critics of multiculturalism worry about the multiple loyalties implicit in it. They fear that without a primary loyalty to the nation-state, the civic, political, and even moral community of a country will fragment, generating problems ranging from limited democratic engagement to a lack of interest in the policies of redistribution (Barry 2001, Gitlin 1995, Huntington 2004, Okin 1999, Pickus 2005, Schlesinger 1998). In response, Kymlicka (2001) posits that “it is the absence of minority rights which erodes the bonds of civic solidarity” (p. 36). Empirically, we do not know whether countries adopting multicultural orientations are less cohesive than

³Much of the early theorizing of multiculturalism came from Canadian and British thinkers, who balanced two sorts of minority claims, those of migrant-origin populations and those of long-standing incorporated nations such as the Québécois and the Scots. The multiculturalism of Kymlicka and Taylor, both concerned with Canadian politics, gives greater moral weight to internal national minorities’ claims than to those of immigrants. However, the discourse on multiculturalism in continental Europe has almost exclusively focused on immigrants (Joppke 2004).

others, or whether immigrants living in states with traditional liberal orientations feel less like full citizens than those in countries that recognize and accommodate cultural communities.

Another criticism of multiculturalism contends that it reifies cultural distinctions, making them appear more important than they are. According to some, this solidifies artificial distinctions of race and ethnicity better overcome through universal citizenship (Barry 2001, Bissoondath 1994, Hollinger 2000). Gender scholars, such as Susan Moller Okin (1999), have used the issue of reification to argue that multiculturalism facilitates women's oppression within migrant cultures, an oppression best overcome by granting all women universal rights to individual liberty (but see critiques in Okin 1999, Song 2005). Other feminists fear that a focus on cultural communities homogenizes minority groups, silencing internal debate and forcing marginal voices within the group to identify with unitary group goals (Yuval-Davis 1997, p. 18). Moreover, the discourse of multiculturalism creates an uncritical and depoliticized reading of culture that impedes understanding of structural power differences, such as racism and sexism, and their exclusionary effects (Bannerji 2000). Further empirical research could help disentangle whether multiculturalism fosters gender inequality, as Okin argues, or whether it undermines a politics that addresses structural gender, racial, and other inequalities, as Yuval-Davis and Bannerji suggest.

Future research also needs to break down the meaning and practice of multiculturalism in different times and places. Critiques of multiculturalism often presume that the meaning and content of multiculturalism are easily identifiable and universally the same. Yet a liberal nationalist conception of passive multiculturalism, which confines cultures of origin to the private sphere such as in France or, arguably, the United States, is quite different from cultural pluralism or active multiculturalism in which minority cultures are recognized in policy debates and institutionalized in the public sphere, such as in Canada and, to a lesser extent,

in the Netherlands (Bloemraad 2006, 2007a; Entzinger 2003; Faist 2000).

Recent scholarship measures multiculturalism as an index, examining specific policy arenas such as education, religious practice, media, dual citizenship, minority cultural activities, bilingual education, and affirmative action (Banting et al. 2006, pp. 56–57) or evaluating cultural requirements for naturalization, religious rights (especially for Islam), cultural rights, institutions for political representation, and affirmative action (Koopmans et al. 2005, pp. 51–71).⁴ These attempts to disaggregate multiculturalism serve two purposes. First, they force scholars to note the variation within and between countries in policies and discourses directed at immigrants. Second, attempts at measurement and operationalization help social scientists evaluate what effect, if any, the degree of multiculturalism has on particular outcomes. For example, if the acquisition of legal citizenship status through naturalization is taken as a measure of political integration, we find a positive correlation between state multiculturalism and levels of naturalization (Bloemraad 2006, Koopmans et al. 2005).

A final set of empirical questions concerns diversity, social inequality, and redistribution, harking back to themes raised by T.H. Marshall. Scholars and public commentators in Europe worry that multiculturalism aggravates socioeconomic distinctions as well as cultural ones. According to Koopmans and colleagues (2005), multiculturalism can foster spatial segregation and hamper migrants' integration into the labor market and educational system, thereby generating economic inequality. More generally, observers wonder whether multicultural policies undermine government provision of public benefits (Barry 2001, Gitlin

⁴In the classification developed by Banting et al. (2006), Canada and Australia rank as the only two "strong" multicultural states; the United States, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom rank as "moderate"; and France, Germany, Japan, and Norway rank as "weak." Koopmans et al. (2005) consider the Netherlands the most multicultural, Great Britain and possibly post-2000 Germany in the middle, and France and Switzerland as the least multicultural.

1995, Gwyn 1995). An influential group of economists has advanced the proposition that the more ethno-racially diverse a population, the less likely a country will engage in redistribution (Alesina et al. 2001, Alesina & Glaeser 2004). Indeed, a recent study suggests that greater ethno-racial diversity correlates with lower social capital and social trust, although state action might mitigate such effects (Putnam 2007). Such speculation over mitigating effects is supported by research suggesting that given demographic diversity “countries with strong [multiculturalism policies] saw the largest rise in social spending and the greatest strengthening of their redistributive effort” (Banting et al. 2006, p. 66; Banting & Kymlicka 2003). Such debates pose a fundamental question: How can societies best deal with multiple inequalities based on culture, religion, race, gender, and socio-economic condition? Does attention to one inequality aggravate others? By addressing such questions, sociologists can ground philosophical debates in empirical research.

Participation and Assimilation

A final area of research from the perspective of nation-state citizenship investigates immigrants’ participation in their receiving societies. Traditionally, notions of participatory citizenship are framed as engagement in political governance. Yet as Marshall (1950) points out, we need to consider other modes of participation, particularly those related to economic well-being and social inclusion, that underpin people’s capacity to act as citizens. Feminist theorists problematize the public/private distinction that underlies much theorizing on citizenship, reminding us that the way nation-states govern familial relations affects participation, often excluding (immigrant) women from full citizenship (Korteweg 2006a; Lister 2003; Pateman 1989; Yuval-Davis 1997, 1999).

From this perspective, citizenship is not necessarily about legal status because formal citizenship and equal participation might not overlap. For example, Germany and France have

different citizenship laws and thus differ in how much immigrants can participate in formal politics. However, it is unclear whether residential integration, employment, and educational outcomes are substantially better for Maghrebins in France than for Turks in Germany. Markers of integration such as economic advancement, educational attainment, or cultural acceptance can become measures of second-class citizenship, whatever one’s legal status (Alba & Silberman 2002; Brysk 2004; Ong 1996; Portes & Rumbaut 2001, 2006). Conversely, participation in the labor market or business sector, payment of taxes, participation in local schools, raising families, or other activities that make people an integral part of their local communities and institutions can be understood as a form of participatory citizenship that allows immigrants to make citizenship-like claims on the state and others, even in the absence of legal citizenship status, and perhaps even in the absence of legal residence (Carens 1987, Coll 2004, Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994, Leitner & Ehrkamp 2003, Rosaldo 1997).

In American sociology, the primary way of understanding participation this broadly is through debates about immigrants’ assimilation, in either the first or subsequent generations [for more thorough reviews of this literature, see Alba & Nee (2003), Bean & Stevens (2003), Waters & Jimenez (2005)]. Traditionally, assimilation in the United States has been viewed as a largely linear process by which immigrants give up past languages, identities, cultural practices, and loyalties to “become American,” with various types of integration thought to follow each other in progressive stages (Alba & Nee 2003, Gordon 1964, Park 1930, Park & Burgess 1969 [1921], Warner & Srole 1945). The particular sequence differs from one writer to another, as do opinions of how many generations full assimilation takes, but these accounts suggest that integration is possible and even inevitable.

Today, numerous U.S. scholars are less sanguine about the process and outcome of integration. Beginning in the 1960s and continuing to the present, models of resurgent or

reactive ethnicity and segmented assimilation challenge the idea of a single sequential path to assimilation, suggesting that racial hierarchies and/or limited economic opportunities shape identities and integration (Glazer & Moynihan 1963, Portes & Rumbaut 2006, Portes & Zhou 1993, Zhou 1999). This literature argues that immigrants' race and economic positions intersect to create three distinct incorporation pathways: traditional assimilation into the white middle class; selective integration when immigrants of color retain ethnic ties and culture to facilitate upward socio-economic mobility; or "downward" assimilation into a racialized urban minority with limited economic opportunities.

The debate over assimilation is ongoing. Alba & Nee (1997, 2003) contend that intergenerational integration into an American cultural, social, and economic mainstream remains the dominant empirical pattern, and they reclaim the word assimilation (which today tends to be viewed negatively) as an accurate description of the social world (see also Brubaker 2001). In current formulations, assimilation (or alternatives such as integration or incorporation) usually means the narrowing of differences between immigrants and the native-born majority population in certain aspects of social life (e.g., labor force participation), but leaves open difference along other, often cultural, lines ranging from food preferences to "fundamental beliefs and ideas regarding existence" (Zolberg & Long 1999, p. 8). Such reformulations undermine an oft-positing dichotomy between an ideology of multiculturalism or one of assimilation. The idea of "integration" consequently becomes much closer to certain notions of multiculturalism.

Within assimilation research, cultural assimilation, social integration, and economic mobility receive primary attention; civic and political integration are secondary (but see Bloemraad 2006, Chung 2005, Cordero-Guzman 2005, Portes & Rumbaut 2006, Smith 2005). Perhaps as cause or consequence of the limited attention to civic and political integration, the relationship between immigrants' political citizenship and other participation is

undertheorized. Political incorporation might facilitate socio-economic assimilation if immigrants and their children use political power to change institutional barriers blocking their mobility. Alternatively, limited socio-economic incorporation might spur immigrants' political mobilization or impede their political participation. Future research should examine how political citizenship affects other forms of participation, and vice versa. In addition, scholarship on participation and assimilation in the American context could pay more attention to the state, beyond entry policy or antidiscrimination measures.

European research, by contrast, sees a variety of state-based policies, some assimilationist, others more multiculturalist, as affecting integration (Entzinger 2003, 2006; Fournier & Yurdakul 2006; Joppke 2004; Korteweg 2006b). European policies increasingly focus on culture and have the integration of Muslim immigrants as their central problematic. Cultural concerns often focus on gender relations in ongoing debates about how to regulate or sanction forced marriage and honor killings, as well as the wearing of hijab, niqab, and burqa (Fournier & Yurdakul 2006, Korteweg 2006b, Razack 2004, Yurdakul 2006). These practices are often seen as antithetical to European values of gender equality and emblematic of the perceived antiliberal, antidemocratic influence of Islam (Okin 1999). Such European worries over problematic immigrant cultures stand in contrast to much of the American scholarship, which often sees immigrant cultures as protective against the negative influence of U.S. culture and thus conducive to integration and better socio-economic outcomes (Portes & Rumbaut 2001, Zhou & Bankston 1998; but see Huntington 2004).

There is some bridging of American and European approaches to integration and assimilation in work that compares the position of immigrant groups in the United States, France, and Germany (Alba 2005, Zolberg & Long 1999; see also Joppke & Morawska 2003). Using theories of immigrant assimilation developed in the United States, these researchers use

the language of boundaries to identify social, cultural, legal, and policy practices that differentiate immigrants and their descendants from the majority. In doing so, they bring together U.S. considerations of social boundaries with European attention to state policies in the process of immigrant integration. They also move from a comparative case-oriented methodology to a variable-oriented one in which boundaries become the key analytical focus.

Thus, the various debates on citizenship and immigration within nation-states emphasize different dimensions of citizenship. Discussions of ethnic versus civic citizenship examine the link between legal status, political participation, and belonging to the nation-state. Debates over multiculturalism center on rights and belonging. Research on assimilation and integration considers, implicitly or explicitly, an expanded notion of citizenship as participation in all dimensions of social life. All wrestle with how to achieve citizenship's promise of substantive equality. Yet each area could also be expanded and deepened if researchers integrated intersections between the dimensions of citizenship more fully into their empirical and theoretical work.

TRANSCENDING BORDERS: POSTNATIONAL AND TRANSNATIONAL CITIZENSHIP

Much of the discussion of citizenship—as legal status, rights, full participation, or belonging—situates research and analysis squarely within the borders of the country within which immigrants settle. Over the past two decades an expansive and growing literature questions such a bounded approach, raising normative and empirical questions about the relevance of state borders. Is state sovereignty undermined by new supranational institutions and global human rights norms, and if so, is the importance of formal citizenship decreasing for today's immigrants? At a normative level, should state-based citizenship be the key way of understanding membership and allocating rights? Should notions of belonging be exclusively tied to a

single state, or can they be promoted across state boundaries so that people can live cosmopolitan or transnational lives? If individuals increasingly see their lives and attachments spanning political borders, how will this affect political participation and social cohesion, topics so central to certain “within borders” debates about immigrant citizenship? In this section we consider citizenship as transcending the nation-state, in scholarship on cosmopolitanism and postnationalism, and citizenship as spanning multiple nation-states, in scholarship on transnationalism and dual citizenship.

Citizenship Beyond Borders: Cosmopolitan and Postnational Citizenship

Within liberal theory, cosmopolitanism and liberal nationalism represent two poles in a theoretical debate over the relationship between state borders and the rights guaranteed by citizenship (Vertovec & Cohen 2002). Political cosmopolitanism argues that rights ought to transcend national boundaries; liberal nationalism argues that individual rights are best guaranteed within the context of the nation-state (Bosniak 2001, 2006; Calhoun 2007; Carens 1987). An open, empirical question is whether the social solidarity presumed necessary to facilitate democratic participation and redistributive social policies can be fostered outside the context of the nation-state (or in the context of an extremely permeable nation-state) given that the emotional aspects of such solidarity are difficult to promote outside affective communities (Calhoun 2007, Turner 1993). At a practical level, without institutions such as courts and policing apparatuses, it is unclear how rights can be guaranteed absent a state-like structure. As Arendt (1979 [1951]) notes in reflecting on the atrocities of World War II, rights might be inalienable and universal, but the stateless have few protections. This leads Bosniak (2006) to raise a paradox of liberalism: Only by curtailing the liberty of individuals who fall outside a given nation-state can the liberty of those within be guaranteed.

Yet numerous scholars point out that state borders are increasingly penetrated by flows of capital, goods, people, and ideas (e.g., Castles 2002, Castles & Davidson 2000, Portes et al. 1999, Smith & Guarnizo 1998, Vertovec 2004). International capitalism links disparate economies and regions, in some cases generating migration from the global South to the North when foreign investment or large development projects destabilize traditional economies (Massey et al. 1998, Sassen 1998). Powerful multinational corporations constrain states' sovereignty, while the growing number of international free trade agreements similarly push markets beyond state borders. Advances in international transportation and communication technologies allow migrants to maintain more sustained cross-border ties, and such advances facilitate the circulation of ideas and cultures on a global scale, helped along by transnational or international economic, social, religious, and political organizations (Portes et al. 1999, Levitt 2001, Smith 2003). Finally, scholars point to the spread and institutionalization of human rights as a constraint on states' actions (Brysk & Shafir 2004, Soysal 1994). These dynamics suggest that globalization is a reality that undermines the relevance of borders and state sovereignty. Sophisticated theories of cosmopolitanism argue that we need political institutions that give (collective) social actors parity with global economic actors (Habermas 2003) and that such institutions should be rooted in shared universal values while recognizing cultural particularisms (Beck & Grande 2007).

The global human rights argument is especially prominent in scholarship on postnational membership. It contends that the expansion of a human rights discourse and legal apparatus compels nation-states to extend membership rights to immigrants based on personhood rather than membership in a particular political unit (Bauböck 1994, Jacobson 1996, Soysal 1994). According to these scholars, the moral power of human rights, the development of international bodies such as the United Nations, European Union, and international

courts of justice, and the advocacy work of international social movements undermine state-based citizenship.⁵ Although states matter, they are increasingly constrained by international law and human rights, making a narrow, state-defined citizenship increasingly illegitimate.

Most evidence to support postnational citizenship comes from Western Europe. Soysal's (1994) influential study of six European countries argues that regardless of where they reside, Turkish immigrants are given civil rights, many social rights, and even some political rights. Political rights tend to be those most tied to nation-state citizenship, but countries such as the Netherlands, Sweden, and New Zealand allow noncitizens local voting rights (Bauböck 2005, Hayduk 2006). Even in Japan, Gurowitz (1999) argues, pro-migrant advocates used international human rights norms and appeals to "the standards of international society" to pressure local and prefecture governments into providing greater rights for noncitizens (p. 445). Although nation-states will not disappear any time soon, various researchers find "a shift in the major organizing principle of membership in contemporary polities: the logic of personhood supersedes the logic of national citizenship" (Soysal 1994, p. 164).

The European Union is one site in which a certain postnational citizenship might be coming to fruition. EU citizenship tries to create a new idea of belonging to an overarching "European" identity and institution, and it also sets up a standard and ideal of European citizenship against which national or local policies concerning immigrants can be compared (Lahav 2004). Yet EU citizenship also resembles traditional nation-state citizenship: The status of EU citizen is only open to citizens of EU member countries and cannot be given directly to immigrants from non-European countries (Parekh 2006). This raises two questions. How important is this form of postnational citizenship to those who have access to it? How do the

⁵Other sources of rights and nonterritorial citizenship are also possible, such as one based on neoliberal ideas about the free movement of labor (Hollifield 1992).

exclusionary aspects of European Union citizenship affect immigrants' incorporation at the national level?

The postnational approach has been criticized on at least three grounds. First, despite some evidence of noncitizen rights, postnationalism lacks extensive empirical support (Faist 2000, Koopmans & Statham 2003, Tambini 2001). Postnational scholars appear to be making a prediction or outlining a normative desire, rather than describing objective conditions (Stasiulis 1997). Second, some contend that it is redundant to announce the "rediscovery" of human rights in global discourse because these are already present in liberal democratic practices (Joppke 1999). Finally, critics claim that scholars of postnational citizenship fail to analyze immigrant agency and the actual frames and targets of migrant mobilizing at a local level. Doing so, one finds that the reference of political mobilization for many immigrants lies in their own ethno-national networks or in national publics and governments, not with international actors or supranational institutions, though immigrants at times do make appeals to human rights to advance their claims (Jacobson & Ruffer 2004, Koopmans & Statham 1999, Koopmans et al. 2005, Yurdakul 2006).

A question for further study concerns the appropriate location for social rights and economic protections. Many postnational arguments presume that the erosion of state-centered citizenship is a good thing in that human rights protect people from an arbitrary state. Yet, to the extent that the state also protects people from the vagaries of the international market, postnational citizenship might be a path to reduced social benefits as citizenship is redefined vis-à-vis a global market rather than political or community membership.

Thus, scholars need to examine how much state-based citizenship matters in migrants' everyday lives and how global human rights might affect immigrants' citizenship practices (Somers 2006; but see Brysk 2004, Lentini 2007). Postnational approaches, like other theories of citizenship that use simple dichotomies between citizens and noncitizens, often ignore

the many, variable statuses migrants can hold within a country, such as asylum seeker, refugee, or undocumented immigrant (Morris 2002). The focus on citizenship status may obscure how legal residence can structure migrants' life chances more than citizen/noncitizen distinctions. Massey (2007) argues forcefully that lack of status now joins race, class, and gender as a central axis of stratification in American society.

An estimated 30% of the foreign-born population in the United States and 10% of all migrants in Europe do not have a legal right to reside in the countries in which they live (Koser 2007, p. 59; Massey 2007, chapter 4; Passel 2006). Lack of legal documentation undermines feelings of security and belonging, the ability to participate fully in the political system, and the ability to negotiate with citizen employers over work conditions (Menjívar 2006, Stasiulis & Bakan 2005). What happens to the legitimacy of liberal democratic states when millions of temporary or unauthorized migrants live and participate in these societies but have no avenue for eventual legal citizenship and live in fear of deportation? The challenges faced by undocumented migrants highlight the continued salience of the state, which through granting or withholding residency and citizenship status profoundly affects immigrants' life chances.

Citizenship Across Borders: Transnationalism and Dual Citizenship

Whereas postnationalists believe supranational institutions and human rights norms undermine traditional state-based citizenship, a transnational approach underscores the existence (and perhaps normative preference) for multiple memberships within the current system of state sovereignty (Faist 2000, Vertovec 2004). Multiple memberships fuel a "deterritorialized" citizenship transcending geographically defined political and legal entities (Basch et al. 1994). Unlike in other work on citizenship and migration, the emigrant status of international migrants receives as much, if not more, attention than immigrant status.

Transnationalism. Research on transnationalism suggests that pressure for deterritorialized citizenship comes from at least two different sources. First, “migrants, through their daily life activities and social, economic and political relations create social fields that cross national boundaries” (Basch et al. 1994, p. 27). Through hometown associations, business investments, religious affiliations, and political ties, migrants retain ties to their country of origin, leading lives in two or more settings (Levitt 2001, 2007; Portes et al. 1999). Second, sending and receiving states can also promote transnational activities and allegiances (Faist 2007b, Levitt 2000, Smith 2003). Sending countries, in particular, can view continued ties to emigrants as an instrument to encourage financial remittances or investment in the country of origin and as a way to expand political, social, and economic borders to diasporas (Itzigsohn 2007). Together, migrants’ and states’ actions contribute to the process of deterritorialized nation building.

The simultaneous dynamics of transnational citizenship can be seen most clearly in cross-border political participation, although this form of participation is certainly not the only type of transnationalism. Nation-states, political parties, or political movements can look for ideological, financial, and organizational support among expatriates living overseas, while expatriate citizens can push particular agendas on policy makers in the host and/or the sending country (Fox 2005, Guarnizo et al. 2003, Itzigsohn 2000, Itzigsohn et al. 1999). For example, a study of Mexican and Dominican Republic immigrants in the United States shows how political officials of the sending countries promote dual citizenship to encourage the flow of remittances and because dual nationals can affect U.S. policy toward the sending countries (Itzigsohn 2007). Similarly, Kurds in Germany seek to intervene in the human rights challenges of the Kurdish minority in Turkey by creating political strategies directed at policy makers in Germany (Østergaard-Nielsen 2002). More generally, scholars of transnationalism argue that integration into the host society and the

maintenance of cross-border ties are not incompatible (Levitt & Glick Schiller 2004).

Researchers trying to measure the breadth and depth of transnationalism often find that only a small proportion of immigrants can be characterized as active transmigrants, that transnational activism declines with time in the country of settlement, and that it rarely survives into the second generation, though scholars debate the proper way to measure transnationalism (DeSipio et al. 2003, Levitt & Waters 2002, Rumbaut 2002). Some research suggests that immigrants facing blocked mobility, especially men, turn to political participation in the homeland as a counterweight to lost status (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo 2005, Jones-Correa 1998). Others question the transnational paradigm in toto, arguing that receiving states effectively transform foreigners into nationals by altering immigrants’ perceptions of belonging (Waldinger 2007). Nevertheless, such findings do not preclude that feelings of belonging to the new home country can coincide with activity on behalf of the sending country. Questions for those studying transnational citizenship include empirical questions regarding its scope and importance, as well as further theorizing as to why certain societies or groups might be more or less inclined to embrace transnational citizenship.

Dual citizenship. One manifestation of deterritorialized memberships is the increasing number of states permitting, and even promoting, dual or multiple citizenship (Bauböck 2007, Faist & Kivisto 2007, Fox 2005, Hansen & Weil 2002, Jones-Correa 2001, Weil 2001). Whereas a century ago most states viewed dual citizenship as bigamy, increasing numbers of states allow legal attachments to multiple countries, sometimes because of international conventions, at other times because of domestic policy or emigrant mobilization (Spiro 2004).

Countries apply rules about dual citizenship differentially. For example, countries more used to emigration than immigration can target their own emigrants abroad, but not extend dual citizenship to immigrants who live in their

own borders, as in the case of Poland (Faist 2007b, Górny et al. 2007). Conversely, some traditional immigration countries show limited enthusiasm for dual citizenship, worried about the trade-off between political autonomy and transnational citizenship (Bauböck 2007, p. 81). In the United States, Supreme Court decisions and State Department directives permit multiple citizenship, yet the oath that all would-be citizens must swear still contains a promise to renounce prior allegiances (Ansgar 1991/1992, Duckett 2000, Spiro 1997). For those troubled by dual citizenship, multiple membership raises questions of competing loyalties and obligations—for whom does one fight in the event of a military conflict?—as well as concerns about immigrant integration and political cohesion (Hammar 1985, Pickus 2005, Renshon 2001, Schuck 1998; but see Bloemraad 2007b).

In the European Union, the dual citizenship of non-EU nationals has been a central sticking point in debates of German citizenship reform, with those concerned about multiple membership arguing that dual citizenship may prevent immigrant integration (Faist et al. 2007).⁶ In Sweden, however, dual citizenship, adopted in 2001, was seen as a human rights issue (Spång 2007). The contrast between Germany and Sweden demonstrates that arguments against dual citizenship attempt to make “citizenship conditional on the assumption of certain duties by immigrants, whereas arguments in favor of dual citizenship emphasize individual rights” (Gerdes & Faist 2007, p. 138).

There are at least three aspects of multiple citizenship that require further research. As Kivisto (2007) suggests, we need to know more about citizenship decision making and the state actors (both elites and nonelites) who resist or embrace dual citizenship, especially in

comparative perspective. Second, we need to know more about people who choose or reject dual citizenship to understand better the reasons for their choices (but see Bloemraad 2004). Third, research is needed on the relationship between dual citizenship and its effects on migrant activities. It is unclear, for example, how dual citizenship affects the flow of remittances. The available evidence does, however, suggest that permitting multiple citizenships likely enhances, rather than undermines, political incorporation by encouraging immigrants’ naturalization and expanding the “training ground” in which people learn transferable political skills (Bloemraad 2004, DeSipio et al. 2003, Jones-Correa 2001).

Reading across the literature on transnationalism, one is struck by the fact that most empirical research has centered on the United States as the primary country of reception, whereas it is still an emerging field in Canada or Europe (but see Caglar 2001, Faist & Kivisto 2007, Faist & Özveren 2004, Landolt 2007). We need to know whether this is because immigrants in the United States are more likely to lead transnational lives, or whether scholars in other countries have been slower in adopting a transnational framework. Furthermore, most scholars focus on multiple citizenship across nation-states, but one could easily envisage multiple political memberships in different territorial units (Bauböck 2003, Favell 2001a). A number of cities have increasingly tried to exercise some control over the rights and responsibilities of residents in a manner similar to state-based citizenship, so that we could imagine talking about a particular migrant being a citizen of New York City and Mexico (RC Smith 1998), or of Berlin and Turkey (Caglar 2001). Importantly, all versions of multiple citizenship continue to see a political unit, one with some ability to make political decisions and exercise enforcement, as the source of rights and membership status.

In sum, both postnational and cosmopolitan citizenship link legal status to persons rather than territory, raising questions about how to secure rights that are overwhelmingly

⁶Germany’s new citizenship law, in force since 2000, allows children born in Germany to immigrant parents to hold dual citizenship, although the child must give up his or her other citizenship between the ages of 18 to 23 to remain a German national (Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration 2000).

guaranteed by states. Transnational and dual citizenship extend people's ability to participate in and belong to multiple, territorially based political units. All these treatments of citizenship question the link between citizenship and a single nation-state. However, the dimensions of citizenship—status, rights, participation, and belonging—remain the salient axes in evaluating notions of equality.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS: THE INTERSECTION OF THEORY AND METHODS

We have argued for a broad conceptualization of citizenship along four dimensions—status, rights, participation, and belonging. This conceptualization helps link normative concerns about equality and inclusion with empirical research that investigates (a) whether immigrants' life chances are equivalent to those of native-born nonimmigrants, (b) the extent of immigrants' participation in formal and informal politics, and (c) how social, economic, and political participation are connected to belonging. Yet we find a gap between abstract political theory and empirical social science. Above, we highlight areas in which normative citizenship claims have researchable implications. Here, we conclude with some observations about the normative implications of empirical research, recommending greater focus on immigrants' agency.

Sociologists of citizenship and immigration face dilemmas of methodology, measurement, and reference points that speak to the heart of normative and theoretical debates around citizenship. Empirical data on immigrants' membership and participation can quickly become recast as evidence for "successful" or "failed" integration, rife with implicit or explicit notions of "good citizenship" and distinctions between "better" and "problematic" immigrant groups. In the United States, Huntington's (2004) charge that Mexican migrants are failing to integrate into American society and that the United States needs to return to the roots

of it Anglo-Protestant creed carry a strong assimilatory notion of "good citizenship" with decidedly religious and cultural overtones.⁷ In European countries such as Britain, Germany, France, and the Netherlands, many studies of immigration focus on the problematic integration of Muslim communities and government strategies for improving integration policies (Kastoryano 2002, Koopmans et al. 2005). The challenge for researchers is to recognize Muslims' diverse ethno-national and religious backgrounds and not to attach "good citizenship" to a measure of "Europeanization," which in popular debate is often understood as assimilation into a Judeo-Christian culture or, at the least, the abandonment of public signifiers associated with Islam.

Such cautions do not mean that researchers should abandon attempts to adjudicate between successful and failed integration. Rather, we must carefully specify success and failure to avoid normative pitfalls. For instance, most people, including immigrants, would agree that learning a host society's dominant language facilitates economic advancement, political and civic participation and social interaction with fellow residents. Thus, language acquisition is often used as a marker of integration. Recently, countries like the Netherlands have increased language requirements for legal residency or citizenship status. But do limited majority language skills necessarily mean failed integration and bad citizenship? What about retaining the language of origin? Historically, in the United States, "Americanization" efforts promoted the abandonment of immigrants' native language, yet research suggests that those who are fully bi- or multilingual have better cognitive and educational outcomes and, for immigrant families, better intergenerational relations (Peal & Lambert 1962, Portes & Hao 2002, Portes & Rumbaut 2001). Does good citizenship, locally or globally, require

⁷There have been many, largely critical, responses to Huntington's thesis. See, for example, Telles (2006), Citrin et al. (2007), and the June 2006 issue of *Perspectives on Politics*.

multilingualism of immigrants and majority populations? The question of appropriate indicators is critical for public policy and academic scholarship.

Another thorny methodological issue centers on reference points: Who should demonstrate integration, at what point in time, and compared with whom? Do we judge integration and full citizenship over an immigrant's life course or, as many American scholars of assimilation do, should we instead evaluate second and third generation progress? European research has largely focused on the immigrant generation, in part because statistics identifying the second generation are limited given recent migration or political restrictions on collecting such data (but see Alba & Silberman 2002, Simon 2003). Careful statistical work, in addition to other methodologies, will be important in evaluating whether immigrants and their descendants hold "second-class citizenship," in T.H. Marshall's (1950) holistic sense of citizenship.

Future research also must think carefully about the standard to which immigrants are held. Usually, evidence for immigrants' failure to integrate or for anti-immigrant discrimination—often alternative interpretations of the same data—rely on comparison with the "average" native-born citizen. One could argue, however, that immigrants should be compared to people with comparable human capital (Alba & Nee 2003, Bean & Stevens 2003), or that immigrants should be held to higher standards because immigration is a privilege accorded by established citizens (Borjas 1999). Cross-country comparisons between immigrant groups can also illuminate the effects of particular social and historical contexts on immigrant integration, including historical legacies of racial stratification. Although often ob-

scured in the "Data and Methods" section of an article or placed in the "Methodological Appendix" of a book, decisions about measurement and reference points reflect important theoretical assumptions regarding the meaning and embodiment of citizenship.

Beyond measurement, future research must take immigrant agency into account. Many studies focus on receiving states and their policies, neglecting how immigrant groups respond to citizenship laws and integration policies, and how their presence and participation affect the meanings and practices of citizenship (but see Foner 2003, Jacobson & Ruffer 2004, Yurdakul & Bodemann 2006). Future research should examine how immigrant groups define and negotiate their own citizenship, thereby building more dynamic theories that allow for change over time.

Finally, the study of citizenship and immigration cannot be viewed as uniquely the domain of immigration scholars. Rather, the intersection of citizenship and immigration raises broad issues of inequality, state power, and social cohesion. T.H. Marshall's seminal text on citizenship and class reflects such concerns. Yet his work is grounded in an understanding of citizens as born and raised in their country of residence. In the twenty-first century, international migration not only renders axes of internal differentiation more complex, but also challenges the salience of the borders separating one nation-state from another. If large-scale immigration continues—and all indications suggest that it will—social scientists of all types will need to consider the repercussions of migration for notions of status, the allocation of rights, participation in global and multiple local societies, and feelings of belonging that are captured by the notion of citizenship.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any biases that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Michal Bodemann, Tomás Jiménez, Christian Joppke, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, Sarah Song, John Torpey, and Phil Triadafilopoulos for valuable feedback during the writing of this article. Deanna Pikkov provided expert research assistance.

LITERATURE CITED

- Abu-Laban Y. 1994. The politics of race and ethnicity: multiculturalism as a contested arena. In *Canadian Politics*, ed. JP Bickerton, AG Gagnon, pp. 242–63. Peterborough, ON: Broadview. 2nd ed.
- Abu-Laban Y. 2002. Liberalism, multiculturalism and the problem of essentialism. *Citizensh. Stud.* 6(4):459–82
- Alba R. 2005. Bright vs blurred boundaries: second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 28(1):20–49
- Alba R, Nee V. 1997. Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 31(4):826–74
- Alba R, Nee V. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Alba R, Silberman R. 2002. Decolonization immigrations and the social origins of the second generations: the case of North Africans in France. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 36(4):1169–93
- Aleinikoff TA, Klusmeyer D, eds. 2001. *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington, DC: Brookings Inst./Carnegie Endow. Int. Peace
- Alesina A, Glaeser E. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Alesina A, Glaeser E, Sacerdote B. 2001. Why doesn't the United States have a European-style welfare state? *Brookings Pap. Econ. Act.* 2001(2):187–254
- Ansgar KH. 1991/1992. Dual nationality, the myth of election, and a kinder, gentler State Department. *Univ. Miami Int.-Am. Law Rev.* 23(2):421–64
- Arendt H. 1979 (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harvest
- Aristotle. 1992. *Politics*. Transl. TA Sinclair. London: Penguin
- Bannerji H. 2000. *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto: Can. Scholars Press
- Banting K, Johnston R, Kymlicka W, Soroka S. 2006. Do multiculturalism policies erode the welfare state? An empirical analysis. In *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies*, ed. K Banting, W Kymlicka, pp. 49–90. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Banting K, Kymlicka W. 2003. Are multiculturalism policies bad for the welfare state? *Dissent* 2003(Fall):59–66
- Barry B. 2001. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Basch L, Glick Schiller N, Szanton Blanc C. 1994. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. Langhorne, PA: Gordon & Breach
- Bauböck R. 1994. *Transnational Citizenship: Membership and Rights in International Migration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar
- Bauböck R. 2001. Cultural citizenship, minority rights, and self-government. See Aleinikoff & Klusmeyer 2001, pp. 319–48
- Bauböck R. 2003. Towards a political theory of migrant integration. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 37(3):700–23

- Bauböck R. 2005. Expansive citizenship: voting beyond territory and membership. *Polit. Sci. Polit.* 38:683–87
- Bauböck R. 2007. The trade-off between transnational citizenship and political autonomy. See Faist & Kivisto 2007, pp. 71–93
- Bean FD, Stevens G. 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Beauftr. Bundesregier. Migr., Flüchtl. Integr. 2000. *Einbürgerung: Fair, Gerecht, Tolerant*. <http://www.einbuengerung.de>
- Beck U, Grande E. 2007. *Cosmopolitan Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
- Benhabib S. 2002. *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Bissoondath N. 1994. *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin
- Bloemraad I. 2000. Citizenship and immigration: a current review. *J. Int. Migr. Integr.* 1(1):9–37
- Bloemraad I. 2004. Who claims dual citizenship? The limits of postnationalism, the possibilities of transnationalism, and the persistence of traditionalism. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 38(2):389–426
- Bloemraad I. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Bloemraad I. 2007a. Citizenship and pluralism: the role of government in a world of global migration. *Fletcher Forum World Aff.* 31(1):169–83
- Bloemraad I. 2007b. Much ado about nothing? The contours of dual citizenship in the United States and Canada. See Faist & Kivisto 2007, pp. 159–68
- Bodemann M, Yurdakul G, eds. 2006. *Migration, Citizenship, Ethnos*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Borjas GJ. 1999. *Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Bosniak L. 2000. Citizenship denationalized. *Indiana J. Glob. Legal Stud.* 7:447–509
- Bosniak L. 2001. Denationalizing citizenship. See Aleinikoff & Klusmeyer 2001, pp. 237–52
- Bosniak L. 2006. *The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Brubaker R. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Brubaker R. 2001. The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 24(4):531–48
- Brubaker R. 2004. 'Civic' and 'ethnic' nationalism. In *Ethnicity Without Groups*, pp. 132–46. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Brysk A. 2004. Children across borders: patrimony, property, or persons? See Brysk & Shafir 2004, pp. 153–76
- Brysk A, Shafir G, eds. 2004. *People Out of Place: Globalization, Human Rights and the Citizenship Gap*. New York: Routledge
- Caglar A. 2001. Constraining metaphors and the transnationalisation of spaces in Berlin. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.* 27(4):601–13
- Calhoun C. 2007. Nationalism and cultures of democracy. *Public Cult.* 19(1):30
- Carens JH. 1987. Aliens and citizens: the case for open borders. *Rev. Polit.* 49(2):251–73
- Castles S. 1986. The guest-worker in Western Europe: an obituary. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 20(4):761–78
- Castles S. 2002. Migration and community formation under conditions of globalization. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 36(4):1143–68
- Castles S, Davidson A. 2000. *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. New York: Routledge

- Castles S, Kosack G. 1973. *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe*. London: Oxford Univ. Press
- Castles S, Miller MJ. 1993. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York: Guildford
- Chung AY. 2005. 'Politics without the politics': the evolving political cultures of ethnic nonprofits in Koreatown, Los Angeles. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.* 31(5):911–29
- Citrin J, Lerman A, Murakami M, Pearson K. 2007. Testing Huntington: Is Hispanic immigration a threat to American identity? *Perspect. Polit.* 5(1):31–48
- Coll K. 2004. Necesidades y problemas: immigrant Latina vernaculars of belonging, coalition and citizenship in San Francisco, California. *Lat. Stud.* 2:186–209
- Cordero-Guzman HR. 2005. Community-based organizations and migration in New York City. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.* 31:889–909
- DeSipio L, Pachon H, de la Garza RO, Lee J. 2003. *Immigrant Politics at Home and Abroad: How Latino Immigrants Engage the Politics of Their Home Communities and the United States*. Claremont, CA: Tomás Rivera Policy Inst.
- Duckett K. 2000. The meaning of citizenship: a critical analysis of dual nationality and the oath of renunciation. *Immigr. Natl. Law Rev.* 21:717–34
- Dynneson TL. 2001. *Civism: Cultivating Citizenship in European History*. New York: Peter Lang
- Entzinger H. 2003. The rise and fall of multiculturalism: the case of the Netherlands. See Joppke & Morawska 2003, pp. 59–86
- Entzinger H. 2006. Changing the rules while the game is on: from multiculturalism to assimilation in the Netherlands. See Bodemann & Yurdakul 2006, pp. 121–46
- Faist T. 2000. Transnationalization in international migration: implications for the study of citizenship and culture. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 23(2):189–222
- Faist T, ed. 2007a. *Dual Citizenship in Europe: From Nationhood to Societal Integration*. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Faist T. 2007b. The fixed and porous boundaries of dual citizenship. See Faist 2007a, pp. 1–44
- Faist T, Gerdes J, Rieple B. 2007. "We are all 'Republican' now": The politics of dual citizenship in Germany. See Faist 2007a, pp. 45–76
- Faist T, Kivisto P, eds. 2007. *Dual Citizenship in Global Perspective: From Unitary to Multiple Citizenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Faist T, Özyeren E, eds. 2004. *Transnational Spaces: Agents, Networks and Institutions*. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Favell A. 2001a. Integration policy and integration research in Europe: a review and critique. See Aleinikoff & Klusmeyer 2001, pp. 349–99
- Favell A. 2001b. *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*. New York: St. Martin's. Rev. ed.
- Fleras A, Elliott JL. 1992. *Multiculturalism in Canada: The Challenge of Diversity*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson
- Foner N. 2003. Immigrants and African Americans: comparative perspectives on the New York experience across time and space. In *Host Societies and the Reception of Immigrants*, ed. JG Reitz, pp. 45–71. La Jolla, CA: Cent. Comp. Immigr. Stud.
- Fournier P, Yurdakul G. 2006. Unveiling distribution: Muslim women with headscarves in France and Germany. See Bodemann & Yurdakul 2006, pp. 167–84
- Fox J. 2005. Unpacking transnational citizenship. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 8:171–201
- Gerdes J, Faist T. 2007. Varying views on democracy, rights and duties, and membership: the politics of dual citizenship in European immigration states. See Faist & Kivisto 2007, pp. 137–60

- Gitlin T. 1995. *The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why America Is Wracked by Culture Wars*. New York: Metropolitan Books
- Glazer N, Moynihan DP. 1963. *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Gordon MM. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Górny A, Grzymala-Kazłowska A, Korys P, Weiner A. 2007. Selective tolerance? Regulations, practice and discussions regarding dual citizenship in Poland. See Faist 2007a, pp. 147–70
- Guarnizo LE, Portes A, Haller W. 2003. Assimilation and transnationalism: determinants of transnational political action among contemporary migrants. *Am. J. Sociol.* 108(6):1211–48
- Gurowitz A. 1999. Mobilizing international norms: domestic actors, immigrants, and the Japanese state. *World Polit.* 51(3):413–45
- Gwyn R. 1995. *Nationalism Without Walls: The Unbearable Lightness of Being Canadian*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart
- Habermas J. 2003. *The Future of Human Nature*. London: Polity
- Hammar T. 1985. Dual citizenship and political integration. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 9(3):438–50
- Hansen R, Koehler J. 2005. Issue definition, political discourse and the politics of nationality reform in France and Germany. *Eur. J. Polit. Res.* 44:623–44
- Hansen R, Weil P, eds. 2002. *Dual Nationality, Social Rights and Federal Citizenship in the US and Europe: The Reinvention of Citizenship*. New York: Berghahn
- Hayduk R. 2006. *Democracy for All: Restoring Immigrant Voting Rights in the United States*. New York: Routledge
- Heater D. 2004. *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press
- Herbert U. 2001. *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland: Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge*. München: CH Beck
- Hollifield JF. 1992. *Immigrants, Markets, and States: The Political Economy of Postwar Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Hollinger DA. 2000. *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books
- Hondagneu-Sotelo P. 1994. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Huntington SP. 2004. *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Ireland PR. 1994. *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity: Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Itzigsohn J. 2000. Immigration and the boundaries of citizenship: the institutions of immigrants' political transnationalism. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 34(4):1126–54
- Itzigsohn J. 2007. Migration and transnational citizenship in Latin America: the cases of Mexico and the Dominican Republic. See Faist & Kivisto 2007, pp. 115–36
- Itzigsohn J, Cabral CD, Medina EH, Vazquez O. 1999. Mapping Dominican transnationalism: narrow and broad transnational practices. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 22(2):316–39
- Itzigsohn J, Giorguli-Saucedo S. 2005. Incorporation, transnationalism, and gender: immigrant incorporation and transnational participation as gendered processes. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 39(4):895–920
- Jacobson D. 1996. *Rights across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press
- Jacobson D, Ruffer GB. 2004. Agency on a global scale: rules, rights and the European Union. See Brysk & Shafir 2004, pp. 73–86
- Janoski T. 1998. *Citizenship and Civil Society: A Framework of Rights and Obligations in Liberal, Traditional, and Social Democratic Regimes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

- Jones-Correa M. 1998. *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- Jones-Correa M. 2001. Under two flags: dual nationality in Latin America and its consequences for naturalization in the United States. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 35(4):997–1029
- Joppke C. 1998. Asylum and state sovereignty: a comparison of the United States, Germany, and Britain. In *Challenge to the Nation-State: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States*, ed. C. Joppke, pp. 109–52. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Joppke C. 1999. *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Joppke C. 2004. The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy. *Br. J. Sociol.* 55(2):237–57
- Joppke C, Morawska E, eds. 2003. *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Kallen E. 1982. Multiculturalism: ideology, policy and reality. *J. Can. Stud.* 17(1):51–63
- Kastoryano R. 2002. *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*. Transl. B Harshav. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Kivisto P. 2007. Conclusion: the boundaries of citizenship in a transitional age. See Faist & Kivisto 2007, pp. 274–79
- Koopmans R. 2004. Migrant mobilisation and political opportunities: variation among German cities and a comparison with the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.* 30(3):449–70
- Koopmans R, Statham P. 1999. Challenging the liberal nation-state? Postnationalism, multiculturalism, and the collective claims making of migrants and ethnic minorities in Britain and Germany. *Am. J. Sociol.* 105(3):652–96
- Koopmans R, Statham P. 2003. How national citizenship shapes transnationalism: a comparative analysis of migrant and minority claims-making in Germany, Great Britain, and the Netherlands. See Joppke & Morawska 2003, pp. 195–238
- Koopmans R, Statham P, Giugni M, Passy F. 2005. *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Korteweg AC. 2006a. The construction of gendered citizenship at the welfare office: an ethnographic comparison of welfare-to-work workshops in the United States and the Netherlands. *Soc. Polit.* 13(3):313–40
- Korteweg AC. 2006b. The murder of Theo van Gogh: gender, religion and the struggle over immigrant integration in the Netherlands. See Bodemann & Yurdakul 2006, pp. 147–66
- Koser K. 2007. *International Migration: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Kymlicka W. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon
- Kymlicka W. 2001. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Kymlicka W, Norman W. 1994. Return of the citizen: a survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics* 104:352–81
- Lahav G. 2004. *Immigration and Politics in the New Europe: Reinventing Borders*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Landolt P. 2007. Nation-state building projects and the politics of transnational migration: locating Salvadorans in Canada, the United States, and El Salvador. In *Citizenship and Immigrant Incorporation: Comparative Perspectives on North America and Western Europe*, ed. G Yurdakul, M Bodemann, pp. 141–62. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Leitner H, Ehrkamp P. 2003. Beyond national citizenship: Turkish immigrants and the (re)construction of citizenship in Germany. *Urban Geogr.* 24(2):127–46

- Lentin R. 2007. Ireland: racial state and crisis racism. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 30(4):610–27
- Levitt P. 2000. Migrants participate across borders: towards an understanding of its forms and consequences. In *Immigration Research for a New Century: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. N Foner, RG Rumbaut, SJ Gold, pp. 459–79. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Levitt P. 2001. *The Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Levitt P. 2007. The changing contours of immigrant religious life. In *Citizenship and Immigrant Incorporation: Comparative Perspectives on North America and Western Europe*, ed. G Yurdakul, M Bodemann, pp. 99–122. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Levitt P, Glick Schiller N. 2004. Transnational perspectives on migration: conceptualizing simultaneity. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 38(145):595–629
- Levitt P, Waters MC, eds. 2002. *The Changing Face of Home: The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Lister R. 2003. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: NY Univ. Press. 2nd ed.
- Magnette P. 2005. *Citizenship: The History of an Idea*. Colchester: ECPR
- Maher KH. 2004. Globalized social reproduction: women migrants and the citizenship gap. See Brysk & Shafir 2004, pp. 131–52
- Mann M. 2001. Ruling class strategies and citizenship. In *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T.H. Marshall*, ed. M Bulmer, AM Rees, pp. 125–44. London: Routledge
- Marshall TH. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Massey DS. 2007. *Categorically Unequal: The American Stratification System*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Massey DS, Arango J, Hugo G, Kouaouci A, Pellegrino A, Taylor JE. 1998. *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Menjívar C. 2006. Liminal legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan immigrants' lives in the United States. *Am. J. Sociol.* 111(4):999–1037
- Mill JS. 1993 [1859]. *On Liberty and Utilitarianism*. Bantam: Classics
- Miller D. 2000. *Citizenship and National Identity*. Oxford: Polity
- Morris L. 2002. *Managing Migration: Civic Stratification and Migrants' Rights*. New York: Routledge
- Odmalm P. 2005. *Migration Policies and Political Participation: Inclusion or Intrusion in Western Europe?* London: Palgrave Macmillan
- OECD (Organ. Econ. Co-op. Dev.). 2007. *International Migration Outlook: SOPEMI 2007 Edition*. Paris: OECD Publ. <http://www.oecd.org/els/migration/imo>
- Okin SM. 1999. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Ong A. 1996. Cultural citizenship as subject-making: immigrants negotiate racial and cultural boundaries in the United States. *Curr. Anthropol.* 37(5):737–62
- Østergaard-Nielsen E. 2002. Working for a solution through Europe: Kurdish political lobbying in Germany. In *New Approaches to Migration?: Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*, ed. N Al-Ali, K Koser, pp. 186–201. London: Routledge
- Parekh B. 2006. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2nd ed.
- Park RE. 1930. Assimilation, social. In *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. ERA Seligman, A Johnson, pp. 281–83. New York: Macmillan
- Park RE, Burgess EW. 1969 (1921). *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Passel JS. 2006. The size and characteristics of the unauthorized migrant population in the U.S.: estimates based on the March 2005 Current Population Survey. *Pew Hispanic Res. Rep.*, Washington, DC. <http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=61>

- Pateman C. 1989. *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism, and Political Theory*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press
- Peal E, Lambert WE. 1962. The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychol. Monogr.* 76(27):1–23
- Penninx R, Kraal K, Mariniello M, Vertovec S. 2004. *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Pickus N. 2005. *True Faith and Allegiance: Immigration and American Civic Nationalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Pocock JGA. 1995. The ideal of citizenship since classical times. In *Theorizing Citizenship*, ed. R Beiner, pp. 29–52. Albany: SUNY Press
- Portes A, Bach RL. 1985. *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Portes A, Guarnizo LE, Landolt P. 1999. The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 22(2):217–37
- Portes A, Hao L. 2002. The price of uniformity: language, family and personality adjustment in the immigrant second generation. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 25(6):889–912
- Portes A, Rumbaut RG. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley/New York: Univ. Calif. Press/Russell Sage Found.
- Portes A, Rumbaut RG. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press. 3rd ed.
- Portes A, Zhou M. 1993. The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 530:74–96
- Putnam RD. 2007. *E Pluribus Unum: diversity and community in the twenty-first century*. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scand. Polit. Stud.* 30(2):137–74
- Razack S. 2004. Imperilled Muslim women, dangerous Muslim men, and civilised Europeans: legal and social responses to forced marriages. *J. Fem. Legal Stud.* 12(2):129–74
- Renshon SA. 2001. *Dual Citizenship and American National Identity*. Washington, DC: Cent. Immigr. Stud.
- Roberts LW, Clifton RA. 1990. Multiculturalism in Canada: a sociological perspective. In *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, ed. PS Li, pp. 120–47. Toronto: Oxford Univ. Press
- Rosaldo R. 1997. Cultural citizenship, inequality, and multiculturalism. In *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space and Politics*, ed. WV Flores, R Benmayor, pp. 27–38. Boston: Beacon
- Rumbaut R. 2002. Severed or sustained attachments? Language, identity, and imagined communities in the post-immigrant generation. See Levitt & Waters 2002, pp. 43–95
- Sassen S. 1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money*. New York: New Press
- Sassen S. 2006. The repositioning of citizenship and alienage: emergent subjects and spaces for politics. See Bodemann & Yurdakul 2006, pp. 13–34
- Schachar A. 2000. On citizenship and multicultural vulnerability. *Polit. Theory* 28(1):64–89
- Schachar A. 2001. *Multicultural Jurisdictions, Cultural Differences, and Women's Rights*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Schlesinger AM Jr. 1998. *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. New York: Norton
- Schuck PH. 1998. *Citizens, Strangers, and In-Betweens: Essays on Immigration and Citizenship*. Boulder, CO: Westview
- Simon P. 2003. France and the unknown second generation: preliminary results on social mobility. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 37(4):1091–1119
- Skocpol T. 1992. *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

- Smith G. 1999. Overlapping collectivities: local concern, state welfare and social membership. In *Confronting the Present: Towards a Politically Engaged Anthropology*, pp. 195–227. Oxford: Berg
- Smith MP, Guarnizo L, eds. 1998. *Transnationalism from Below*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction
- Smith RC. 1998. Transnational localities: community, technology and the politics of membership within the context of Mexico and US migration. See Smith & Guarnizo 1998, pp. 196–240
- Smith RC. 2003. Migrant membership as an instituted process: transnationalization, the state and extraterritorial conduct of Mexican politics. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 37(2):297–343
- Smith RC. 2005. *Mexican New York: Transnational Lives of New Immigrants*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Smith RM. 1997. *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in US History*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press
- Somers M. 2005. Citizenship troubles: genealogies of struggle for the soul of the social. In *Remaking Modernity*, ed. J Adams, L Clemens, A Orloff, pp. 438–69. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Somers M. 2006. Citizenship, statelessness and market fundamentalism: Arendtian lessons on right to have rights. See Bodemann & Yurdakul 2006, pp. 35–62
- Song S. 2005. Majority norms, multiculturalism, and gender equality. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 99(4):473–89
- Soysal YN. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Spång M. 2007. Pragmatism all the way down? The politics of dual citizenship in Sweden. See Faist 2007a, pp. 103–26
- Spiro PJ. 1997. Dual nationality and the meaning of citizenship. *Emory Law Rev.* 46(4):1411–85
- Spiro PJ. 2004. Mandated membership, diluted identity: citizenship, globalization and international law. See Brysk & Shafir 2004, pp. 87–108
- Stasiulis DK. 1997. International migration, rights, and the decline of ‘actually existing liberal democracy.’ *New Community* 23(2):197–214
- Stasiulis DK, Bakan AB. 2005. *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*. Toronto: Univ. Toronto Press
- Tambini D. 2001. Post-national citizenship. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 24:195–217
- Taylor C. 1993. Shared and divergent values. In *Reconciling the Solitudes: Essays on Canadian Federalism and Nationalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s Univ. Press
- Taylor C. 1994. The politics of recognition. In *Multiculturalism*, ed. A Gutmann, pp. 25–73. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Telles E. 2006. Mexican Americans and the American nation: a response to Professor Huntington. *Aztlán: J. Chicano Stud.* 31(2):7–23
- Tilly C. 1996. Citizenship, identity and social history. In *Citizenship, Identity and Social History*, ed. C Tilly, pp. 1–18. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Turner BS. 1993. Contemporary problems in the theory of citizenship. In *Citizenship and Social Theory*, ed. BS Turner, pp. 1–18. London: Sage
- UN Popul. Div. 2006. *International Migration and Development Report 2006*. New York: UN Publ.
- Vertovec S. 2004. Migrant transnationalism and modes of transformation. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 38(3):970–1001
- Vertovec S, Cohen R, eds. 2002. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Waldinger R. 2007. The bounded community: turning foreigners into Americans in twenty-first century L.A. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 30(3):341–74
- Warner WL, Srole L. 1945. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press

- Waters M. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Waters MC, Jimenez TR. 2005. Assessing immigrant assimilation: new empirical and theoretical challenges. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 31:105–25
- Weil P. 2001. Nationalities and citizenships: the lessons of the French experience for Germany and Europe. In *Citizenship, Nationality, and Migration in Europe*, ed. D Cesarini, M Fulbrook, pp. 74–87. London: Routledge
- Young IM. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Yurdakul G. 2006. State, political parties and immigrant elites: Turkish immigrant associations in Berlin. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.* 32(3):435–53
- Yurdakul G, Bodemann M. 2006. “We don’t want to be the Jews of tomorrow”: Jews and Turks in Germany after 9/11. *Ger. Polit. Soc.* 24(2):44–67
- Yuval-Davis N. 1997. Citizenship and difference. In *Gender and Nation*, pp. 68–88. London: Sage
- Yuval-Davis N. 1999. The ‘multi-layered citizen’: citizenship in the age of ‘glocalization.’ *Int. Fem. J. Polit.* 1(1):119–36
- Zhou M. 1999. Segmented assimilation: issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation. In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, ed. C Hirschman, P Kasnitz, J DeWind, pp. 196–211. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Zhou M, Bankston CL. 1998. *Growing Up American: How Vietnamese Children Adapt to Life in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage
- Zolberg A, Long WL. 1999. Why Islam is like Spanish: cultural incorporation in Europe and the United States. *Polit. Soc.* 27(1):5–38



Contents

Prefatory Chapters

Reproductive Biology, Technology, and Gender Inequality:
An Autobiographical Essay
Joan N. Huber 1

From Mead to a Structural Symbolic Interactionism and Beyond
Sheldon Stryker 15

Theory and Methods

Methodological Memes and Mores: Toward a Sociology
of Social Research
Erin Leabey 33

Social Processes

After Secularization?
Philip S. Gorski and Ateş Altınordu 55

Institutions and Culture

Religion and Science: Beyond the Epistemological Conflict Narrative
John H. Evans and Michael S. Evans 87

Black/White Differences in School Performance: The Oppositional
Culture Explanation
Douglas B. Downey 107

Formal Organizations

Sieve, Incubator, Temple, Hub: Empirical and Theoretical Advances
in the Sociology of Higher Education
Mitchell L. Stevens, Elizabeth A. Armstrong, and Richard Arum 127

Political and Economic Sociology

Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation,
and Challenges to the Nation-State
Irene Bloemraad, Anna Korteweg, and Gökçe Yurdakul 153

Differentiation and Stratification

The Sociology of Discrimination: Racial Discrimination in Employment, Housing, Credit, and Consumer Markets <i>Devah Pager and Hana Shepherd</i>	181
The Second Generation in Western Europe: Education, Unemployment, and Occupational Attainment <i>Anthony F. Heath, Catherine Rothon, and Elina Kilpi</i>	211
Broken Down by Race and Gender? Sociological Explanations of New Sources of Earnings Inequality <i>Kevin T. Leicht</i>	237
Family Structure and the Reproduction of Inequalities <i>Sara McLanahan and Christine Percheski</i>	257
Unconscious Racism: A Concept in Pursuit of a Measure <i>Hart Blanton and James Jaccard</i>	277

Individual and Society

Horizontal Stratification in Postsecondary Education: Forms, Explanations, and Implications <i>Theodore P. Gerber and Sin Yi Cheung</i>	299
Gender Inequalities in Education <i>Claudia Buchmann, Thomas A. DiPrete, and Anne McDaniel</i>	319
Access to Civil Justice and Race, Class, and Gender Inequality <i>Rebecca L. Sandefur</i>	339
How the Outside Gets In: Modeling Conversational Permeation <i>David R. Gibson</i>	359
Testing and Social Stratification in American Education <i>Eric Grodsky, John Robert Warren, and Erika Felts</i>	385

Policy

Social Networks and Health <i>Kirsten P. Smith and Nicholas A. Christakis</i>	405
--	-----

Sociology and World Regions

Gender in African Population Research: The Fertility/Reproductive Health Example <i>F. Nii-Amoo Dodoo and Ashley E. Frost</i>	431
Regional Institutions and Social Development in Southern Africa <i>Matthew McKeever</i>	453

Conditional Cash Transfers as Social Policy in Latin America: An Assessment of their Contributions and Limitations [Translation] <i>Enrique Valencia Lomelí</i>	475
Las Transferencias Monetarias Condicionadas como Política Social en América Latina. Un Balance: Aportes, Límites y Debates [Original, available online at http://www.annualreviews.org/ go/EValenciaLomeli] <i>Enrique Valencia Lomelí</i>	499

Indexes

Cumulative Index of Contributing Authors, Volumes 25–34	525
Cumulative Index of Chapter Titles, Volumes 25–34	529

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Sociology* articles may be found at
<http://soc.annualreviews.org/errata.shtml>