



Chapitre de livre

2021

Published version

Open Access

This is the published version of the publication, made available in accordance with the publisher's policy.

Citizenship and migration: mapping the terrain

Giugni, Marco; Grasso, Maria

How to cite

GIUGNI, Marco, GRASSO, Maria. Citizenship and migration: mapping the terrain. In: Handbook of Citizenship and Migration. Marco Giugni and Maria Grasso (Ed.). Cheltenham : Edward Elgar, 2021. p. 1–19. doi: 10.4337/9781789903133.00006

This publication URL: <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:153326>

Publication DOI: [10.4337/9781789903133.00006](https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789903133.00006)

1. Citizenship and migration: mapping the terrain

Marco Giugni and Maria Grasso

CITIZENSHIP AND MIGRATION: A FALSE OXYMORON

Citizenship lies at the heart of modern democracies. As a result, scholars have addressed it from a variety of different angles, ranging from normative-philosophical reflections to more “positive” yet theoretically-oriented discussions, to analyses based on empirical evidence. Moreover, today migration represents both a key policy field and an important field of study in its own right. And yet, the two concepts aligned, as in this *Handbook of Citizenship and Migration*, might come across as in opposition. This contrast appears as all the more stark when we consider those characters which are seen to embody these two terms: while citizens are those who are generally ascribed as belonging to a specific place (originally, the city, today, more generally a country), migrants are by definition people who move from one place (a city, a country, and so forth) to another. Yet, citizenship and migration are so intimately linked that it is hard to theorize one without taking into account the other. Citizenship and migration in democracies are often seen as two different terms, bringing up belongingness, or a one-sided view of people and their situation (for example, see the search to identify and categorize individuals). The fact that the recently published *Oxford Handbook of Citizenship* (Shachar et al. 2017b) is co-edited by four scholars who have published extensively on migration is perhaps symptomatic of the state of affairs. This is all the more true in our increasingly globalized world. In such a context, the increasing flows of migrants – especially refugees and asylum-seekers – who escape poverty, violent conflicts or other difficult situations, are often used as scapegoats for a wide array of challenging social issues facing contemporary democracies, often by political entrepreneurs seeking to further their own ends. Moreover, consideration of the long-term patterns of exploitation, North–South inequalities, conflict, and so forth, that lead to the increasing migration flows further challenges traditional conceptions of citizenship, putting these to a strenuous test, and in the process pushes the conceptual boundaries of what has hitherto been understood as a “citizen.”

There is no single all-encompassing definition of citizenship. Definitions can be narrower or broader, with some stressing certain aspects rather than others, depending on the perspective and the discipline. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines citizenship along two major lines: as the status of being a citizen, or as membership in a community. The first aspect focuses our attention on what or who is a citizen. According to the same source, a citizen is an inhabitant of a city or town (especially one entitled to the rights and privileges of a freeman), a member of a state (or a native or naturalized person who owes allegiance to a government and is entitled to protection from it), or a civilian, as distinguished from a specialized servant of the state.

Scholarly work also abounds in definitions. While we agree with Shachar et al. (2017a) that articulating a single definition to suit all purposes is either a hopeless task or a sectarian project, here we would nonetheless like to adopt one. To do so, we follow that proposed by Bellamy (2008: 17):

Citizenship is a condition of civic equality. It consists of membership of a political community where all citizens can determine the terms of social cooperation on an equal basis. This status not only secures equal rights to the enjoyment of the collective goods provided by the political association, but also involves equal duties to promote and sustain them – including the good of democratic citizenship itself.

In a similar fashion, while purposely eschewing the risks entailed in subscribing to a single definition of citizenship, Shachar et al. (2017a: 5) have recently pointed to its manifold dimensions, which are addressed in their volume: “as legal status and political membership; as rights and obligations; as identity and belonging; as civic virtues and practices of engagement; and as a discourse of political and social equality or responsibility for a common good.”

While Shachar et al.’s list of dimensions also includes a discursive side which is absent – or at least, left implicit – in Bellamy’s definition, both approaches see citizenship as having three key components: membership, rights and participation. While all three aspects are constitutive of what citizenship is and should be, different theoretical traditions have stressed a specific aspect. Here the literature often distinguishes between two main models of citizenship: the Greek and the Roman models. The Greek model, whose roots go back to Ancient Greece but also to the later Roman Republic (*res publica populi romani*), emphasizes a republican conception of citizenship as equal participation, hence stressing a political view of citizenship and the importance of political participation within a collectivistic notion of the common good. In contrast, the Roman model, whose origin is to be found in the Roman Empire, advocates a liberal conception of citizenship as equal status, hence stressing a legalistic view of citizenship and the importance of equality before the law with a more individualistic notion of individual rights. All models of citizenship, including those of the Italian Renaissance city-states or those put forward in the French and American revolutions, and so forth, go back to the republican and liberal models.

Importantly, both Bellamy’s (2008) definition and the dimensions listed by Shachar et al. (2017a) also point to the debate in terms of the ideal toward which citizenship should aim: civic equality or, rather, equality *tout court*. Most contemporary democracies today tend to employ the Roman or liberal, more limited conception. More radical thinkers tend instead to argue for Greek or republican conceptions. Thus, the central purpose of democracy tends to be understood to be aligned with the underlying rationale for citizenship: the establishment of a condition of civic equity. As Tilly (2007: 13–14) put it, “a regime is democratic to the degree that political relations between the state and its citizens feature broad, equal, protected and mutually binding consultation.” Therefore, when it comes to linking these three components of citizenship to migration, a key question is this: To what extent are migrants of all sorts – whether citizens of migrant origin, foreigners as regular migrants with some residence permit, or asylum-seekers and refugees, and so forth – granted the condition of civic equity? To answer this question, we maintain that we need to look into all three components of citizenship and raise issues pertaining to membership and belonging, rights (and duties), and (civic and political) participation.

Concerning the other key term for this *Handbook*, the field of migration studies has been burgeoning in recent decades, most likely due to the increasing political and policy relevance of migration-related issues. We do not hope to be successful in summarizing this enormous body of literature – or, rather, these bodies of literatures – in the context of this brief introduction. The chapters to follow all provide references, overviews, insights and discussions which cover much of this literature – generally in connection with the concept and theme of citizen-

ship – so we refer the reader to these more specific and focused discussions. In the remainder of what follows, we more traditionally, for an introduction to a volume of this sort, touch upon some key theoretical themes which we think are central to the discussion developed in the volume. We also cover the various parts and chapters and their contents to refer the reader to these. We start this discussion by going back to the now traditional distinction between immigration policy and immigrant policy (Hammar 1985). The former is meant to regulate the entry and stay of immigrants – the regulation of immigration flows – while the latter deals with the integration in the host society or country of residence. This distinction is also helpful to “classify” research and scholarly writing in this field. However, we should be aware of the fact that immigration policy and immigrant policy are not mutually exclusive, and are perhaps becoming increasingly blurred today. Yet, this distinction is helpful, at a minimum, to draw our attention to the main focus of a given policy and, in our case, to the subject matter of the discussions in the following chapters. Indeed, some chapters are more concerned with the implications for citizenship of immigration policy, while others pay more attention to the nexus between citizenship and immigrant policy.

In particular, this *Handbook* aims to provide readers with a state-of-the-art coverage of debates on citizenship and migration. Its underlying premise is that citizenship and migration are intimately related to each other, both conceptually and empirically. While most existing accounts acknowledge this fact, they often treat them separately, or focus on one term or the other, at best pointing out the implications for the other term. In other words, certain accounts focus on migration and show the connections with citizenship, while others focus on citizenship and mention migration as an important related topic. This *Handbook*, in contrast, aims to put both terms on an equal footing through a more integrated approach. Accordingly, the chapters included in this volume all examine how citizenship and migration intersect in contemporary thinking in this field, in some way or another.

While far from claiming exhaustivity, the *Handbook* aims to be comprehensive in coverage and approaches. By their nature, both citizenship and migration require an interdisciplinary analysis: from sociology and political sociology, to political science, to geography, economics, anthropology, history, philosophy, and other disciplines and subdisciplines. Furthermore, their study calls for both normative and more “positive” approaches, and from an empirical angle, for both in-depth case studies and broader comparative studies, as much as for both quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches. Scholarly discussions and analyses of citizenship and migration often also imply looking at studies in proximate fields and topics, especially when the goal is to consider them jointly. This *Handbook* sets itself the aim of providing an integrated account that establishes these sorts of connections.

To accomplish this task, the *Handbook* is structured in five parts. Part I provides a broad overview of the theoretical (both normative and more empirical) perspectives linking the migration issue to citizenship conceptions and practices, as well as a discussion of the methodological approaches (both quantitative and qualitative) employed for the study of citizenship and migration. Each of the three following parts addresses issues relating to the three main components of citizenship mentioned earlier, namely membership, rights and participation. Part II deals with the membership dimension of citizenship and migration. Part III deals with the rights dimension of citizenship and migration. Part IV deals with the participative dimension of citizenship and migration. Finally, Part V broadens the picture by discussing some key present challenges and future perspectives in the study of citizenship and migration. Each part includes five chapters written by leading scholars in the field. This introductory chapter

maps the terrain for the chapters to follow by pointing out the core issues they address, and by presenting the content of those chapters. We do so following the five-fold thematic structure of the *Handbook*.

PART I: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

Theories of citizenship can broadly be divided into two types: normative and empirical. Simply put, normative theories aim to define which rights and duties citizens should have, while empirical theories describe and explain how citizens acquired these rights and duties. Part I of the *Handbook* deals with both aspects, in relation to the topic of migration. To be sure, both the normative and the empirical dimensions of our subject matter permeate the entire *Handbook*. Yet, the chapters in this part offer a broader and more general overview on both counts. They aim to provide an account of normative thinking as well as empirical perspectives and also models of citizenship, including both quantitative and qualitative approaches to studying citizenship and migration.

Normative-theoretical thinking informs much empirical research on citizenship and migration, sometimes explicitly so, while most often such normative underpinnings are left implicit. By discussing some of the more relevant questions for normative thinking at the start of the volume this provides the groundwork – or the lenses, so to speak – to approach all works in citizenship and migration. This further allows for considering their (generally implicit) normative implications or grounding; going back, as we saw earlier, to the total, republican or Greek and more limited, liberal or Roman conceptions of citizenship and their links with migration. That said, as we turn to the chapters on empirical perspectives and models of citizenship, we also consider the key challenges of empirical works on the intersections of citizenship and migration that aim to capture the realities of the societal expressions of these trends, such as in terms of the experiences of migrants of different generations or their patterns of societal integration. Moreover, we also look at how political and institutional contexts impact on these by looking at models of citizenship in relation to integration.

When it comes to empirical work in particular, we know of course that the choice of methods is of essence. Therefore, attention is also paid to methodological approaches to the study of citizenship and migration. Methods in social science have developed considerably in recent years, not least thanks to the dramatic advances in computer technology which have allowed for more sophisticated modelling in quantitative methods, for example. Thus, today we dispose of a broader toolkit for the study of citizenship and migration in terms of both data collection and analysis, ranging from quantitative to more qualitative approaches. Such methodological pluralism can only be beneficial to the field, especially when quantitative and qualitative data and methods can be combined, such as in mixed-methods approaches. Moreover, a volume of this sort aims to go beyond methodological nationalism, too. Quantitative approaches tend to focus on the analysis of survey data at the individual level. However, here the challenge is to identify suitable data, as population studies may not contain enough cases for the migrant populations of interest and thus it becomes important to target migrants specifically in surveys, with concomitant issues arising in terms of how to develop random sampling frames in these contexts, which migrants to target, and so forth. Qualitative studies tend to focus on more subjective experiences, generally through the analysis of data from interviews. Here the aim

tends to be that of understanding thought processes rather than general population patterns. As such, these all remain important issues, and the last two chapters in Part I of the *Handbook* examine methodological approaches in detail, including example applications to the study of citizenship and migration.

Moving on to the specific chapters, this part of the *Handbook* starts off in Chapter 2 with a discussion of normative perspectives on citizenship and migration by Matteo Gianni. This chapter reviews the main arguments advanced by scholarship on the admission and inclusion of immigrants in Western societies, and offers an analysis of the central position of citizenship in determining legitimate and fair ways for organizing immigration societies. Starting from the assumption that an analytical and normative conception of citizenship is needed to unveil the wrongs inherent in certain citizenship regimes and that citizenship is an essentially contested concept, this chapter suggests a number of aspects that should be taken into account to determine the moral and political perimeters of a model of citizenship that is able to promote democratic values and justice constraints in Western immigration and mobile societies. First, since citizenship represents a powerful normative baseline to contest justice and democratic wrongs, a model of citizenship suited to liberal democratic societies cannot disregard some minimal and publicly acceptable standards. Second, one should avoid focusing on a purely legalistic and formal conception of citizenship, to embrace a performative view that sees it also as a political and discursive practice that transforms moral values into meanings and actions. Third, one should acknowledge the (partial) decoupling of citizenship and nationality, and how this fundamentally challenges the traditional view of the national state. Fourth, by doing so, this can allow for developing an imaginary for future-oriented, new institutional modalities of governances of transnational, mobile, culturally-differentiated settings. In brief, this chapter emphasizes the idea of citizenship as an inherently political matter, stressing the importance of citizenship understood as membership of a political community.

Moving from the normative to the more empirical perspective, Chapter 3, by Laurence Lessard-Phillips and Nobuko Nagai, provides an overview of approaches to study the intersection between migration and citizenship. This chapter starts from a standpoint similar to that of the current introductory chapter, by stating that migration and citizenship are inextricably tied to each other in complex ways. The chapter stresses the need to think about how to move on from theoretical refinements to ensure that the complexities of the intersection between citizenship and migration are reflected in empirical work. This leads to the argument that “we ought not to think of a single intersection but instead of a multiplicity of intersections between citizenship and migration that are contingent on different conceptualizations and how these need considering in empirical work.” Practice and analysis are two sides of the same coin, and both must find their place in the study of the connections between citizenship and migration.

As we mentioned earlier, a number of studies in the field of immigration and ethnic relations politics have focused on the role of state policies and practices towards migrants for their integration in countries of residence. This body of work has often built upon the concept of citizenship models, configurations or regimes, hence showing once again the close connection between migration and citizenship. Chapter 4, by Luca Pfirter, Lisa Marie Borrelli, Didier Ruedin and Stefanie Kurt, takes stock of this important body of work. The chapter proposes a re-evaluation or reconceptualization of citizenship models which takes into account insights from the (b)ordering perspective and border regime theories, based on a more practice-focused analysis of integration and yielding a more nuanced picture of current citizenship models. While they use examples – excursions, as they call them – drawn from the case of Switzerland,

their argument goes well beyond that specific case. The urge to rethink commonly used concepts of “integration” as mechanisms for governing social cohesion, with which the chapter concludes, cannot but be taken seriously if we want to advance knowledge on how state-related discourses and practices impinge upon migrants’ integration and, therefore, on their relation to citizenship.

The last two chapters of Part I deal with methodological issues. Chapter 5, by Natalia Malancu and Alexandra Florea reviews work that studies the relationship between migration and citizenship by means of quantitative approaches and methodologies, with a dual purpose. First, it provides information on novel advances in terms of topics, measures, methods and techniques over the past decade. Second, it signals opportunities for future contributions and highlights particular limitations to be factored in. The chapter shows how scholars are constantly blending and recasting established theoretical perspectives at different (micro/macro/meso) levels of analysis, elaborating on methodological innovations such as the life-course perspective, experimental designs, network analysis and big data, as well as advances in measuring citizenship, transnationalism and its variants: extra-territorial citizenship and multiple citizenship. Furthermore, the chapter shows how data availability and policy concerns that underpin data production have historically restricted the research agenda, and that research would benefit from refining the understanding of to whom and under which conditions citizenship matters. In this way, the *Handbook* brings forth a very diverse and multi-perspective picture of how to study migration and citizenship – from policy analysis, to experiences, to implementation, to theorization, and so on.

While the opposition of quantitative and qualitative methods in the social sciences can be considered, with Boudonian memory, as a *fausse querelle* (Boudon 1969), it nevertheless still structures scholarly work, including in citizenship and migration. Following Chapter 5 on quantitative approaches, Chapter 6 by Maria Xenitidou discusses qualitative approaches and methodologies. Given the wide variety of qualitative methods employed to address citizenship and migration, the chapter focuses more specifically on an approach drawing on the discursive turn in social psychology, including developments in discursive psychology and rhetorical psychology, as well as recent developments in critical discursive social psychology. The aim here is to show the ways in which constructions of citizenship are constituted in relation to migration. From a substantive point of view, the chapter concludes that discursive and rhetorical approaches in social psychology, addressing the ways phenomena are oriented and categories are negotiated and constituted while managing identity implications, are a matter of analytic scrutiny and interrogation. The chapter shows that while qualitative research insights are linked to context, the ways in which social actors relate to issues and construct themselves as well as others suggest that there are dominant “ways of seeing” and power hierarchies.

PART II: MEMBERSHIP

As we mentioned earlier, each of the three central parts of the *Handbook* deals with one of the three main dimensions of citizenship, namely membership, rights, and participation. These three dimensions are very much embedded in the definition of citizenship as discussed earlier. As Bellamy (2008: 16) has noted, “membership, rights, and participation go together. It is through being a member of a political community and participating on equal terms in the framing of its collective life that we enjoy rights to pursue our individual lives on fair terms

with others.” So, these three dimensions are not easy to separate in practice, even though the participative dimension is more closely linked to a specific view and definition of citizenship, one which is closer to the ancient Greek model and the republican conception stressing political citizenship which foresees the participation of citizens to the *res publica* or “public affairs” and the common good.

Apart from this caveat, the first key dimension of citizenship refers to membership, or belonging. This dimension concerns who is a citizen (Bellamy 2008). It is about who should be included in the political community and, conversely, who should be excluded from it. Indeed, the history of citizenship is also a history of progressive inclusion of different groups who were previously excluded, often after decades of ongoing political struggle. Migrants are one such group, perhaps the one most directly concerned by the definition of criteria for inclusion in – or exclusion from – the national community. This is also due to the fact that citizenship is still attached to the national state, and therefore to the membership therein (Maas 2013). However, as works on national models, regimes or “philosophies” of integration and citizenship show (Brubaker 1992; Favell 1998; Koopmans et al. 2005; Vink 2017), such criteria vary from one country to another. In particular, states provide a different mix of institutional arrangements for membership of migrants, depending on a number of formal and less formal aspects such as granting citizenship or accepting public displays of ethnic difference (Koopmans et al. 2005). So, in spite of trends towards convergence (Joppke 2007), migrants are members – or “more” members – of the national community in some places compared to others.

Issues relating to membership and belonging have perhaps acquired increasing importance in public and political debates in recent years due to the rise of radical right populist parties, which put national belonging and prerogatives at center stage in their political programs and discourses. In this regard, the “identitarian turn” in politics – carried by those parties, but also by the so-called “identitarian movements” – centers the debate about immigration on issues concerning membership and belonging to the national community (Giugni and Grasso 2018). In this context emerge discussions of who is a member and who truly belongs. Discredited conceptions of belongingness linked to heritage have been revamped by right-wing populist political entrepreneurs in recent times. While racism is not overtly biological in nature in the current context, it tends to take the form of a cultural protectionism which favors an often romanticized and idealized, autochthonous culture, in contrast to the changes brought forward by what are often negatively characterized as the ‘invading hordes’ of migrants or non-citizens, who are not seen by those coming from this perspective as rightful citizens. Often the discussions focus on issues, for example, of social protection and who should have right to this, denying universalism and claiming instead that some people should be ahead of the queue in light of their earlier presence on the territory – so-called welfare chauvinism.

Part II of the *Handbook* thus deals with migration issues relating to the membership dimension of citizenship. Like the following two parts – those devoted to rights and participation, respectively – it starts with a chapter addressing the subject matter from a more general perspective. Some more specific aspects are then discussed in the subsequent chapters. James Hollifield provides in Chapter 7 such a general discussion of the membership dimension of citizenship, in relation to the issue of migration. This chapter discusses the issues of managing migration and mobility. In particular the focus is on liberal democracies with their opposing economic pressures – the liberal market and the economy pushing for a more open approach to migration, whereas political, legal and security concerns tend to support greater closure – in other words, a liberal paradox. The chapter looks at the market and at the development of

civil and human rights; however, events such as the Covid-19 pandemic push for the closing of borders. In light of all this, the chapter explores the extent to which recent crises might be leading to an “end of liberalism.”

Research on people’s attitudes on immigrants and immigration has basically followed two main paths: a path stressing the self-interests of certain groups in society as well as the competition between natives and migrants over certain resources; and a path emphasizing group-related identities, values, attitudes and symbols (Ceobanu and Escandell 2010; Hainmueller and Hopkins 2014). In Chapter 8, Alin M. Ceobanu and Xavier Escandell review works on public attitudes towards citizenship and the extension of rights to immigrants in Europe. Such works typically exploit survey data allowing to grasp people’s attitudes on immigration. In line with the dimension of citizenship addressed in this part of the *Handbook*, the focus of the chapter is on how claims to membership trigger restrictive responses from national publics. Using data from several multinational survey projects, the chapter examines the micro- and macro-level determinants of attitudes – most often, opposition – towards granting citizenship and expanding rights to immigrants. The important conclusion which the chapter arrives at is that citizenship acquisition is important for the life chances of naturalized immigrants, which happens without the natives necessarily consenting to full incorporation in the national and political community.

Much of the research on migration pertaining to the membership dimension of citizenship deals with migrants’ integration. Belonging to a community, after all, means being well integrated in that community. This has been studied from different angles, namely from the perspective of economic, social, cultural, and political integration. Economic integration is the focus of Chapter 9 by Nathan Lillie and Quivine Ndomo. This chapter explores the implications of the market–society duality, inherent in contemporary capitalist societies, through the lens of migrant integration, exclusion and exploitation in host countries and transnational labour markets. This duality was famously stressed by Polanyi (1944), who argued that there was a fundamental conflict between the unregulated market mechanism and the elementary requirements of an organized social life. In this vein, the chapter argues that a solution to the adverse effects of market citizenship on migrants as well as on the national working class lies in integration as a form of decommodification, and reinforcing migrant-centric translocalization and the protection of rights. Migrant integration and economic citizenship must thus be understood in terms of their interaction with national class hierarchies, national class conflicts and compromises.

The question of social integration is discussed by Shamit Sagar in Chapter 10. This chapter addresses more specifically the citizenship and migration nexus through an examination of belonging and social cohesion, starting from the observation that it is differences – real or perceived – between migrants and everyone else that are at the heart of debates concerning migrants’ membership of the societies. As the chapter stresses, migrants remain persistently connected to political concerns and disputes about membership and collective purpose. To assess why this issue spurs such strong reactions, the chapter discusses two views of social cohesion – two metaphors – representing the extreme ends of a continuum ranging from social cohesion as passive, to a conception of societal cohesion as active. We should note, incidentally, that these two metaphors reflect two conceptions of citizenship as discussed earlier: a “passive” view that puts at center stage how laws should grant individual rights and a more “active” view that stresses the participation of the citizens in the production of such rights. The chapter goes on to ask whether mixing helps in promoting social cohesion,

as some forms of mixing can lead to accentuating grievances, linked to wider concerns over declining confidence in democratic institutions and processes. In turn, the chapter links this to wider assessments of the causes of and responsibilities for discrimination, and how this might translate to different types of political support.

Chapter 11, by Thijl Sunier, examines a topic most closely linked in this part of the *Handbook* to the question of cultural integration. This is accomplished by examining the question of the political inclusion of Muslims in Western societies, and more specifically Muslims with a migrant background in Western Europe as a case in point for illustration in this context. This chapter starts from a speech made in 1991 at an international conference by Bolkenstein, the Dutch leader of the right-wing liberal People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD), where he emphasized the risks he saw in what he conceived as the multiculturalist idea of cultural relativism as a possible model for governance of Islam in Europe. This was seen as a turning point in the debate about the place of Islam in European societies. The chapter then goes on to argue that the immigration of Muslims to Europe and principles of citizenship are linked to one another through the concept of loyalty, seen as key in relation to the nation-state.

PART III: RIGHTS

The second key dimension of citizenship refers to rights or, as in Arendt's (1951) famous formulation, "the right to have rights." In her view, citizenship is crucial to reaching the ideal of universal human rights. Indeed, citizenship is often defined in terms of rights, or rights and duties. As Bellamy (2008) has noted, rights have often been seen as the defining criterion of citizenship. He goes on to say that:

Contemporary political philosophers have adopted two main approaches to identifying these rights. A first approach seeks to identify those rights that citizens ought to acknowledge if they are to treat each other as free individuals worthy of equal concern and respect. A second approach tries, more modestly, simply to identify the rights that are necessary if citizens are to participate in democratic decision-making on free and equal terms. Both approaches prove problematic. Even if most committed democrats broadly accept the legitimacy of one or other of these accounts of citizens' rights as being implicit in the very idea of democracy, they come to very different conclusions about the precise rights either approach might generate.

The most influential treatise of citizenship as rights is arguably Marshall's (1950) well-known historical account of the emergence of different kinds of rights. He famously distinguished between three types of rights, which were introduced and established at different times in history: civil, political and social rights. He linked citizenship to the large-scale social processes of state formation, the emergence of commercial and industrial society, as well as the creation of a national consciousness, and saw it as a succession of class struggles for the acquisitions of different types of rights and duties. In this developmental approach, civil rights (the basic freedoms such as freedom of speech and freedom of association) are the first to have been implemented, from the 17th to the mid-19th century; followed by political rights (basically, voting), from the late 18th to the early 19th century; and finally by social rights (access to the welfare state provisions), from the late 19th to the mid-20th century. Of course, the concrete establishment of each specific right or sets of rights varied much across countries, depending on contextual factors. They also varied depending on the social group.

Thus, for example, universal suffrage – voting rights for women – at the national level was established as early as 1893 in New Zealand, and 1920 in the United States, but only in 1971 in Switzerland. The same applies to migrants, as the introduction and extent of social and political rights for migrants vary deeply across countries.

Marshall's approach to citizenship is important in many respects, not least because of its emphasis on social citizenship, and for establishing that both social and political citizenship are required in order to reach a condition of full equality. However, this approach has not been spared criticisms. In particular, his theory has been criticized for reflecting a traditional view of citizenship based on the male breadwinner model, one in which the rights of women are derived from the professional activity of their spouse given that social citizenship stems from having paid work. Feminist thinkers have since provided a more balanced view of social citizenship (Fraser 1997; Orloff 1993). These considerations are in particular developed in Chapter 16 on gender in this part of the *Handbook*, as discussed below.

When it comes to migrants, the strong focus on the rights dimension of citizenship is reflected in public and political debates, which often focus on the fact that the state should grant – or not, depending on one's political stance – different sorts of rights, in particular social and political rights. This, in turn, is reflected in the fact that policies mostly bear on granting those rights, while policies aiming to improve the sense of belonging of migrants to the political community are often lacking. Although, as we said earlier, in recent years issues relating to integration – above all, framed in terms of certain groups of migrants considered as coming from “distant” cultures or having different religions, such as Muslims – have gained ground, the question of which and how many rights should be granted to migrants remains a key issue in public and political debates, and it is also a much discussed topic in scholarly writing.

Part III of the *Handbook* is devoted to discussing the relationship between migration and citizenship rights. Thomas Janoski provides in Chapter 12 a general discussion of the rights dimension of citizenship in relation to migration. This is done by examining three major themes relating to the advances and challenges of rights in the area of migration: foundational theories of citizenship and how they are affected by human rights theories; how “second-class citizens,” who are often immigrants, gain full citizenship; and how legal immigrants, asylum seekers and undocumented immigrants gain citizenship. Through a discussion of the foundational citizenship theories and a focus on the quest for citizenship on the part of immigrants and asylum seekers, Janoski argues that three challenges shape the new citizenship and immigrants as “citizens-to-be.” First, there is the challenge posed to citizenship theories by human rights theories, which are complementary but also rest on different legal bases. Second, there is the challenge posed by minority groups – including migrants and asylum seekers – who claim citizenship. Third, there is the challenge posed by the emergence of transnational citizenship and increasing international migration. The chapter ends with the important conclusion that citizenship is characterized as a constant struggle, something which also emerges throughout the *Handbook*.

Chapter 13, by Jean-Thomas Arrighi, addresses a more specific and much debated issue: migrants' right to vote. More precisely, the chapter compares the dual trend around the world of expanding the right to vote to emigrants living outside their country of nationality, and to immigrants living in countries of which they do not hold nationality. The comparative survey of contemporary democratic norms shows that states have been far more prone to grant national voting rights to their own citizens abroad than local voting rights to foreigners durably settled within their territory. The chapter then discusses the normative underpinnings of these

uneven policy trends, and shows that they run counter to prevailing arguments in democratic theory. It concludes that far from supporting the idea that citizenship has become more liberal and less valuable than in the past, the recent evolution of democratic norms points in the exact opposite direction. Instead, it tells a story of double standards, where emigrants are represented as benevolent tourists whose right to participate is taken for granted, whereas immigrants take the suspicious traits of vagabonds, whose right to vote must be earned through naturalization. Ultimately, it is illustrative of the nation-state's two-faced and inconsistent response to one and the same phenomenon of people crossing international borders.

As we mentioned earlier, citizenship has traditionally and for a long time been anchored in the national state. In recent decades, however, the emergence of supranational entities and forms of government – or governance – has challenged the national prerogative in terms of citizenship as well as in terms of regulation of immigrants' flows. Chapter 14, by Willem Maas, shifts the focus from the national and local level concerned by migrants' voting rights, to the supranational level, by examining citizenship and migration in the European Union (EU). The chapter provides an overview of the historical development of citizenship and migration in Europe, from the early 19th century to this day. It explains how the First World War and its aftermath resulted in the transition across much of Europe from multi-ethnic and multinational communities to ethno-national states. The Second World War resulted in further border changes and migrations, led to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and related conventions on refugees, and kickstarted the process of European integration. Migration into Europe also occurred as a result of colonialism and decolonization, as many colonial subjects and citizens moved to their respective metropolises, with ongoing political effects as demonstrated by the Windrush scandal. The chapter further looks at how those arguing for European citizenship have tried, since the war, to develop and enhance common European rights and free movement, but nonetheless the development of EU citizenship faces continuing challenges.

As Marshall (1950) amongst others showed, social rights are a key dimension of citizenship. They also play a major role in political debates about immigration, often representing the basis for framing arguments in favor of or against migration and the inflow of newcomers. This aspect is dealt with in Chapter 15 by Edward Koning, which examines the links between citizenship, migration and social protection, pointing to the limits of welfare state protection in a context of migration. The chapter first demonstrates that access to social programs and benefits rarely depends on formal citizenship, and that instead most welfare systems rely on residence as the primary indicator of membership. It then argues there are three main reasons to question that such a residence-based model offers appropriate social protection today or can do so in the future. First, formal equality between all residents does not guarantee social equality between native-born citizens and immigrants. Second, the residence-based model is poorly positioned to accommodate undocumented migrants, refugee claimants, and especially temporary migrants. Third, the increasing political relevance of welfare chauvinism and anti-immigrant populism encourages governments to look for ways to reduce their social commitments to immigrants within the confines of the residence-based model, in particular by throwing up additional hurdles to acquiring long-term residence permits. As a result, Koning concludes, the replacement of citizenship by legal long-term residence as the key criterion for inclusion in national welfare systems has not resulted in equality between immigrants and the native-born.

Analyses of migration, but sometimes also theories of citizenship, are often gender-blind or, worse, gender-biased. To avoid such blindness or bias, Chapter 16 by Daiva Stasiulis, the

final chapter in Part III of the *Handbook*, is devoted to the rights dimension of citizenship, addressing gender perspectives on citizenship rights for migrants. The chapter explores how gender differences, in articulation with other social divisions such as race, ethnicity, and class, continue to prevail in migrant access to and exclusion from different bundles of citizenship rights. A major source of this differentiation is the ascendance of neoliberalism, the privileging of highly skilled and wealthier immigrants, the androcentric definitions of “skill,” and the differential relationship of migrant women and men to the labor market. While highly skilled immigrant women have made some modest gains, the retraction in programs for family immigration and asylum seekers has disproportionately reduced access to permanent residence for women. This chapter also points to the role of women in reproducing the nation and the naturalization of racialized women as best suited for reproductive work. The chapter argues that “gender equality” is less likely to mean harmonizing upwards, through enhanced avenues to rights and protections for female migrants or expansion in the fundamental citizenship right to stay for both female and male migrants, than a harmonization downwards of diverse state protections. Far from representing growing gender equality, this chapter maintains, current trends are leading more women into back-breaking labor associated with low-wage migrant men, and increased numbers of migrant men into sectors associated with “women’s work,” such as care-giving occupations, reflecting the “blindness to difference” of neoliberal forms of governance. These processes are supported by states seeking cheap labor, and the transfer of authority over migrant selection and protection to employers. Temporary migrant labour is often partitioned off from national belonging and citizenship. The author suggests that while permanent residence remains a goal of migrant justice, emergent models of social protection rely less on national citizenship or international human rights than transnational, non-state networks of support across borders. These aspects of the nexus between migration, citizenship and gender are becoming increasingly important in societies, and deserve particular attention in scholarship.

PART IV: PARTICIPATION

The third key dimension of citizenship is the one most closely linked to the idea of political citizenship; that is, the participatory dimension. Research and scholarship on migration has paid relatively scant attention to this aspect, as compared to the mass of works on membership and rights. Of course, this is not to say that there is no literature on political participation per se. Quite on the contrary, it forms one of the most flourishing fields in political science and sociology, as well as other disciplines, especially if we consider both electoral and non-electoral participation. Also, often this scholarship importantly links with citizenship. The point is that studies of the participation around issues relating to migration are not so numerous, and the field is even narrower if we consider the participation of migrants themselves (see Giugni and Grasso 2019). Furthermore, existing works do not always make the link with citizenship. The chapters in Part IV of the *Handbook* will help in filling this gap.

As Bellamy (2008: 1), amongst others, has noted, “citizenship has gone hand in hand with political participation in some form of democracy.” While, traditionally, such participation was mainly – if not exclusively – linked to the right to vote, new forms and modes of participation have more recently entered the “action repertoire” available to citizens to raise their concerns and claim their rights (Giugni and Grasso 2021). Thus, non-institutional forms such

as participation in social movements and protest activities have become more important and widespread, paralleled by an increased legitimacy accorded to such actions by both citizens and the state, which has led to, amongst other things, a normalization of protest behavior (Dalton 2019; Marsh and Kaase 1979; Van Aelst and Walgrave 2001). Additionally, more individualized forms of participation – or at least, apparently so – such as political consumerism and, more generally, the so-called “life-style politics” (de Moor 2017; Micheletti 2003; Stolle and Micheletti 2013) have become increasingly important and widespread. Moreover, “digitally networked participation” (Theocharis 2015) continues to further transform the ways in which citizens engage in politics.

All this has led scholars to depict the rise of a new kind of citizen – especially among the younger generations – variously called “critical citizens”, “dissatisfied democrats,” “engaged citizens” (as opposed to “dutiful citizens”) or “self-actualized citizens” (Bennett 2008; Dalton 2004, 2009; Norris 1999). These types of citizens are said to be highly interested in politics, but also to show little system support and trust towards established political actors and institutions, cynicism about established politics, and at the same time confidence in the fact that both individual and collective action can help to change things. They also tend to engage in more individualized and direct forms of action, to emphasize quality of personal life and social relations, particularly in relation to the rise of the digital age and its impact on citizenship for young people.

New modes of political participation have therefore emerged, leading to new forms of relationship between citizens and the state; that is, new forms of citizenship. In terms of migration studies, the basic question is then to know the extent to which migrants participate politically – electorally, when they have the right to, as well as non-electorally and in such new modes of participation – and, more generally, how what the participatory dimension of citizenship looks like when it comes to immigration and immigrants. The chapters in Part IV of the *Handbook* offer many elements and give many insights with respect to this question. Katia Pilati provides in Chapter 17 a general discussion of the participative dimension of citizenship in relation to migration. This overview of studies examining migrants’ political engagement in electoral (voting) and non-electoral activities is geared towards assessing how citizenship and, more precisely, institutionalized citizenship regimes – that is, the set of legal norms, laws, policies and ideas of the nation in the countries where migrants settle – affect migrants’ participation in individual and collective political actions, by shaping constraints and opportunities of migrants’ political participation. Additionally, the chapter considers whether the effect of the citizenship regime on political activities is moderated by migrants’ involvement in organizations, and by migrant organizations and their networks. Results show a consistently negative impact of a closed citizenship regime on migrants’ chances to engage in the political sphere: both on individual engagement in political activities such as voting and non-electoral activities, as well as on political activities by migrant organizations. Moreover, a moderating effect of citizenship regimes is found, following research showing that the relationship between citizenship regimes and political actions is conditional upon the presence of intermediate structures of mobilization such as voluntary organizations, at both the individual and the collective level. An important finding in the literature, in this regard, is that citizenship regimes shape the type of networks that migrant organizations establish with other organizations, and the political activities that these organizations are active in.

Chapter 18, by Rens Vliegthart, discusses the issue of “framing” immigration. It reminds us that immigration and, therefore, citizenship are contested issues (Koopmans et al. 2005).

This is an aspect that has been taking on increasing importance in recent years, due to the rise of social media and the frequent use of migration by radical right and populist parties. Indeed, migration has become one of the main battlegrounds of these parties, along with opposition to European integration, and an anti-establishment discourse which is one of its defining traits. The chapter employs a framing perspective to look at how actors who emphasize certain aspects position themselves in debates. They do this to influence politicians, and public opinion in particular, through a threat focus; whereas migrant groups often cannot defend themselves, due to low resources and therefore the inability to participate in debates. This suggests low levels of opportunities for migrant groups to advocate for their rights and to act as citizens, which is a very important political implication for understanding democratic rights and inequality as linked to citizenship and migration.

Chapter 19, by Oliver Strijbis, focuses on a specific yet basic mode of participation, especially in terms of citizenship theory: voting. As the chapter stresses at the very beginning, the right to vote and to stand for election belongs among the fundamental rights of citizenship. In spite of such importance, scholarship on the voting behavior of immigrants is quite sparse. This chapter fills this gap by summarizing theories on the electoral behavior of people with a migration background. It does so based on original data on immigrants' voting intentions in Germany, but also by offering the first comparative analysis on the success of immigrant parties. The analysis yields three important findings. First, the relationship between migration background and vote choice cannot be explained by social stratification and status alone. Second, political socialization, related to the country of origin and whether a voter belongs to an "outgroup" due to their specific migration background, is shown to be much more important for vote choice. Third, immigrant parties are only a viable choice for those of a migration background who do belong to an outgroup, and only in those contexts where the electoral system is highly proportional. As a result, the chapter predicts that for the foreseeable future successful immigrant parties will remain the exception rather than the rule. The chapter further concludes that the literature on the voting behavior of immigrants needs a stronger focus on the role of nationality, as well as causal mechanisms, and more comparative analyses.

Voting is crucial in liberal democracies as a way to connect citizens' concerns with political elites and institutions, yet it is far from being the only way to engage politically and to express the participatory dimension of citizenship. Many other forms exist, which for migrants who do not have voting rights become even more important in this respect. In Chapter 20, Daniela Vintila and Marco Martiniello discuss migrants' political participation beyond electoral arenas, by focusing on non-electoral, unconventional and extra-parliamentary participatory acts through which migrants give voice to societal concerns, aiming to provide a roadmap of the changing nature of migrants' participation beyond electoral politics. The chapter notes how the literature on this topic still has important questions open for the research agenda of comparative migration studies. It suggests an agenda for further research, based on current gaps in existing literature. The contours of such an agenda can be summarized, as the authors do, in four lessons, which are worth listing here. First, the literature on migration needs to pay more attention to the increasing diversity of modes and channels of migrant political mobilization. Second, there is a need for a new typology of active citizenry across borders that takes into account immigrants, emigrants and transnational engagement. Third, there is a need to extend the levels of analysis and geographical scope in generalizing key findings on citizenship praxis. Fourth, the chapter calls for a comprehensive explanatory framework of personal, political and societal determinants of migrants' participation.

Chapter 21, the final chapter in this part of the *Handbook* devoted to the participatory dimension of citizenship and migration, by Leila Hadj Abdou and Sieglinde Rosenberger, zooms in on a specific field in migration issues, namely asylum. The chapter notes how this is a much contested field which has given rise to much debate and has seen the emergence of protests in recent years, and provides an overview of migration-related protests that have emerged in the contested policy field of asylum, covering anti-refugee protests as well as solidarity protests with, and protests by, asylum seekers and refugees calling for membership rights and social inclusion. The chapter discusses key ideas and conceptions of citizenship emerging from these protests and engaging with theoretical approaches to asylum activism, in particular perspectives on active citizenship from below. The argument put forward maintains that that pro-asylum protests can protect individual migrants, and protests by migrants are also powerful “acts of citizenship from below,” but that these protests tend to fall short of producing substantial citizenship rights. The analysis shows how there remains a considerable gap between citizenship in terms of acts and in terms of rights, and this should remain a very important concern.

PART V: PRESENT CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Citizenship has defined the terms of the relation between ordinary people and the state for centuries, particularly in terms of rights and duties related to work, public service, and parenthood or family formation (Isin and Turner 2007). Today, however, it is under siege. Both the traditional conceptions and practices of citizenship are being challenged by the set of large-scale transformations often summarized – perhaps somewhat roughly – by the term “globalization.” This poses a number of challenges for the traditional view of citizenship, which considers the national state as the unique frame of reference for being a citizen. Indeed, modern citizenship has built itself in close connection with two other large-scale processes: state formation and democratization (Tilly 2007). Globalization threatens the centrality of the national state in various ways: by limiting its power relative to other actors, by reducing its autonomy in the sense of its possibilities for action, and by weakening the collective identity decisive for its viability (Goldmann 2002). In other words, the national states – and, therefore, traditional citizenship – must face both a political and a cultural threat. Both can be articulated with reference to migration. On the one hand, migration challenges old political allegiances and may lead to patterns of realignment. For example, the work of Kriesi et al. (2006, 2008, 2012) has stressed the emergence of a new cleavage between winners and losers of globalization. Culturally, this challenge also emerges in the idea of old patterns and traditions being challenged and undermined by the influx of new populations, as galvanized by welfare chauvinist political entrepreneurs, for example. On the other hand, progressive thinkers have stressed the dynamic nature of citizenship and its constant remolding through new immigrant waves.

The chapters in Part V of the *Handbook* all deal with these present challenges, while opening up future perspectives for thinking about research on citizenship and migration. Here the possible relevant issues are manifold, and the choice of aspects to be addressed is necessarily selective and limited to the number of chapters that could be included in this part of the *Handbook*. We could not do without a discussion of citizenship and migration in the globalized world. Catherine Wihtol de Wenden offers us such a discussion in Chapter 22. This chapter points out a paradox whereby globalization, by definition, increases and accelerates

mobility across the world, but at the same time leads to more and more barriers being erected to immigration for a variety of groups. Thus, a universal right to emigrate goes along with, and is in some way counterbalanced by, a discretionary power to impede such a right on the part of states. This paradox has crucial implications for citizenship, especially in relation to migration, as it involves redefining what belonging is, leading to an evolution of the concept of citizenship. In the end, this chapter warns us, as do many others in this *Handbook*, against a static view of citizenship and, by contrast, stresses the need to adopt a more dynamic view that acknowledges the fact that citizenship is an evolutive concept. Moreover, the chapter notes how advocacies and transnational mobilizations may lead to the enlargement of the notion of citizenship beyond nationality and traditional belongings.

Linked to this, Manlio Cinalli and David Jacobson point out, in Chapter 23, the need to adopt a more dynamic and agentic perspective with respect to citizenship, moving away from a state-centric approach often followed in the scholarly literature. The argument put forward in this chapter advocates for a more comprehensive approach to citizenship, drawing on its epistemological, ontological, phenomenological and teleological dimensions, that acknowledges the multidimensionality of the concept of citizenship. Such an approach places the multi-level dynamics occurring among different actors across the policy and public spheres at center stage, hence allowing a move away from the traditional, state-focused view of citizenship which may distort the analysis of citizenship and its dynamics in fundamental ways. Key to this argument is the willingness to bring agency into the account of citizenship. As the chapter notes, while citizenship is the realm of institutions and policy elites, non-state actors – those from the so-called civil society – are also part and parcel of it. As the chapters in Part IV of the *Handbook* also point out, citizenship is also made of individuals and collective actors participating and engaging in “acts of citizenship” (Isin and Turner 2007). This also means giving less emphasis to membership, and more to agency and participation in the definition and analysis of citizenship.

Traditionally, issues and discussions revolving around issues of citizenship and migration have focused on the national level: the national state, more specifically, sometimes, especially in recent years, on the supranational level, and much less often on the subnational level. This probably comes above all from the fact that classical conceptions and definitions of citizenship focus on the national state. In other words, citizenship – and, relatedly, migration – has been seen as mainly, if not exclusively, attached to the national state. This is well represented in Marshall’s (1950) view of the historical development of citizenship rights. However, as Sandro Cattacin and Fiorenza Gamba make clear in Chapter 24, cities have played a fundamental role in the relationship between citizenship, migration and rights. As they describe, while the national states have obscured the role of cities for a long time, in recent decades cities have again become the core of inclusion policies in a mobile world. As a result, citizenship and migration are no longer simply a matter of the state regulating the relationship between these two terms, but cities have also increasingly begun to claim that role.

In Chapter 25, Pontus Odmalm addresses the emergent phenomenon of populism links to the key themes of citizenship and migration. More precisely, this chapter explores the connections between populism, citizenship and migration, with a specific focus on the question of whether or not the populist radical right has a populist understanding of “citizenship” and “the citizen.” Right-wing populists typically oppose multicultural policies and societies, and therefore find in immigration their main political battleground, aiming to fight open borders and integration policies which, in their view, would lead to a supposed “invasion” of the country.

The stance of radical right populist parties towards immigration has been studied widely. What is less studied, as this chapter argues, is how such a stance relates to citizenship, and whether the populist worldview is also echoed in the populist radical right's appreciation of citizenship and the citizen. The analysis, focusing on six parties in six Western European states, suggests that a populist understanding of the citizen has become salient to the populist radical right; in particular, concerning the conceptualization and understanding of the differences between the citizen and the non-citizen. At the same time, citizenship interpreted along authoritarian and nativist lines, and assimilation as a prerequisite for formal inclusion into the polity, continue to characterize the populist radical right, and therefore translate into a continued challenge for more widespread integration and openness in the current juncture without the articulation of a robust progressive discourse as a counterpoint.

Much debate as well as scholarly writing in recent years has revolved around multiculturalism, forming a contested field (Koopmans 2013). Different views have been proposed, and such views have changed over time, sometimes quite considerably. All of this, of course, also has deep political implications and is reflected in political debates concerning immigration and how to handle it. At times, multiculturalism has been praised and has appeared to have become the panacea for all evils, responding to the challenges posed by immigration and an increasingly multi-ethnic populations in many, if not all, European countries, including those which were not traditionally immigration countries. Critics of multiculturalism and multicultural policies, however, have not been missing. On the side of public debates, the post-9/11 period and, more recently, the wave of terrorist attacks by members or followers of the Islamic State, have spurred the rise of a number of criticisms about the legitimacy and effectiveness of multicultural views and policies. The risk of a loss of collective or national identity is only one such critical arguments. On the scholarly side, critical positions vis-à-vis multiculturalism have emerged, sometimes framed in terms of the "clash of civilizations" thesis (Huntington 1996), sometimes based on more subtle argumentations. In this vein, a number of scholars have pointed to the limits of multiculturalism, without necessarily throwing the baby out with the bath water. This is also what Ricard Zapata-Barrero does in Chapter 26. Starting from a constructive criticism of multiculturalism, he advocates a change of policy paradigm from multicultural citizenship to intercultural citizenship within a new context of diversity which characterizes what he calls the post-multicultural era. This points to a different approach to diversity, referring to a change of focus from a static and centered-point approach based on an individual or group agent, to a more dynamic and network-based approach resulting from interpersonal contact and multiple diversity-based relations. As this chapter points out, intercultural citizenship, albeit complementary rather than opposed to multicultural citizenship, offers new interpretative maps and a different way of zooming into or out of the diversity dynamics in the post-multicultural era. In particular, the idea of intercultural citizenship holds promise, as it enhances the importance of including all the people living in a diverse society, independently of their legal status.

REFERENCES

- Arendt, Hannah. 1951. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
- Bellamy, Richard. 2008. *Citizenship: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, Lance. 2008. "Changing Citizenship in the Digital Age." Pp. 1–24 in Lance Bennett (ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Boudon, Raymond. 1969. *Les méthodes en sociologie*. Paris: PUF.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Coebanu, Alin M., and Xavier Escandell. 2010. "Comparative Analyses of Public Attitudes Toward Immigrants and Immigration Using Multinational Survey Data: A Review of Theories and Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 309–28.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2004. *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices: The Erosion of Political Support in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2009. *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2019. *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, 7th edition. Washington, DC: CQ Press. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/citizen-politics/book249477>.
- de Moor, Joost. 2017. "Lifestyle Politics and the Concept of Political Participation." *Acta Politica* 52: 179–97.
- Duyvendak, Jan Willem, and Peter W.A. Scholten. 2009. "Questioning the Dutch Multicultural Model of Immigrant Integration." *Migrations Société* 21: 77–105.
- Favell, Adrien. 1998. *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist Condition"*. London: Routledge.
- Giugni, M. and M.T. Grasso (eds). 2018. *Citizens and the Crisis: Perceptions, Experiences, and Responses to the Great Recession in Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giugni, M. and M.T. Grasso. 2019. "Trust, Identity, Skills, or Recruitment? Assessing Four Explanations of the Relationship between Associational Involvement and the Political Participation of Migrants." *International Migration Review*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0197918319856362>.
- Giugni, M. and M.T. Grasso (eds). 2021. *Youth and Politics in Times of Increasing Inequalities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goldmann, Kjell. 2002. "Internationalisation and the Nation-State: Four Issues and Three Non-Issues." *European Journal of Political Research* 41: 281–305.
- Hainmueller, Jens, and Daniel J. Hopkins. 2014. "Public Attitudes Toward Immigration." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 225–49.
- Hammar, Tomas (ed.). 1985. *European Immigration Policy: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Isin, Engin F., and Bryan S. Turner. 2007. "Investigating Citizenship: An Agenda for Citizenship Studies." *Citizenship Studies* 11: 5–17.
- Joppke, Christian. 2007. "Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe." *West European Politics* 30: 1–22.
- Koopmans, Ruud. 2010. "Trade-Offs between Equality and Difference: Immigrant Integration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State in Cross-National Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36: 1–26.
- Koopmans, Ruud. 2013. "Multiculturalism and Immigration: A Contested Field in Cross-National Comparison." *Annual Review of Sociology* 39: 147–69.
- Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Marco Giugni and Florence Passy. 2005. *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Martin Dolezal, Marc Helbling, Dominic Hoglinger, et al. 2012. *Political Conflict in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Romain Lachat, Martin Dolezal, Simon Bornschier and Timotheos Frey. 2006. "Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared." *European Journal of Political Research* 45: 921–56.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Romain Lachat, Martin Dolezal, Simon Bornschier and Timotheos Frey. 2008. *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Maas, Willem (ed.) 2013. *Multilevel Citizenship*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Marsh, Alan, and Max Kaase. 1979. "Background of Political Action." Pp. 97–136 in Samuel H. Barnes and Max Kaase (eds), *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Marshall, T.H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Micheletti, Michele. 2003. *Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Norris, Pippa (ed.). 1999. *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Orloff, Ann Shola. 1993. "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States." *American Sociological Review* 58: 303–28.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Shachar, Ayelet, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad and Maarten Vink. 2017a. "Introduction: Citizenship – Quo Vadis?" Pp. 3–11 in Ayelet Shachar, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad and Maarten Vink (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shachar, Ayelet, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad and Maarten Vink (eds). 2017b. *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sniderman, Paul M., and Louk Hagendoorn. 2007. *When Ways of Life Collide: Multiculturalism and its Discontents in the Netherlands*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stolle, Dietlind, and Michele Micheletti. 2013. *Political Consumerism: Global Responsibility in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Theocharis, Yannis. 2015. "The Conceptualization of Digitally Networked Participation." *Social Media + Society* 1: 1–14.
- Tilly, Charles. 2007. *Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Aelst, Peter, and Stefaan Walgrave. 2001. "Who is That (Wo)man in the Street? From the Normalisation of Protest to the Normalisation of the Protester." *European Journal of Political Research* 39: 461–86.
- Vink, Maarten. 2017. "Comparing Citizenship Regimes." Pp. 221–44 in Ayelet Shachar, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad and Maarten Vink (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.