



International Symposium

Within and beyond citizenship

Lived experiences of contemporary membership

Oxford, April 11th -12th 2013

Conference Report

Written by Jennifer Allsopp

Conference team

Jennifer Allsopp (RSC/OISP), Elaine Chase (OISP), Roberto G. Gonzales (Chicago), Vanessa Hughes (COMPAS), Nando Sigona (Birmingham)

Contents

Overview	3
Conference Programme	4
Background	6
Plenary Sessions	7
Plenary 1: Learning to be non-citizens	7
Plenary 2: Spaces of (non)citizenship and belonging	7
Panel Sessions	9
Panel 1: Everyday experiences of contemporary membership	9
Panel 2: Socio-legal constructions of precariousness	9
Panel 3: The meanings of citizenship	10
Panel 4: Notions of membership and immigration regimes	11
Panel 5: Legal status, political mobilisation and practices of belonging	12
Panel 6: The Roma at the Margins of EU Citizenship	13
Panel 7: Parenting and precarious status	13
Panel 8: Politics and scales of belonging	14
Panel 9: Youth, politics of belonging and civic engagement	15
Panel 10: Diversity, legal status and practices of citizenship	15
Concluding Roundtable	17

Overview

Within and Beyond Citizenship was the first of two international symposia convened in 2013 by Dr Nando Sigona from the University of Birmingham and Dr Roberto G. Gonzales from the University of Chicago investigating the relationship between legal status, rights and belonging in contemporary diverse societies. The Oxford symposium was organised by the Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), Oxford Institute of Social Policy (OISP) and the Refugee Studies Centre (RSC) at the University of Oxford and the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago. It investigated the interplay between forms and modes of contemporary membership, migration governance and the politics of belonging. Participants discussed issues such as the position of the non-citizen in contemporary immigration and emigration states; the nexus between human mobility, immigration control, and citizenship; the tension in policy and practice between coexisting traditions and regimes of rights; the position of mixed status families in relation to the nation-state; and the intersection of 'race' and other social cleavages and legal status.

Conference Programme

Day 1

Welcome

Bridget Anderson (University of Oxford), Dawn Chatty (University of Oxford), Roberto G. Gonzales (University of Chicago), Martin Seeleib-Kaiser (University of Oxford), Nando Sigona (University of Birmingham)

Plenary Session 1

- Nicholas de Genova (Goldsmiths College) *Citizenship's shadow: obscene inclusion, abject belonging, or, the regularities of migrant 'irregularity'*
- Roberto G. Gonzales (University of Chicago) *Immigration, schooling and the transition to 'illegality'*

Chair/Discussant: Bridget Anderson (University of Oxford)

Panel Session A

- Panel 1: *Everyday experiences of contemporary membership*
Giulia Fabini (University of Milan)
Agnieszka Kubal (University of Oxford)
Sarah Meyer (Johns Hopkins University)

Chair/Discussant: Dawn Chatty (University of Oxford)

- Panel 2: *Socio-legal constructions of precariousness*
Kathryn Dennler (York University, Toronto, Canada)
Peter Dwyer (University of Salford) & Hannah Lewis (University of Leeds)
Mimi Zou (University of Oxford)

Chair/Discussant: Martin Seeleib-Kaiser (University of Oxford)

- Panel 3: *The meanings of citizenship*
Ben Gidley (University of Oxford) & Zoe Khor (Birkbeck College)
John Park (University of California Santa Barbara)
Jason Tucker (University of Bath)

Chair/Discussant: Kirsten McConnachie (University of Oxford)

Panel Session B

- Panel 4: *Notions of membership and immigration regimes*
Diletta Lauro (University of Oxford)
Martijn Stronks (VU University Amsterdam)
Ounia Doukoure (European University Institute/ Trans Europe Experts)
Lucy Williams (University of Kent)

Chair/Discussant: John Park (University of California Santa Barbara)

- Panel 5: *Legal status, political mobilisation and practices of belonging*
Jane Lilly Lopez (University of California San Diego)
Rosa Parisi (University of Foggia)
Jacqui Andall (IHEID, Geneva/ University of Bath)
Thomas Swerts (University of Chicago)

Chair/Discussant: Jennifer Allsopp (University of Oxford)

Day 2

Panel Session C

- Panel 6: *The Roma at the margins of EU citizenship*
Rachel Humphris (University of Oxford)
Julija Sardelic (University of Edinburgh)
Huub van Baar (University of Amsterdam)

Chair/Discussant: Ben Gidley (University of Oxford)

- Panel 7: *Parenting and precarious status*
Ana Rosas (University of California Irvine)
Umut Erel (The Open University)
Alice Haynes (Centre for Research on Children and Families)

Chair/Discussant: Vanessa Hughes (University of Oxford)

- Panel 8: *Politics and scales of belonging*
Esra Kaytaz (University of Oxford)
Oana Romocea (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Ana Gutierrez (London School of Economics)

Chair/Discussant: Elaine Chase (University of Oxford)

Panel Session D

- Panel 9: *Youth, politics of belonging and civic engagement*
Synnøve Bendixsen (IMER Bergen)
Elaine Chase (University of Oxford) & Jennifer Allsopp (University of Oxford)
Kathie Friedman-Kasaba (Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies)

Chair/Discussant: Roberto G. Gonzales (University of Chicago)

- Panel 10: *Diversity, legal status and practices of citizenship*
Anna Tuckett (London School of Economics)
Ayse Akalin (Istanbul Technical University)
Kristin Biehl (University of Oxford)

Chair/Discussant: Melanie Griffiths (University of Oxford)

Plenary Session 2

- Tanya Golash Boza (University of California Merced), *Feeling like a citizen, living as a denizen: deportees' sense of belonging*
- Nando Sigona (University of Birmingham), *Campzanship: understanding the camp as a political space*

Chair/ Discussant: Matthew Gibney (University of Oxford)

Concluding roundtable

Discussants: Elaine Chase (University of Oxford), Julia O'Connell Davidson (University of Nottingham), Roberto G. Gonzales (University of Chicago)

Chair: Nando Sigona (University of Birmingham)

The full conference programme is available here:

<http://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/pdfs/conferences/within-beyond-citizenship-programme-100413.pdf>

Background

Scholarly literature shows that neoliberal globalisation, through the delocalisation of state borders, precarisation of labour, restructuring of the welfare system and emergence of new non-state actors operating transnationally, has fractured the connections between state, territory and residents, triggering a significant transformation in the meanings, practices and experiences of membership in contemporary Western democracies.

The coexistence of different regimes of rights and the interplay of multi-layered systems of governance are a feature of contemporary societies. The multiplication of legal statuses for non-citizens is one of the manifestations of this transformation. However, little is known about the impact of the proliferation of legal statuses and precarisation of membership on the 'members' of these societies. Nor is much known about the ways in which legal status (or its absence) intersects with social cleavages such as age, class, gender and 'race' and shapes social relations.

Conceptions of state membership have been based on a notion of a bounded community whereby rules of legal citizenship determine community belonging and set the parameters for exclusion. More recently, however, a burgeoning line of scholarship is challenging the primacy of the nation-state for determining membership and endowing rights, arguing that recent trends in globalisation, human rights, and multiculturalism have made state borders less consequential. Focusing on non-citizens' long-term presence and their status as persons, this scholarship argues that non-citizens create spaces of belonging that supersede legal citizenship. To be sure, both the older and the newer definitions raise critical questions as to when and how territorial presence constitutes membership.

The position of undocumented migrants encapsulates the complexities and idiosyncrasies of contemporary membership. Today, undocumented migrants are creating families and establishing residences in territories where they do not have full legal rights. Regulating undocumented (also 'unauthorised', 'irregular' or 'illegal') migration has become a high-priority objective of policy interventions worldwide. The growth of large, settled populations lacking full citizenship raises questions of how different segments of these populations are being incorporated into host societies, what factors determine different pathways and outcomes for these populations, and how the condition of undocumentedness shapes migrants' everyday lives. While all receiving countries regulate who is allowed in and what entitlements they receive, national policies differ widely.

The lives of undocumented children living in families are inexorably linked to the fates of adult migrants but are shaped differently. Children who migrate independently also face a range of unique challenges as they transition to adulthood. Although the protection of children is seen as a valence issue worldwide, national governments face the growing challenge of how to best provide for children's well-being, given the political popularity of strong enforcement stances and stringent immigration policies against undocumented immigration. This tension has produced a broad range of state responses, with implications for local communities, services and protections.

Within and Beyond Citizenship sought to showcase emerging scholarship in this area.

Plenary Sessions

Plenary 1: Learning to be non-citizens

In the opening plenary, **Nicholas de Genova** (Goldsmiths College) and **Roberto G. Gonzales** (University of Chicago) laid out some key tensions pertaining to contemporary conceptualisations of belonging as governed by immigration regimes and as experienced by migrants in their everyday lives. As pointed out by Discussant, **Bridget Anderson**, both papers problematised the notion of migrant 'illegality' and raised questions concerning the intersection between 'irregular' status and regularisation.

Nicholas de Genova began with the proposition that in a bordered world, migrant 'illegality' comes to exist as the shadow of citizenship. Indeed citizenship and alienage (or migrant status), he proposed, may be best understood as two key figures of a spectrum of 'bordered identities'. The concept of bordered identities, De Genova argued, allows us to better appreciate how exclusions, as realised through technologies of exclusion such as border policing and enforcement, also perform inclusionary work. This inclusionary work is, he stressed, in turn inseparable from the systemic processes of migrant illegalisation and the subordination of migrant labour. Juxtaposing the scene of exclusion to the 'obscure of inclusion' can complicate conventional notions of 'belonging' and allow various sorts of abject belonging or membership to come more clearly into view, he continued. This may allow us to see not only the 'necropolitical extremities' of regulatory regimes of border policing but also the biopolitical regularities that they produce - above all, the 'irregularity' of 'irregular' migration. Rounding off, De Genova posed the question: to what extent are researchers implicated in this process by continuously re-reifying migrants as a distinct category, by re-fetishising and re-naturalising the epistemological stability attributed to borders and to the territorial states and identities which they define?

Continuing the problematisation of migrant 'illegality', Roberto G. Gonzales drew attention to the untenable situation facing more than 2.1 million undocumented immigrant children and young adults who have lived in the USA since childhood. He pointed out that generally children have received less attention than their adult counterparts and migrant workers in academic studies on rights and citizenship. Drawing on fieldwork in Greater Los Angeles with 20-34 year old, Mexican-origin, undocumented young adults, Gonzales demonstrated how the transition to adulthood for someone who has grown up in the USA can coincide with a discovery of 'illegality'. As laws begin to narrowly circumscribe their everyday lives, these young adults must learn to be 'illegal'. Gonzales explored what this means for their experiences of belonging and citizenship, highlighting, for example, the importance of social capital and the role of individual community members and teachers in mediating transitions in the face of restrictive practices linked to immigration status. As young people make the transition to adulthood, Gonzales concluded, they may move from spaces of membership to spaces of rejection, from inclusion to exclusion, having to re-learn and retool as they engage with various structures of belonging.

Plenary 2: Spaces of (non)citizenship and belonging

In the closing plenary, **Tanya Golash Boza** from the University of California Merced explored questions of belonging in relation to USA-born individuals without citizenship status. **Nando Sigona**, in his paper, considered the situation of inhabitants of Roma camps in Italy. Both papers considered the relationship

between territory and rights, and geographies of empowerment and segregation. In his response, Discussant, **Matthew Gibney** drew attention to a range of normative questions raised by the papers. Speaking first, Tanya Golash Boza returned to the theme of undocumented migrants in the USA, focusing in on the theme of territorial rights. Whilst being born in the USA gives individuals an inalienable right to stay there, she noted, her paper considered the situation of those who do not regularise their status and who are therefore vulnerable to deportation. Golash Boza suggested that the experiences of these individuals demonstrate that territorial rights are not a necessary condition for social and cultural citizenship; in other words, that it is possible to feel a sense of belonging - to a nation or local community - without being a naturalised citizen. Returning to a theme explored elsewhere in the conference, Golash Boza stressed that those who are naturalised may, in turn, *not* feel a sense of belonging to the nation. Her paper thus called into question the assumption that citizenship rights are hierarchical, suggesting that social, cultural, and legal citizenship rights are non-convergent. It also provided evidence that alienage and its related exclusion mechanisms are not always a salient aspect of the lives of non-USA citizens. Instead, she showed how alienage becomes relevant at certain points, such as at the moment of deportation.

In the final paper of the conference, Nando Sigona demonstrated the relevance of the concept of space to discussions of citizenship, expounding the concept of 'campzanship' and articulating the importance of the camp to discussions of belonging. The camp, he argued, is a manifestation of the complexity of membership rather than the exception, as has often been theorised. Drawing on research in Roma camps in Italy, Sigona explored how the camp can be theorised as a space of autonomy; it can allow those who are in some way 'rejected' to position themselves within society, signifying a fragmentation of the traditional idea of citizenship. Yet Sigona similarly explained how camps may operate a logic of public assistance and control. Occupying this paradoxical position, Roma refugee camps in Italy are not outside the normal, he concluded, but much more part of the ordinary than we would like to think. When conceptualising citizenship, Sigona thus stressed that we should consider not just the border, but experiences of spatiality and confinement.

Panel Sessions

Panel 1: Everyday experiences of contemporary membership

The three papers presented in the first panel had, as its Discussant **Dawn Chatty** (University of Oxford) pointed out, a number of common themes. These included the discretion which often characterises the enforcement of immigration laws, the power shifts which occur between migrants and the authorities which enforce immigration laws, and the attitudes of migrants themselves towards such laws.

Opening the panel, **Guilia Fabini** (University of Milan), drew on interviews with undocumented migrants in Bologna (Italy) to argue that being documented is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition of membership for migrants in Italy. Her argument centred on the finding that discretionary police power often means that those who are undocumented go free, while those who do have valid documents are at times arrested if these are interpreted as fake. Identifying a lack of fear of the police on the part of many undocumented migrants in Italy, Fabini laid out what she sees as ‘the rules of the game’ for such migrants vis-à-vis the police. These include not committing crimes and not being too visible so as to demonstrate to the police that they pose no danger.

Next, **Agnieszka Kubal** (University of Oxford) opened her paper by proposing the concept of ‘semi-legality’ as a heuristic device and an analytical alternative to the binary opposition frequently made between legality and illegality. Semi-legality, she claimed captures the ambiguous and multiple relationships which migrants can have with immigration laws. She presented the case of one of her respondents, Marko, a Ukrainian migrant who had obtained an Italian residence permit before migrating onwards to work in Norway, to illustrate the utility of the concept of semi-legality for understanding these relationships, as well as the legal consciousness of migrants themselves.

In the final paper of the session, **Sarah Meyer** (John Hopkins University) presented the findings from research conducted in Mae Sot, which sits on the border between Burma and Thailand. Meyer described how, in contrast to the apparent fearlessness of migrants vis-à-vis the Bolognese police identified in Fabini’s paper, anxiety about arrest and deportation shapes the lives of Burmese migrant workers in Thailand and limits their freedom of movement. She described how, while documentation can allow such migrants to contest unfair treatment in the workplace and foster greater freedom of movement, it can also create further restrictions on their lives. Given that these migrants at times acquire documents with the financial support of their employers, they become indebted and are compelled to remain in that employment even if working conditions are highly unfavourable or exploitative.

Panel 2: Socio-legal constructions of precariousness

This panel, which was chaired by **Martin Seeleib-Kaiser** (University of Oxford), considered the ways in which migration regimes interact with livelihood strategies and labour, both in terms of shaping socio-legal status and rendering certain statuses - and the lives of those who hold them - particularly precarious.

In her paper, **Kathryn Dennler** (York University in Toronto) applied Judith Butler's theory of performativity to the situation of refused asylum seekers in the UK, explaining how experiences of illegality which stem from their position as refused asylum seekers take the form of severe restrictions on their emotional, material and economic lives. In this context, immigration status (or lack thereof) may be defined by the state, she argued, but it is not necessarily experienced *through* the state. Drawing on the theme of mediation introduced in Roberto G. Gonzales's plenary paper, she considered in particular the significance of street level social workers, shop assistants and bureaucrats who interpret law and entitlements face-to-face. Within the context of these everyday encounters, Dennler highlighted various 'micro moments' in which immigration status can be contested.

Next, **Peter Dwyer** (University of Salford) and **Hannah Lewis** (University of Leeds) engaged a discussion around exploitation, forced labour and its impact on the everyday experiences of those seeking sanctuary in England. The landscape of complex and conditional rights in the UK has led, they argued, to a tiering of entitlements in which 'social legal status is not the only game in town'. In this context, certain socio-legal statuses can facilitate forced labour and severe labour exploitation, rendering lives precarious and livelihoods dependent on everyday trust and judgements.

In the panel's closing paper, **Mimi Zou** (University of Oxford) drew on the concepts of 'hyper-dependence' and 'hyper-precariousness' to explore the way in which immigration controls create precarious workers through the institutionalisation of uncertainty. Continuing the theme of forced labour from the previous paper, Zou drew on the case of the Australian temporary migrant work visa – the 457 visa scheme, arguing that the visa, which is employer-driven, has given rise to a continuum of forced labour which includes both un-skilled and skilled migrant workers. As pointed out by Chair and Discussant **Martin Seeleib-Kaiser** (University of Oxford), Zou's paper demonstrated the need to integrate a discussion on labour rights into discussions of migration and migration regimes.

Panel 3: The meanings of citizenship

The third panel of the conference, which was chaired by **Kirsten McConnachie** (University of Oxford), showcased the complexity of understandings of integration and naturalisation across a variety of contexts in addition to problematising the various normative qualities attributed to citizenship.

Ben Gidley (University of Oxford) and **Zoe Khor** (Birkbeck College) began by providing an analysis of potential citizens' motivations for naturalisation in the UK in contexts where acquisition is not just instrumental but also psycho-social. Drawing on recent research, they explained that a desire to naturalise may be linked, for example, to the global prestige of the British passport, or to the importance of securing safety for the future and for their children. In contrast to these subjective motives, Gidley and Khor highlighted the civic republican model of naturalisation in operation in the UK, as enacted in citizenship devices such as the UK naturalisation test and course, and citizenship ceremonies. They demonstrated the extreme heterogeneity in the way this process is experienced, as structured by class, gender, ethnicity, previous immigration status, country of origin, migration route and place of settlement in the UK, concluding that the current government's emphasis on testing integration for citizenship is flawed.

In his paper, **John Park** (University of Chicago) considered the moral and legal position of citizens when confronted with unlawful people in USA legal history. He argued that, because the policing of unlawful people doesn't work, states have long required citizens to participate in policing. The fact that slaves were not allowed to run away, for example, was combined with rules about what citizens should do with fugitive slaves. Similarly, in California during the Chinese and Asian Exclusion period, citizens were expected to report on Chinese and Asian immigrants. Drawing on a range of local and state level examples, Park demonstrated how these historical debates relate to contemporary debates over 'reporting' irregular migrants in the USA.

In the final paper of the panel, **Jason Tucker** (University of Bath) considered the issue of statelessness and its relevance to contemporary discussions of citizenship. Debates often focus around the citizen and the non-citizen, Tucker stressed, whereas the stateless person is not a citizen of any state. Drawing on research in Lebanon, where 1 in 10 residents are stateless (most of whom are Palestinians), Tucker highlighted the contradiction between the demand for the right to return to a Palestinian state and the evocation of a global citizenship which exists *beyond* the nation. Conceptions of global citizenship, he concluded, depend on the political context and need to be more nuanced.

Panel 4: Notions of membership and immigration regimes

The fourth panel, which had as its Discussant **John Park** (University of California Santa Barbara), considered the ways in which migrants and citizens strategically perform or engage with and also contest notions of membership promoted within and beyond immigration regimes.

Opening the panel, **Diletta Lauro** (University of Oxford) delivered a paper addressing the notions of membership put forward by anti-deportation campaigns in the UK. Lauro analysed how challenges to citizenship can be made from within the state by focusing on a grass-roots campaign against the deportation of a Nigerian student who is dependent on expensive medication which is unavailable in Nigeria. Undertaking a textual analysis of anti-deportation campaigns such as those run by the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns (NCADC), she identified within the arguments made by such groups a communitarian, dynamic and performative notion of citizenship in which membership is acquired through activities undertaken by the migrant and ties developed with host communities. Lauro went on to discuss some of the limitations of such campaigns, observing that they tend to replicate narratives of the 'good citizen' rather than challenging them.

In the second paper of the panel, **Martijn Stronks** (VU University of Amsterdam) presented an historical analysis of the notion of time in the Dutch deportation clause. Using the idea of a 'sliding scale' and contrasting parallel concepts of 'time-as-rootedness' and 'time-as-integration', Stronks discussed the ways in which Dutch policy shifted from being 'hard on the outside and soft on the inside' during the 1990s to being 'hard on both the inside and the outside' since the turn of the new millennium.

Next, **Ounia Doukoure** (European University Institute) discussed what she termed the 'reticularisation' of the legal expectations and experiences of membership on the part of migrants eligible for naturalisation. Drawing on ethnographic research conducted in France, Italy and the UK, her paper focused on migrants' networks of acquaintances, friends and family and the ways in which they share precedents and narratives concerning membership with one another.

In the final presentation, **Lucy Williams** (University of Kent) discussed the experiences of former immigration detainees and 'failed' asylum seekers living in the community. Based on ethnographic research conducted in the UK, Williams presented the stories of two men who had previously experienced immigration detention. She suggested that many of the constraints entailed by detention in fact continue once individuals are released into the community. Arguing that both men have exercised an abject form of agency in order to meet their basic needs, she described how they are compelled to 'perform' destitution and vulnerability.

Panel 5 - Legal status, political mobilisation and practices of belonging

This panel, chaired by **Jennifer Allsopp**, took as its thematic focus the ways in which citizenship is experienced relationally beyond the individual, whether through social movements or in familial contexts. In particular, speakers drew attention to the positioning of the family and the nation as the dual and often contradictory locus of citizenship.

Thomas Swerts (University of Chicago) explored the ways in which national and post-national forms of belonging can be co-existent. Drawing on the example of a transnational march of undocumented migrants which took place in 2012, Swerts raised the question of what transnational mobilisation means for citizenship in a time of globalization. Whilst recognising that post-national trends were present in the march, he also highlighted the need to recognise the practical and symbolic importance of national citizenship regimes in the context of such mobilisations.

In the second paper of the panel, **Rosa Parisi** (University of Foggia) drew on ethnographic research on women living in squats in Rome to demonstrate the positive role of immigrants, in particular women, in establishing new practices and experiences of belonging. She argued that through the practice of squatting citizenship is challenged by both migrants and citizens, giving rise to a simultaneous dismantling of the inequality produced by borders. Where the family is conceived as a border zone, she argued that squatting can also be a way of challenging dominant patriarchal models of citizenship. She concluded that squatting can be used as an act of citizenship to challenge the order of things; to enact the re-territorialisation of the relationship between space and between the binaries of legal/illegal and inclusion/exclusion.

In the third paper, **Jane Lilly Lopez** (University of California San Diego) used Irene Bloomrad's four dimensions of citizenship (legal status, rights, political and other participation and sense of belonging) to explore the disaggregation of citizenship as experienced by mixed status families and couples in the USA. Citizenship in this context, she argued, should be understood as a family affair, for a partner's non-citizen status can affect the citizenship experience of the 'citizen' member of the couple, leading, in some cases to experiences of 'de-assimilation' on the part of the citizen. Lilly-Lopez's research suggests, more broadly, that one's experience of citizenship in terms of rights, participation and sense of belonging can change, even if one's status doesn't. Integration, she argued, should thus be seen as circular, with citizens moving towards immigrants as well as migrants assimilating inwards towards citizens.

In the final paper of the panel, **Jacqui Andall** (IHEID, Geneva) considered the position of Ghanaian labour migrants in Japan who use marriage as part of a migration strategy. She explained that it is

difficult to regularise one's status in Japan as a foreign worker and that where permission is granted it is based on strict normative criteria which centre around notions of honesty. In order to get a spouse visa, a couple must perform to certain expectations: cohabitation, mutual support and cooperation, children, no criminal convictions and no offense to immigration control. Drawing on the example of a Ghanaian man who died during his deportation in 2010 having lived unmarried to his partner for a significant period of time, Andall demonstrated the way in which normative judgements about good migrants - and good families - and a failure to conform to them can lead to tragic consequences.

Panel 6: The Roma at the Margins of EU Citizenship

The three papers in this panel focused on the lived experiences of the Roma in relation to notions of boundaries and borders. As pointed out by Chair and Discussant **Ben Gidley** (University of Oxford), the three papers presented an interesting study of 'in-betweenness' in their critical approach to citizenship.

The first paper by **Rachel Humphris** (University of Oxford) examined how Roma migrants have negotiated and contested regulations of transition controls in UK bureaucracy since Bulgaria acceded to the European Union in 2008. Drawing on the work of Etienne Balibar, she highlighted both the unsettled nature of access to citizenship and the different ways in which regulations are exercised in everyday bureaucratic practice. Further developing the theme of time introduced in Martijn Stronks's paper, Humphris drew particular attention to the role of waiting in citizenship; waiting speed, which is controlled by bureaucrats, she concluded, has become a source of anxiety to migrants.

Drawing on Gayatri Spivak's concept of the subaltern, **Julija Sardelic** (University of Edinburgh) focused on the re-positioning of Romani minorities in the context of transformations of post-Yugoslav citizenship regimes. Analytically distinguishing two levels of citizenship in Yugoslavia: federal and republican, she explored the concrete difficulties experienced by some Roma in accessing citizenship, for example the need to prove ones residence, language and cultural criteria, and lack of funds necessary for naturalisation.

In the final paper of the panel, **Huub van Baar** (University of Amsterdam) highlighted the position of Europe's Romani minorities and migrants through the methodological lens of the securitization – citizenship nexus. In contemporary Europe, groups of people with vulnerable citizenship status have been increasingly framed in terms of security, he argued, and this securitization often undermines the capacity for citizenship. In this conjuncture of security and precarious citizenship, his paper demonstrated how those subject to securitization are inventing novel ways to enact themselves as citizens.

Panel 7– Parenting and precarious status

This panel, which was chaired by **Vanessa Hughes** (University of Oxford), critically examined experiences of parenting within and beyond precarious legal status. Building on the theme of family introduced in previous panels, speakers demonstrated the ways in which the immigration status of one family member can impact on the lives of others.

In the first paper of the panel, **Alice Haynes** (Centre for Research on Children and Families) argued that, for refused asylum seekers in Britain, maternal identity is intimately linked to self-esteem. Her paper explored the ways in which her informants' lives were transformed by their difficult experiences in the migration system and how this, in turn, influenced their experiences of motherhood. Common experiences of 'bad mothering' that emerged in Haynes's research in relation to precarious immigration status included a feeling of not being able to prioritise and protect one's children from the system; not being emotionally available to one's children; and the guilt of not being able to put one's children first.

The second paper by **Umut Erel** (Open University) provided an interesting contrast to Haynes's paper in its treatment of the situation of EU citizen migrant mothers. Studying the experiences of such 'privileged migrants' is important, Erel argued, as it allows us to deconstruct and problematise notions of privilege and competence and to consider the ways in which citizenship generates inequality as well as rights. Erel's paper explored the ways in which family norms can define access to certain citizenship rights, such as mobility. Drawing, for example, on the case of a mother who was able to construct a career in art galleries through moving between Italy and London, she demonstrated that mobility can be an essential strategy to support one's family.

Closing the panel, **Ana Rosas** (University of California Irvine) outlined the everyday difficulties of parenting in detention and drew attention to the situation of 46,000 parents who are separated from their USA-born children because of deportation. Drawing on her research with Mexican parents who face deportation, Rosas showed how whole families develop strategies of survival and resilience in the face of lived experiences of everyday precariousness wrought by immigration regimes. Strategies include facilitating the bonding of children with neighbours and faith groups and teaching children to memorise transnational family histories. Like Jane Lilly-Lopez, Rosas suggested that citizenship can and should be conceived of and experienced as a 'family affair'.

Panel 8: Politics and scales of belonging

The three papers in this panel drew attention to different layers of belonging. As pointed out by Discussant, **Elaine Chase** (University of Oxford), they also addressed themes of risk and agency.

Opening the panel, **Esra Kaytaz** (University of Oxford) presented the situation of Afghan asylum seekers in Turkey, whose lives are often characterised by exploitation and vulnerability to deportation. Kaytaz argued that the assumption often made by policy-makers that the threat of irregularity will deter migrants from entry does not correspond to the views of asylum seekers themselves; Afghan asylum seekers in Turkey do not view irregularity as transgressing social, cultural or moral norms. Kaytaz also analysed the extent to which irregularity is perceived as a risk by such migrants.

In the second paper, **Oana Romocea** distinguished between Romanians who arrived in the UK before the fall of Communism as political refugees, those who arrived after 1989 as highly skilled migrants, and those who arrived after Romania joined the EU in 2007 as labour migrants. She then explored the ways in which the identity of these migrants forms at the intersection of top-down citizenship and bottom-up understandings of nationality in their daily lives.

Ana Gutierrez opened the final presentation of the session with the example of a Latin American migrant whose journey to work in London is fraught with stress because of the stories she reads of migrants like herself being arrested on public transport and then deported. Gutierrez went on to argue that the 'illegality' of these women is not merely a juridical status, but leads them to assume a different means of existence. In other words, they live in heightened awareness of their own deportability.

Panel 9: Youth, politics of belonging and civic engagement

The three papers in this panel, which was chaired by **Roberto G. Gonzales** (University of Chicago), considered the experiences of young migrants in relation to shifting contours of identity, analysing their hopes and dreams and various strategies of civic engagement.

In her paper, **Synnøve Bendixsen** (IMER Bergen) looked at three groups of self-defined refugees (Ethiopians, Iranians and Palestinians) advocating for their rights in Norway to consider the cultural construction or irregular migrants as political subjects. Bendixsen considered the various narratives employed by the three groups, including i.) universalist discourses around human rights; ii.) being a 'genuine' refugee; iii.) the Norwegian nation's obligation to them; and iv.) the worthy citizen. These various narratives, she argued, placed the refugees in contradictory discursive and political positions vis-à-vis the nation-state. Like Thomas Swerts's paper, Bendixsen's paper suggested that, in mobilisations for rights and membership, national discourses of citizenship can interact and interplay with more universalist discourses.

Elaine Chase and **Jennifer Allsopp** (University of Oxford) presented next on the ways in which futures are conceptualised in policy in relation to independent young migrants in Europe and the bearing this has on subjective experiences of belonging and the development of ontological security as 'a sense of projected self'. Evident contrasts exist, they argued, in the ways in which such young people experience and enact a sense of belonging and purpose in relation to their future plans, and the ways in which states impose a limited set of futures options for these young people within the context of immigration regimes. The crux of this tension, Chase and Allsopp argued, lies in the attempt to reconcile the best interests of the child with the rights of the state to control its borders. In their paper they showed how this tension is institutionalised in the Council of Europe 'Life Project planning' policy framework.

In the final paper of the panel, **Kathie Friedman-Kasaba** (Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies) considered the experiences of Bosnian refugees resettled in Seattle in the aftermath of ethnic cleansing, specifically, how memories and experiences have affected the next generation. We know that refugees are often more likely to take part in social movements and be politically active, she pointed out, yet the area of political integration or civic engagement is under-researched in relation to refugees. Her research suggests that, due to the metropolitan super-diversity of a Seattle community, refugee civic activism in Seattle necessarily takes place in a global context.

Panel 10: Diversity, legal status and practices of citizenship

Papers in this panel, which was chaired by **Melanie Griffiths** (University of Oxford), converged around the theme of temporalities of citizenship and experiences of multiple belonging.

In her paper, **Anna Tuckett** (London School of Economics) highlighted the dynamic tensions that shape experiences of migration, citizenship and belonging in Italy. Tuckett focused on the process through which migrants are made 'other' in everyday life by assessing the routinised experiences of racism and discrimination which they encounter.

In the second paper, **Ayse Akalin** (Istanbul Technical University) presented a transnational story of one Filipino family. One of the protagonists was Rebecca, a mother of ten who came to Turkey in 1993 to provide for the financial welfare of her children after leaving an abusive husband and who first became naturalised in Turkey through a marriage of convenience. Drawing on Rebecca's story, Akalin deliberated on the multifoldedness of belonging and non-belonging in the transnational context.

The final panellist, **Kristen Biehl** (University of Oxford) presented on the experience and regulation of citizenship in a space of 'illegality' in Istanbul. Noting the fact that Turkey has been rapidly transforming into a country of destination and transit for immigrants, Biehl's paper presented ethnographic research from a neighbourhood in Istanbul called Kumkapi which has become a key residential and employment hub for immigrants whose national/ethnic/religious/gender backgrounds, migration motives and legal statuses vary greatly. Drawing on the example of Kumkapi, Biehl explored how migrants experience membership in urban spaces where distinct and conflicting rights regimes and governing practices related to national belonging co-exist.

Concluding Roundtable

The concluding roundtable brought together some of the main themes and questions raised over the course of the conference. The panel, which was chaired by **Nando Sigona** (University of Birmingham), included **Elaine Chase** (University of Oxford), **Julia O'Connell Davidson** (University of Nottingham) and **Roberto G. Gonzales** (University of Chicago). Participants were also invited to make contributions from the floor.

Discussants began by pointing out how the conference had drawn attention to the particular situation of children and young people who are caught between experiences and aspirations of membership and the realities of precariousness wrought by immigration regimes. They agreed that more attention should be given to the specific circumstances of these children and young people.

The second point concerned the ways in which speakers had contested the value of citizenship, both conceptually and as a legal status. What, it was asked, is the true value of legal citizenship and related strategies of naturalisation in a context where we are witnessing the 'hollowing out' of citizenship and citizenship rights? Could getting rid of one set of borders expose another set of borders in the fabric of the citizenry, asked Bridget Anderson (University of Oxford)? Several participants agreed that more research is needed to compare the experiences of irregular migrants and those of marginalised citizens. Rounding off this point, participants also pointed out that further consideration is needed in regard to the many people in the world who have no experience of citizenship at all.

The third point of discussion concerned the ways in which citizenship and belonging had been shown to intersect at the level of everyday experience. The rich variety of conference papers had, it was agreed, demonstrated ample evidence that individuals do not subjectively experience categories in the way they are constructed and written by the state. Yet how, in the context, it was asked, would it be possible to make citizenship resemble something more akin to its lived experience?

Expanding on the implications of this disconnect between formal categorisations and lived experience, the fourth point of discussion pivoted on the practical question: how can we, as researchers, conduct research in these contexts without reifying the status-quo? As Nando Sigona put it, is there a risk, as hinted at by Nicholas de Genova (Goldsmiths College) in the opening plenary, that we may be fetishising citizenship as a necessary good?

The final point raised in the closing roundtable came back to the need, raised during both days of the conference, to expand the idea of citizenship beyond something given to or experienced by the individual, whether in relation to civic participation or the intimacy of the familial sphere. How, as Jane Lilly-Lopez (University of California San Diego) put it, can we move from a conception of citizenship as a formal contract between an abstract individual and a state towards a conception of citizenship as a collective affair or a collective act?

Nando Sigona concluded the discussion by announcing that some of the themes and questions raised during *Within & Beyond Citizenship* will be addressed in a second symposium in October 2013.

