

Citizenship models and migrant integration – Rethinking the intersection of citizenship and migrant integration through (b)ordering

Luca Pfirter

luca.pfirter@unine.ch

and

Lisa Marie Borrelli

and

Didier Ruedin

and

Stefanie Kurt

POST-PRINT

This is a draft chapter. The final version is available in: Pfirter, Luca, Lisa Marie Borrelli, Didier Ruedin, and Stefanie Kurt. 2021. 'Citizenship Models and Migrant Integration – Rethinking the Intersection of Citizenship and Migrant Integration through (b)Ordering'. In *Handbook of Citizenship and Migration*, edited by Marco Giugni and Maria Grasso, 52–65. London: Edward Elgar. ISBN: 978 1 78990 312 6

The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher, and is for private use only.

<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789903133>

Abstract

This chapter proposes a re-evaluation of citizenship models in the light of an “integration turn” in migration policies and promotes a re-conceptualisation from a (b)ordering perspective. It develops a threefold theoretical discussion which will be complemented with examples from the Swiss case in order to underpin the theoretical developments and to illustrate the conceptual changes suggested in this chapter. The chapter ends with a plea to rethink commonly known concepts of “integration” through a border studies lens. Such a view would enable to provide new insights of how “integration” further “integrates” (b)ordering practices into the daily routines of authorities, bureaucracies and legal actors.

Keywords: integration, bordering, citizenship models, Switzerland, discrimination

Chapter 4: Citizenship models and migrant integration – Rethinking the intersection of citizenship and migrant integration through (b)ordering¹

Introduction

“Obtaining the Swiss passport should be the last step in a longer phase of integration, the so-called icing on the cake. To receive the red passport, a foreigner should practice, strive for it, learn and fight, in order to be perfectly integrated when passing the finish line of naturalisation, just like a sports person.” (Thomas Minder, SWISS MP, authors’ translation)

Due to an increasing and rather alert monitoring of immigrant flows to Western Europe, researchers have paid close attention to citizenship and how nation states attempt to organise migrant groups along lines of deservingness. This includes decisions on who receives asylum, who is eligible for a tourist or work visa, who will be naturalised, or who will be detained and deported. As shown in the introductory quote, receiving citizenship is increasingly not understood as a right, but connected to complex policies and normative notions of deservingness, which a potential applicant has to fulfil: it has become a (sport) game in which one has to prove themselves worthy and where the finish line may become illusive.

When studying policies and practices directed at migrant groups with the right to stay, we observe an increasing struggle of Western societies to integrate immigrants within their welfare and state structures (Heckmann and Schnapper 2003). Public and political discourse may often highlight presumed problems of immigration and particularly the civic integration of immigrants (Van der Brug et al. 2015). Consequently, a search for citizenship and integration models has occurred, in which different national contexts are examined and described in order to understand the different societal and political approaches of ‘integration’ (Kraler, Reichel, and Entzinger 2015; Ruedin 2011). Broadly speaking, immigrant integration is described as the economic, political, social, and cultural participation of non-citizens in society in order to eventually achieve a more ‘permanent’ and ‘safe’ status, that of citizenship. Integration as such reflects rights and obligations for the immigrants and the majority population (Schnapper 2007).

In the academic arena, developments around the (in)ability to reach citizenship have spurred debates, as perceived problems of immigrant integration have increasingly made it clear that the conceptions of citizenship models cannot account for all the social phenomena observed on the ground. For this reason, researchers have developed various conceptualisations and analytical arguments regarding the interplay between citizenship models and immigrant integration (Kraler, Reichel, and Entzinger 2015). While these new models became more inclusive and relational, they come with their own issues, because they often reproduce state logics and neglect the socio-temporal changes of the data used in order to create ideal-type constructs (Bonjour and Duyvendak 2018; Ellermann 2019; Goodman 2019). Through the increasing juridification, evaluation, monitoring and operationalisation of integration in politics (and policies and laws thereof) and academia, we are losing sight of discriminatory, racist and exclusionary tendencies embedded in politics, practices and research. Indeed, generalised models offering an overview and comparative view between nation states might normalise these problematic tendencies by codifying them into seemingly rationale categories. Indeed, they can depoliticise highly discriminatory categories of people, created by statistics and indicators (Akin and Banfi 2019).

¹ Acknowledgements: The article was supported by the National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) – on the move, which is funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. Author contributions: LP, LMB, DR designed the study, LP, LMB, SK, DR wrote the chapter, LP, LMB, SK, DR edited the chapter.

Many studies on the role of citizenship models are motivated by a conviction that the collected and displayed data, frequently arranged in comparative country cases, play an important role in understanding which policies and guidelines facilitate (or hinder) immigrant integration. Put differently, citizenship models serve as predictors for the outcome of interest: to what extent and how quickly immigrants become part of the majority population of the country of destination – or why some immigrants fail to do so (Simonsen 2016).

Another strand of the literature and research on citizenship, however, highlights the proliferation of migrant categories (Rajkumar et al. 2012) and the increased precarity and temporality of citizenship even in so-called ‘liberal’ regimes (Banki 2013; Rajkumar et al. 2012; Ellermann 2019). Bonjour and Duyvendak (2018), for example, elaborate on how ‘Dutch civic integration policies aim at “barring people with poor prospects”’ (p. 882). Kraler (2018) highlights the ‘simultaneity of inclusion [...] and exclusion (through specific conditions)’ (ibid., 4) that we find in regularisation programmes attempting to integrate irregularised immigrants. This shift from enabling membership to imposing fixed conditions on membership has been called a ‘civic integration turn’ (Bonjour and Duyvendak 2018; Goodman 2019).

In this chapter we propose a re-evaluation of citizenship models to avoid methodological nationalism and propose an alternative perspective on how “immigration and citizenship policy continues to create hierarchies among migrants” (Ellermann 2019, 1), which current models (or regimes) are not fully equipped to do. For the sake of clarity, in this chapter we systematically refer to ‘citizenship models’: While earlier research seems to have favoured the term ‘model’, later work favours ‘regime’. There is no clear distinction between both terms, and they tend to be used as synonyms (see Koopmans et al. 2005; Koopmans 2013).

To support our argument, we trace developments from simplified to increasingly differentiated understandings of how citizenship models and immigrant integration relate. In particular, we progress from established citizenship models and introduce recent work on (b)ordering as an alternative perspective drawing on border regime theories. We argue that this re-conceptualisation allows grasping timely changes of integration and migration management within and between nation states.

Indeed, (b)ordering perspectives place their scope partly on street-level practices and policy implementation, which play a crucial role for shaping migrants’ integration (see Belabas and Gerrits 2017; Suvarierol and Kirk 2015; Lindberg and Borrelli 2019; Borrelli 2019). These aspects are neglected by citizenship models and integration indicators (see Akin and Banfi 2019), despite an increase in stricter migration policies, including the sorting, selecting and evaluating of migrants not only at the individual but also at the group level. Sorting, for example, can occur on the basis of social class, gender, religion or race/ethnicity (Korteweg 2017; Bonjour and Duyvendak 2018) and is done by bureaucratic agents, who bear distinct discretionary powers. We argue that by investigating the intersection of citizenship studies and models on the one hand, and research questioning the inclusionary character of (civic) integration (and including a thorough examination of the implementation ‘on-the ground’) on the other hand, will advance a more nuanced picture of current citizenships models.

The chapter engages in a threefold theoretical discussion, leading from citizenship models to (b)ordering perspectives. Since we argue for a more practice-focused analysis of integration, each theoretical section is supported by an excursus on Switzerland in order to illustrate the different theoretical underpinnings. The changes of Swiss policies highlight a particular understanding of immigrant integration (becoming gradually exclusive) and the effects for many immigrants, but also their meaning in the socio-political context. We focus on this one case because it allows us to clearly illustrate the described developments.

Citizenship models: Inclusive versus exclusive, ethnic versus civic

Before we can discuss citizenship models and how well they help to understand policy implementation processes and individual experiences of integration, we need to establish a general un-

derstanding of integration. We use a broad definition, introduced by Heckmann and Schnapper (2003:10), describing immigrant integration “as the inclusion of new populations into existing social structures of the immigration country”, whereby they refer to economic, social, and cultural structures. Immigrant integration is often described as the outcome of a process, by which immigrants (and their descendants) become part of society (see introductory quote). In practice, this process concerns complex patterns of reciprocal processes in which immigrants are asked to adapt to the country of destination, but in return members of the majority population react to and adjust to newcomers (Ruedin 2011; Schnapper 2007). This legal and conceptual ‘two-way process’ is however seldom realized in practice, and integration often describes a ‘one-way process’ (Akin and Banfi 2019).

Yet, citizenship models attempt to grasp these patterns and we find much comprehensive work on them (Koopmans et al. 2005; Koopmans 2013; Vink 2017; Bauböck et al. 2006), which plays a relevant role in discourses on immigrant integration. Indeed, citizenship models are thought to reflect how members of the majority population and the institutions of the country of destination react to and adapt to the needs of immigrants in order to facilitate their integration. The use of models allows to classify these reactions of the majority population in a way that they reflect historical developments and country specificities. Some countries tend to be more open to immigrants and expand access to key institutions (such as political rights) to newcomers, while others tend to be more exclusive and tend to restrict access.

Indeed, citizenship models (Koopmans et al. 2005; Brubaker 1992) have been studied and compared in context of nation states, inter-state relations, or via supranational policies (e.g. within the EU context). They focus on the current (and historically developed) policies and laws in order to map how individuals may gain membership in a self-governing community, and generally describe who gets access to nationality and by which means (Dronkers and Vink 2012). At the same time, these models are compared to each other and sometimes ranked (from favourable to unfavourable access).

Different indices have been developed to ‘measure’ integration in order to organise societies into citizenship models, many of which draw heavily on policies “that shape integration” (Akin and Banfi 2019, 86) and reproduce state discourses (Kraler, Reichel, and Entzinger 2015). In empirical studies, researchers often draw on the Migration Integration Policy Index (MIPEX; see Huddleston et al. 2015), which tries to capture various aspects of immigrant integration policies. Its wide coverage and ready expression of these policies in a single overall measure make for an attractive predictor variable in many studies. Proponents of alternative indices tend to criticise the MIPEX or other competing indices, which fundamentally capture citizenship models on a single dimension (see Bjerre et al. 2015 for an overview of indices). Those who favour particular indices tend to ignore the exact research question other researchers have in mind in individual studies using different indices, and for that reason do not shy away from proclaiming universal all-purpose typologies. Often, they use extensive theoretical considerations to create these indices, yet neglect that not all research using citizenship models aims to study immigrant integration, but may be interested in other social phenomena that draw on the same theories. This leads to different indicators used. Given the construction of these indices on the basis of individual indicators, researchers could in principle disassemble and reassemble existing indices to make them fit particular research questions (Ruedin 2015).

A widely used classification comes from Koopmans et al. (2005), who use a two-dimensional typology of citizenship models. Still following the underlying idea of capturing the way nations and their institutions deal with immigrants in a universal manner, they argue for an expansion of dimensions by differentiating between two dimensions that do not add up to a single dimension of inclusivity and exclusivity. The cultural dimension differentiates between ethnic and civic conceptions of the nation; the legal dimension between pluralism and monism. This approach yields four ideal-types.

Whether one- or two-dimensional, many studies have linked these citizenship models to a plethora of outcomes, including minority politics, political debates, political participation and repres-

entation of minority groups, or naturalisation (Huddleston and Vink 2013; Koopmans et al. 2005; Bird 2005; Hainmueller and Hangartner 2013; Dancygier and Laitin 2014; Helbling 2014; Dronkers and Vink 2012; Ersanilli and Koopmans 2010). The success of various measures of citizenship models stems from their success in statistically predicting variance in these outcomes, but also of assessing how policies and institutions shape the behaviour and choices of the majority population and how they deal with immigrants.

Excursus 1: The Swiss case as example and short-falling of indices

When compared to other European countries, Switzerland seems to fit into the category of being an exclusive or restrictive citizenship model. MIPEX ranks Switzerland as ‘halfway favourable’ regarding integration and puts it at the 21st place out of 38 compared countries (Huddleston et al. 2015). Yet, MIPEX by design neglects the large cantonal marge of appreciation, which is not depicted by the one-dimensional perspective. By contrast, the migration-mobility indicators developed by the nccr – *on the move* (2019) allow inter-cantonal comparisons and highlight much variation between cantons. Thus, the use of Switzerland as ideal type (Koopmans et al. 2005) is already challenged by the lack of harmonisation between cantonal and communal levels, despite legal changes in the federal legislation that impose some changes on the cantonal level (Kurt 2017a; 2017b; Manatschal 2011; Manatschal and Stadelmann-Steffen 2013; Wichmann et al. 2011). Similar issues arise not only within federal states, but also when focusing on subnational levels in which regional aspects are treated with relevance (Ruedin 2015; Koopmans, Michalowski, and Waibel 2012). Citizenship is thus always “embedded in multilevel [...] and transnational constellations of citizenship regimes” (Vink 2017, 240).

Policy complexity vis-à-vis citizenship models

Joppke (2017) argues that the notion of citizenship models has lost importance particularly in Western Europe. In his argument, the influence of European legislation has led to a trend towards a more civic understanding of citizenship and as such a convergence of immigration integration policies. This view is problematic, because it paints the picture of citizenship policies becoming generally more liberal in all Western states, contrasted with so called ‘slave states’ or autocratic rentier states of the Gulf region, ‘categorically deny[ing] permanent settlement and citizenship to their labour migrants’ (Joppke 2017, 387). This simple differentiation denies a critical view on (colonial) preserved inequalities in so called ‘liberal states’. While countries with a strong *jus sanguinis* tradition such as Germany now allow for some *jus soli* provisions, comprehensive approaches to citizenship models and more careful examinations of changes over time, cast further doubt on this argument of convergence (Huddleston et al. 2015; Ruedin 2015).

Model comparisons, even across time may still fail to capture the multiple ways in which immigration and citizenship policy continue to (re)produce discrimination (Ellermann 2019) through the stratification of immigrant status or group-based discrimination. They also neglect intersections of class, gender, race/ethnicity and religion (to name a few), which cause a hierarchical and highly differentiated potential to gain membership between certain groups, despite liberal policies overall. Instead, these approaches are prone to support static, ideal-typical categories of citizenship regimes (Vink 2017). These ideal-typical categories, however, often fail to reflect complex realities on the ground and socio-political contexts in which these policies are embedded.

Interestingly, the common two-dimensional approaches to citizenship models resonate with common-sense notions of integration as a responsibility of the individual: it is in the hands of the migrant to ‘fight’ for integration and acceptance in society and prove him- or herself (recall the quote at the beginning of this chapter). This individualised understanding of integration allows for a highly simplified differentiation between those who deserve to stay and integrate and those with ‘poor prospects’ (Bonjour and Duyvendak 2018). The quote at the beginning of the chapter further represents a restrictive understanding of citizenship, becoming the endpoint of a successful immigrant integration. However, this creates a paradox: While integration is typically seen as

the responsibility of immigrants, the general legal structure includes an inclusive understanding of citizenship, e.g. by giving the possibility to qualify for an early naturalisation in order to encourage further integration (Hainmueller, Hangartner, and Pietrantuono 2017).

Further, using models to describe different types of integration policies conveys the idea that there actually exists a 'national integration strategy', which is planned and consistent. Much like Heckmann and Schnapper (2003), we disagree with this view and argue that integration policies and their implementation constantly change, partly due to shifting power relations, partly due to the heavy politicisation, which also is driven by public discourses on migration management (Ruedin, Alberti, and D'Amato 2015).

Here, some recent research on citizenship models supports our line of argument and takes up an inclusive perspective (Koopmans and Michalowski 2017; Vink 2017), in which citizenship is studied via the processes and trajectories which govern the access to citizenship, including an understanding of institutions, policies and actors and thus give credit to an ever-changing policy field. This processual understanding of citizenship also allows to envision 'integration' as at stake for all people residing on the territory of a nation state without disposing of citizenship understood as nationality.

Concurrent with this broader research interest, we find an increasing preference to use the term 'citizenship regime' instead of 'citizenship model' and a theoretical reconfiguration towards studying outcomes and consequences of policies and their potentially detrimental or conducive effect on immigrant integration (Vink 2017). As Bloemraad (2015) and Vink (2017) maintain, when understood this way, citizenship models enable to study the bureaucratic practice and take into consideration "the opportunity structure for mobilization" (Vink 2017, 236) and try to overcome methodological nationalism, which causes essentialised national models to emerge (Vink 2017). Yet, it remains unclear how these suggestions can be put into place and while these approaches measure rights, they also lack explanations of institutional and motivational roots (Koopmans 2013). Vink (2017: 229) argues that while citizenship models help us to structure and organise different political units, they tend "to reify ideal-types" due to their abstract categories. As such, citizenship models should be used as heuristic tools – indexing of immigrant rights in order to show dimensionality – instead of taken as reality. Accordingly, citizenship models further allow a current 'state of art' mapping, but at times also longitudinal tracing of changes in access possibilities. Indeed, indexing and indicators can, as Akin and Banfi (2019: 87) argue "institutionalize the idea of an irreducible ontological difference between 'us' and 'them' by concealing the political nature of integration". To do so, however, it is relevant for the study of subnational policy variations (cf. Manatschal and Stadelmann-Steffen 2013).

Excursus 2: The Swiss (gendered) integration stage model

Switzerland implemented an integration stage model – the idea of a step-by-step integration – related to the total revision of the *Federal Act on Swiss Citizenship* (SCA) on 1st of January 2018 and the partially revised *Federal Act on Foreign Nationals and Integration* (FNIA) on 1st of January 2019. It reflects the idea of citizenship as reaching the final 'finishing line' once passing the integration exam. The intentions of recent legal changes were to include and align conditions for citizenship with decisive integration criteria to ensure and promote migrants' integration. Despite intentions of certain harmonisation, e.g. specific levels of oral and written language competence for permits and Swiss Citizenship (for an overview, see Kurt 2018), the margin of appreciation of the cantons and communes remains large (Probst et al. 2019). Above-discussed citizenship regime approaches (Bloemraad 2015; Vink 2017) recognise the multitude of actors and institutions implementing different legal acts on the federal, cantonal and communal level. They attempt to grasp the multidimensionality created by the legal framework to differentiate foreign persons (see entry and stay conditions connected to various integration instruments to ensure a 'successful' integration). Yet, these approaches fail short of taking up organisational-inherent inequalities.

Naturally, a differentiation between liberal and restrictive citizenship models appears when aiming for country comparison of immigration and migration policies (Ruedin 2015). However, this binary comparison neglects the potential restrictiveness of liberal regimes and underlying structural violence as well as exclusionary factors, which automatically appear ‘less violent’ when placed in contrast with more authoritative regimes. The concept of citizenship and its benefits are under constant renegotiation, created by multiple actors and groups affected by them (Koopmans and Michalowski 2017).

For example, to ensure the integration process of a foreigner, authorities entrusted with the implementation of the FNIA, are obliged to report data and required information. Specifically, authorities must report the opening of criminal investigations, but also on civil and criminal judgments, changes in connection with civil status or in the case of refusal to permit a marriage. Additionally, authorities are required to communicate claims for social assistance, claims for unemployment benefits and claims for supplementary benefits. Finally, disciplinary measures by school authorities, measures taken by child and adult protection authorities and other decisions indicating a special need for integration in accordance with the integration criteria (art. 97 FNIA) are also reported.

It remains unclear how the recent citizenship models can grasp not only the inherent restrictiveness, but also the various realities, such as the communication between and within authorities in a multilevel setting as well as the appreciation of the received information, applied to different migrant categories (Probst et al. 2019). Moreover, these obligations for authorities to communicate intend a certain control of migrant’s integration as to detect ‘integration deficits.’ Particularly such integration deficit can ‘downgrade’ a permanent residence permit to a ‘regular’ residence permit (art. 63 para. 2 FNIA) or result in a withdrawal of residence permit in Switzerland (art. 62/ art. 63 FNIA). A logic of control and discipline in measuring and monitoring integration becomes visible (Akin and Kurt, n.d.).

The proposed theories of bordering could take up these less visible, but highly relevant aspects of discrimination within integration, as we will highlight with a brief example of gendered absurdity (see Fischer and Dahinden 2016 for a more systematic approach):

Naturalisation candidates need to demonstrate their successful integration, by also “encouraging and supporting the integration of one’s wife or husband, registered partner or the minor children for whom one has parental responsibility” (art. 12 para. 1 let. 2 SCA). Even though this criterion itself does not appear as gender biased, the parliamentary debates very much highlight a rather gender discriminatory perspective. Martin Bäumlé of the Green Liberal Party, for example, made the following comment: “For us it is really central that the integration of the female partner [original German: *Lebenspartnerin*], the woman, the male partner or the children is considered when deciding on the naturalisation. Here it is relevant that cantons and municipalities receive a new tool, which they currently do not have. For example, when a man does not at all take care to integrate his wife – which very often happens – not giving her the opportunity to learn the language, then this man cannot be naturalised. Because he is not integrated; because he does not know our ways, how to treat a wife and woman...” (National council, spring session, 8th meeting, 13.03.13, 08h00, AB 2014 N233; own translation). Similarly, the message of the Federal Council clearly states that “the applying husband, who for example rejects the integration of his wife within Swiss life styles, cannot be considered as integrated and thus his application for naturalisation will be denied” (Eidgenössisches Justiz- und Polizeidepartement EJPD 2015; own translation). A passivity is ascribed to the woman and wife, who needs not only to be given the chance to integrate, but be *made* integrated, ideally from her male partner. Administrative authorities also implement a gendered and stereotyped bias: We refer to a decision by the State Secretariat for Migration, in which it states that, a foreign woman, who is working as a sex worker and married to a Swiss man, does not meet the criteria for naturalisation, because she does not perform the fidelity expected within a stable couple’s relationship (decision was reversed by the Federal Administrative Court, F-5326/2014, 23th November 2016). Thus, administrative authorities reproduce imple-

ment discriminatory gender aspects, but these inherent inequalities are not grasped by the citizenship model.

The (b)ordering perspective on integration and citizenship

Prior research on the civic integration turn elaborates on the various axes of in- and exclusion, for example social class, as much as gender and ethnicity in order to avoid a one-sided focus on culture and identity (Bonjour and Duyvendak 2018; Brubaker 2010). Following this work, we argue that citizenship models cannot adequately depict consequences of migration and citizenship laws and policies when confronted with the elusive concept of integration. We have elaborated how citizenship models try to establish ideal-typologies and mapping of different 'arrangements.' We traced more comprehensive approaches that consider wider societal processes and perceive citizenship policies as dynamic.

Nevertheless, even more inclusive approaches to citizenship models that consider bureaucratic practices, have failed to pay sufficient attention to the effects of street-level discretionary practices and case law. Similarly, it has yet to be described what these approaches understand under 'informal' sets of rules and practices within the regime. Besides non-meritocratic attributes of social group membership being still highly relevant for the differential legal distinction for access to territory and citizenship, merit and thus deservingness are still (or yet again) a key factor. This was illustrated through the increasing juridification of integration within migration law and policies.

Territorial access and citizenship are granted increasingly as a privilege, rather than a right, underlined by discourses which shifted from depicting asylum seekers as fleeing war and persecution to being asylum shoppers, economic migrants, or potential terrorists (Vaughan-Williams 2008; Rosas 2006; Crawley and Skleparis 2018; Colombo 2017). There are tendencies to improve the sense of citizenship and community within societies (Walters 2004), while at the same time creating deterrence narratives for those deemed unworthy (Tuckett 2017), visible through the enhancement of immigration controls, the focus to combat irregular entry and trafficking/smuggling (Walters 2004). The attempt to control unwanted immigration is embedded within racialised, classed and gendered logics (Achermann 2013; Khosravi 2010; Walters 2004), drawing heavily on discussions on 'migrant integration' (Schinkel 2018). As we showed in the preceding extract on Swiss discourses of integration and the law governing it, we find an attribution of passivity for female migrants, for whose integration their male partners become responsible and upon which their integration is measured. Hence, in order to account for these exclusionary and disciplinary aspects of integration requirements and measurements, we have to bring in additional perspectives, which are able to explain such processes.

Building on literature and research on citizenship highlights the proliferation of migrant categories (Rajkumar et al. 2012) and the increased precarity and temporality of citizenship even in so-called 'liberal' regimes (Banki 2013; Rajkumar et al. 2012; Ellermann 2019). These issues have been addressed by studies which take into consideration the turn to civic performance (Chauvin, Garcés-Masareñas, and Kraler 2013) and precarity of place (Banki 2013), underlining the challenges of physical residence rather than focusing on the precarity migrants face in contexts of work. It is argued that citizenship becomes rather temporary, manifesting in a hierarchy of migrant categories with more or less short-lived temporalities (Rajkumar et al. 2012).

Instead of studying policies and creating indicators to assess the inclusiveness and exclusiveness of citizenship regimes (looking at the possibility of citizenship acquisition, the potential loss of citizenship, membership and rights), and thereby reproducing political discourses on the deservingness of rights, we will now elaborate how policies are used to govern and create certain citizenship models, which are linked to certain groups of mobile people. Hence, citizenship models do not automatically become more inclusive in so-called 'liberal' states. On the contrary, we show how migrants are increasingly selected on the grounds of group-based discrimination (or 'othering'), sometimes veiled through a language of integration policies, and research, as enhancing 'migrant integration' (Hadj Abdou 2019; Schinkel 2018).

Hence, with the rise of civic integration and the application of these policies defined as favourable and positively influencing ‘migrant integration’, it is necessary to question to what extent we can take (civic) integration policies as representative of more inclusive citizenship models (or regimes). We conceptualise civic integration policies, and more generally the operationalisation of integration in comparative citizenship studies, as “the result of dynamic and more or less successful attempts at ‘ordering’ relations between places and people” (Novak 2017, 4), between a nationally defined territoriality and ‘migrant others’ (Walters 2004). Integration, as illustrated with the Swiss example, becomes a palpable and important factor in controlling migration, but also citizenship. This interplay between (social) ordering and border-making can be fruitfully analysed (see processes of (b)ordering by van Houtum and van Naerssen 2002). This perspective supports a refocus of citizenship studies and models to uncover hierarchizing and exclusionary practices/tendencies often concealed by the ‘liberal’ discourse.

The (b)ordering perspective also highlights, how border control takes over the aim “to tap the energies of one flow while taming and suppressing the other” (Walters 2004, 245). Hence, borders are increasingly understood as sites of filtration (Darling 2011), which are not territorially defined, but flexible and intrinsically connected to migration control more generally by producing both mobility and immobility (Novak 2017; Lindberg and Borrelli 2019). Instead of thinking about borders in terms of a static, fixed, and territorial lines, their interrelation with immigration control and with a diversity of actors implies to think “in terms of a set of practices” (Parker and Vaughan-Williams 2009, 586) producing differentiated forms of access to rights (Casas-Cortes et al. 2015, 57). This multiplicity of practices represents a continuous social construction with important material consequences (van Houtum 2012, 406). In critical scholarship on the increased sophistication of border regimes and the management of human movement, there is a trend in analysing such socio-political phenomena as processes of (b)ordering (Fassin 2011; Novak 2017; van Houtum and van Naerssen 2002), which we also want to propose as a lens to nuance more generally the intersection of citizenship and ‘migrant integration’ research.

Putting in place integration requirements supports (b)ordering and as such can be used to govern social cohesion by continuously splitting the ‘deserving’ and the ‘undeserving’ (Khosravi 2010, 126). Government agencies dealing with the assessment of integration and citizenship become proxy actors in the border regime by taking over practices of migration control, as they function as agencies of threshold. Concepts like ‘borderscapes’ (Rajaram and Grundy-Warr 2007) and ‘border as method’ (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013) can further contribute to an understanding of how integration and citizenship requirements govern ‘foreign nationals’ with effects for the ‘whole population’. There is a linkage to borders, which needs to be understood as going beyond their role to determine access to territory, but as delineating boundaries of entitlement, belonging and citizenship (Anderson, Gibney, and Paoletti 2011; Morris 2002). This is evidenced in the ‘integration stage model’ in Switzerland, embedded in laws, which have been implemented in 2018 and 2019. Exclusion and ostracism are not only implemented geographically but run through all levels of migration control – from the entry of a territory, to integration measures and acquiring citizenship. Therefore, commonly known citizenship models such as the Swiss ‘Integration Stage Model’ and notions of integration as such reproduce the neo-liberal normalised idea of a legally binding model expecting foreign nationals to overcome certain hurdles to ‘win’ and ‘deserve’ their residence status.

Excursus 3: The Swiss (economic) integration stage model

Swiss citizenship policies are not becoming more inclusive due to an increased mobilisation and reification of integration that perpetuates the view that citizenship is something to be earned by immigrants (evaluated by testing of language skills, assessment of integration levels of family members (older than 12 years) and a police background check in order to evaluate the ‘moral character’ of a person, amongst further measures).

Since 1st January 2019, integration is defined by more specific criteria. Besides an assessment of integration by considering the foreigners’ respect for public safety, security, public order and for

the values of the Federal Constitution, language skills and the participation in working life or efforts to acquire an education (art. 58a FNIA). Depending on the initial permit, a foreign person might be confronted with multiple integration exams (Kurt 2017a). Additionally, to support migrants' integration, cantonal and communal authorities have to possibility to implement specific integration measures and instruments, e.g. integration agreements and recommendation. The inability to fulfil such agreements can lead to a downgrade or loss of a residence permit (art. 33 para. 5; art. 43 para. 4, art. 44 para. 4, art. 58b para. 3, art. 63 para. 1 let. g FNIA).

As was already the case under the former law, integration is linked 'to the possession of a (secure) legal status' (art. 4 para. 2 FNIA; Kurt 2017b), though the security of a status is increasingly based on permanent impermanence. Indeed, current citizenship policies echo the narratives of austerity, which we find in and beyond the European context (Tuckett 2017). The increased demonisation of welfare benefit recipients as example, manifested in the current Swiss migration framework, supports (b)ordering approaches. Art. 121a para. 3 *Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation* states that "the decisive criteria for granting residence permits are primarily an application from an employer, ability to integrate, and adequate, independent means of subsistence».

The FNIA stipulates that the admission of a foreign person is (only) allowed considering the aspect of the Swiss economy as a whole (art. 3 para. 1 FNIA). Consequently, financial independence or active labour market participation are crucial for migrant's admission and integration within Switzerland. Moreover, since the entry into force of the FNIA, permanent residence holders are no longer protected from a revocation of their permit if becoming dependent on social benefits as it was the case in the former law. The former art. 63 para. 2 FNIA stated that the permanent residence permit of foreign persons rightfully and legally staying for 15 years (and more) in Switzerland, cannot be revoked in case of social aid dependency.

These changes represent an increasing conditionality of foreign nationals' stay in Switzerland and their trajectory of acquiring Swiss citizenship. When the decisive difference is not between the 'well integrated' and the 'less integrated' but "between those to whom integration is not an issue at all, and those for whom it is" (Schinkel 2018, 4), we find indeed that requiring integration is a '(b)ordering tactic' (De Genova 2017). The reification of 'integration', as exemplified within the Swiss legal system and practices thereof, unveil how 'differences' are governed and thereby hierarchies (re)produced (Hadj Abdou 2019). Therefore, (b)ordering provides a useful analytical concept to investigate the internalisation of border control and the connected aspects of social ordering (van Houtum and van Naerssen 2002) which are becoming apparent due to the increased mobilisation of integration.

Conclusions and outlook

Today, we face an increase in stricter citizenship regimes that sort, select and evaluate immigrants not only at the individual but also the group level, including social class, gender, religion or race/ethnicity. As Ellermann (2019) argues, current developments such as the rise of populist movements support the assumption that the stratification of immigrant status and group-based discrimination remain an everyday reality across Europe. We argued that by investigating the intersection of citizenship studies, and models, with research questioning the inclusionary character of (civic) integration, a more nuanced picture of current citizenships models is possible. Through the increasing juridification, evaluation, monitoring and operationalisation of integration in politics (and policies and laws thereof) and academia, we are in danger of losing sight of discriminatory, racist and exclusionary tendencies.

The effects of exclusionary citizenship and integration policies are visible throughout society. This chapter therefore argues that there is a need to complement currently used citizenship models with a border regime lens. Citizenship and migrant integration do not exist as objective models and measurements, because these concepts (re)produce state narratives, and follow policies, which purposefully have an excluding character (Korteweg 2017; Schinkel 2018). Current approaches do not sufficiently acknowledge how integration is both a (b)ordering practice and an

inclusionary process. Put differently, integration can be conceptualised as governing social cohesion, where indicators of citizenship demonstrate how exclusive or inclusive law is, rather than assuming that it can tell about the 'status' of someone's integration.

Little research has been conducted on how these dimensions are represented in everyday discourses of those who are affected by relevant policies, as well as those who implement them on various political and judicial levels. For this reason, we proposed to link both quantitative and qualitative studies in a multidisciplinary research setting and apply typologies and indicators to real contexts. Here one may be able to see how these built categories play out. Despite raising the problem of state-centred research interest (cf. Vink 2017), this approach allows to question the very databases which are available, the political-economy of data-creation and funding of research.

As a conclusion, we would like to encourage rethinking commonly known concepts of 'integration' as mechanisms of governing social cohesion. Assessment of state's performances on migrant integration and the impact on social cohesion are strengthened by the (b)ordering lens, considering current challenges in changing societies. Thinking processes of (b)ordering and the reification of integration together would enable to develop this subject and provide new insights to further destabilise migration research which still all too often relies on essentialist categories and (re)produces hegemonic knowledge (Dahinden 2016). Such a view would imply to deepen research on 'integration' as a governmental tactic which facilitates, rather than counteracts, forms of discrimination, racialisation and othering. Hence, the question of how 'integration' actually further 'integrates' (b)ordering practices into the mundane practices of authorities, bureaucracies and legal actors becomes a very pressing one.

References

- Achermann, Christin. 2013. 'Excluding the Unwanted: Dealing with Foreign-National Offenders in Switzerland'. In *Politik Der Inklusion Und Exklusion*, edited by Ilker Ataç and Sieglinde Rosenberger, 91–109.
- Akin, Arkan, and Elisa Banfi. 2019. 'Depoliticizing Integration through Statistical Indicators'. *Journal of Political Power* 12 (1): 86–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2019.1573612>.
- Akin, Arkan, and Stefanie Kurt. n.d. 'The Logics of Integration Policy in Switzerland' forthcoming.
- Anderson, Bridget, Matthew J. Gibney, and Emanuela Paoletti. 2011. 'Citizenship, Deportation and the Boundaries of Belonging'. *Citizenship Studies* 15 (5): 547–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2011.583787>.
- Banki, Susan. 2013. 'Precarity of Place: A Complement to the Growing Precariat Literature'. *Global Discourse* 3 (3–4): 450–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23269995.2014.881139>.
- Bauböck, Rainer, Eva Ersboll, Kees Groenendijk, and Harald Waldrauch, eds. 2006. *Acquisition and Loss of Nationality: Policies and Trends in 15 European States*. IMISCOE Research. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Belabas, Warda, and Lasse Gerrits. 2017. 'Going the Extra Mile? How Street-Level Bureaucrats Deal with the Integration of Immigrants'. *Social Policy & Administration* 51 (1): 133–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12184>.
- Bird, Karen. 2005. 'The Political Representation of Visible Minorities in Electoral Democracies: A Comparison of France, Denmark, and Canada'. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 11 (4): 425–65.
- Bjerre, Liv, Marc Helbling, Friederike Römer, and Malisa Zobel. 2015. 'Conceptualizing and Measuring Immigration Policies: A Comparative Perspective'. *International Migration Review* 49 (3): 555–600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12100>.

- Bloemraad, Irene. 2015. 'Theorizing and Analyzing Citizenship in Multicultural Societies'. *The Sociological Quarterly* 56 (4): 591–606. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tsq.12095>.
- Bonjour, Saskia, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2018. 'The "Migrant with Poor Prospects": Racialized Intersections of Class and Culture in Dutch Civic Integration Debates'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41 (5): 882–900. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01419870.2017.1339897>.
- Borrelli, Lisa Marie. 2019. 'The Border Inside – Organizational Socialization of Street-Level Bureaucrats in the European Migration Regime'. *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 0 (0): 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2019.1676815>.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- . 2010. 'Migration, Membership, and the Modern Nation-State: Internal and External Dimensions of the Politics of Belonging'. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 41 (1): 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jinh.2010.41.1.61>.
- Casas-Cortes, Maribel, Sebastian Cobarrubias, Nicholas De Genova, Glenda Garelli, Giorgio Grappi, Charles Heller, Sabine Hess, et al. 2015. 'New Keywords: Migration and Borders'. *Cultural Studies* 29 (1): 55–87. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09502386.2014.891630>.
- Chauvin, Sébastien, Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas, and Albert Kraler. 2013. 'Working for Legality: Employment and Migrant Regularization in Europe'. *International Migration* 51 (6): 118–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12109>.
- Colombo, M. 2017. 'The Representation of the "European Refugee Crisis" in Italy: Domopolitics, Securitization, and Humanitarian Communication in Political and Media Discourses'. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 0 (0): 1–18.
- Crawley, Heaven, and Dimitris Skleparis. 2018. 'Refugees, Migrants, Neither, Both: Categorical Fetishism and the Politics of Bounding in Europe's "Migration Crisis"'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (1): 48–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1348224>.
- Dahinden, Janine. 2016. 'A Plea for the "de-Migrantization" of Research on Migration and Integration'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (13): 2207–25. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01419870.2015.1124129>.
- Dancygier, Rafaela M., and David D. Laitin. 2014. 'Immigration into Europe: Economic Discrimination, Violence, and Public Policy'. *Annual Review of Political Science* 17 (1): 43–64. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-082012-115925>.
- Darling, Jonathan. 2011. 'Domopolitics, Governmentality and the Regulation of Asylum Accommodation'. *Political Geography* 30 (5): 263–71. <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0962629811000643>.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2017. 'Introduction: The Borders of "Europe" and the European Question'. In *The Borders of 'Europe': Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering*, edited by Nicholas De Genova. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Dronkers, J., and Maarten Peter Vink. 2012. 'Explaining Access to Citizenship in Europe: How Citizenship Policies Affect Naturalization Rates'. *European Union Politics* 13 (3): 390–412. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116512440510>.
- Eidgenössisches Justiz- und Polizeidepartement EJPD. 2015. 'Erläuternder Bericht Vernehmlassungsentwurf zur Verordnung zum Bürgerrechtsgesetz'.
- Ellermann, Antje. 2019. 'Discrimination in Migration and Citizenship'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1561053>.
- Ersanilli, Evelyn, and Ruud Koopmans. 2010. 'Rewarding Integration? Citizenship Regulations and the Socio-Cultural Integration of Immigrants in the Netherlands, France and Germany'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (5): 773–791.

- Fassin, Didier. 2011. 'Policing Borders, Producing Boundaries. The Governmentality of Immigration in Dark Times'. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40 (1): 213–26. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-anthro-081309-145847>.
- Federal Act on Foreign Nationals and Integration*. 2019. <https://www.admin.ch/opc/en/classified-compilation/20020232/index.html>.
- Federal Act on Swiss Citizenship*. 2018. <https://www.admin.ch/opc/en/classified-compilation/20092990/index.html>.
- Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation*. 1999. <https://www.admin.ch/opc/en/classified-compilation/19995395/index.html>.
- Fischer, Carolin, and Janine Dahinden. 2016. 'Gender Representations in Politics of Belonging: An Analysis of Swiss Immigration Regulation from the 19th Century until Today'. *Ethnicities* 17 (4): 445–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796816676844>.
- Goodman, Sara Wallace. 2019. 'The Civic Integration Turn'. In *The Routledge Handbook of the Politics of Migration in Europe*, edited by Agnieszka Weinar, Saskia Bonjour, and Lyubov Zhyznomirska, 167–79. London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hadj Abdou, Leila. 2019. 'Immigrant Integration: The Governance of Ethno-Cultural Differences'. *Comparative Migration Studies* 7 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0124-8>.
- Hainmueller, Jens, and Daniel Hangartner. 2013. 'Who Gets a Swiss Passport? A Natural Experiment in Immigrant Discrimination'. *American Political Science Review* 107 (1): 159–87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000494>.
- Hainmueller, Jens, Dominik Hangartner, and Giuseppe Pietrantuono. 2017. 'Catalyst or Crown: Does Naturalization Promote the Long-Term Social Integration of Immigrants?' *American Political Science Review* 111 (2): 256–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000745>.
- Heckmann, Friedrich, and Dominique Schnapper, eds. 2003. *The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies: National Differences and Trends of Convergence*. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
- Helbling, Marc. 2014. 'Opposing Muslims and the Muslim Headscarf in Western Europe'. *European Sociological Review* 30 (2): 242–57. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jct038>.
- Houtum, Henk van. 2012. 'Remapping Borders'. *A Companion to Border Studies*, 405–18.
- Houtum, Henk van, and Ton van Naerssen. 2002. 'Bordering, Ordering and Othering'. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 93 (2): 125–36. <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1467-9663.00189>.
- Huddleston, Thomas, Ozge Bilgili, Anne-Linde Joki, and Zvezda Vankova. 2015. 'Migrant Integration Policy Index 2015', edited by Migrant Policy Group (Brussels 2015), . <http://mipex.eu>.
- Huddleston, Thomas, and Maarten Peter Vink. 2013. 'Membership and/or Rights?: Analysing the Link between Naturalisation and Integration Policies for Immigrants in Europe'. <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/28121>.
- Joppke, Christian. 2017. 'Citizenship in Immigration States'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*, edited by Ayelet Shachar, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad, and Maarten Vink. Oxford: Oxford Handbooks Online.
- Kelsen, Hans. 1949. *General Theory of Law and State*. 3rd ed. Vol. 1. The 20th Century Legal Philosophy Series. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Khosravi, Shahram. 2010. *'Illegal' Traveller: An Auto-Ethnography of Borders*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=668040>.
- Koopmans, Ruud. 2013. 'Indices of Immigrant Rights: What Have We Learned, Where Should We Go?' *Comparative European Politics* 11 (5): 696–703. <https://doi.org/10.1057/cep.2013.17>.
- Koopmans, Ruud, and Ines Michalowski. 2017. 'Why Do States Extend Rights to Immigrants? Institutional Settings and Historical Legacies Across 44 Countries Worldwide'. *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (1): 41–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414016655533>.

- Koopmans, Ruud, Ines Michalowski, and Stine Waibel. 2012. 'Citizenship Rights for Immigrants: National Political Processes and Cross-National Convergence in Western Europe, 1980–2008'. *American Journal of Sociology* 117 (4): 1202–45. <https://doi.org/10.1086/662707>.
- Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Marco Giugni, and Florence Passy. 2005. *Contested Citizenship*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press. <https://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/contested-citizenship>.
- Korteweg, Anna C. 2017. 'The Failures of "Immigrant Integration": The Gendered Racialized Production of Non-Belonging'. *Migration Studies* 5 (3): 428–44. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnx025>.
- Kraler, Albert. 2018. 'Regularization of Irregular Migrants and Social Policies: Comparative Perspectives'. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 0 (0): 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2018.1522561>.
- Kraler, Albert, David Reichel, and Han Entzinger. 2015. 'Migration Statistics in Europe: A Core Component of Governance and Population Research'. In *Integrating Immigrants in Europe*, edited by Peter Scholten, Han Entzinger, Rinus Penninx, and Stijn Verbeek, 39–58. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16256-0_3.
- Kurt, Stefanie. 2017a. 'Fast-Tracking Full Citizenship in the Context of the Swiss Integration Stage Model'. Working Paper #5, October 2017, NCCR WP15,.
- . 2017b. 'A Modest Start: Integration Policies in the Field of Asylum'. *Nccr – on the Move, Highlights #2* (blog). October 2017.
- . 2018. 'Sprechen Und Schreiben Sie Deutsch? Niveau A1, A2 Oder B1?' *Nccr – on the Move, Blog* (blog). 1 February 2018. <https://blog.nccr-onthemove.ch/sprechen-und-schreiben-sie-deutsch-niveau-a1-a2-oder-b1/?lang=de>.
- Lindberg, Annika, and Lisa Marie Borrelli. 2019. 'All Quiet on the "Eastern Front"? Controlling Transit Migration in Latvia and Lithuania'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1575719>.
- Manatschal, Anita. 2011. 'Taking Cantonal Variations of Integration Policy Seriously — or How to Validate International Concepts at the Subnational Comparative Level'. *Swiss Political Science Review* 17 (3): 336–57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1662-6370.2011.02027.x>.
- Manatschal, Anita, and Isabelle Stadelmann-Steffen. 2013. 'Cantonal Variations of Integration Policy and Their Impact on Immigrant Educational Inequality'. *Comparative European Politics* 11 (5): 671–95. <https://doi.org/10.1057/cep.2013.16>.
- Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2013. *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Morris, Lydia. 2002. *Managing Migration: Civic Stratification and Migrants' Rights*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Novak, Paolo. 2017. 'Back to Borders'. *Critical Sociology* 43 (6): 847–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920516644034>.
- Parker, Noel, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2009. 'Lines in the Sand? Towards an Agenda for Critical Border Studies'. *Geopolitics* 14 (3): 582–87. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14650040903081297>.
- Probst, Johanna, Gianni D'Amato, Samantha Dunning, Denise Efonayi-Mäder, Joëlle Fehlmann, Andreas Perret, Didier Ruedin, and Irina Sille. 2019. 'Kantonale Spielräume Im Wandel'. SFM-Bericht 73. Neuchâtel: Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies.
- Rajaram, Prem Kumar, and Carl Grundy-Warr, eds. 2007. *Borderscapes. Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*. Borderlines Series 29. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rajkumar, Deepa, Laurel Berkowitz, Leah F. Vosko, Valerie Preston, and Robert Latham. 2012. 'At the Temporary–Permanent Divide: How Canada Produces Temporariness and Makes Cit-

- izens through Its Security, Work, and Settlement Policies'. *Citizenship Studies* 16 (3–4): 483–510. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2012.683262>.
- Rosas, Gilberto. 2006. 'The Thickening Borderlands: Diffused Exceptionality and "Immigrant" Social Struggles during the "War on Terror"'. *Cultural Dynamics* 18 (3): 335–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0921374006071618>.
- Ruedin, Didier. 2011. 'Conceptualizing the Integration of Immigrants and Other Groups'. *COMPAS Working Paper* 89.
- . 2015. 'Increasing Validity by Recombining Existing Indices: MIPEX as a Measure of Citizenship Models*'. *Social Science Quarterly* 96 (2): 629–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12162>.
- Ruedin, Didier, Camilla Alberti, and Gianni D'Amato. 2015. 'Immigration and Integration Policy in Switzerland, 1848 to 2014'. *Swiss Political Science Review* 21 (1): 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12144>.
- Schinkel, Willem. 2018. 'Against "Immigrant Integration": For an End to Neocolonial Knowledge Production'. *Comparative Migration Studies* 6 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1>.
- Schnapper, Dominique. 2007. *Qu'est-Ce Que l'intégration?* Paris: Editions Gallimard.
- Simonsen, Kristina Bakkær. 2016. 'How the Host Nation's Boundary Drawing Affects Immigrants' Belonging'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (7): 1153–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2016.1138854>.
- Suvarierol, Semin, and Katherine Kirk. 2015. 'Dutch Civic Integration Courses as Neoliberal Citizenship Rituals'. *Citizenship Studies* 19 (3–4): 248–66. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13621025.2015.1006578>.
- Tuckett, Anna. 2017. "'The Island Is Full. Please Don't Come": Narratives of Austerity and Migration in a UK Citizenship Class'. *Anthropology Today* 33 (5): 24–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8322.12381>.
- Van der Brug, Wouter, Gianni D'Amato, Joost Berkhout, and Didier Ruedin, eds. 2015. *The Politicisation of Migration*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vaughan-Williams, Nick. 2008. 'Borderwork beyond Inside/Outside? Frontex, the Citizen-Detective and the War on Terror'. *Space and Polity* 12 (1): 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562570801969457>.
- Vink, Maarten. 2017. 'Comparing Citizenship Regimes'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*, edited by Ayelet Shachar, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad, and Maarten Vink. Oxford: Oxford Handbooks Online. <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198805854.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780198805854-e-10>.
- Walters, William. 2004. 'Secure Borders, Safe Haven, Domopolitics'. *Citizenship Studies* 8 (3): 237–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102042000256989>.
- Wichmann, Nicole, M. Hermann, Gianni D'Amato, Denise Efonayi-Mäder, R. Fibbi, J. Menet, and Didier Ruedin. 2011. 'Gestaltungsräume Im Föderalismus: Migrationspolitik in Den Kantonen'. Bern: EKM.