Citizenship and Emplacement:
Processes and practices of inclusion of newcomers
by

Maja Korac-Sanderson
School of Law and Social Sciences
University of East London
UK

> 'To what state I belong now [after the experience of displacement] is a purely practical matter. I don't feel that I belong to any state but I have to have someone's passport.'
> *[Mirsad, fled Bosnia. At the time of interview he was 25 years old and living in Rome seven years]*

In this paper I examine the relationship between the right to establish home in the receiving society and the series of practices of 'nesting', 'home-making' and becoming 'of place'. Understanding of this relationship is important because integration and active participation of newcomers in receiving societies is not only about legally established, formal citizenship rights. Within this state constructed discourse being a member is linked to the notion of a 'right baring citizen' who 'belongs' to 'a national society of citizens' (Holston&Appadurai 1996), which is linked to a territorial nation state. However, how people integrate in the receiving society is also centrally linked to informal practices of social inclusion or strategies 'from below', which link diverse people, as individuals and groups in different local settings, predominantly cities, in which they struggle to regain control over and reconstruct their lives.

Consequently, citizenship viewed as a marker of belonging and entitlement linked to institutional, political and economic realms of the receiving society has become too narrowly defined concept to enable understanding of contemporary formations and meanings of citizenship (Neveu *et al.* 2011). In this sense, the grassroots strategies of inclusion may be better appreciated at the level of the city (Varsanyi 2006) and at the level of neighbourhood. The latter is important for conceptualising the local community as based on the *common space* characterised by propinquity of a neighbour (Bulmer, 1986) and the potential for social reproduction and change (Appadurai 1996: 179). In other words, approaching citizenship as a social process (Flores and Benmayor 1997, Isin 2000, Dagnino 2003) enables us to examine and understand how people experience citizenship in their everyday lives (Coll 2010:5). In conceptualizing citizenship, therefore, it is important to broaden it to include human relationships, subjectivity, and feelings (Coll 2004: 188). By doing so, we acknowledge it as multilayered and multifaceted, involving mutually constituted and also often overlapping realms of experience (Coll 2010: 114).

The discussion of the processes and practices of inclusion of newcomers is in this paper set within this conceptual framework. I argue that central to any consideration of citizenship as social process involving immigrants is the concept of emplacement. It refers to the multifaceted processes by which newcomers develop a sense of belonging and become 'of place'. The following discussion are reflections based on an earlier ethnographic work about integration practices articulated by refugees from Bosnia as well as other Yugoslav successor states, who by stroke of luck or choice found themselves living in Rome and Amsterdam since the early to mid 1990s (Korac 2009).

Formal citizenship as non-belonging

Research and studies demonstrate that formal citizenship is primarily relevant to refugees and other migrants as the right to remain indefinitively in the receiving society, that is: as the right to return (de Haas 2005; Korac 2009). The lack of this right profoundly affects life options for all migrants, particularly refugees. In this sense, the right to return is fundamental indeed. The lack of formal citizenship rights is also experienced as a 'humiliating' and 'degrading' experience, as studies demonstrate, because it is linked to the

life options for all migrants, particularly refugees. In this sense, the right to return is fundamental indeed. The lack of formal citizenship rights is also experienced as a 'humiliating' and 'degrading' experience, as studies demonstrate, because it is linked to the state imposed notion of 'not belonging', linked to the 'conquest of the state by the nation' (Isin & Turner 2007). These state imposed notions of belonging increasingly do not reflect experiences and aspirations of immigrants themselves. As indicated by Mirsad's words quoted at the beginning of this article, the meaning of membership in a (new) society is no longer perceived by immigrants and refugees in particular, as being linked to nationality and territories of nation-states. Rather, it is primarily viewed as the access to freedom of travel and movement (Korac 2009).

Citizenship is indeed about more than the legal rights that newcomers hope to acquire. As the rapidly growing literature demonstrates (Walby, 1994;Yuval-Davis and Anthias, 1989; Lister, 1997; Hall and Held, 1990; Rosaldo, 1994; Ong, 1996; De Genova and Ramos-Zayas, 2003; Bell and Binnie, 2000; Soysal, 1994; Bhabha, 1998; Goldring), a growing number of historically excluded groups, such as women, people of colour and diasporic communities, lesbians and gays, as well as transnational migrants no longer perceives formal expressions of citizenship as defined by states as a means of fostering active participation in society and its legal and political structures. Hence, it is not surprising that more recently arrived immigrants, including refugees, have similar experiences and views.

For example, among the Bosnian and other refugees who fled war-torn Yugoslavia and who were involved in my study about their 'home-making' practices and experiences in Rome and Amsterdam, participation in the political arena and democratic processes by voting in Italy and Netherlands was not perceived as an important indicator of being included, even after almost ten years in both countries/cities (Korac 2009). Reasons for this are threefold. Participants in my research overwhelmingly belonged to the generation of people brought up in an undemocratic political system, which shaped their perception of mainstream politics and political participation as a 'dirty business'. This conviction, shared by all, was only strengthened by their experiences of the first so-called 'democratic', multi-party political elections in Yugoslavia, in 1990, which they found deeply disappointing. Their subsequent experiences of the limitations of representative forms of democracy in capturing heterogeneity of interests and identities in the receiving societies were not conducive to changing their attitudes. The fact that, 'not many people vote here', as many of the people involved in my research remarked in relation to the situation in Italy and the Netherlands, has also contributed to the perception that the right to participate in mainstream politics is not a highly important and valued mechanism of inclusion.

In addition to this lack of interest to become an integral part of the mainstream politics, many immigrants also may not see a niche for themselves within the context of ethnic minority group politics in the receiving society. This was certainly the case with many of Bosnian and other refugees involved in my study (Korac 2009). Because of growing diversity, particularly in cities, it is becoming increasingly important to understand practices of inclusion 'from below' and acknowledge them by developing policies that enhance both formal as well as diverse informal 'acts of citizenship' (Isin & Nielsen 2008). Narrow legal approach obscures the multiplicity of ways in which many people of diverse nationalities and immigration statuses act to claim their rights as entitled political subjects (Coll 2004).Indeed, for disadvantaged and marginalised groups such as refugees, active political participation can also be defined in terms of participation in informal politics. Negotiation with welfare state institutions, for example, may be a much more pertinent practice of political engagement to these groups than participation in mainstream politics (Anthias 2002).

If citizenship rights are perceived as status, signifying formal rather than active participation and inclusion, how the people who are 'managed' and 'guided' by the policies of receiving states actually 'nest' themselves in the new socio-cultural settings?

Diversity requires new forms of public interaction, dialogue, and civic, non-ethnic, participation that are tied through new forms of informal citizenship practices. This implies the growing importance of place, as locales, such as cities in which newcomers mostly settle, for defining and enacting membership in (new) society, rather than nation-states. Culturally diverse communities can find the basis of commonality in place-based attachments and civil integration at the local level. The local level and the city in particular, increasingly assume new centrality in the current European setting.

Emplacement: The centrality of agency and context

Central to any considerations of citizenship as a social process linked to the issues of immigration and immigrant integration is the concept of emplacement. Originally coined within the field of refugee studies as 'a flipside of displacement' (Malkki 1995) and further

Central to any considerations of citizenship as a social process linked to the issues of immigration and immigrant integration is the concept of emplacement. Originally coined within the field of refugee studies as 'a flipside of displacement' (Malkki 1995) and further developed within the integration debate by Korac (2009) and Brettell and Reed-Danahay (2012), emplacement refers to the processes that shape how newcomers become actively engaged citizens and how they develop a sense of belonging to the new society and become 'of place'. Hence, it refers to the intersection of a range of 'place' and 'home-making' strategies of differently situated individuals and groups of newcomers in specific contexts and points in time.

Processes of emplacement are embedded in different types of connection, emerging forms of interaction, and networks of social relations through which newcomers forge a place for themselves in a new society, create meaning and form attachments (Korac 2009). Thus, integral to the emplacement processes are newcomers, immigrants and refugees, understood as agents who are actively engaged in the processes of regaining control over and reconstructing their lives in the receiving societies. As a sense of place is developed through various forms of social relations, it is tied through the interaction of structure and agency. This process is influenced by the intersection of micro and macro structures of power.

States dominate and dictate both immigration and integration rules. However, the patterns, logic, forms, and practices of 'travelling towards home' and home-making of newcomers increasingly do not fit them. Scholarly literature, policy documents as well as public debate on immigration and integration overwhelmingly emphasise the agency of the structural and institutional domains of the receiving states. There is no doubt that immigrants, particularly refugees, and receiving states are unequal partners, because the state is critical in determining their opportunities. However, primary focus on the agency of the receiving state and its institutional mechanisms leaves us without much insight into the kinds of meaning newcomers attach to citizenship of the receiving state and how they strategies their inclusion and participation in the receiving society.

Putting im/migrants as social actors centre stage and the acknowledgement of the power of context is the recognition that macro is not the only site of power. The centrality of context puts emphasis on the importance of micro, everyday relations of power. Foucault's (1980:98) notion of power as something that circulates, that is never localised here or there, but employed and exercised through a net-like organization is useful for understanding of these micro nods of power. He recognizes that individuals are not only inert or consenting targets of power, its points of application. They are always also the elements of its articulation or the vehicles of power (*ibid*.). Therefore, Foucault's notion of power is particularly relevant for understanding im/migrants as social actors.

In specific contexts of emplacement, therefore, individual and group social positioning and local dynamics intersect with structural and global dynamics in different ways. This process is critically shaped by im/migrants themselves through their vision, human capital and aspirations. These are negotiated at different levels and scale of organization through networks of relations with a range of actors, including various level institutional and non-institutional structures. Agency is hence 'embodied in social relations' (Long 2001: 15).

Consequently, the centrality of context in approaching immigrants as social actors enables understanding of how specific contexts, viewed as a nexus of global and local structures, shape their everyday practices. Put differently, as ground level social reality contains important dimensions of global processes (Burawoy *et al.* 2000), the context here is understood as a complex system of intersecting structures and conditions. Emplacement, hence, always occurs in specific locations and is characterised by shifting identities and the changing character of belonging. Rather than being fixed, claims and attributes of group belonging are situated and produced in complex and shifting locales, that is, in a 'translocational' sphere characterised by the interplay of a range of locations and dislocations in relation to ethnicity, national belonging, gender, class and race (Anthias 2001: 634).

Putting newcomers and their agency centre stage in discussing the relationship between citizenship and emplacement is enabling our understanding of how they, as people with individual histories, in particular contexts, locales and in specific points in time, strategise and negotiate between continuity and change, existential needs and longer-term life plans, old loyalties and new identities. The intersection of all these processes and practices constitutes integration and shapes experiences as well as meanings attached to citizenship. Central to this process, which is not linear or stage-sequential, are social networks through which they rub along, bond and bridge in places in which they (are allowed to) settle.

Central to this process, which is not linear or stage-sequential, are social networks through which they rub along, bond and bridge in places in which they (are allowed to) settle.

The role of social networks in emplacement

Negotiating entry in the new society, as well as the process of becoming 'of place', are shaped by different forms of contact established by refugees and other newcomers. Through various forms of social interaction they struggle to create a meaningful life and place for themselves in the receiving societies. Many of the contacts they establish and networks they create are initiated and tied through the institutional structures of particular local settings (e.g. church organisations, community groups, NGOs, municipality). Increasingly, as studies demonstrate, links are also established in cyberspace, as new social media are not only new communication channels in migration networks, but they actively transform the nature of these networks (Dekker and Engbersen 2012).Hence, internet and social media connections and opportunities are contributing to multiple configurations of social networks involving different agents (van Meeteren and Pereira 2013). Forms of social interaction can also be established through semi-invisible micro-links of sociability linked to more informal contacts between diverse groups of people in urban areas in which they 'rub along together' and in some contexts and circumstances develop a positive web of support. Although some argue that 'avoidance is part of modern city living' (Scheffer 2011: 47), cities are also places of encounter. Jane Jacobs (1961), quite a few decades ago, pointed to the importance of social networks developed through seemingly 'unpurposeful' and 'random' contacts of neighbours in cities through which they form social networks and relationships of trust.

Some of these informal networks of support are embedded in *bonding* social networks, established among co-ethnics thus within the (ethnic) group boundaries. The importance of social networks among co-ethnics for the process of adaptation of newly arrived has long been established (e.g. Gurak&Caces, 1992; Lamba & Krahn 2003; Williams 2006; Jasinskaja-Lahti *et al*. 2006; Beaman 2012). They can be indeed instrumental for *getting by and getting on with life*. Some authors argue that this type of connecting represents a protective strategy, because ethnic networks can represent safe havens for socially and culturally excluded immigrant groups (e.g. Barnes 2001; Reinsch 2001).

My research, in which I explored lived-in worlds of refugees by focusing on different types of connection and networks of social relations, points out to the important role of these emerging forms of interaction, particularly to the value of so-called bridging social networks between newcomers and the majority local populations (Korac 2009). Through these networks of social relations they create meaning and form attachments. In doing so, they forge a place for themselves in the new society. I argue that examination of the importance and the role of social ties should go beyond consideration of co-ethnic links. It requires recognition of greater differentiation of networks among migrants, those established along horizontal (i.e. co-ethnic) and vertical (i.e. minority-majority) lines, as well as spatially and temporarily. Moreover, studies indicate that co-ethnic networks are often loosely conceptualised, as well as that there is a lack of attention and research about how migrants establish ties with the receiving community and what is the role of this type of networks (Korac 2009, Ryan *et al.* 2008).

Indeed, a positive web of support that is created through *bridging* social networks can be and often is a critical resource for re-establishing lives of refugees and other immigrants. However, minority-majority bridging social networks have most often been regarded within the migration and integration literature as a by-product of so-called successful integration of individuals who, as some argue, 'normally cluster together and develop their own infrastructure' (Castles 2000: 199), but in time, so-called 'successful immigrants' make links with mainstream 'social frameworks'.

It is important to challenge the notion that it is somehow natural for newcomers to cluster together. This notion implies that ethnic and cultural boundaries are fixed, embedded in shared and unchanging norms, values, as well as a sense of belonging to community, defined in the singular. It also suggests that newcomers themselves first and foremost aim to 'nest' themselves within a co-ethnic milieu. These interpretations within academic and public discourses are linked to the notion of 'community' to which somehow all people coming from the same country naturally belong, or for which they strive. Such notion can straightjacket our understanding of the processes of nesting of refugees and other immigrants who may have, and often do, different ideas about connecting and belonging.

Moreover, within the refugee context, the understanding of community often has specific connotations. Such is the case of people coming from Bosnia and other Yugoslav

who may have, and often do, different ideas about connecting and belonging.

Moreover, within the refugee context, the understanding of community often has specific connotations. Such is the case of people coming from Bosnia and other Yugoslav successor states, for example. The character of conflicts they were fleeing brought to the attention of the international media, public, political, and academic realms the issue of ethnic difference, the grievances, and animosities within the region. As a consequence, interpreting and understanding these differences and constructing the 'identity' and the 'community' of those labelled by their ethnicity became central to approaching people from the war-torn country as well as to creating knowledge and policies. They become embedded in neatly structured categories linked to an ethno-national, territorial mode of thinking within which there is no space for in-between categories and blurred boundaries of a very real human experiences. And yet, this territorial type of knowledge continues to inform academic and public debates as well as a range of policies that affect lives of people who are forcibly displaced.

My research shows, however, that refugees from war-torn Yugoslavia were involved in active cross-ethnic networking which was both desired and also often necessary (Korac 2009). Moreover, they themselves often identified bridging social links with local populations as highly desirable and often preferable to co-ethnic ties. This was not necessarily linked to attempts to assimilate and lose ones' own distinct sense of identity and culture. Rather, bridging networks were perceived as a two-way communication that is central to the process of mutual adjustment and change that is paramount to social cohesion understood as people-to-people relations in (urban) places enabling them to live together differently. Acknowledgement and recognition of such aims and attempts to access close-knit local communities in places in which newcomers settle, is by no means to underestimate difficulties they confront in doing so (Korac 2009).

The lack of bridging social networks between newcomers and local populations is to a great extent constructed by and is a consequence of the fact that the organising principles for incorporating newcomers (including refugees) in most of the European receiving societies are conceptualised and based upon their identity and incorporation as ethnic groups or communities. This emphasis on the groups understood as 'ethnic communities' and on their (group) cultural rights is often seen as a way of mobilising their resources from within for integration purposes (Penninx 2003; 2004)**.** This approach has been at the core of multicultural policies of integration. Ethnicity is, however, only one dimension of diversity. It always intersects with other axes of difference, such as gender, age, class, occupation, physical ability etc. This emphasis on co-ethnic clustering in receiving societies and 'ethnic group incorporation' makes it difficult to recognise that the process of nesting is a multi-sided practice characterised by dialectic relationship between different types of connections that shape ways of incorporation of newcomers, including refugees.

Indeed, bridging links with majority groups can be established and in particular circumstances quite early on, as it was the case in my Roman study (Korac 2009; 2003). In such cases, these networks help refugees to *get by* and *ahead* with their lives by providing vital information, contacts, and by enhancing the use of the considerable human capital they bring to new urban settings. Very importantly, bridging contacts are also central to the process of *getting inside* and feeling 'of place'. This is because bridging links and networks not only channel information and provide access to resources, they also *interpret* information and articulate meaning and in this sense they serve as a *dictionary* to local urban settings as well as wider society and culture. This process is particularly important for the acquisition of substantive citizenship rights, which are acquired through social practice, rather than through law (Glick Schiller and Çağlar, 2008). Indeed, formal citizenship is linked to equality of social rights, but this is not automatically translated into social acceptance. The role of bridging social networks is an important part of the process of conversion of formal rights into substantive rights, because they are embedded in types of social practice that engender social acceptance, and challenge social isolation. In this sense, bridging social networks contribute to the creation of 'communities of practice' through which immigrants develop sense of belonging to the receiving society, as pointed out by Brettell and Reed-Danahay (2012).

The lack of bridging links to the receiving society and the resulting social isolation engender a sense of non-belonging. A telling example of the importance of 'bridging social networks' with the local, 'host' populations and the consequences of feeling socially isolated and therefore detached from the receiving society comes from my study of the place-making strategies of refugees from war-torn Yugoslavia in Amsterdam (Korac 2009). The lack of bridging social links with the Dutch caused a sense of insecurity concerning their legal status and newly acquired citizenship rights. Although the vast majority of those involved in my

strategies of refugees from war-torn Yugoslavia in Amsterdam (Korac 2009). The lack of bridging social links with the Dutch caused a sense of insecurity concerning their legal status and newly acquired citizenship rights. Although the vast majority of those involved in my research had Dutch citizenship, quite a few of them expressed a degree of uneasiness or even fear of a possibility of their citizenship being revoked if the political situation in the Netherlands was to change and somehow was to turn all non-native Dutch into undesired aliens.

Wallman's (1979) argument that a social boundary has two kinds of meaning, structural or organizational, and subjective, based on the experience of participants, helps explain this seemingly paradoxical situation. She suggests that: 'Because a social boundary is about the organization of society no more and no less than it is about the organization of experience, neither element has more or less reality than the other. Both the difference and the *sense* of difference count' (Wallman 1979: 7). Among the people in my Amsterdam study, the social distance from the Dutch was translated into doubts concerning equality of citizenship rights between the two groups. In the context of the Dutch 'integration model' to which they have been subjected, citizenship was perceived as yet another way of state control rather than a guarantee of equality and full participation. Therefore, if the acquisition of formal citizenship rights to inclusion and equality are not accompanied by bridging social networks in the receiving society, the organization of experience of refugees will remain strongly shaped by their feelings of 'otherness', perceptions of inequality and exclusion. Such experiences of exclusion cannot be overcome or changed by acquisition of formal citizenship rights.

The discussion so far focused on the processes of becoming 'of place' linked to the creation and role of social networks and related systems of social relations that are situated locally. Social networks of newcomers, however, create systems of social relations composed of networks of networks, also referred to as 'social fields', which are themselves embedded in power asymmetries (Glick Schiller and Çağlar, 2009: 179). These networks may be locally situated as well as extended nationally or transnationally (*ibid*).

Emplacement within transnational social fields

Transnationalism and the possibilities of transnational life strategies, as studies show (Glick Schiller, Basch, Szanton Blanc, 1995; Levitt 2001; 2003; Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller 2003; Goldring 2002), challenge the dominant conception of membership, integration and belonging linked to a single unitary realm of nation-state. Transnationalism increasingly allows for emplacement that entails multi-layered forms of membership and incorporation that reach across the borders of multiple states, placing different dimensions of home in 'transnational social spaces' (Faist 2000). Transnational links that cross the borders of states are emerging from the process of globalisation and increased migration. As the result of these processes, refugee (immigrant) communities are becoming importantly transnational in character. They are embedded in ties and networks crisscrossing national borders, which affect their daily lives in the receiving states and increasingly shape the meanings of belonging and orientation to place.

Experiences of transnationalism affect the ways in which newcomers conceptualise place; it often becomes conceptualised through different but complementary dimensions of home, associated with the different material, sociocultural and symbolic resources of each place. In this process of emplacement, it is the receiving society that is usually perceived as the 'practical' home (Graham and Khosravi 1997) associated with the material and legal 'security dimension' of place (Eastmond 2006). Conversely, the country of origin is perceived as the 'cultural-spiritual home' (Graham and Khosravi 1997) linked to the 'emotional dimension' and fulfilment it offers (Eastmond 2006).

When missing dimensions of home, such as a specific form of sociability extending beyond family and kinship ties, cannot be re-created in physical reality, through regular reunions for example, immigrants often create them in the virtual reality of cyberspace. Moving across borders in cyberspace allows them to piece in virtual spaces into the 'place' in which they feel at home (Eastmond 2006; Graham and Khosravi 2002). In this sense, 'cyberspace can be an alternative "territory," where a transnational community or a virtual neighbourhood can be constructed' (Graham and Khosravi 2002: 228).

Transnational cyberspace practices generate richness and diversity of ideas and social relations. Therefore, cyberspace territories, like real territories, provide a site where the meaning of ethnic or national identity is reshaped. Cyberspace connections and networks of compatriots across borders encompass national and transnational processes (Graham and Khosravi 2002). Consequently, depending on specific circumstances and contexts, as in real space, cyberspace activities may either deterritorialise identities or intensify them as well as

compatriots across borders encompass national and transnational processes (Graham and Khosravi 2002). Consequently, depending on specific circumstances and contexts, as in real space, cyberspace activities may either deterritorialise identities or intensify them as well as produce 'a passion for locality' in the form of 'cyberspace nostalgia'.

The discussion so far demonstrated that newcomers link and engage with their new and old homes through various types of transnational practices. Through these processes they negotiate a way of being and a way of belonging, to borrow from Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004), and combine them into one experience and social field. The acknowledgement of the processes of emplacement in transnational social fields, requires moving beyond 'container theory of society' (Beck 2000; Faist 2000; Urry 2000), and focusing on 'transnational social fields', as defined by Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004). This provides the opportunity to trace concrete movement and connection of people within social fields, which are multidimensional and their boundaries are not contiguous with those of nation-states (*ibid.*). By the same token, as Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) point out, the concept of social field challenges the notion of neat divisions of connection into local, national, transnational, and global.

Emplacement in transnational social fields also means that newcomers 'settle' in-between, often both as a way of being as well as the way of belonging. This state of 'betwixt and between' (Turner 1967: 93) is a consequence of the separation that is inherent in (forced) migration and therefore is part and parcel of the very nature of the experiences of (forced) migrants. In this sense, they as social agents embody processes of a radical social change characterised by a set of continuously intersecting processes linking local and global structures and settings, past and present, victimisation and resilience, here and there. Their experiences are characterised by dynamism as well as ambiguity, anxiety and often also fear. This in-between space they inhabit is radically different from the world of binaries characterising conventional knowledge as well as the public discourse on (forced) migrants, such as: bogus/genuine, legal/illegal, integrated/segregated. Because their lifeworlds inhabit spaces between borders and boundaries defined by territorial, cultural, cognitive and emotional codes, much of their experiences are about blurred boundaries and in-between categories.

Scholars have been pointing to the shortcomings of the binary construction of knowledge (e.g. Said 1978) and recognising the between as a space from which to challenge it. Stoller (2009), following Bhabha's (1994) concept of 'interstices' emphasises how 'dwelling in the between' can also be 'illuminating'. In this sense, in-betweenness is a place of 'provocative linkages' (Stoller 2009). These 'imaginative interstices' (Stoller 2009) linked to transnational practices of emplacement within social fields also challenge the conventional understanding of citizenship, which links rights and loyalties exclusively to a single (nation) state.

Transnationalism and the meaning of citizenship

Meanings of state membership are changing, as evident from the provision of dual-state membership by an increasing number of (northern) states. Moreover, the endorsement of human rights principles governed by universal discourses embedded in international agreements and nation-states' constitutions, rather than the principle of sovereignty, are also affecting meanings of citizenship. Refugees and other migrants, as Faist (2000: 207) points out, are taking advantage of this growing tendency and the opportunities it creates to move around and make a place for themselves.

Through these transnational practices, some authors have argued, nation-states have become 'deterritorialized' (Basch et al.1994). Others claim, more convincingly, that the very concept of citizenship is changing. The international human rights regimes that transcend the jurisdiction of individual nation-states, political practices associated with so-called global civil society, as well as solidarity and identity shaped by transnational practices have all been indicators of the process of denationalising of citizenship (Bosniak 2001: 242–43; 2007).

However sound these and other arguments about postnational citizenship are, one has to remember that the potential of human rights discourse for refugees and other migrants is still limited. For them, to create a space and a possibility of having a home outside their homelands or to locate it in transnational social space is undermined by the fact that human rights discourse is still interpreted and enforced by nation-states (Xenos 1996: 243–44). In this sense, states still dictate migration rules, although the logic and forms of transnational mobility may increasingly not fit them. Moreover, over the past years, some (European) states have been attempting to counteract the transnational orientation of migrants by proposing the abolishment of dual nationality for third-generation migrants, and by discouraging dual nationality in general (de Haas 2005). For all these reasons, it would be

proposing the abolishment of dual nationality for third-generation migrants, and by discouraging dual nationality in general (de Haas 2005). For all these reasons, it would be obviously premature to claim that the logic of transnationalism has completely superseded national logic (Castles 2004: 212). Also, as the discussions in this paper and other studies demonstrate, transnationalism and transnational networks are always importantly connected to specific localities within nation-states.

With these points of caution in mind, studies including my own, strongly indicate that for many immigrants, and refugees in particular, it is actually the possibility of moving and not that of becoming 'rooted' in a particular place that is central to their place-making strategies and the complex process of emplacement in the receiving societies. In this sense, and in spite of the continuous importance of the nation-state, transnationalism, transnational links and strategies have deconstructed its notion in some important ways, making formal citizenship no longer the main locus of identity for many newcomers. Formal citizenship rights, specifically the right to indefinite residence, that is, to unconditional return, are making such place-making strategies possible, and are enhancing the process of emplacement of newcomers.

In lieu of conclusion

The discussion in this paper explored the relationship between formal citizenship rights and the processes by which newcomers develop feelings of attachment to the receiving state and society. Understanding of this relationship is important because integration is not only about legally established citizenship rights. I argued that how people integrate in the receiving society is centrally linked to informal practices of social inclusion or strategies 'from below', which link diverse people as individuals and groups in different local, translocal and transnational settings. The discussion pointed out that while the acquisition of formal citizenship rights is *sine qua non* for the establishment of transnational place-making strategies, citizenship as a status appears to be less central to the complex realm of belonging, and matters associated with becoming and being 'of place'. I argued that if newcomers are not successful in establishing bridging social networks and ties in the receiving societies, citizenship will have very little meaning and consequence for their experiences of inclusion and the sense of belonging. It remains a goal to be desired for its practical aspects, such as freedom of movement/travel and the formal right to establish a 'home'. The meaning and nature of 'home', however, is to be negotiated within the various specific contexts – those pertaining to individual immigrants, to localities and societies they come from as well as in which they struggle to settle.

References:

Anthias 2002 'Beyond Feminism and Multiculturalism: Locating Difference and the Politics of Location', *Women's Studies International Forum* 25(3): 275–86.

Anthias, F. 2001 'New Hybridities, old concepts: the limits of 'culture'. Ethnic and Racial Studies 24(4): 619–41.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minessota Press.

Barnes, D. 2001 'Resettled Refugees' Attacment to their Original and Subsequent *Homelands: Long-term Vietnamese Refugees in Australia', Journal of Refugee Studies* 14(4):395–411.

Basch, L., N. Glick-Schiller and C.S. Blank.1994. Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Post-Colonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Beck, U. (2000) 'The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology in the Second Age of Modernity', *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1):79-107

Bell, D. and J. Binnie. 2000. *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Beaman, L.A. 2012 'Social Networks and the Dynamics of Labour Market Outcomes: Evidence from Refugees Resettled in the U.S.': *Review of Economic Studies*, 79 (1): 128-161

Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Beaman, L.A. 2012 ‘Social Networks and the Dynamics of Labour Market Outcomes: Evidence from Refugees Resettled in the U.S.’; *Review of Economic Studies*, 79 (1): 128-161

Bhabha, J. 1998. ‘‘Get Back to Where You Once Belonged’’: Identity, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Europe. *Human Rights Quarterly* 20: 592–627.

Bhabha. H. 1994 *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Brettell, C. and D. Reed-Danahay 2012 *Civic Engagements: The Citizenship Practices of Indian and Vietnamese Immigrants*. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Bosniak, l. 2001 ‘Denationalizing Citizenship’, in T.A. Aleinikoff and D. Klusmeyer (eds) *Citizesnhip Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Bulmer, M. (ed) (1986). *Neighbours: The Work of Phillip Abrams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burawoy,M., J.A. Blum, S.G.Z. Gille, T. Gowan, L.Haney, M.K;awiter, S.H.Lopez, S.O.Riain, M.Thayer 2000 Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World. Berkeley and London: University of California Press

Castles, S. 2004 ‘Why Migration Policies Fail’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(2): 205–27.

Castles, S. 2000. *Ethnicity and Globalization*. London: Sage.

Coll, K., 2010. *Remaking citizenship: Latina immigrants and new American politics*. Stanford University Press.

Coll. K. 2004 ‘Necesidades y Problemas: Immigrant Latina Vernaculars of Belonging, Coalition & Citizenship in San Francisco, California’, *Latino Studies* 2004, 2, (186–209)

Dagnino, E. 1994. On Becoming a Citizen: The Story of Dona Marlene. In Migration and Identity, eds. Rina Benmayor and Andor Skotnes, Vol. III, pp 69–84, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Genova, N, and A. Y. Ramos-Zayas, eds. 2003. Latino Crossings: Racialization and Citizenship Between Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Chicago. New York: Routledge.

De Haas, H. 2005 *International Migration, Remittances and Development: Myths and Facts*. Global Migration Perspectives, Paper No. 30. Geneva: Global Commission on International Migration.

Dekker, R. and G. Engbersen 2012 *How social media transform migrant networks and facilitate migration*; IMI Working Papers, No 64, University of Oxford.

Eastmond, M. 2006 ‘Beyond Exile: Refugee Strategies in Transnational Contexts’, in F.Crépeau, D. Nakache, M. Collyer, N.H. Goetz, R. Modi, A. Nadig, S. Sˇ poljar-*Vrzˇ ina and L.H.M. van Willigen (eds) Forced Migration and Global Processes: A View from Forced Migration Studies*. Lanham: Lexington.

Faist, T. 2000.‘Transnationalization in International Migration: Implications for the *Study of Citizenship and Culture’, Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23(2):189–222.

Flores, W. and R. Benmayor. 1997. *Latino Cultural Citizenship*. Boston: Beacon

Foucault, M. 1980 Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings 1972–1977. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Giddens, A. 1984 *The Constitution of Society: An Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. 1984 *The Constitution of Society: An Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Glick Schiller, N. and A. Caglar (2009) 'Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies: Migrant Incorporation and City Scale'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 2

Glick Schiller, N. and A. Caglar, 2008'And Ye Shall Possess It, and Dwell Therein': Social Citizenship, Global Christianity, and Non-Ethnic Immigrant Incorporation. In *Immigration and Citizenship in Europe and the United States: Anthropological Perspectives,* D. Reed-Danahay and C. Brettell, eds. Rutgers University Press

Glick Schiller, N., L. Basch, C. Blanc-Szanton, 1995; 'From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration' *Anthropology Quarterly,* 68(1):48-63

Goldring, L. 2002 'The Mexican State and Transmigrant Organizations: Negotiating the Boundaries of Membership and Participation', *Latin American Research Review* 37(3):55-99.

Goldring, L. 2001. The Gender and Geography of Citizenship in Mexico–US Transnational Spaces. *Identities* 7: 501–537.

Graham, M and S. Khosravi 2002. 'Reordering Public and Private in Iranian Cyberspace: Identity, Politics, and Mobilization', *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 9(2): 219–46.

Graham, M and S. Khosravi 1997. 'Home is Where You Make It: Repatriation and *Diaspora Culture among Iranians in Sweden', Journal of Refugee Studies* 10(2):115–33.

Guarnizo, L.E., A. Portes, and W. Haller 2003 'Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants' *American Journal of Sociology* 108(6):1211-48.

Gurak, D.T. and F. Caces.1992. 'Migration Networks and the Shaping of Migration *Systems', in M. Kritz, L. Lim, and H. Zlotnik (eds) International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hall, S., and D. Held. 1990. Citizens and Citizenship. In New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s, eds. Stuart Hall and Martin Jacque, pp. 172–188. New York: Verso.

Heater, D. 1990. *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*. London: Longman.

Holston, J. and A. Appadurai (1996) 'Cities and Citizenship'; *Public Culture*, 8: 187-204

Isin, E., ed., 2000. *Democracy, citizenship and the global city*. New York: Routled

Isin, E. & G.M. Nielsen 2008 *Acts of Citizenship* London: Zed Books

Isin, E. & B.S.Turner 2007 'Investigating Citizenship: An Agenda for Citizenship Studies', *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1)5-17

Jacobs, J. 1961 *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*.New York: Random House.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., K. Liebkind, M. Jaakkola and A. Reuter 2006 'Among Three Immigrant Groups Perceived Discrimination, Social Support Networks, and Psychological Well-being'; *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 37(3): **293-311**

Korac, M. 2009 *Remaking Home: Reconstructing Life, Place and Identity in Rome and Amsterdam*. Oxford, New York: Berghahn Books

Korac, M. 2003 'The Lack of Integration Policy and Experiences of Integration: A Case Study of Refugees in Rome', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16(4): 398–42

Kouthari, U. 2001 'Power, Knowledge and Social Control in Participatory Development'. In

Study of Refugees in Rome', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16(4): 398–42

Kouthari, U. 2001 'Power, Knowledge and Social Control in Participatory Development'. In Cooke, B. and U. Kothari eds. Participation: The New Tyranny? London: Zed Books.

Lamba, N.K. & H.Krahn 2003 'Social capital and refugee resettlement: The social networks of refugees in Canada'; *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 4(3): 335-360

Levitt, P. 2003 'Keeping Feet in Both Worlds: Transnational Practices and Immigrant Incorporation'. In *Integrating Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States: From Post-Nationals to Transnational*. C. Joppke and E. Morawska ed. London: Macmillan-Palgrave.

Levitt, P. 2001 *The Transnational Villagers* . Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Levitt, P. and N. Glick Schiller. 2004. 'Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society', *International Migration Review* 38(3):1002–39.

Lister, R. 1997. Citizenship: Towards a Feminist Synthesis. *Feminist Review* 57: 28–48.

Long, N. 2001. *Development Sociology: Actor Perspective*. London: Routledge.

Long, N. 1992. 'From Paradigm Lost to Paradigm Regained? The Case of an Actor Oriented Sociology of Development', in N. Long and A. Long (eds) Battlefields of

Knowledge: The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development. London: Routledge.

Malkki, L.H. 1995 'Refugees and Exile: From 'Refugee Studies' to the National Order of Things', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 495–523.

McNay, L. (1994) Foucault: A Critical Introduction, London: Polity Press.

Morawska, E. 2001 'Structuring Migration: The Case of Polish Income-Seeking Travellers to the West', *Theory and Society* 3:47-80

Neveu, C., J. Clarke, K. Coll, and E. Dagnino 2011 *Citizenship Studies* 15(8): 945-964

Ong, A. 1996. Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making. *Current Anthropology* 37: 737–762.

Penninx, R. 2004. *Integration of Migrants: Economic, Social, Cultural and Political*

Penninx, R. 2003 'Integration: The Role of Communities, Institutions, and the State', *Migration Information Source*, Special Issue (October): Integration & Immigrants. Washington: Migration Policy Institute. http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/ (Accessed 3 June 2005).

Reinsch, P. 2001 *Measuring Immigrant Integration: Diversity in a European City*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Richmond, A. 1993 'Reactive Migration: Sociological Perspectives on Refugee Movements', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 6(1): 5–24.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1994. Cultural Citizenship in San Jose´ , California. *POLAR* 17: 57–63.

Ryan, L., R.Sales, M.Tiliki, B.Siera 2008 'Social Networks, Social Support and Social Capital: The Experiences of Recent Polish Migrants in London', *Sociology* 42(4): 672-690

Scheffer, P. 2011 Immigrant Nations: Achieving consensus on the politics of multiculturalism. Cambridge: Polity

Soysal, Y.N. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Stoller, P. 2009 *The Power of the Between: An Anthropological Odyssey*. Chicago

Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Stoller, P. 2009 *The Power of the Between: An Anthropological Odyssey*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Turner, J.H. 1988 *A Theory of Social Interaction*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Urry, J. 2000 *The Global Media and Cosmopolitanism*. Paper presented at: Transnational America Conference, Bavarian American Academy, Munich, June. http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/sociology/research/publications/papers/urry-global-media.pdf (Accessed February 2014)

Van Meeteren, M. and S. Pereira 2013 *The differential role of social networks: Strategies and routes in Brazilian migration to Portugal and the Netherlands;* IMI Working Papers, No 66, University of Oxford.

Varsanyi, M. 2006 Interrogating 'urban citizenship' *vis-a`-vis* undocumented migration. *Citizenship studies*, 10 (2), 229–249.

Walby, S. 1994. Is Citizenship Gendered? *Sociology* 28: 379–395

Wallman, S. 1979 'Introduction: The Scope for Ethnicity', in S. Wallman (ed.) *Ethnicity at Work*. London: Macmillan

Williams, L. 2006 'Social Networks of Refugees in the United Kingdom: Tradition, Tactics and New Community Spaces', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32(5): 865–79.

Xenos,N. 1996 'Refugees: The Modern Political Condition', in M.J. Shapiro and H.R.Alker (eds) *Challenging Boundaries: Global Flows, Territorial Identities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Yuval-Davis, Nira, and Floya Anthias eds.. 1989. Women-Nation-State. London: Macmillan

Zetter, A. 1991 'Labelling Refugees: Forming and Transforming a Bureaucratic Identity', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4(1): 39–62.