

5-2018

Barriers to Citizenship and the Impact on Immigrant Integration

Daniela Escamilla

California State University, Monterey Bay

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csumb.edu/caps_thes_all

Recommended Citation

Escamilla, Daniela, "Barriers to Citizenship and the Impact on Immigrant Integration" (2018). *Capstone Projects and Master's Theses*. 334.

https://digitalcommons.csumb.edu/caps_thes_all/334

This Capstone Project (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Capstone Projects and Master's Theses at Digital Commons @ CSUMB. It has been accepted for inclusion in Capstone Projects and Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ CSUMB. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csumb.edu.

California State University, Monterey Bay

Barriers to Citizenship and the Impact on Immigrant Integration



Daniela Escamilla

Global Studies Capstone

Dr. Richard Harris & Dr. Ajit Abraham

Spring, 2018

Introduction

Migration is a central aspect of globalization. Globalization is not a new concept or phenomenon, it refers to the interaction and integration of people, government, and nations around the world and impacts economies, the environment and makes a significant impact on people as well. Movement is a critical aspect of humanity; however, at borders, mobility is violently restricted through laws that prioritize citizen rights over human rights, states run on a system that preserves privilege and opportunity for some while limiting it to others (Jones, 2016). Millions of people have had to leave their homeland in search of better opportunities, which according to article 13 of the Declaration of Human rights freedom of movement is their human right (UN General Assembly, 1948). However, not all states abide by this human right; many restrict immigrants from opportunities and resources, justified by claiming to be protecting their own national identity. Lack of access to citizenship has an impact on immigrants ability to integrate into a host country, the barriers immigrants face to acquire legal status prevents them from integrating successfully. It also makes it incredibly difficult to gain upward mobility economically, socially, politically, and culturally. In many countries, immigrants without legal status are unable to work legally, which makes them easy to exploit. Without legal status, immigrants are also unable to vote, which leads them having little control over the legislation that gets passed that in most cases affects them the most. In order for an immigrant to acquire citizenship, they must go through specific naturalization policies and procedures that are different for each country. Countries that have a more rigorous naturalization process have class-biased discrimination that that purposely allows certain individuals to naturalize, while it excludes others that are deemed worthy.

By restricting certain people from acquiring citizenship and benefiting from the added benefits of becoming a citizen they are restricted from opportunities to have upward mobility. These barriers to upward mobility do not allow immigrants to integrate successfully. It is globally significant to explore the impact of globalization has had on migration and explore how immigrants are able or unable to integrate into a host country because it shines a light on the role of the state to keep certain people excluded. Immigrants in a country are expected over a certain amount of time to become integrated into their host country, rather than be seen as a newcomer. This expectation is hard to live up to due to the various barriers placed to make the integration process more rigorous. For example, the barriers to citizenship make it difficult for immigrants to be able to gain legal status that would not only protect them but also serve as a symbol of inclusion and membership. The way in which citizenship has been denied to some and made accessible to others is linked to social and political phenomena that involve power struggles over meaning and identity (Edkins, Zehfuss and Lynn Doty, 2014).

My interest in this topic stems from personal experience. Shortly after turning one, due to economic issues in Mexico my parents had no choice but to migrate to the United States. Growing up undocumented, with parents who were also undocumented made me acutely aware of the injustices and intentional laws that kept us oppressed. The dialogue that arises when speaking of being undocumented is usually one that incriminates migrants and blames the situation they are in on the migrants themselves. However, I know very well that is not the case. When people say if you would have done things the right way you would not be in the situation you are in today. But what people do not understand is that migration is not always a decision made by the individual, especially if they are a child. Instead, it is the only option available. When it comes to acquiring legal status, many are astonished when an immigrant reveals they

have been in the country for over a decade and still have no legal standing. What many disregard is the fact that they do not choose to be undocumented. The reality is there is a lack of opportunities for them to acquire any legal status let alone citizenship. Even for those that have some pathway towards citizenship obstacles are placed to keep as many excluded. Countries around the world treat immigrants differently however one thing that is true is that all have a naturalization process that is intended to rule out specific people. Countries that provide limited opportunities for naturalization make it harder for immigrants to integrate into their host country. I was born in Mexico but have lived in the United States my entire life. Due to the fact that I grew up in this country I have integrated culturally and politically. My peers would not know or suspect I was undocumented because my life has been very similar to theirs. However, the lack of legal status will never allow me to fully integrate into this country because of my identity of undocumented overshadows all my other identities when it comes to certain things such as applying for a job, driver's license, scholarships, or voting.

Literature Review

Integration is the process by which immigrants become accepted into society. According to Rinus Penninx (2003), there are two factors involved in the integration process, the two parties involved in the integration process are the immigrants themselves accompanied with their characteristics, efforts, and adaptation as well as well as the receiving society. The outcome is not solely dependant on the immigrants' efforts and willingness to integrate into society. The receiving society institutional structure and reaction towards newcomers have a significant impact on the outcome. The reception of immigrants in a country can impact immigrants ability to adapt, and it could also affect the reason for deciding to acquire citizenship. In a nation where immigrant are regularly subjected to discrimination, many are more likely to go through the

naturalization process to obtain full citizenship protection. In contrast, a country more welcoming to immigrants, the driving forces behind the decision to acquire citizenship can be linked to identity or other benefits attributed to citizenship.

Both, Canada and the United States require anyone applying for citizenship to have been a legal resident for a certain number of requires years before being able to go through the naturalization process. Obtaining legal residency status is the first and a very significant step for immigrants in both countries. The transition from undocumented to a legal resident on its own has a colossal impact on an immigrants ability to integrate into the host country. Some of the benefits that come with becoming a lawful permanent resident are being able to work in the country legally, freedom to travel, social benefits, and the ability to seek citizenship. In the United States, the different pathways toward citizenship are limited to only certain immigrants who qualify to become a permanent resident. In the United States immigrants can obtain permanent residency through family reunification provisions, where in Canada more skill- based immigrants can get legal status (Aptekar, 2013). In order to obtain legal residency someone, usually a family member or a spouse, must submit an immigrant petition (USCIS,2017). Unlike Canada, the United States does not have any pathway towards citizenship through education or what they call in Canada, a caregiver pathway. The Live-in Caregiver Program allows people in Canada who have completed the required amount of time working as a caregiver (Immigration, 2017). Canada also offers a pathway to legal residency through education; this pathway allows international students apply for permanent residency. After being admitted into a school, the student is able to work legally while completing their studies. After completing their studies, Canada provides ways for them to stay, gain experience, and become a Canadian permanent resident (Immigration, 2017). Understanding the lack of access to a pathway toward citizenship

in the United States compared to Canada is compelling to my report because it sets up the framework to why immigrants in Canada are able to integrate more successfully in comparison to immigrants in the United States.

Even though there are many differences in the pathways to obtain legal residency in both countries, Canada and the United States have similar requirements and procedures for the process of transitioning from legal resident to naturalized citizen. The United States application fees are slightly higher than in Canada, and the process tends to be longer than in Canada however, both countries have a language requirement, a background check, and an application fee. The requirement that naturalization applicants demonstrate English-language literacy for many is the most challenging obstacle. The language requirement is consistent with the broad and political assimilation perspectives on naturalization. This also means that those that do not speak English cannot become members and receive the benefits that come with becoming a citizen. Barriers, such as the language barrier, are placed to exclude as many people as possible and deny them the opportunity of gaining upward mobility.

Peter J Spiro (1999) discussed barriers to citizenship and why citizenship is an essential factor to an immigrants ability to integrate into a host country. Spiro claims that “naturalization law is a real instrument of exclusion and subordination.” He argues that US naturalization requirements do not seem as excluding in a comparative perspective. However, the barriers are meant to keep as many people as possible from going through the naturalization process successfully. Aptekar (2016) believes naturalization is not only about turning outsiders into members it is also about social control. This claim can be demonstrated in the way in which immigrants in both Canada and the United States are screened ‘eligibility and fitness.’ The standards are higher than for natural born citizens to ensure that they will enrich the new host

county. Aptekar argues that naturalization can also be a mechanism of stratification because most immigrants are left out, and only those considered the most deserving would become citizens and be able to benefit from the benefits and protections. Patekar's analysis supports my claim that the barriers to citizenship impact immigrants ability to integrate into a host country.

One fact that is true for most countries around the world is that citizenship allows access to a wide range of rights and benefits such as, being able to vote, run for office, obtain access to more desirable jobs, educational benefits, travel benefits, and protection from deportation. According to Sofya Aptekar (2013), high rates of citizenship among foreign-born signal success in immigrant incorporation. Despite the many similarities in both countries naturalization process the proportion of immigrant with citizenship in the US has fallen far below that in Canada. Low citizenship, however, brings up the question about “hurdles in the naturalization process and boundaries erected around national membership. Patekar's analysis is significant to this report because it is a reflection on how the United States low citizenship exposes a more substantial issue which is how are these barriers keeping people from having upward mobility. In comparison to the United States, Canada’s high rates of citizenship is a reflects how immigrants have been able to integrate more efficiently.

Going through the naturalization process also was economic benefits, Shierholz (2010), reported that the family incomes of naturalized citizens are 14 percent higher than those of non-citizen. The option to naturalize has economic benefits for immigrants that are eligible. According to Gathman (2015), “citizenship results in higher wage growth, more stable employment relationships, and upward mobility into better-paid occupations and sectors.” Gottman's findings demonstrate the importance of citizenship to the ability to have upward mobility not only socially but also economically. Barriers to citizenship also create barriers to

employment because in many countries such as the United States and Canada you must acquire legal status before being able to work legally. Some jobs such as private sector jobs or government jobs require citizenship. Therefore barriers that prevent immigrants from becoming citizens also restrain them from being able to obtain higher quality jobs.

Although the processes and opportunities for becoming a permanent legal resident are very different in the United States compared to Canada, the transition from legal resident to a naturalized citizen is very similar. The reasons that motivate people to make that transition to citizen are very different in both countries. Aptekar (2016) investigates how immigrants explain their decisions to acquire citizenship. She found that that American immigrants decided to go through the naturalization process were in search of the protection that citizenship offers in an anti-immigrant policy climate. According to Aptekar, most American immigrants do not frame the naturalization process as identity-changing. Instead, it is perceived as the most logical move after deciding they will settle permanently. Most Canadian immigrants, on the other hand, characterized naturalization as an “active process that tied them positively to a valued nation.”

The host countries perception of immigrants also plays a significant role in the success of immigrant integration and the opportunities to upward mobility for immigrants. Immigrants in the United States and Canada are perceived and treated very differently. In the United States immigrants are commonly blamed for the problems the country is facing. The perception of an immigrant in Canada is very different compared to the United State’s perception of immigrants. Paul M. Ong (2011) discusses how between 1990 and 2000 naturalization rates increased substantially due to anti-immigrant hostility. Ong relates this phenomenon to defensive naturalization which is “the act of seeking citizenship in response to increasing anti-immigrant sentiment.” Defense naturalization is relevant to recent naturalization patterns in the United

States, many have decided to obtain citizenship to have the protection it provides in anti-immigrant policy climate. Many legal residents in the United States have gone through the naturalization process for the protection it offered. The United States currently has a very anti-immigrant environment and it impacts individuals motivations for acquiring citizenship. Marisa Penalosa and John Burnett (2017) explain how immigrants in Canada have more access to upward mobility not only because immigrants in Canada have more and different pathways to citizenship, what gives Canadian immigrants an advantage over American immigrants is that their country is more welcoming to immigrants. Penalosa and Burnett mention how instead of blaming immigrant for the country's problems, Canadians consider immigration critical to their economic success.

Obtaining legal status is just one factor in the process of becoming a citizen in a host country socially and politically. Choosing whether to go through the process of naturalization is an individual choice. A study conducted in 2012 explains how becoming a citizen is a personal choice that is associated with characteristics such as duration of residence in the country, age, education, and language acquisition (Logan, Oh and Darrah, 2012). This study utilizes data from Census reports and other measures that allow them to examine aspects of the community and policy context that influence an individual to choose to obtain citizenship status. (Logan, Oh, and Darrah, 2012) concludes that individual-level predictors such as age, years in the country, and education have substantial impacts on the likelihood of becoming a naturalized citizen. (Logan, Oh, and Darrah, 2012) Also states that this phenomenon is consistent with the expectations of assimilation theory. Milton Gordon (1964) argues that acquiring citizenship can be viewed as a result of assimilation. He supports his claim by stating that once an immigrant adapts to a host country successfully, the next step is expressing commitment to host country and change in

identity, this can be done by becoming a citizen. Gordon's analyses align with the common idea that immigrants who integrated into a host country are more likely to become naturalized. Logan and Gordon's connections between assimilated immigrants and success rate in acquiring citizenship help prove the claim that barriers to citizenship are purposely keeping certain immigrants from naturalizing while making citizenship more accessible to others.

Immigrants are expected over an undefined period to become like the 'others' in their new host country. The question is by what standards are outsiders judged to decide whether they have assimilated. Whether someone is considered assimilated or not is different for everyone. For some assimilation is based on things such as fluency in the dominant language, educational success, economic success, and familiarity with host country's culture and history. For others, becoming assimilated involved relinquishing all ties to the home county (Lalami, 2017). New assimilation theory argues that over that over time, most migrants achieve socio-economic equality with the native-born but that ethnicity and race do matter and both the native-born and the immigrants change along the way (Alba & Nee, 2003). This new perspective acknowledges that the patterns of assimilation and integration vary on the country, reasons for leaving the country, immigrant characteristics, and the political, social, and economic context of the sending and receiving communities (Levitt and Jaworsky,2007). Applying assimilation theory to the ability of immigrants being successful in acquiring citizenship demonstrates the discrimination and exclusion of the system to include certain immigrants and exclude others. This especially true in countries like the United States, with anti-immigrant sentiment.

Members of the 1.5 generation are individuals whose identity is seen as not quite a member of the state or belonging to the nation but also not as an outsider. 1.5 generation refers to people who migrate at a young age, usually because of their parents, and who have had most of their

education and cultural and social development occur in the host country. The 1.5 generation tends to be more similar to the second generation, which are those who are born in the host country, compared to the first generation of migrants (Gonzales and Chavez, 2012). In the United States and Canada the 1.5 generation can assimilate into the host's countries culture, but in the United States, the opportunity to obtain citizenship is limited or nonexistent. In the United States, there is currently a great deal of debate of what to do to address the issues regarding citizenship and the 1.5 generation. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), is an executive order put in place by Barack Obama in 2012 that protected nearly 800,000 young undocumented immigrants that were brought to the US as children from deportation. On September 5, 2017, the Trump administration formally announced the end of DACA and it has had negative repercussions on the lives of DACA recipients in the United States. According to the Pew Research Center DACA recipients come from around the world Mexico is by far the top country of origin for active DACA recipients (548,000), followed by El Salvador (25,900), Guatemala (17,700) and Honduras (16,100). A significant number of DACA recipients also hail from Peru (7,420), South Korea (7,310), Brazil (5,780), Ecuador (5,460), Colombia (5,020) and Argentina (3,970) (López et al., 2018). Being denied access to legality creates an identity that frames the lives of undocumented immigrants. Their lives are framed in a way that regardless of the years spent in the host country and acculturation of norms and behavior and educational achievement are all inconsequential to everyday routines as undocumented immigrants because so much depend on and requires legal immigration status (Gonzales, 2016). The question that this research is addressing is how barriers and lack of access to Citizenship and legal status create an identity that impact immigrants ability to integrate into a host country economically, socially, politically, and culturally.

Theoretical Perspective

Everett Hughes (1945) theory of master identity reflects this reality. According to Hughes, master status is a status that overrides all others in perceived importance; it is the primary identifying characteristic of an individual. The idea of 'noncitizen' being a master status is an appropriate way to express the influence of citizenship in the process of immigrant integration. It also demonstrates that citizenship is not a direct byproduct of assimilation because other factors that come into play and that can exclude them from being able to become naturalized. Some of those factors, for example, can be the lack of pathways to citizenship in the United States that prevent many from being able to acquire any legal status.

Roberto G. Gonzales (2016), also associated illegality as a master status in his work. He argued that "illegality mattered more than other statuses and achievements." Gonzales supports his claim using the 1.5 generation as an example, the 1.5 generation refers to immigrants that arrived to the U.S. as children. "The years lived in the United States, acculturation to American norms and behavior and educational attainment are all inconsequential," the identity of illegality overshadows all other identities. To most, the 1.5 generation would be considered immigrants that have fully assimilated, however, this does not guarantee or offer them any pathway to citizenship in the United States. This reality demonstrates that barriers to citizenship even exclude immigrants who meet their requirements but because of the lack of a path to citizenship they are unable to integrate fully. Without legal status, they can only be incorporated to an extent because the lack of citizenship denies them individual rights and protections.

It is clear that countries that have a more rigorous naturalization process such as the United States also tend to have class biased discrimination that prohibits particular people from having upward mobility. The barriers to upward mobility do not allow immigrants to integrate

successfully into a host country. Even for those that can obtain legal residency status, there are still barriers that discourage them from going through the naturalization process. Being deprived of Citizenship has always included an exclusionary component, citizenship creates the notion of insider and outsider. The new identity of outsider or insider is what keeps certain people oppressed and excluded because it becomes the individuals master status. The status of either insider or outsider supersede all other identities.

Methodology

I primarily used qualitative methods in obtaining data for my report on immigrant integration and access to citizenship. Most of my data was collected through bibliographic research utilizing others scholars work and research on the impact of access to naturalization in the United States and Canada. The qualitative data I included in my report comes from different disciplines to be able to gain a better understanding of the more recent migrant experiences. For example, I looked at various scholars work on immigrant integration and the different naturalization process in the United States and Canada. I also incorporated information from government reports that demonstrate the opinion people have on the citizenship requirements and naturalization process in their country. I also obtained the latest information about immigration law relating to naturalization form both Canada and the United States government websites. I chose to research Canada and the United States because one country is deemed to be one of the best places to be an immigrant while the other is known to have a significant population of immigrants that tend to be excluded or oppressed. This report will look at how and why immigrants in different countries with similar naturalization process have a different experience and level of difficulty when integrating into the host country.

Findings and Analysis

Requirements for Citizenship intended to exclude rather than include

Canada is considered to be one of the best countries to be an immigrant, while the United States has a reputation of treating immigrants like second-class citizens throughout its history. One would think that both countries would have very different ways and procedures to naturalize immigrants one that is more inclusive and the other designed more strategically designed to exclude. Surprisingly, Canada and the United States have similar requirements and procedures for the process of transitioning from legal resident to naturalized citizen both countries have a language requirement, a background check, and an application fee. The naturalization process does tend to take longer and is more expensive in the United States than in Canada. The language requirement in Canada is also little different than in the United States because in Canada you have two options either French or English and in the United States English is the only option. The fees and language requirement are two of the most significant obstacles faced by legal residents who want to undergo the transition to the citizen in other parts of the world as well. For example, to become a citizen France requires applicants to provide proof of adequate knowledge of French, Mexico also requires applicants to prove knowledge of Spanish and even Mexican history.

The language requirement unarguably is an exclusionary act on its own, the purpose it serves is to exclude immigrants who have not mastered the language of the new host country. As discussed previously, the language requirement is not a unique phenomenon to Canada and the United States it is a practice that is used globally. Countries require immigrants who aspire to be citizens to be fluent in the official language of their country. However, the United States does not have an official language. Canadian immigrants who choose to go through the naturalization process have the choice between French or English, which are both the countries official

languages, the United States only has one option which is English. Why would the United States, a nation where over 500 languages are spoken, have a language requirement if they do not have an official language? Countries such as the United States who worry that their national identity will be diluted by immigrants tend to place higher restriction to be able to restrict or make it more difficult for certain immigrants to gain access to citizenship.

The Language testing is not the only test some countries require; many also are tested about their knowledge of the country through a civics test. The civic test tests immigrants knowledge of the host country's history and practices to protect their own national identity but has not proven to be successful because there is evidence that native-born citizens would do worse or even fail these test. For example, in Canada, a nationwide survey conducted in 2011 showed that immigrants in Canada tend to have a stronger knowledge of the countries history than the native born (Banulescu-Bogdan, 2012). This demonstrates how standards for immigrants who desire to go through the naturalization process tend to have higher standards compared to native-born citizens.

Figure 1, which is found at the end of this report, demonstrates the different naturalization policies around the world. The conditions under which citizenship is granted across the globe vary however, as mentioned before most countries require immigrants who want to become citizens to pass a language and civics test to pay a fee. These requirements are strategic ways to exclude specific people. How so? Immigrants who come from a background where they were unable to obtain an education are restricted because before becoming citizens they have to be able to speak the language and be able to read to take the test. Even those who can read write and speak the language can face other issues such as economic issues. Without legal status, having a job that can sustain a family is difficult to obtain. Having to be able to

economically support a family and paying for the fees required prevent others from applying for citizenship or even to renew their permanent residence status. In Canada, the cost to renew for a permanent resident card is 50 dollars, and in the United States, it is 540 dollars. The price to renew permanent residency is lower in both countries compares to applying for citizenship, I do not see this as a coincidence. It benefits the government for an immigrant to pay the fees to renewal fees rather than naturalization fees, this way they continue to make money and not have to grant the benefits of citizenship to a higher number of immigrants. Citizenship is a not static it is continuously changing and negotiated and is not equally distributed (Reiter, 201). This can be seen in the way requirement for citizenship is changed throughout history to keep particular people from obtaining it in. The United States has a history of restricting citizenship on the basis of race one example are the Chinese exclusion laws that excluded Chinese immigrants from obtaining citizenship and consequently constructing a second-class citizen identity for Chinese immigrants that make them susceptible to discrimination and oppression and instead of integrating them into the host country, it excludes them.

Immigrants all over the world face quite different life changes based on their legal status. According to Guillermina Jasso (2011), migration and stratification are “intimately and irrevocably linked.” Stratification deals with differential life changes and analysis of who gets what and why. Borders placed around the world create the self and the other, by doing so some are seen as belonging while others do not. Those who are seen as belonging are called ‘citizens’ and those who do not are excluded, and in some cases, their existence is deemed as illegal. Social stratification is universal but takes different forms across different societies. Although the various forms around the world systems of legal status stratification in each country dictate the access to the rights that benefit citizens. The way in which society responds to immigrants that

enter into their territory without proper authorization says a lot about their preconceived notions of the self and other.

The societies in Canada and the United States both have very distinct notions of self and other. The way the United States responds to immigrants that enter into their territory is by seeing them as a threat and as the cause of the problems the country faces. The United States anti-immigrant sentiment has reached a record high under a Trump presidency. The issues the country faces are regularly blamed on immigrants, and the distinction between the self and others seems to increase constantly. However, when speaking of the immigrants responsible for the problems in the country it is evident that not the entire community of immigrants are to blame only a selected few. Immigrants from Latin and Muslim countries are placed in a category of immigrants that do not belong and are to blame for the countries problems while immigrants from European countries are put in a category of belonging and seen as enriching and benefiting the country. The perception of an immigrant in Canada is very different compared to the United State's perception of immigrants. Instead of blaming immigrants for the country's economic problem Canadians believe that immigration is critical to their economic success. The process of determining who belongs and who does not, and under what conditions one may enter its borders creates different categories of legal membership that grant political and social rights that are distributed unevenly across the distinct legal status categories that are created.

Citizenship is the most important marker of an immigrants full and equal membership in a national society it also awards certain formal legal rights such as public benefits, voting rights, protection from deportation and the power to run for office (Banulescu-Bogdan, 2012). Citizenship also seals the sense of belonging to a host country. While some scholars such as Gordon (1964) see citizenship as a by-product of assimilation it also can be argued that barriers

to citizenship can prevent someone from ever being considered fully “assimilated.” Regardless of how much they are integrated and have adapted, an immigrant is into a host country's culture, language, or other aspects of society, without any legal status they will not be able to integrate fully. Countries such as the United States that do not offer many opportunities or pathways for undocumented immigrants to obtain legal residency to then be able to naturalize prevents them from being able to incorporate into the host country fully. The identity of illegality is prevalent over any other identities.

For example in the United States, DACA recipients and other members of the 1.5 generation immigrant to the country at a very young age. They, for the most part, grew up alongside native-born citizens and in most cases are accustomed to their host countries norms, culture, and language rather than their home country. Regardless of how assimilated or integrated these individuals are they are still not citizens. Because of the restrictions on naturalization or any kind of permanent legal status, their ‘non-citizen’ status becomes a master status that overrides all other identities that are perceived important. In the United States, DACA recipients have been described to be American in every way except on paper (citizenship) without citizenship they can never fully integrate into the host country. I know this from personal experience, as an immigrant and a DACA recipient myself I understand the importance of citizenship and how the lack of becomes a status and identity. As much as I integrate into American society and culture my status as noncitizen does not allow me to integrate fully.

Regardless of other achievements or statuses that are perceived important such as being a college graduate, doctor or teacher. The lack of legal status overshadows these identities. Canadian immigrants who plan to reside in Canada permanently choose to make that transition from legal resident to citizen for identity reasons. Citizenship to them is a confirmation that they

are Canadian. For Canadians, the 'non-citizen' identity also overrides other identities when it comes to cementing a sense of belonging to the host country. Citizenship permanently seals their identity as belonging and allows them to integrate more successfully. The lack of legal status becomes a part of immigrant's identity, and it limits the ability of immigrants to integrate into a host country because the lack of citizenship denies them from rights such as voting and protection from deportation.

Conclusion

With this report, I support the claim that naturalization is intended to exclude rather than include and borders have created a sense of insider and outsider that keeps certain people excluded. Excluding others from resources and opportunity is based on the belief that the member of the inside group, in this case, citizens, should be protected at all costs and with little regard to the effects it has on others such as migrants and refugees (Jones, 2016). Lack of legal status and citizenship become an overshadowing identity that complicates an immigrants ability to integrate into their adopted country. The most immediate step to solving many of the issues faced due to lack of citizenship would be to open, or better yet, remove all borders and allow free movement. The only citizenship status one would have would be a citizen of the world. Most agree that this concept paint a euphoric image of the world and it would be more practical to make incremental changes rather than maintaining hope for an entirely different world than we live in today.

Figure 1

	Australia	United Kingdom	Canada	France	Germany	The Netherlands	United States	Norway	Sweden
Years of residence	4 years, at least 3 years permanent residence	5 years, permanent residence	3 years, at least 2 years of permanent residence	5 years, continuous	8 years, habitual legal residence	5 years, continuous	5 years, permanent residence	7 years within the past 10 years, resident and work permit statuses count	5 years, residence across temporary and permanent residence permit
Language requirement	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Civics/country knowledge requirement	yes	yes	yes	yes*	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Good Character ^a requirement	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes
Dual citizenship	yes	yes	yes	yes	no*	no	yes*	no	yes
Birthright citizenship	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	Upon application
Administrative fees for ordinary naturalization, in country (euros)	€198 (\$242)	€850 (\$1,040)	€148 (\$181)	€ 0	€255 (\$312)	€567 (\$694)	€552 (\$680)	€316 (\$386)	€146 (\$178)
Naturalization rate (OECD 2007)	81%	67%	89%	47%	37%	78%	50%	70%	82%

Sources: European Union Democracy Observatory (EUDO) 2010 for European countries, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 2011 for non-European countries and "Naturalization Rate."
^aFor "normal" naturalization procedure (i.e. not through spouse or refugee status).

References

- Alba R, Nee V. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Aptekar, Sofya “How Barriers to Citizenship Status Increase Inequality in the United States.” 2013 *How barriers to Citizenship Status Increase Inequality in the United States* 1 Oct. 2017
- Aptekar, Sofya. “Making Sense of Naturalization: What Citizenship Means to Naturalizing Immigrants in Canada and the USA.” *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, Immigrants in Canada and the USA.” *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, vol. 17, no. 4, 2016, pp. 1143–1161.,doi:10.1007/S12134-015-0458-5.
- Banulescu-Bogdan, N. (2012). *Shaping Citizenship Policies to Strengthen Immigrant Integration*. [online] migrationpolicy.org.
- Edkins, J., Zehfuss, M. and Lynn Doty, R. (2014). *Global politics*. London: Routledge, pp.201-216.
- Gathmann, C. (2015). Naturalization and citizenship: Who benefits?. *IZA World of Labor*.
- Gonzales, R. and Chavez, L. (2012). “Awakening to a Nightmare”. *Current Anthropology*, 53(3), pp.255-281.
- Gonzales, R. and Vargas, J. (2016). *Lives in limbo*.
- Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, Everett Cherrington. “Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status.” *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 50, no. 5, 1945, pp. 353–359. *JSTOR*.
- Immigration, R. (2017). *Immigration and citizenship - Canada.ca*. [online] Canada.ca. Available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/services/immigration-citizenship.html> [Accessed 13 Dec. 2017].
- Jasso, G. (2011). Migration and stratification. *Social Science Research*, 40(5), 1292-1336. doi:

10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.03.007

Jones, R. (2016). *Violent borders*.

Lalami, L. (2017). *What Does It Take to 'Assimilate' in America?*. [online] Nytimes.com. [Accessed 1 Dec. 2017].

Levitt, Peggy, and B. Nadya Jaworsky. "Transnational Migration Studies: Past Developments and Future Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33.1 (2007): 129-56. Web.

Logan, J., Oh, S. and Darrah, J. (2012). The Political and Community Context of Immigrant Naturalization. *J Ethn Migr Stud.*

Ong, Paul M. "Defensive naturalization and anti-immigrant sentiment: Chinese immigrants in three primate metropolises." *Asian American Policy Review*, vol. 21, 2011, p. 39+. Accessed 12 Dec. 2017.

Penaloza, Marisa, and John Burnett. *For A Stark Contrast To U.S. Immigration Policy, Try Canada*. 26 Jan. 2017,

Penninx, R. (2003). *Integration: The Role of Communities, Institutions, and the State*. [online] migration policy.org. Available <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/integration-role-communities-institutions-and-state> [Accessed 2 Dec. 2017].

Reiter, Bernd. *The Dialectics Of Citizenship*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2013.

Shierholz, H. (2010). *Immigration and Wages: Methodological advancements confirm modest gains for native workers*. Economic Policy Institute.

Spiro, Peter J. "QUESTIONING BARRIERS TO NATURALIZATION ." *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal*, 1999.

UN General Assembly. (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights* (217 [III] A). Paris.

USCIS. (2017). *Homepage*. [online] Available at: <https://www.uscis.gov/> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2017].

Jasso, G. (2011). Migration and stratification. *Social Science Research*, 40(5), 1292-1336. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.03.007

