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Chapter 1: Introduction

Migration involves changes for both the individual on the move and for the communities that send and receive migrants (Suarez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard, 2004). Refugee movement amplifies these changes, due to the forced and oftentimes violent nature of this migration (Nyers, 2006). Refugee resettlement – a term used to describe finding new homes for refugees outside their home countries – can be considered a form of “organization-led” migration (Barkdull, Weber, Swartz and Phillips, 2014) as refugees must interact with local, national and international entities. This study presents a case of these interactions and experiences in a prominent resettlement area in California. The United States is the third largest resettling country for refugees (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2015) and the state of California, in addition to having the highest number of immigrants in the U.S. (Migration Policy Institute, 2013), is the third largest state for refugee resettlement (Office of Refugee Resettlement, 2014).

Resettlement in California is organized primarily through the existence of resettlement “forums,” networks of different organizations with varying involvement in resettlement that meet regularly to share information and resources. Through my participation in one of these forums, I saw that one of the primary concerns of the forum was providing social services, particularly educational resources, to refugees on their way to citizenship. The question of citizenship has theoretically and practically rich implications. Citizenship is the primary way in which belonging is organized in the world (Castles and Miller, 2003). Refugees are a contentious issue through which to look at citizenship because a hallmark of forced migration is the inevitable loss of citizenship (Nyers, 2006) and uncovers the many issues in the political organization of the
nation-state system. Citizenship is also a relevant concept for refugees because of the variegated ways in which they can access rights with or without this legal status (Soguk, 1999; Ong, 2003).

Following this theoretical focus on citizenship and grounded in the realities of a group of social services organizations, this dissertation presents a case study of a refugee resettlement area in Northern California, specifically taking as an object of inquiry the ways in which individuals from both refugee and U.S.-born backgrounds experience migration and citizenship, based on the descriptions that they offered to me in interviews. The ways in which this resettlement forum uses education and employment as conduits to citizenship are also examined in detail based on analysis of the forum’s monthly meeting minutes.

**Problem Statement**

The power of the nation-state has been debated (Soysal, 1994; Joppke, 1998; Torres, 2009), but as Harvey (2007) says, not merely the strength but also the nature of the state has been transformed. Building blocks of solidarity – civic, racial and ethnic affiliations– are being reconfigured, in thought and in practice. While a nation-state framework has once presented a powerful imagined community (Anderson, 1991), there has been a decline in the relevance of such frameworks, further exposing the myth of “one nation, one race.” At the same time, much of immigration remains regulated by states (Joppke, 1998). This tension between (il)legalizing bodies and fragmented associations of people has resulted in economic and political wars that create forced migration and, in turn, challenge unity (Betts, 2011; Betts and Loescher, 2011).

In a world that is organized by nation-states with self-contained political communities, a person must be citizen of a country in order to receive the space to exercise his or her civil, social and political rights and is, in turn, tended to by the nation-state. However, under the advent of the human rights regimes (de Sousa Santos, 2002), other figures now have access to rights that
used to belong only to those who participated as citizens in a national community. The refugee in particular no longer fits into an existing political community and stands in opposition to it; subsequent attempts to assist refugees signal governance that come from levels beyond the nation-state, such as from the United Nations. In fact, the discourse around refugee assistance is a moralizing one that calls upon the obligation of the international community to step in when a sovereign state no longer attends to its people.

The nation-state can also have a hand in creating educational systems. For example, Gramsci has argued that educational systems can be used to socialize individuals into a dominant culture (Torres, 1998). Additionally, Freire (2000) contends that education is not neutral but political. Paulo Freire advocated for a model of schooling in which students are the subjects of their own education, and eschewed a “banking education” where the school is an “authoritarian device” that transmits official knowledge. Schools and the nation-state have been strange bedfellows. Historically, the rise of the nation-state, particularly in Europe, coincided with the rise of mass schooling, with the school taking on the additional task of fostering allegiance to the state (Ramirez and Boli, 1987). Dewey (1916/1944) claims that education as a social process has no aim until a society is defined but he underscores a tension between education and society when he indicts the nation-state for having aims that are too narrow, limiting the social aim of education; hence, even though context and society are important in the process of education, Dewey (1916/1944) also warns against the infusion of a nationalist aim in the process of education. He argues that education should be “concerned with the reconciliation of national loyalty, of patriotism, with superior devotion to the things which unite men in common ends, irrespective of national political boundaries” (pg. 114), but this aim can stand in contrast to efforts by the state to engender an education system with the creation of a “national” labor or
military force in mind. The value of examining educational processes, according to Anderson-Levitt (2003), lies outside of looking at what looks the same, and instead, using conflict theory that says that “culture is not necessarily shared values but simply an agreement to disagree about specific opposed values,” (pg. 13) echoing Dewey’s mode of associated living centered around schools where a cultural dialogue is sued as a “shared way of talking about similarities as well as differences.”

Ong (2003) argues that the school is a point of contact in society for the resettled refugee student to experience “modern state power in universalizing citizenship paradoxically through a process of individuation” (80) – that is, after their persecution for being part of a group and after they are clumped with other refugees in the U.S., refugees go through a different process of individualization in schools where, among other things, they must achieve through individual measures such as test scores and grades. Considering attendance in poorly performing, violent inner-city schools, Suarez-Orozco (1989) found that his sample of Central American refugee students maintained that “no matter how bad things seemed to be in the inner city, they were never as bad as they would be at home” (100-101). This lens of comparison has been found to be a driving force for immigrant and refugee students to maintain school attendance (Suarez-Orozco, 1989; Caplan, Whitmore and Choy 1989; Portes and Rumbaut 1996), even in poorly performing and under-resourced schools. Suarez-Orozco (1989) found that survivor’s guilt played an important role in scholastic motivation: students, using a dual frame of reference, were found to consistently verbalize the awareness of sacrifices that loved ones made in order to make escape possible. School achievement was equated with making these sacrifices worthwhile for immigrant and refugee students (Suarez-Orozco, Suarez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

Learning also occurs outside of schools. For example, Schugurensky (2000) offers a
typology of the spectrum of informal to formal education: he describes non-formal education as “organized educational programs that take place outside the formal school system,” while informal learning refers to the educative processes that occur outside of institutions and programs, formal or not. Refugee education in camps falls under the category of emergency education, which for the most part is administered by the UN or private humanitarian organizations (Crisp, Talbot and Cippolone, 2001) and can be termed non-formal education, as it exists outside of a formal school system. These non-formal programs vary in quality and in most cases, the fact that they even exist and that students have the chance to attain some form of education has to be satisfactory.

The study

I locate my study on the refugee experience in this nexus of nation-state, immigration and education, particularly focusing on two research questions: 1) How do refugees and their social workers experience citizenship? 2) How does this population use non-formal education programs in refugee resettlement to construct ideas of citizenship? In providing a background for this study, I first offer an overview of the resettlement process in Chapter 2, especially as it pertains to major international negotiations throughout world history; this section describes international, U.S. and California policies on refugees. California is one of the top three refugee-receiving states in the U.S. and my study takes place in a region of California that receives the most refugees in the state. Chapter 3 provides a review of the literature on the broad topics and theories about citizenship, race and belonging. This chapter is meant to provide a brief overview of the concepts that led me to my research questions and methodology. Each of the findings chapters itself also has a separate theoretical framework and literature review woven in with my analysis. Chapter 4 gives an account of the guiding methodological framework of my study, in addition to details about the data collection and analysis processes. I explain my process of
phenomenological analysis in studying people’s life experiences based on interview data. I carried out fifteen interviews with former refugees, U.S.-born social workers and students who have been resettled in the California region where I carry out my fieldwork; I also analyzed document data in the form of organizational meeting minutes from a consortium of social service organizations working primarily in refugee resettlement. Because the experiences of citizenship and education are bound in state policies, my research takes into account people from three types of social services organizations: federally-funded national social service agencies, ethnic-based community organizations called the Mutual Assistance Agencies and a private non-profit community service organization.

Echoing the topics around which I organized my literature review, my findings are organized into three related themes, each having to do with a different point in the process of refugee resettlement. Chapter 5 focuses on my informants’ narratives of becoming refugees and of fleeing their home countries, and how these experiences influence their perspective on citizenship and political participation; thus, this chapter is largely informed by the interviews that I conducted with students who are in the process of attaining citizenship and former refugees most of whom are in the process of or have already become naturalized citizens and who are working in resettlement. Chapter 6 follows these informants as they arrive in the context of resettlement and consequently encounter the U.S.-born social worker interviewees; thus, in this chapter, I put my interviews with different people in conversation with each other within a funds of knowledge and aspirations framework to analyze the experience resilience and resistance. Chapter 7 focuses on the nature of day-to-day resettlement work; here, I relied on document data and interviews with U.S-born to uncover how concerns around employment and education engender perspectives on citizenship and collaboration. Finally, I discuss these findings’
theoretical and practical significance, along with study limitations and suggestions for future research, in the concluding chapter (Chapter 8).
Chapter 2: Background

Refugee resettlement is a multi-agency effort, spanning global to local, neighborhood levels. In this section, I provide organizational background to my informants’ experiences of forced migration. Firstly, I describe the organizational development of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), especially as it concerns world politics and historical forces. I then explain how the United States treats refugees, and end with mechanisms of resettlement in California. These issues present the macro-level landscape of upon which the topics of this dissertation take place.

Phases of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

The UNHCR serves as the global arbiter for displaced peoples. An international organization under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, the UNHCR was formally established in 1950, the culmination of a few decades of post-World Wars rebuilding that the international community had been steadily accomplishing (Loescher, 2001). Despite being founded with a three-year mandate, this organization recently celebrated its 60th anniversary and stands as a testament to violence, mobility and the important role of the state in the world. The UNHCR describes its functions as follows:

“the agency is mandated to lead and co-ordinate international action to protect refugees and resolve refugee problems worldwide. Its primary purpose is to safeguard the rights and well-being of refugees. It strives to ensure that everyone can exercise the right to seek asylum and find safe refuge in another State, with the option to return home voluntarily, integrate locally or to resettle in a third country.”

In short, the UNHCR has the following functions: protection, emergency response, assistance, “durable” solutions - namely voluntary repatriation, local integration and resettlement. Because resettlement is the most resource-intensive - involving caseworkers at the international and

national level (Troeller, 2002) – it is the option that is exercised the least. Out of the 10.5 million
refugees currently of concern to the UNHCR around the world, only 1% are resettled; only a few
states also participate in the UNHCR resettlement programs, with the United States being the top
resettlement country, followed by Canada, Australia and the Nordic countries.

The UNHCR was founded in the wake of WWII and in its formative phase, this
organization addressed the movement of European refugees. Refugee operations were initially
directed primarily by donor states’ funding and thus oftentimes these states’ policies. However,
the first high commissioner van Heuven Goedhart expanded the scope of this newly forming
organization by going to private donors, such as the Ford Foundation. With this funding, the
UNHCR was able to assist in the refugee integration from East to West Germany (Loescher
2001). The second phase of the UNHCR began with the Algerian refugee crisis in 1957. Because
of the Algerian war for independence from France, refugees fled to Tunisia, resulting in the
UNHCR’s first involvement in a Third World country resettlement. The Algerian refugee crisis
expanded UNHCR operations from Europe to other parts of the world, starting in the 1960s and
lasting through the 1980s, partly due to the extension of the cold war and due to decolonization
movements. From the 1990s onwards, conflicts such as civil wars in Bosnia/Yugoslavia in
Rwanda saw the UNHCR working with internally displaced peoples, who had fled their homes
due to violence but who were not looking to leave their countries; the focus in this era, extending
up to today, turns to human security and human rights, with an eye on addressing economic
factors that lead to forced migration (Loescher, 2001; Chimni, 2004). Table 1 summarizes these
different phases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception and European Refugee Crises</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>UN Declaration of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1940s to 1950s)</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Founding of the UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Convention on the Status of the Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>UNHCR involvement in integrating refugees from East to West Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decolonizations and involvement outside</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Algerian independence war and refugees in Tunisia (first major UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (~1960s to 1980s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>operation outside Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1967 Protocol eliminating geographic and time statutes on definition of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human security and Humanitarianism</td>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Relief efforts for Internally Displaced Peoples (IDPs) in Bosnia,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1990s to 2000s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kosovo and Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>Relief efforts and resettlement primarily for Iraqi refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Brief timeline of the UNHCR

Defining a refugee has constantly been an important task. The UNHCR’s work was legalized by the 1951 Convention of the Status of Refugees which defines a refugee as someone, who:

“owing to wellfounded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.”

In the 1951 definition, the term refugee was reserved for people coming from Europe due to events before 1951; the 1967 protocol removed these geographical and time limits to allow for the UNHCR to assist in refugee movements across the globe. The United States was a signatory

---

on the 1967 but not the 1951 convention. According to the 1951 Convention, a refugee needs protection because they “are not protected by their own governments [so] the international community steps in to ensure [refugees] are safe and protected” (pg. 2). In this rationale, the UNHCR assumes that the basis for protection of individual rights lies in the states; failing this, the international community becomes responsible. At the same time, “the 1951 convention does not prescribe a particular procedure for the determination of whether a person is a refugee” and instead, “an individual assessment is the preferred approach.” (pg. 5) The UNHCR requires that “states designate a central authority with the relevant knowledge and expertise to assess applications.” Thus, the UNHCR is partly limited in scope by the laws and orientations of the countries to which refugees first flee. For example, Turkey, a signatory to the 1951 convention (with geographical limitations on who qualifies as a refugee) and not the 1967 protocol, is the first country of escape for many Syrian refugees. Similarly, neither Indonesia nor Thailand, first countries of escape for refugees from Burma, are parties to any of the conventions. In such cases, the national governments work on a case-by-case basis with the UNHCR.

Traditionally, the role of the UNHCR has been to exercise judgment in terms of the three options available to the organization to assist refugees: (1) repatriation, i.e. aiding refugees to return home; (2) integration, i.e. helping the refugees live in the first host community or (3) resettlement, which can be a part of local integration or resettling to the developed countries that UNHCR has a relationship with. Repatriation provided a particularly troublesome situation for the UNHCR because the organization had to assess whether conditions were conducive for returnees; these “objectivist” criteria for return are oftentimes the state’s perspective on the measure of safety, removing the refugee’s subjective experiences and desires for return (or not) to their home countries (Chimni, 2004). The problems with defining a refugee have exacerbated
with the increase in people’s movements across the world. For example, the UNHCR in defining refugees must also contend with asylum-seekers who usually arrive in developed countries through unauthorized movement and who seek citizenship once they are in those new countries. Governments often fear that asylum-seekers are not “true” refugees in the way that the convention outlines but are instead economic migrants. This question led to the expansion of the UNHCR’s role and the organization, under the leadership of High Commissioner Stoltenberg, began to also take into account the role of poverty as a form of violence and extended their services to include the provision of development aid as a way of preventing refugee flows.

Today, the UNHCR excercises a combination of voluntary and non-voluntary repatriation, the latter of which is decided upon in consultation with the UN Security Council (Chimni, 2004; Adelman, 2001). Involving the Security Council means that rather than defining the refugee removed from boarder concerns, the refugee definition and solution must take into account human security. For example, Adelman (2001) argues for expanding human security to include issues such as economic, social and environmental safety; within this lens, the scope of the UNHCR can include legal and developmental provisions. This position also means recognizing that the UNHCR is not in a position to prevent refugee flows but can be in charge of providing relief when forced migration occurs.

**Resettlement in the United States**

In the United States, there are three federal agencies involved in refugee resettlement. First, the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration under the Department of State “directs U.S. admission policies and coordinates with overseas processing of refugees.”

---

UNHCR and other overseas refugee programs. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigrant Services (USCIS), under the Department of Homeland Security, is “responsible for making individual refugee status determinations abroad,” a task primarily carried out by individual Refugee Officers in the USCIS Refugee Affairs Division. USCIS also conducts security clearances, adjusting status for refugees and naturalization, as it does for all U.S. immigrants.

Finally, the U.S. office that interacts directly with refugees is the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), under the Department of Health and Human Services. This agency “administrates federal funding to state and local programs for social services, English language training and employment services.” This office is a hub for partnerships and collaborations with state, local and other federal agencies, in addition to ethnic-community based organizations traditionally called Mutual Assistance Associations, and international voluntary agencies with local U.S. offices such as the International Rescue Committee and Catholic Charities. ORR also administers the position of county refugee coordinators. There are two special programs that are came up in my research: firstly, the Refugee School Impact Grant provides funding for school-age refugees’ support services such as after-school programs and parental involvement programs. ORR also administers the Targeted Assistance Project, which provides funding specifically for programs that facilitate refugees obtaining employment.

Within its immigration history, the United States has a distinct history of refugee resettlement. U.S. federal refugee resettlement policies developed partly out of domestic politics and national interests in an ad-hoc manner (Zucker 1983; Scanlan and Loescher 1989). For

---

5 Ibid.
6 The California Department of Social Services officially uses the term Ethnic-Community Based Organizations to replace the older term, Mutual Assistance Agency. The term MAA came about based on the idea that members of the same ethnic community mutually assist each other (Hein, 1997). Because my informants use the term MAA, I have kept it throughout the dissertation.
example, the United States resettled many Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees after the
Vietnam War and refugees from communist states after World War II, while simultaneously
turning away asylum-seekers from Haiti, Cuba and Central American countries, such as
Guatemala and El Salvador due to the U.S.’s relations with these countries’ governments. The
first established refugee legislation was the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which formalized the
relationship between international voluntary agencies in order to ensure that the refugees did not
remain a “public charge,” in the United States. This Act permitted the admissions of refugees
fleeing post-war Europe. The Refugee Assistance Program of 1975 was created in response to
the influx of Indochinese refugees and was written into law as the Refugee Act of 1980, which
aligned itself with the UN definition of the refugee and brought about standardized services for
all refugees admitted to the U.S. It also instituted the Office of Refugee Resettlement to improve
coordination and cooperation among agencies interacting with refugees.

The resettlement process begins in refugee camps, situated along borders between
countries or within countries. U.S. and international agency officials interact with refugee
applicants in camps, thereby starting the socialization process to become a resettled refugee
(Malkki 1995). For example, refugees may see learning English as a way to help ensure their
chances of resettlement in the United States (Ong 2003). This has particular impact on children
as refugee education in camps emphasizes lessons that prepare refugees to “become American.”
Once refugees are approved to arrive in the United States, the placement of refugees in welfare
services carries additional significance; for example, the “bifurcated model” of Asian immigrants
depicts the ethnic Chinese immigrants as model minorities on the one hand, and Asian refugees
from Cambodia and Laos as “the new underclass” on the other (Ong 2003). The Lost Boys of
Sudan, former child soldiers whose resettlement to the United States from the infamous Kakuma
refugee camp made headlines in the 1990s, continue to struggle with the “refugee” label while being integrated into the racial dynamics of African American men in the United States (McKinnon 2008).

**Refugee Resettlement in California**

The ORR, in partnership with voluntary agencies (traditionally called “volags”) that are national in scope, delegates oversight of resettlement to the county level. In conversation with the ORR, volags such as the IRC and Catholic Charities choose where to resettle refugees. Some factors that go into these resettlement decisions include locating an ethnic-community base, cost of living and availability of jobs. States that receive the lion’s share of initial resettlement are Texas, California and New York with California resettling a total of about 700,000 refugees in the past forty years. California has organized its refugee resettlement into “resettlement forums” that span seven metropolitan areas: Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento and four metropolitan regions in the Bay Area. Each of these high-impact areas has a refugee resettlement coordinator who is based out of the Social Services office. The forums are coordinated either by a part-time, stipend-ed forum coordinator or voluntarily based on rotation by leadership of resettlement agencies.

---

7 “Refugee Programs Fact Sheets – California Department of Social Services.” Retrieved from http://www.cdss.ca.gov/refugeeprogram/PG1726.htm
8 Ibid.
Chapter 3: Review of the Literature and Theories

As outlined in the problem statement, the topics of concern for this dissertation are the workings of the state, the nature of citizenship and immigration and the role that education plays in the lives of immigrant students. This review focuses on literature around these phenomena with the end of highlighting the concepts that I study in the lives of my informants.

State, sovereignty and citizenship

Mann defines the “infrastructural power” of the state as “the capacity of the state to penetrate civil society and to implement logistically political decisions throughout the realm” (113). The state comes into contact with “organized publics” (Joppke 1998) in civil society, which may be comprised of certain employers, advocacy and ethnic groups. Globally-limited sovereignty entails that power is negotiated with international forces; this is exemplified in the law, “as is codified in the UN Declaration of Human rights, the right of asylum is the right of sovereign states to grant asylum, not the right of the individual to be granted asylum” (Joppke 1998, 101). In immigration, state monopolization of policies show that, notwithstanding globalization or increase in travel, the state still holds supreme importance in every day lives of migrants (Torpey 2000). The state achieves this monopolization by acting as the sole organ of identification for individuals through documentation – most notably, the passport – which also usurps the control of access to national spaces. States, with their limited willingness in extending paperwork to immigrants, are open to participation by citizens of other states “only at the margins” (240) through tightly patrolled and nationalized immigration policies.

Such paperwork is also tied to the ability to access services through rights granted via citizenship. Marshall’s original concept of full membership as a citizen (published in 1950, the same year as the founding of the UNHCR) encompasses three types of rights that evolve in
sequential stages: in the institution of citizenship, civil liberties such as freedom of speech are extended before political liberties. Tracing the rise of these rights in the history of England, he elucidates how civil liberties such as freedom of speech developed before political rights, such as the right to vote. Last to develop, but the most crucial in being a citizen with the accountability of a state, are social rights, which entitled citizens to economic welfare. Citizenship theories building upon this work question, among other things, the evolutionary nature of these rights.

There are different motivations and end results for the nation-states in the granting of these different rights, and while civil and political rights may maintain the social class status quo in a state, social rights involve a transformation of hierarchies (Turner 1993). Turner outlines a post-modernist critique of Marshall’s citizenship theory that is pertinent to and empirically substantiated by current global events; he questions the viability of a “unitary theme” of citizenship amidst different social and cultural traditions that inform what it means to be a citizen; he concludes that national cultures will ultimately determine what citizenship constitutes in practice (Turner 1993) and that newcomers challenge the unity of this national culture. For example, Soysal (1994), in her study of Turkish migrant workers in Germany, found that they participated in the host country without formal citizenship but with a wide range of rights and privileges. This led Soysal to claim that guest workers exhibit a new type of “post-national citizenship” that does not require the nation-state as the foundation of its existence; however, in doing so, she is privileging the civil and social rights in the institution of citizenship and de-emphasizing the importance of the ability to participate in a national polity through political and cultural rights.

As solidarity has been traditionally defined in terms of “national identity,” the notion of “others” becomes important because the right to vote is still tied to “national collectivity” and
carries a strong symbolic meaning (Torres 2009). Therein lies the biggest predicament with citizenship: the tension between identity and rights, a tension that may also be unearthed in Marshall’s distinction between the civil right of “the liberty of person” with free speech and the political obligation to a collective. In fact, social rights, such as rights to education, have taken precedence in the 21st century as the most salient parts of human rights but political rights remain reserved for full citizens of a nation-state.

**Notions of Difference: Race, Culture and Citizenship**

The movement and re-integration of peoples have introduced a different discourse about nations, nationalities and citizenship. Kearney (1991) makes the distinction between boundaries and borders by saying that boundary is the “legal spatial delimitations of nations” while borders delimit “cultural zones” (pg. 53). Even though the power of the nation-state may still be a force in migration, individual migrants, moved by such disparate winds such as labor, family connections and cosmopolitanism, redefine cultural zones through their movements; the nation-state then becomes tasked with new forms of control. This leads Basch, Schiller and Blanc (1994) to claim that nationalism is not going away but is being deterritorialized, with implications for the limits of nation-states as containers of culture.

Delgado and Stefancic (2011) particularly indict the racism of immigration laws when they say that:

> The legal definition of whiteness took shape in the context of immigration law, as courts decided who was to have the privilege of living in the U.S. As many ordinary citizens did, judges defined the white race in opposition to blackness or some other form of otherness…only those deemed white were worth of entry into our community. (85)

Historical evidence, along with research, clearly indicates that becoming an “American citizen” has been equated with either whitening or blackening (Ong 2003) processes. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argued that class power in the United States is mapped around racial lines. Ladson-
Billings and Tate trace the intersection of race and property to further highlight the contradictions of U.S. citizenship; a political conception of citizenship in the United States was first only extended to property owners, laying the foundation for a tension between “human rights” and “property rights” (i.e. the right of a human to own property). In a similar vein, Gott (2000) argues for a “critical race globalism” which calls for a “race critique for international justice analysis,” (1504) making CRT international and based on material realities on a global scale. Gott calls for an analysis of how refugee law, citizenship, admission regimes and segmentation or labor markets along migrant/nonmigrant lines allows researchers to keep in mind the global flows of migrant sending and receiving countries (and the historical context of these flows) in addition to the cultural and racial landscape of any locality.

Although immigration discourse and laws are still very much state-centered, with governments creating new ways of controlling the movement of people in the name of national security, literature on the nature of belonging and affective ties to homelands shows that the lives of immigrants are not as clear cut along the lines of state borders. For example, Mandel’s warns (2008) that the “existential anguish” experienced by the Turkish immigrant to Germany, “caused by persistent legal and bureaucratic hurdles and procedures” (15), should hold us back from completely accepting a post-national citizenship, citizenship that is no longer tied to a nation. While literature on the state and citizenship presents a broad-based set of theories, ethnographies focus on the lives of migrants, presenting on-the-ground ways of making sense of the world order of state. For example, Shankar’s (2008) work with South Asian youth in Silicon Valley underscores the spaces of resistance and meaning-making for these youth. Similarly, Smith-Hefner (1999) follows the lives of first generation Khmer-American students in Boston, showing how parents want children to maintain their Khmer language, culture and identity and the
conflicts in moral education that this parental desire creates.

Ong (2003) and Rosaldo (1996) argue that the school is both a public domain and a cultural space. State interventions at home and abroad that affect the lives of its citizens and youth in schools are no exception. This could be attributed to what John Dewey calls the process of transmission and communication in education: He describes democracy as a “mode of associated living” that arises from conjoint communicated experience. In this way, the process of education is essential to democracy, as it instigates the “freeing of individual capacity in a progressive growth directed to social aims” (52). Dewey underscores the importance of experiential learning in education; based on the ideas of continuity and interaction, claiming that a child’s past experiences bear on how children interact with the lessons with which he is presented. Thus, students bring their own histories and stories into the classroom which should be taken into account in pedagogical approaches to teaching and learning.

**Belonging and Education**

“Belonging” especially legitimized in a legal bureaucratic sense exists when there is a match between cultural and political membership, a situation that is becoming rarer, as immigration increases and individuals hold memberships in multiple communities⁹. However, a conflation continues to exist “between political belonging as a citizen and cultural belonging as a national” (Castles and Davidson 2009, vi). While access to education as a social right exists within a human rights framework, cultural belonging is a contested terrain in education. For example, Roy and Roxas (2011) conducted a study on the educational experiences of Somali Bantu refugees in the United States, interviewing teachers and parents, and conducting

---

⁹ There exist rich theoretical and empirical work on the nature of belonging of immigrant youth and children in schools (Malsbary, 2014). In my review here, I touch upon this literature to the extent that it is relevant to refugee students but given this study’s focus on the nature of the state, the review encapsulates refugees’ experiences of belonging as a citizen.
participant observations. Roy and Roxas pointed out that teachers attributed misbehavior to “issues at home” but were not able to pinpoint specific problems, whereas the Somali Bantu families “talked at length about a number of ways” that they assist their children at home, despite their inexperience with the language and formal schooling.

This is an issue that Depouw (2012) took up in her study of Hmong-American college students. Depouw used a critical race theory framework to highlight Whiteness as property, and historicize Hmong-American experience in the U.S. Black-White binary finding when White teachers emphasized academic achievement, teachers talked about these students in the same terms a when they emphasized academic achievement, and “blackened” them when a student “chose to commit a significant amount of time to the welfare of her family by working” (233). Depouw’s interviews with the students particularly highlight the importance of counter-stories that challenge the dominant ideology in the students’ lives. An interviewee reported that it is important to know “the truth about who you are, your background and your people and what they’ve done and what they’ve sacrificed” (235). Similarly, Roy and Roxas highlight the importance of storytelling in the lives of the Somali Bantu families; the researchers advocate for a model of teacher education moving away from tolerance which “implies an allowance of something at the most minimal level rather than a dialogic perspective that promotes meaningful discussion” (537-538) – and they suggest doing this before deficit thinking can set in.

In a democratic society that involves difference, disagreement and conflict are important. According to Torres, it is important to “consider whether it is possible that exposure to similar processes of learning creates different conclusions” (107). As the limits of a state-based notion of citizenship are particularly evident when insiders – those born citizens - become the enemy in wartime, Muslim American youth in Sunaina Maira’s study had to find spaces in which they
engaged in a “dissenting citizenship.” Maira defines dissenting citizenship as “an engagement with the nation-state that is based on a critique of its politics and not automatically or always in compliance with state policies” which indicates that these citizens sometimes “stand apart from the dominant perspective within the nation at some moments and also identify with others outside the nation who are affected by U.S. foreign policy” (201). Additionally, dissenting citizenship, unlike a post-national citizenship directly engages with “the role and responsibility of the nation-state and the question of belonging and rights for subjects,” (201) focusing on the ambivalence of belonging in nation-states. This phenomena is also evident in Thea Abu El-Haj’s (year) work with Palestinian-American youth in New York City whose sense of belonging exists “outside of the recognized borders of a nation-state” (286): the U.S. foreign policies of whether they be imperial or humanitarian directly affects the youth in schools. Dissenting citizenship would thus use notions of difference in order to push for a paradigm in which modern structures of the nation-state are not abandoned but are instead transformed into frameworks relevant for the marginalized.

Conclusion

Here, I have offered three themes that broadly encompass concepts relevant to refugee resettlement. At the most macro-level, I begin the idea of the nature of a state’s power and of the nation-state a homogeneous entity. Then, I review research on the lived experiences in a diverse society, particularly the U.S. where my empirical work takes place. Refugee resettlement is a dynamic process, occurring only over the course of a finite time before full citizenship is inevitably attained. Additionally, it is a time when connections are being rebuilt. Building upon the themes that I highlight in this literature review, I carry out a phenomenological study of the refugee experience. As the nation-state system and its loopholes have created the citizen and the
refugee, a phenomenological approach focused on how people experience education, culture and workings of the state is appropriate for study the context of resettlement. I expand upon my methodology in examining these processes in the next chapter.
Chapter 4: Methods and Methodology

Lifeworld research: Phenomenology as a method

In the tradition of hermeneutic phenomenology, the researcher “pursues the individual…against the background of an understanding of the evasive character of the logos of the other, the whole, the communal or the social” (van Manen 1990, pg. 7). The phenomenology of the refugee experience forms the basis of the case study presented here. Based on prior participation in this California metropolitan area resettlement forum, I (in discussion with some of my research participants) defined a focus for this phenomenological research study, namely citizenship and education. Having this pre-determined focus for phenomenological description offers an instrumental case study, in which the researcher and research participants may already know the focus of the case (Stake, 1995; Cousin, 2005). Thus, the methodological framing for this dissertation is as an instrumental case study of the phenomenon of refugeehood in a resettlement community in California.

Relying primarily on interview data contextualized by visits to organizational meetings and workplaces of my interviewees, my data analysis and collection focused on the interplay between the “meaning structures of our lived experiences” - in my case, immigration, difference, diversity and education - and these structures’ imprints on my participants’ life-worlds which the philosophical tradition based on Heidegger’s work defines as “being in the world.” Ashworth (2003) clarifies this definition of the life-world by enumerating some “interrelated elements” of the life-world:

1. **Selfhood**: What does the situation mean for social identity, the person’s sense of agency, and their feeling of their own presence and voice in the situation?
2. **Sociality**: How does the situation affect relations with others?
3. **Embodiment**: How does the situation relate to feelings about their own bodies?
4. **Temporality**: How is the meaning of time, duration, biography intrinsic to the
situation in which one finds oneself?
5. **Spatiality**: How is their picture of the geography of the places they need to go and act within affected by the situation?

6. **Project**: How does the situation relate to the person’s ability to carry out the activities they are committed to and which they regard as central to their life?” (p. 215-216)

The idea here is that the self is formed in concert with one’s world and by focusing on this interaction, phenomenological research allows us to understand how a person’s life experiences shape his or her perspective on the world. My analysis took to task these tenets in different ways, as I explain in each findings chapters.

The data for this study was mostly garnered through interviews that I conducted after participating in the meetings of a resettlement forum in California, meetings that I attended both before and after I began research for this project. I ended my data collection after carrying out fifteen interviews (as described below), two years of meeting minutes and about a total of four visits to forum meetings. Following Bowen’s analysis of meeting minutes (2009), I also employed document analysis methodology, a process that I explain in detail in Chapter 7, which incorporates findings from this analysis.

In analyzing my interview and document data, I used both a thematic and “exemplificative” analysis on my informants’ narratives. I read and organized my interview transcripts according to the broad questions around life story, citizenship and education I offered to start the conversation a more grounded fashion. I found that the mention of moving from one place to another (be it nation-states or in the case of my U.S.-born interviewees, different U.S. cities or travel outside of the U.S.) came up in each interview, as did mention of family members, regaining citizenship and hopes about how to make the best use of citizenship and Because my phenomenological case study was guided by uncovering the experiences of citizenship in refugee hood, I use these codes to develop the second part of my analysis,
exemplificative description.

I wrote my findings “exemplificatively,” a method of data analysis that van Manen defines as follows: the researcher “begins the description by rendering visible the essential nature of the phenomenon then fill out the initial description by systematically varying the examples,” with the end that “each additional case could enlighten some essential aspects of the nature” of the same essence of phenomenon (27). Thus, I identified the commonalities that make up the phenomenon of refugeehood, citizenship and education that were emerging in all of my interviews. I then added varying examples to this initial description. This was an iterative process; van Manen (1990) posits that phenomenology is a “project of various kinds of questioning” and “requires a dialectical going back and forth among these various levels of questioning” (131). In my analysis, I moved between the coded interview snippets and these interview snippets re-contextualized back in an individual interview; doing so allowed me to analyze the data from the levels of questions that I had asked and from the context of individual participants’ whole interviews. This ensured that the data pieces did not become divorced from the individual life-world where they originated, and the themes I present are indeed the shared essence of the phenomena of refugee and resettlement.

I did not use a software program to code my interviews as I was less interested in the frequency and overlap of occurrences than in the meaning that individual participants assigned to them, and how these individual meanings resonated across my interviews; in fact, Groenewald (2004) has argued that software programs are less amenable to the phenomenological approach as “the understanding of the meaning of phenomena” cannot be reduced to an “algorithmic process” (20). However, due to the overall breadth and volume of the meeting minutes, I did use the software Dedoose for the very first analysis of the organizational meeting minutes from the
refugee resettlement forum. After reading through the corpus of documents I collected, I used Dedoose to code and organize the data according to themes of employment, education and organization type; once I had coded the meeting minutes according to these themes, I used Dedoose to select instances where these codes overlap. The overlap between employment and education allowed me to arrive at the theme of “collaboration” whereas the overlap between employment and organization type allowed me to see that there were variations in how these organizations were working to make sure their clients became employed. The nature of this analysis is specific to the findings that I present in Chapter 7, so I explain the document data analysis process in more detail in this chapter.

After my analysis and initial drafting of the findings chapters, I returned to four of my informants to share my work as a way of carrying out member-checking, a process in which information is “‘played back’ to the informant to check for perceived accuracy and reactions” (Cho and Trent, 2006, 322). These conversations were fruitful in that my participants found my analysis resonant and suggested future lines of inquiry that they were interested in based on our discussion of the findings.

**Sites and people: rationale for selection, access and researcher positionality**

At this point, after I have explained my research sites and before I go into the details of my interview process, it is necessary to mention in some detail how it is that I attained access to these spaces, necessitating a discussion of my own positionality, or where I stand in relation to “the other” (Merriam, Johnson-Bailey, Lee, Kee, Ntseane and Muhamed, 2001) in my research. According to van Manen (1990), phenomenological research is “always a project of someone: a real person, who in the context of life circumstances, sets out to make sense of a certain aspect of human existence” (pg 31). Refugee affairs, particularly in education, have been central to my
work and research. By the time I began conducting research in this particular resettlement area, I had spent about two years working within the spaces there. In addition, I have concerned myself with refugee issues for the past twelve years, beginning with my work with refugee children and adults in Boston and Cambridge. In addition, I have Burmese citizenship and Burma is one of the top three refugee-sending countries in the world. When I first arrived to the United State it was not with refugee status but rather with a student visa to attend a top tier college on a scholarship. My immigration experiences are nothing like my interviewees’ even if some of them are my compatriots. What we do share is a sense of dislocation and continued fear that comes from having escaped a totalitarian regime under which loved ones still lived; we also shared the hope that our escape would benefit not just us but others as well.

Thus, I became interested in the genesis and trajectory of the exiled, especially the role of education because it is within national education systems that people become inculcated as citizens; it is also with education that people are liberated from these inculcations. The research for my Master’s work took place within a school and I investigated how immigrant and refugee students used education to belong, particularly through their use of multiple linguistic repertoires. This experience showed me that their learning extended beyond linguistic practices in school; the importance of attaining citizenship and creating a sense of stability in community-based groups for these students led me to conduct my doctoral research with a focus on formal and non-formal education.

My experiences as an immigrant who shares certain experiences with my informants, along with my experiences as a researcher who has worked with this community before, inform my study at many levels, from inception to analysis. Armed with these prior experiences and
relationships I built with the people and organizations in this resettlement community, I conducted my interviews, the details of which I offer in the next section.

**Interviews**

I recruited my participants in two spaces to which I had access: Forum meetings and an after-school homework space where I had permission to conduct research from the program administrators. At the forum, which is a gathering space for refugee social service providers, I gave a short presentation on my research and passed out a sign-up sheet asking for the contact information of people interested in participating in my research. In the after-school program, I introduced myself to the attendants and invited them to do an interview with me; while there are both immigrant and refugee students in this program, mostly refugees from Burma (with one exception) agreed to do interviews with me in part because they had become close to me based on our common language (although the students are more fluent in languages than in the official language of Burma, Burmese, which I speak). In this way, both spaces provided me with participants that fit my criteria of former refugees working in refugee services, U.S.-born social workers and refugee students.

Following the phenomenological tradition, my interviews were open-ended and addressed three main components: the life trajectory that led my interviewees to where they are today, what their views are on citizenship and being a citizen, and what they believe the purposes of (their) education are. My open-ended interview protocol involved three topics for which I prepared the following questions to start the conversation:

1) Tell me about the story of your life; how did you get to where you are today?

2) What does it mean to be a citizen? (For former refugees, I prefaced this with: You are in the process of gaining a new citizenship here in the U.S. What do you think that
means? What will change?)

3) What do you think education is for?

My interviews with the service providers lasted anywhere from 1 to 1.5 hours. The interviews with the students were shorter and lasted about 45 minutes. I conducted three interviews in Burmese: I transcribed these interviews in Burmese first and then translated them into English. I analyzed these interviews in English, but before writing up my results after the analysis, I went back to the Burmese transcripts to check for translation gaps. Having obtained the entirety of my secondary school education in Burmese and higher education in English, I have a full command of these languages. When in doubt, I consulted the Myanmar-English Dictionary put forth by the Ministry of Education of Myanmar.

The table below summarizes the characteristics of my interviewees. All names used are pseudonyms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym and gender</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity and nation-state</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lin (female)*</td>
<td>Rakkhine - Burma/Bangladesh</td>
<td>Former refugee, now refugee advocate and social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leng (female)</td>
<td>Cambodian - Cambodia</td>
<td>Former refugee, now refugee advocate and social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonali (female)</td>
<td>Tibetan – India</td>
<td>Former refugee, now refugee advocate and social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eh Myo (male)*</td>
<td>Karen – Burma/Thailand</td>
<td>Former refugee, now refugee advocate and social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaw (male)</td>
<td>Burmese – Burma</td>
<td>Former refugee, now refugee advocate and social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura (female)</td>
<td>White American - U.S.</td>
<td>U.S.-born refugee social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris (male)</td>
<td>White American – U.S.</td>
<td>U.S.-born refugee social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi (female)</td>
<td>African American – U.S.</td>
<td>U.S.-born refugee social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehema (female)</td>
<td>African American – U.S.</td>
<td>U.S.-born refugee social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate (female)</td>
<td>White American – U.S.</td>
<td>U.S.-born refugee social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eh Say (female)</td>
<td>Karen – Burma/Thailand</td>
<td>High school student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude* (female)</td>
<td>Chin – Burma/Malaysia</td>
<td>High school student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lian (male)</td>
<td>Chin – Burma/Malaysia</td>
<td>High school student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eh Htoo (female)</td>
<td>Karen – Burma/Thailand</td>
<td>High school student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astha (female)</td>
<td>Bhutanese – Nepal</td>
<td>High school student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. List of Interviewees

The social workers responded to my invitation at the forum for participants; I strove to interview the same number of U.S.-born, refugee-origin social workers and high-school aged refugees who have not yet gained citizenship to maintain equal representation, in order to be able to draw themes equally from these three groups of people.

I first met Lin in 2009 when I volunteered at a pre-school with a program specifically for mothers and children of refugee backgrounds. Lin was a staff member there and had a one-year-old son. Because we both spoke Burmese, we struck up a rapport and I would drive her and her sons back to their apartment after work. I had visited her house and met her family a few times before I asked to do an interview with her. Our conversation took place at her home; when I contacted her again for a member-check after I drafted my findings, she took me to her workplace, a hospital where she was doing medical interpretation work, and we talked outside the patients’ rooms during her downtime.

I met Zaw a bit earlier than I met Lin. Again, I connected with him through my volunteer work with a high school serving immigrant and refugee students; however, I did not get to know him as well as I did Lin. When I began my doctoral research, he introduced me to Eh Myo to interview, declining to be interviewed himself. However, he and I had two or three extensive conversations about refugee resettlement work, in particular his frustrations and his desires as a non-white leader. I approached him again after I analyzed my interview data and this time, he agreed, voicing his interest in my findings and future work. Our conversation took place over the phone and was a combination of the unstructured protocol I had before and an overall conversation about my analysis at this time.
Rehema was in charge of the program where I used to volunteer at the immigrant and refugee high school so I met her around the same time as I met Zaw and Lin. Her path in formal education was circuitous and she has had many other professional positions, including being a flight attendant and a high school teacher. I also went back to her for a member-check, at which point she told me the good news about her acceptance to a Masters program in Education.

I met Leng and Sonali at the Forum meeting, as they responded to my presentation asking for interviewees. I talked to Leng at her workplace at the county hospital where I was able to see health interpreters at work. A Cambodian refugee, she has been involved in refugee resettlement for over twenty years and have published popular books about this topic. Sonali stands out in my interviewees because she is of Tibetan descent and grew up in Tibetan camps and schools in India.

My interview with Laura took place over a meal near her house. By that point, she had facilitated the interviews and welcomed my presence at the monthly forum meetings. Chris and Naomi also responded to my presentation. At the time, Chris worked for a Mutual Assistance Agency, one of the few white men to do so, and had held similar positions in North Carolina in addition to working as a teacher in a refugee camp on the Thai-Burma border. Naomi is the county refugee coordinator; she squeezed my interview in between her home visits to clients. Kate is a community programs administrator. As with Zaw, I was able to carry out her interview only after I began my data analysis. She also served as a “member check.”

I first met Astha when she was a sophomore in high school in 2008. I interviewed her for my Masters research and reconnected with her for the dissertation project through her friends in the after-school program where I recruited interviewees. She is currently a college student and I was able to interview her between her classes in the student center on campus. I interviewed the
rest of the students after school, after the tutoring program. These students are those that self-select to attend the homework help sessions at which I volunteered so they tended to be high-achieving. One of them, Gertrude, did very well in school in Burma, although when I met her she was struggling to learn English in her new school. She, along with Htoo Lar, Lian and Eh Htoo had been in the U.S. for less than a year at the time of our interviews. Eh Say had been in the U.S. for a full school year; she graduated from high school this year as the valedictorian.

The study was explained twice to my informants, once at the initial presentation and participant invitation and another time before the interview. All adult participants signed the consent form (Appendix A) before the interview. I explained in Burmese the study to the participants who were high school students before having them sign their own consent form (Appendix B). In the case of these participants, I also attained the consent of the primary guardian (Appendix C).
According to Miles and Huberman (1994), a conceptual framework is a “visual or written product…that explains either graphically or in narrative form the main things to be studied.” Maxwell (2013) builds upon this idea and adds that the researcher builds a conceptual framework
using relevant ideas from literature. Similarly, the conceptual framework that underpins my study “draws together multiple theoretical perspectives that underpin the reality within which [my] research was defined” (Berman, 2013, 7). Based on my literature review and my prior research experiences with refugees, I arrived at two phenomena to study – what it means to become a citizen and how education is utilized in this process. The resulting phenomenological analysis offers ways that my informants experience citizenship and education.

Figure 1 offers the conceptual framework of this study, beginning with the ideas that came from prior research and theoretical literature, and ending with my contributions to these concepts. Each findings chapter roughly corresponds to a section of my review of theories and literature. At the same time, each of these the three findings chapters is also concerned with three phases of the refugee trajectory; in the chapter on “in-between” citizenship, we encounter the refugees first in their homelands and follow the refugees’ narratives as they navigate leaving their nation-states and losing the connections that were supposed to be their birthright. I attempt to capture refugees’ lived experiences of citizenship or lack thereof in this chapter. The second findings chapter sees the refugees having arrived in their area of resettlement in California and interacting with the social workers who in turn bring their own experiences with belonging to the resettlement work. In the last chapter on social work, I document the frustrations and successes of the day-to-day work, especially bureaucratic, of successful resettlement, which is seen to be defined as gainful employment. Thus, the findings chapters altogether are meant to provide an overview of the resettlement process from the beginning (i.e. leaving a home country) to the end (i.e. utilizing social services in order to be on the path to naturalization as citizen in the U.S.).
Chapter 5: Citizenship on the Move

Introduction and Theoretical framework

In the late 19th century, there was the rise of the territorialization of nation-states and the accompanying bureaucracies that aid in this territorialization (Anderson, 1991). By establishing borders, documentation, national government and sovereignty, the world order became organized around the nation-state system. Once a state has established a territory, it must also attend to its ability to control its boundaries and people’s movements. Thus, the modernized nation-state comes with its arsenal of paperwork and other legislative moves that prove its stature as a nation. This arsenal not only includes cultural symbols such as flags, national anthems, and the like, but also administrative mechanisms such as identity cards and eventually, passports (Torpey 1998).

As these state mechanisms were put in place, the sense of sedentariness became the norm: people’s origins were determined by their linkage to a territory, which they established through owning proof usually in the form of a paper document, to a territorialized nation. In fact, it came to be that if someone was not able to establish this link, that person was suspect - a “vagabond.” Such indictment highlights a dominant way of belonging to the earth that establishes that to be a citizen starts to mean to be rooted. By acquiring documentation that is attained though legal means, a person is able to prove belonging and thus become an accepted, legitimate member of the community. Thus, the bureaucracy and legality around citizenship provide the moral currency of being a citizen, a currency that the citizen can use to participate in his or her polity.

Citizens sometimes cease to fit into the imaginary of the nation-state, primarily by becoming different or deviant from the traditionally assumed homogeneity of nation-state norm. In this case, the person who is forced to leave is the “aberrant citizen” who strayed from the
According to Liisa Malkki (1992), our “attachment to place lead us to define displacement not as a fact about sociopolitical context, but rather as an inner, pathological condition of the displaced” (33). As Agamben (1995) argued, far from being a static, rarified status, the nation-state and the citizen are carefully constructed and maintained - couplings whose tenuous nature is revealed by people who do not fit these molds. The fate of people who do not fit into the imaginary of the nation-state is forced migration and life as refugees. Stripped of their national garb, these people become subject to the exigencies of survival and physical safety becomes paramount as they lose their political belonging. They are only entitled to bare survival modes, a situation that must be rectified by bringing them back into the fold of a nation-state. According to Agamben is “birth comes into being immediately as nation, so that there may not be any difference between the two moments,” and that “there is no autonomous space in the political order of the nation-state for something like the pure human in itself” (93). Refugees through forced migration and expulsion from a nation-state are reduced to naked human life, a state that can only be temporary in a time when nation-states are the only possible containers of being; thus, refugees must be re-recognized as human/citizen through some form of re-linking to a national community. The prospect of firm belonging through not only cultural but also political means is linked to a nation-state.

A major marker of difference in nation-states, which are premised upon a certain homogeneity, is difference in ethnicity. Anthony Smith (1986) has argued that a sense of nationhood does not come out of nowhere and that it is preceded by ethno-nationalism, a sense of connection based on ethnic identity. Mapping this ethnic identity upon a territory and bureaucracy in part creates nationalism. Occasionally, forced migration movements arise when the mismatches between pre-modern ethno-nationalism and modern nationalism become salient.
There is a long tradition of such differences, pre-dating but also brought into modernity by the first internationally-managed refugee movements, including the Holocaust (Soguk 1999). In current times, situations like ethnic cleansing are major drives for refugee flows. Additionally, political refugee situations have arisen where there are weak states - states whose legitimacy is tenuous albeit their attempts at belonging in the world order. Consequently, a legitimating action of such a state may include ethnic cleansing, leading to forced migration movements that produce refugees. As Schmitt (2005) says, “sovereign” is one “who decides the exception.” Nation-states attempt a variety of legitimating actions to prove their territoriality in the world order, and deciding who stays and who goes is another way of proving their legitimacy.

However, it is noteworthy that the fault seems to be not on the nation-state who expelled but by the people who have been expelled. Critiquing the U.N.’s resolutions, Soguk underscores the idea that the “object of intervention…is not human beings as victims of a state gone aberrant,” but “human beings as refugees” (194). In other words, these are citizens who have gone rogue, who “lack the qualities of a citizen” and thus pose a threat to the sanctity and safety of the family of nation-states. Victims of forced migration, refugees have been ejected into a world of nation-states can only be trusted again - “saved” - through re-establishing a linkage with a nation-state; that is, they must return into the fold of a citizenship somewhere. In fact, the three solutions to refugee movements - repatriation, integration to the first country of flight (or

---

10 The meaning and definition of ethno-nationalism may vary based on the place where it arises or the function it plays. It is both an outcome of and degeneration of nationality. For example, Anthony Smith’s definition of ethno-nationalism is based in non-Western societies, generally before the modernization of nation-states. Nazi ethno-nationalism, occurring after the building of a nation-state, provides a rationale for ethnic cleansing. On the other hand, diaspora ethno-nationalism allows people living away from their land of birth to claim a connection with this homeland. Overall, ethno-nationalisms are predicated upon citizenship by blood and are thought of as standing in contrast to civic nationalism, where citizenship and belonging are maintained by political engagement, regardless of bloodline, a situation that is perhaps find more of a home in the United States (Muller, 2008).
“intermediary country”), or resettlement in a third country - all make use of the nation-state structure.

In the phenomenological tradition, the question of selfhood revolves around what a particular situation a person finds himself or herself in can mean for this individual's sense of agency and voice in the situation (Ashworth, 2003). Selfhood is the interiority of an individual's life as informed by out experiences. This section on refugees' thoughts, fears and hopes about citizenship is an attempt at getting at the selfhood behind refugees. This chapter also concerns spatiality because the geography of movement figures in my informants’ lives and affects how they experience citizenship. My findings in this chapter sheds light on this experience of bare life and the concerns that come with it. Agamben also calls the refugee a “limit concept” which “brings a radical crisis to the principles of the nation-state and clears the way for a renewal of categories.” Similarly, Freire (1999) talks about the limit-situation of peoples who have untested feasibility looking toward the future. It is my hope in this chapter to highlight ways in which my informants experience the limit-concept of refugeehood and consequently, begin to look ahead at the possibilities of regaining citizenship. Because refugeehood is a temporary condition, it is possible to develop a schema of in-between citizenship, or interstitial citizenship, as a way of understanding the hopes and ambivalences that come with this situation.

Refugee beginnings: The initial rupture

My informants described how their legitimacy/humanity was questioned when their states decided that they were no longer part of the nation-state of the territory that they inhabited. Their experiences show how a rupture in the linkage between human and citizen can happen to the inhabitants of a weak state at any point in their lives. Astha’s quote below exemplifies the essence of becoming a refugee that was repeated across my interviews with refugee informants:
In Nepal, the Nepali government thinks we’re Bhutanese but in Bhutan, they don’t think we’re Bhutanese. That’s why we can’t have citizenship, unless we go illegal or something.

This rupture brought my interviewees to the realization that different points of views determine their multiple identity markers. When Astha says that the Nepali government thinks she and her family are Bhutanese, she signals to the interpretation of “Bhutanese” as an ethnic identity from the point of view of one nation-state. On the other hand, in the second part - “in Bhutan, they don’t think we’re Bhutanese” - the same label of “Bhutanese” has a different meaning, that of national identity. Astha was born within the boundaries of Bhutan as part of the people of Nepali heritage. The Nepali government calls on an ethnic categorization for expelling Astha and her family while the Bhutanese government uses a nation categorization to disclaim ownership of their ethnic counterparts. In the process, Astha loses her ability to belong in either national spaces.

Another informant uses the discourse of bureaucracy to explain his plight of becoming a refugee. Eh Myo was living in a village that was part of the Burmese nation-state when the Burmese military invaded as part of their response to Eh Myo’s ethnic comrades’ attempts at fighting for secession from Burma. As a consequence of this expulsion, he could pinpoint the disjuncture between citizenship by birth in a territory and citizenship by extension of paperwork.

I lived in Myanmar, but when I look back, it’s like I became illegal. I was no longer part of the country because I never had a registration card, I wasn’t a citizen. I lived in a village like an “original citizen,” but in the village we couldn’t get a registration card. People in a country are supposed to get marked, the country is the marker.

The violence that the Burmese army could enact against him and his village, according to him, could have been prevented had he been properly processed with paperwork to become a citizen. Because he did not have documentation or evidence for being “a part of the country,” he was
unable to become “marked” by the country even though he lived there all of his life, leading to the dismantling of his existence in the space of this nation-state. He rationalizes that had he been able to provide proof of his citizenship, he might not have been expelled by his state.

With newer technologies of the state, the notion of paper as proof of identity and belonging was taken further to regulate and control borders. The institutionalizing of identities becomes even stronger, leading to the legitimized confluence of humanity and citizenship. John Torpey (1998) calls this institutionalization the “embrace of the state,” a necessary step before the penetration of the bureaucracy. Given the need to compete for resources such as education and employment, the closure takes on a more urgent character; the aberrancy of the refugee leaves them exposed and naked, an urgency to be fixed. Because Eh Myo above was not “marked” via his original state’s embrace, he must go knocking on others’ doors in order to partake in resources.

In Lin’s case, her refugee situation was determined for her long before she was born. She traces her ethnicity to her forefathers whose ethnic identity Rakhine, was not recognized as providing a legitimate link to the nation-state in the generation of her grandparents.

My parents are from Burma, from Rakhine state. I was born in Bangladesh but both countries said you are not our citizen, so I was stateless.

Lin’s family, before her birth, did not re-establish a link with a nation-state territory after being expelled from Burma. Lin mentions both a national and sub-national (or ethno-national) identity when she describes that her parents are “from Burma” and “from Rakhine state,” Rakhine being the name of a recognized ethnic minority group. However, three generations ago, the Burmese king, in a bid to secure the lands of the Rakhine murdered the Rakhine administration. This decree remained as modern bureaucratic structures were put in place, resulting in Lin’s family never getting a chance to re-establish a link between their ethnicity and
the nation-state. Lin’s disjuncture thus spans generations and before she eventually claimed
refugee status in Thailand which eventually led to her ability to resettle in the United StatesU,
Lin existed officially as a “stateless” person residing in Bangladesh, the result of birth in a
country where she is without legal ties.

Burma is a multi-ethnic nation that has a long history of internal conflict, beginning with
a coup d'etat in 1962 that led to fifty years of military dictatorship. In the wake of this takeover,
many ethnic groups take up armed resistance to not only be free from the military coup but also
to start their own ethno-nationalist nations (Thawnghmung, 2011). The Karen group from which
my interviewees Eh Say, Eh Myo and Lian hail, have historically been the most active group, a
trait that is rooted also in their religious differences (Rajah, 2002). Because of the violence of
armed conflict, many Karen people have been forced to flee to neighboring Thailand, resulting in
one of the longest protracted refugee situations in the world (Tan and McClelan, 2014). With
recent transition of power from the military to a mostly-civilian government in the renamed and
newly-recognized Myanmar, this refugee situation is coming to an end, and my interviewees are
among the last waves of refugees to be resettled in the U.S.

Refugee becomings: Between states

Once a refugee no longer fits into the mold of the citizen he or she must leave the nation.
In this case, refugees often pass through an intermediary country, the first country that they flee
to, where they apply for refugee status with the international system of governance. During this
period, the discomfort and pain that comes from having lost the accepted link between citizen
and state becomes apparent, as refugees have to navigate through various social difficulties.

First, we went from Magway to Yangon by bus. From Yangon, we couldn’t take the
“upper route” to Malaysia, we had to go the “lower route.” The upper route means that

11 http://www.unhcr.org/547451cc6.html
you are legal in Malaysia, with a passport, a registration card. Lower route is smuggling. So in Yangon, we had to go through a smuggler with that connection. The route wasn’t very easy so we stayed in Yangon for 6 months. It was the rainy season, and it’s difficult to travel during the rainy season. We left Yangon and went to Kawt Thaung by train. And then there were so many problems. We arrived in Kawt Thaung and then the smuggler guided us. We traveled during the night, so the road was dark and we had to go through the forest. We were so scratched up by thorns and sometimes when the situation was not good, we had to hide in the forest. We were hungry, there were so many mosquitos biting us, it was raining hard. It was not easy at all! We went into Thailand, and there were lots of bad people. We were so afraid people were going to see us. But luckily, our smuggler was good. He brought us to an old hangar/garage near a house and fed us. And when we went to Malaysia, we had so many problems. We had to crawl through a barbed wire fence and the wires scratched us a lot. What they did was they used big scissors to cut the wire fence so that one person to pass. The wire fence was very long and about 10 feet high and we had to go pass that.

I present the above snippet because although Gertrude was the only person to give me a seamless account of her process of flight, all my refugee and former refugee informants in some way talked about very similar processes of flight across their interviews. This narrative is of course reminiscent of illegal routes of movement all over the world. There is an informally institutionalized travel route (“the lower route”) that involves firstly attempting to obtain or at least forge a passport and waiting for good weather conditions to travel clandestinely through forests with thorns and bugs. Luckily for her, the smuggler that her family hired seemed to be a seasoned traveller. If the imagery of illegality/undocumented travels is not already salient, Gertrude talks about a 10-feet wire fence that they cut through to walk onto Malaysian soil.

When asked why there was a fence, she used the word “smuggling” for the first time, saying that the Malaysian government was trying to prevent “smuggling” because they want people to arrive via “the upper route,” and that if anyone caught gets thrown into jail immediately. In addition, Gertrude explains her year living in Malaysia as one with many trials

---

12 Gertrude used the Burmese word “pwe sar” here. The literal translation for “pwe-sar” is “broker” but from her description we see that she and her family were led by a smuggler across about 1800 miles from her home in the north of Burma to Kuala Lumpur in Malaysia.
and tribulations, despite the fact that she and her family were in a place of increased comfort and safety than before in their home country of Burma:

We were the people of Burma but we had to suffer from the government and because we had to suffer like that we feel very sad. Malaysia also does not want to help us because the refugees from Burma work a lot and their people become unemployed so people get worried.

Gertrude emphasizes that the lack of belonging in a state, not just in her initial state of Burma but also in the intermediary one of Malaysia, continues the suffering that comes disruption of ties resulting from forced migration. She delineates the role of her government in causing this strife and also the role of another nation-state, Malaysia, whose obligation is to “their people” and their people’s employment. She has interacted with two national governments, neither of which has served her.

In Malaysia, there was still confusion about people’s status. When I asked Gertrude if she was a refugee in Malaysia, she responded that she and her family indeed decided to go for “UN status” there:

When they asked, do you want to come to America, of course we wanted to because there is no future in Malaysia. We weren’t legal in Malaysia, we couldn’t go outside like we wanted, we had to stay in the house for 8 months.

Unlike Eh Say or Eh Myo, Gertrude’s family was not living in refugee camps but in an urban area, where living costs were high and defrayed by sharing close living quarters with other families. Economic concerns, for her, continue to be salient. As much as others speak of seeking opportunities to be safe and having access to education and health, her focus remains on the lack of economic opportunities, even though her discourse also includes the acknowledgement of the precarious nature of existence in Malaysia: “We weren’t legal in Malaysia, we couldn’t go outside like we wanted to, we had to stay in the house for about 8 months.”

Another student, Lian, had a similar story that focused more on his experiences as worker
in the restaurant business. Like Gertrude, he was fifteen at the time of flight and understood that his journey was “because of politics and we didn’t have the opportunity to learn very much, even if we went to the big city.” He stayed for two years in Malaysia, and the only thing he wanted to tell me about his life there was his work, because life in Malaysia “is not that much.” He worked in a restaurant and liked “working and getting some money:”

I enjoyed it because there are many different foods to learn and cook. We can even learn Chinese because all the customers speak only Chinese.

At the same time, their lack of documentation means that they “got a warning” sometimes and “if the police come, we have to hide, running from them.” Regardless of where they were, this intermediary space was one that they knew they were bound to leave – the question was, to where: “When we got the card, we don’t know where we were going to go. Maybe Singapore, maybe another state. They just tell you just go somewhere safety.”

These experiences in the “intermediary country” – where refugees initially escape to before they are resettled – can be seen through the constructions of nation-state borders and boundaries. Michael Kearney (1991) argues that “boundaries are legal spatial delimitations of nations i.e. boundary lines as opposed to the borders of nations which are geographic and cultural zones or spaces” (1991). When legal boundaries clash with the realities or borders that people create within their lives, citizens lose their ability to claim their rights; this situation is predicated upon the confluence of citizenship and humanity. These border and boundary lines slide into and over each other, creating cracks that force people to inhabit precarious spaces, where welcome is sparse and safe existence temporary in the pursuits of a more stable situation.

The state, in general, can be thought of as both a place and an actor (Mann, 1986). This dual nature of state activities is particularly important when we consider the possibility of state control as actor over movement of individuals in and out of its boundaries, in other words, the
state as a territorial place. The state embraces those who arrive in its territory through extension of documentation, penetrate its territory with the intent of policing boundary lines or cage its inhabitants with its policies, depending on the interests of the state. When the embrace no longer includes a swathe of the population, these people – proto-refugees who have not yet gained recognition from the U.N. for this status – become detached, floating in the interstices of different states. These people must then deal with the mechanisms of the international system.

Consequences of the mismatch between citizen and state lead to the care taking of stateless people being jettisoned to the international system, pursuant to its norms and expectations. The irony of the refugee experience is that even though the genesis is collective, the solution out of it in the international system is individual. The balancing act of groups and individuals is most apparent in the process of asking for protection in another nation state. In international governance, a state interacts with another state, so each must be mindful of foreign policy interests. Despite the knowledge that there are refugee situations happening in a given country, a person who has fled this country must make a case for himself or herself to gain safety. The international government processes refugees as individuals even though their existence is based on having been labeled as a part of a persecuted group. Susan Coutin (2001) argues that this process is inherent to a liberal notion of agency inherent in political asylum and international law: individuals have rights to live out their capacities and states have to uphold these individual rights. In her study of Central American asylum seekers in the U.S., she uses the case of people who did not manage to get asylum and protection to show that the U.S. portrays unsuccessful applicants as “rights-bearing citizens” of El Salvador, in order to get out of recognizing the wrongdoings of the El Salvadoran state. In the process, U.S. officials insist upon an individualized narrative of “the oppressed who suffer” in order to be able to provide asylum.
According to Coutin, “a generalized fear…had to be transformed and individualized in order to be legally recognizable” (82).

At the same time, the ethos of humanitarianism and the reality of the situation - in Coutin’s example, the increase in applicants from Central America - will bring about a response from the state in the form of legislative acts, making it easier for applicants to demonstrate their persecution by virtue of being a part of a nation-state. Thus, Ben Herzog (2009) argues that humanitarianism and nationalism are not contradictory in nature but in fact reinforce each other. In the Israeli state’s treatment of refugees over time, Herzog shows how the rhetoric and reasoning behind the decision to resettle both Jewish and non-Jewish refugees is interwoven with the discourse of what Israel as a nation represents. In both Herzog’s and Coutin’s examples, we can see the importance of packaging oneself in alignment with what a nation-state legitimates as its citizens.

For some of my interviewees, the process of authentication begins in the first country that they flee to. To obtain “UN status” in Malaysia, according to Gertrude, her family had to supply satisfactory answers to questions about the difficulties and reasons for leaving their country. After this step and after living in Malaysia for about a year, they were able to go to another country. Unlike Eh Say and Eh Myo, however, they were not living in refugee camps, as such organizations did not exist where they were in Malaysia. Gertrude pointed out that it was easy to locate Burmese people in Malaysia and through these connections, her family eventually received help to contact the UN. In fact, there was an organized network of community organizations there to help similarly undocumented peoples.

There were offices – one office connected us with the UN but whether or not we get the status is up to the UN of course. If you get arrested, because we were not legal, there’s an office that helps you with that. Sometimes, if you end up in jail, the office makes sure you get proper treatment. It was good back then, there were also clinics. If you get sick,
you can go to the clinics and ask for medicine, even without a UN card. They were not UN people but they were connected to the UN.

Wah Blu speaks of this process in more detail, illuminating the need to clarify allegiances in the process of attaining entry to the United States. When I asked about the beginnings of the resettlement process, he first clarifies why he had to come here in the first place by explaining why he couldn’t go to Burma. “I lived in the camp for a long time, about 30 years. I didn’t want to go back to Burma because if I went back, I don’t dare go back to the village. I didn’t have anywhere to go back to.” In a particular moment of poignancy, he mused: “It’s better for us men – women have to suffer more, rape and other things were always happening.” He then brings the U.S. into his conversation and says, this is why “the U.S. and the U.N. have negotiated the number of refugees.” He focuses on the fact that they ask about certain involvements that the refugees have had:

Some people don’t know how to talk and tell their story. If they say something wrong – like if they say they’ve been with an armed rebel group – they won’t get it. We have to say we have not done anything like that. Maybe some people have participated in things like that but for the most part, there is no problem for the villagers but if you happen to say something wrong, you can have some problems.

I probed about what sense he makes of this type of questioning, and he responds somewhat indulgently: “I think around that time, in the world, there were a lot of world terrorists, so I guess they were worried.” His further musings on what makes him eligible for U.S. resettlement in the shed light on the “truth” that is expected of him:

Only true refugees will leave and stay here. If you want to revolt, you will be living on that side in Burma. I’m only living in a camp because I’m a refugee, but they have to ask.

Here, it is not just what is but what is framed to be that is also important. Regardless of the reality of anyone’s situation, a script must be followed when talking to authorities who decide whether or not a person is indeed a refugee. Gertrude is less vivid and certain about her reasons for leaving and becoming a refugee: “There were many things that were not working out. In
terms of business, work was scarce.” While traditionally, perhaps if a different pathway of migration had been taken, they would have been classified as “economic migrants” and not “political refugees.” However, within the framework of human security, Gertrude’s case still shows the persecution that she and her family endured. Eh Myo finds some humor in this line of questioning, and with a laugh, says: “They even ask me if I’ve been involved in politics, and I said, how could I have – I’m a refugee! They tell me, don’t lie and I said, why would I lie? I left my village when I was so young, and I’ve lived in the refugee camp since then.” For him, the truth is self-evident and the bureaucracy seemingly unnecessary.

Once they have obtained refugee status and resettled into the United States, refugees are confronted with U.S. immigration law that requires any citizenship applicant to prove refugee status yet again. Rehema, a teacher of refugee students, criticizes the process of attaining citizenship for refugees as follows:

I have some criticisms of the long road to citizenship, especially for people who are resettled here. These are opposing notions, opposing gestures. First you have to apply and many people are in the refugee camps for decades at a time. And then you get your social security number. And then you have to wait five more years to sort of justify that you really, really need to be here.

After making this point, she looks at me, widening her eyes, in disbelief. All immigrant applicants to the U.S. have to wait in this line of attaining full citizenship, and refugees are no exception. Even though most refugees have been living in camps, often in the case of my younger informants, for their entire lives, they have to go through the hoops of interviews, justifications and waiting to legally become a refugee as sanctioned by the international world order. Her mention of “opposing notions” may mean that the “welcome mat” that resettling countries extend is not so much a mat as it is a bureaucratic labyrinth that refugees must walk through, a tunnel during which they are living in the margins of society.
Rehema gestures to another irony when she talks about “teaching people who should never have to sit in front of her in the first place.” By this, she means that a lot of refugees come out of wars waged in part by the U.S. government. Thus, were it not for U.S. foreign policy, refugees who not be here: in this case, foreign and domestic policies are inextricably linked, yet another gesture of opposition.

**Refugee resettlement: Regaining citizenship**

In the process of becoming citizens in another country, the passport is, for many immigrants, the last documentary link that a person establishes as a tie to the nation-state. Recalling Weber’s idea of bureaucracy as the ultimate instrument of the modernized state, Torpey argues that passports are the “bureaucratic equivalent of money” that constitutes the “currency of the modern state administration” (10). The state embraces its citizens through documentation and highlights the social closure inherent in the institution of citizenship. Thus, gaining a passport as the final documentary link establishes one as a citizen and extends the right of *jus emigrandis* to many.

Given the theoretical and empirical importance of the passport for many, it is surprising that the process of getting new citizenship elicits ambivalence from my participants. My informants recognize the importance of gaining citizenship, especially the passport, and want the power of movement and voting rights from citizenship – but they believe that these gains will be made at the loss of others. For example, for Astha, the currency of a passport is for legitimate movement first: currently, she has all the other rights through permanent residency and the only think lacking is getting a passport.

Asthą; To be honest, I don’t think [getting citizenship] makes much difference. It’s just that you know, I can have a passport. I applied for the study abroad program and I got in but in order to participate, I have to have travel document. That’s the only time I wish I was a citizen.
WW: Are you not a citizen of your own country?
Lian: We are, but the government said if we go to another country without any permission, they will put us in the jail or sometimes. They don’t allow us to go.
WW: What do you think will change when you become a citizen?
Lian: If I become citizen, I can visit back to my country.
WW: Do you want to do that?
Lian: Yes I want to do that and see how it’s going, how it’s changed, maybe is it ok to go back or. If we’re not citizens, we’re not safe to go back. If we’re not citizens, if the government chases us, we’re not able to come back to the US yet. Even if we’re not safe in our own countries.

Showing re-establishment of a link to the nation-state means the ability to do what has led them to the United States: movement that is legal and legitimate. If the government of Burma expels them again, they will only be able to come back to the United States if they have been included in the fold there.

Another element of freedom that comes with citizenship is the ability to vote, participating in the political community. Eh Say talks about this desire as follows:

WW: What does that mean, to become a real citizen?
Eh Say: It means that you can have freedom like that people who were born here.
WW: How is that different from what you have now?
Eh Say: Now we have freedom but we cannot vote - even if you are over eighteen, you cannot vote. When you become a citizen, people say you can vote.

Eh Say goes on to describe the experience of participating democratically that she has had in the past, so she does not yearn for this ability blindly.

Eh Say: I like to vote actually. When I was little, like thirteen or fourteen, when I lived in the refugee camp, every four years, they choose a new camp leader and you can vote whatever you want. Kids can vote too. Voting is important because many ideas is better than one idea. For example, between you and me, one person can say you are good, she needs to be a leader but nobody can decide who I pick.

In fact, Eh Say, the student above who wants to get U.S. citizenship, appears ambivalent about where to vote.

Winmar: If you get a chance to be a citizen in Burma, would you?
Eh Say: In Burma? I don’t know but in Thailand maybe.
Winmar: Why in Thailand?
Eh Say: Because I have never lived in Burma, that’s why I don’t know. But I have lived in Thailand.
Winmar: So you want to be a citizen in Thailand because you have been there.
Eh Say: Not really...because in Thailand, I was only in a refugee camp. You are not citizen, you don’t have freedom like they do. Also they treat you differently.

Eh Say’s democratic participation so far has been in a non-state entity. For people like her who do not have political membership in a nation-state, political participation is hard to locate spatially and territorially. She realizes that despite having the chance to vote in Thailand, it was not in Thailand, a nation-state, but in the interstitial area of the camp where the quality of participation is definitely sub-par. She does not want to gain citizenship and political rights anywhere but in the United States because she has neither affective ties – “because I have never lived in Burma” – nor political ones – “in refugee camp, you are not citizen.” Political leaders are heads of state, elected by and serving the interests of people who live in their jurisdiction. At the same time, states are not serving the interests of those who desire to have political say in their spaces but not able to do so. The interstices between citizen and non-citizen are highly suspect and need to be rectified.

Refugees in my research are caught exactly in these interstices and await the time when they will have established themselves as being part of a stream of bureaucracy/infrastructure that will assist them. Then, they will be re-linked to a nation-state, a membership that comes with self-sufficiency and the ability to shape their own destinies. In imagining ahead to this position, some of my informants talk about their desire to contribute to others’ social welfare and whether or not citizenship will actually aid or hinder them in living out this life goal. For example, Eh Myo who above criticized the process of proving his refugee status, says:

I don’t want to get citizenship here [the U.S.] because I am considering going back to Myanmar to help. But if the law [in Myanmar] says if you are a foreign citizen, you can’t help, I have to take that into account. I always think about this. I want to go back to do
social work.

A desire to be at least engaged in social welfare in Myanmar makes Eh Myo reconsider political membership in the United States even though he will eventually have to attain citizenship per stipulation of his refugee status. The legal process of citizenship interferes with the affective ties he has about going back to help.

At this point, it is useful to recall traditional theories and uses of citizenship, particularly the sequence of rights from Marshall that I mentioned above. By outlining the development of different types of rights, Marshall attempted to reconcile individualistic aspects of citizenship with the accountability and cohesion that can be present in society. Marshall seeks to move away from taking into account goods and services consumed, challenging a property-based notion of citizenship, to seeing holistically the changes and benefits of a national community. Thus, by parsing out how different “citizens” may have different rights, Marshall seeks to illuminate the dilemma of being a citizen without the “concept of full membership of a community” (72).

Refugees in the process of resettlement do not have full membership in a community. While refugee provisions account for social rights, other rights may lag behind as their legal documentation takes a while to take effect. The nature of modern-day citizenship is such that the right to vote is very much tied to legal documentation, so even though people can live in a country with social and, to some extent, civil rights, without political rights, they are still essentially on the margins of society. Soysal's (1994) study of “post-national citizenship” highlights this idea. According to Soysal, guest workers’ participation in the host country without formal citizenship but with a wide range of rights and privileges challenges the idea of rights tied to citizenship. This leads Soysal to claim that guest workers exhibit a new type of “post-national citizenship” that does not require the nation-state as the foundation of its existence; however, in
doing so, she is privileging the civil and social rights in the institution of citizenship and de-emphasizing the importance of the ability to participate in a national polity. Soysal’s work with guest workers in European countries not only turns the sequential nature of Marshall’s theory on its head, but also highlights the importance of social rights in the marginal status of non-citizenship.

However, Soysal in her model of “post-national citizenship” has to concede to the idea of national culture. Even though the Marshallian sequence of rights is reversed in her model, she contends that the right to vote is still tied to “national collectivity” and carries a strong symbolic meaning. The identitarian dimensions of the nation-state are at odds with effectively carrying out citizenship rights but are related to nation-state sovereignty. Arguing that the post-national advocates raise to the center what is mostly a peripheral experience, Joppke (1998) posits that not only can post-national membership become parasitical on the nation-state (because rights are awarded to guest workers without the chance to be responsible to the political community) but also that non-citizenship is an interim marker. States are still the primary organs that enact rights so incorporation into a nation-state must happen eventually.

In the case of refugees, whose lives are no longer protected by their original nation-state, UN-initiated human rights discourse attempts to substitute for the loss of rights-granting communities and monopolization by the state. The refugee has lost or never had documented citizenship in his home country, and now, carries a U.N. document. In this situation, it is not the state but the supra-state structure that has taken up the role of giving documentation but the refugee has neither responsibility nor political right to the UNHCR because the refugee is a transitory status; eventually, a nation-state will claim the refugee and his or her allegiance – and rights – will gain new citizenship and will be bound in a new polity. However, in the meantime,
local or municipal rights are even more important for refugees and stateless people in the enforcement of their social rights (Joppke 1998).

As long as the nation-state is the grantor of rights and belonging, refugees will be caught in between their imaginations and memories of their homeland on the one hand, and their realities of their safe haven on the other. Bryan Turner (1993) states that there are different motivations and end results for the nation-states in the granting of these different rights. Most relevant to the question of gaining new citizenship is the idea that “civil and political rights do not require any new social hierarchy whereas welfare rights…may promote an egalitarian transformation of social hierarchies” (7). Turner questions the viability of a “unitary theme” of citizenship when there exist different social and cultural traditions that inform what it means to be a citizen. He thus says that national cultures will ultimately determine what citizenship constitutes in practice. Turner says that a theory of citizenship must address both rights and obligations that come with the status. He thus exhorts a move away from defining citizenship in political or legal terms without “a revolutionary transformation of the very basis of civil society” (3). Presumably, the connection with a national culture is predicated upon an identity of being from a place and thus a part of it – something that refugees have lost after being expelled from their country of origin.

A former refugee and now a refugee advocate, Lin criticizes the structures of citizenship based on the nature of citizenship based on its instrumentality:

I was born on the border, I don’t have citizenship in just one country. It’s important that if you have citizenship or not, you have human life’s basic needs. It’s no use if you have citizenship but your basic needs are not met, it doesn’t make sense. Seven billion people in the world and a couple of billion are just ok. If you look at Africa, Middle East, Asia, they have citizenship but they are suffering.

According to this point of view, citizenship does not mean much if basic needs are not taken care
of. While citizenship is the primary means by which individuals become a part of a nation, not all individuals within the nation may exercise their rights equally (Torres, 1998). At the same time for Lin, her lack of citizenship was not a deterrent for her to get ahead in her life. She speaks of her opportunities to go to school in relation to her understanding that in some places, there are not enough resources for people to do “what they want with their lives.”

It is because of this inequality in opportunities that Lin goes back to the legal governmental structures as follows:

Undocumented, immigrants and refugees need strong voice. Government must be accountable, not only the U.S. Government but every government. Make sure that people are safe, as humans that they have the right to better education.

Gertrude goes on to further underscore the linkage between morality and legality that the government implements:

Gertrude: I think it just has to do with the government. If the government is good, no one has to go to another country. If they give their citizens jobs, they won’t go to another country. We can stay peacefully and work in our own place.

Conclusion

Rehema sums up her views on citizenship as follows:

Citizenship is a slimy beast. Because on the hand there’s the legal documentation that makes you a citizen, all the hoops and the financial responsibility that that’s attached to. But then there’s the citizenship of humanity in that when you are in a place, you are a citizen of that place.

This “slimy beast” of citizenship has evolved through the legal documentation set up across centuries of modernization and has served valuable purposes. However, citizenship often provides uninhabitable modules of membership, whether this be in the country that an individual was born in, the one that provided a holding place for her, or the one that provided a final safe haven. When borders that people create through movement and the boundaries that have been
drawn don’t coincide with each other, people are caught in between, highlighting the need for a citizenship of humanity. Forced migration from a certain nation-state means knocking on the doors of any other nation in an exercise of rights based in the human person and not on a document.

Figure 2 offers a schematic representation of the refugee migration described in this chapter. A person begins as either a documented citizen (such as Gertrude or Astha) or a de facto stateless person (such as Eh Myo and Lin) in a country of origin. The next step in the process is the flight, which can be seen as a certain moment of rupture that results in the creation of the refugee (the line here is solid because there is no ambivalence about the status of the person after flight). In the intermediary country, the refugee becomes “marked” again as such and is ready for resettlement, per the designation of international entities such as the UNHCR and the agreement of resettlement countries (in this case, the U.S.). The ambivalence of an individual’s status is shown in the dotted lines around the in-between status – “interstitial citizenship” – in the process of resettlement.

Figure 2. Losing and Regaining Citizenship
In this chapter, I looked at the entrenched-ness of the nation-state system, and the problems that refugees experience with citizenship. I argued that refugees, in their in-between states, suffer not only physically and in terms of material needs, but also in terms of political voice and agency. I end this chapter with the idea that refugees need to be reintegrated into the fold of the state in order to have their legitimacy restored. In the next chapter, I bring in the voices of social workers in refugees’ place of resettlement to look at how social workers interact with the refugees to create new connections.
Chapter 6: Resettling Together

Introduction and Theoretical Framework

It is not unexpected that the image of the refugee, like other marginalized peoples, is inscribed with invisibility and voicelessness (Nyers 2006); indeed, refugees, those bystanders to wars that suffer often without reason, are in dire need of caretaking. Casualties are inevitable and lead if not to death then to disrupted communities. A consequence of losing their refugee status involves reclaiming community, and in this section, I offer the experiences of refugees and their social workers as they work together in resettlement. In analyzing my informants’ orientations towards community, I use the framework of Funds of Knowledge (Moll, Amanti, and Gonzalez, 1992) instead of the traditional social and cultural reproduction analysis because Funds of Knowledge framework lends itself to the dynamic nature of resettlement during which my informants are coming to terms with and aspiring beyond what their past and present situations offer.

Funds of knowledge was conceptualized to “refer to historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (Moll et al, pg. 133). I adopt this framework to indicate the knowledges that my interviewees have gained from their experiences with overcoming adversity in their lives. In the phenomenological tradition, people’s sense-making of their own experiences is considered to be intentional acts that result in their own knowledge that are valuable for survival (van Manen, 1990). Thus, I take as a departure point the idea that the bodies of knowledge that my interviewees have developed are “funds of knowledge…in dealing with difficult social and economic circumstances (Moll et al, 1992, pg.133). Moll et al considered groups that were different in some ways from refugees, particularly in that their work was with
household units and not with disrupted communities such as refugees; at the same time, families whose lives spanned the Mexico-U.S. border parallel the experiences of my interviewees, who move across national or generational lines. Both types of experiences bring about “cross-border” (Moll et al, 1992, pg. 136) understandings and knowledges. My interviewees have amassed funds of knowledges of their own and draw upon these funds in their efforts to be resilient and resistant, despite the trauma of rupture.

As I investigated the theme of my informants’ making sense of the past, I also found that my informants’ experiences encompass overcoming oppression and persisting past these injustices, not just for themselves but also for others in similar situations regardless of nationality or locale. Turner and Simmons (2006) offer a model of refugee resilience that explains how resilience and resistance can exist in concert. Resilience traditionally comes from biological assumptions of individual survival against external threats, whereas resistance involves acknowledging and challenging dominant power relations in society. Bringing these two oftentimes-separate processes together, Turner and Simmons argue that the connections that refugees maintain with others contribute to be resilient and overcome adversity and also fuel their responses to oppression. I extend their framework to also include narratives from U.S.-born informants who also talk about how they overcame adversity in their own lives and how these experiences left them with a desire to help others. This chapter concerns the sociality aspect of the life-world in the phenomenological tradition (Ashworth, 2003). Sociality concerns how a situation affects a person's relation with others: here, I investigate how refugee resettlement affects how my informants work together and connect with others.

The capital approach – encompassing economic, social and cultural capital - to understanding social reproduction has been prevalent in social science and education literature
(Morrow and Torres 1994). A primary argument of this capital approach is to challenge the idea that only some people have what it takes to succeed, whereas others – economic, social, racial/ethnic minorities in particular – have been worse off because they lack capital. Morrow and Torres critique some of these approaches to studying social and cultural reproduction because these theories are “parellelist” and encourage independent investigation of different variables. Instead, they call for a model that is “open-ended, takes modernity as an object of critical inquiry…and yet considers the political implications of theory and research in the context of a project of…emancipation” (46). This kind of analysis, according to them, will allow for politics to be “considered as a horizon that opens up possibilities for human action and as a contested…terrain intrinsically linked to…individual identity and action” (46). As I explained in the previous chapter, refugee resettlement involves coming into being in the interstices of states, a limit-situation that can open up possibilities to reconsider taken-for-granted concepts such as citizenship.

Zipin, Seller and Hattam (2012) similarly argue for expanding the scope of an analysis of capital; they assert that capital’s relevance is in its exchange and not use value. Thus, capital is subject to the whims of the market, privileging dominant ways of being over possible alternatives. Instead, Zipin et al. (2012) see value as that which makes sense in a person’s life-world: “the cultural substance of value is knowledge that has uses for social life…not abstracted from living social use by a logic of accumulation of knowledge that, due to its scarcity, has ‘market-exchange value’ which can be parlayed by…networked collectives of ‘social capitalists’” (181-182). Thus, people become absorbed into a world of accumulating capital in order to exchange it for other goods in a series of winning or lose. Instead of buying into this meaningless competition, capital must be infused with “lifeworld values” that have more
relevant use in people’s lives. Here, Zipin et al. (2012) call upon Moll, Amanti and Gonzalez’s (1992) framework of Funds of Knowledge because the concept of funds, while maintaining a monetary logic, offers a more fluid and dynamic way of thinking about people’s life-worlds that is more collective and future-oriented. Funds of knowledge are living entities, created and recreated throughout a person’s life and community. Funds challenge the reified nature of capital because it mobilizes the knowledge and skills of “less-advantaged” students to “fund” processes that go beyond the rote-like learning in service of existing dominant structures. According to Zipin et al. (2012), this framework makes sense in the current times wherein “fragmentation and flux make for unsettlement more than either ‘settled’ continuities of solid modern social-institutional grids or inter-individual and inter-family social reciprocities of communitarian philosophical imaginaries” (184).

This situation is particularly relevant for refugees whose life-worlds are on the outer extremes of the current world-order; they are victims of disrupted communities whose experiences of survival have to be transformed into a force or fund that is of use in their resettlement context. Additionally, this is a state that is temporary, a condition that is in flux, in the process of “resettlement” so their embodied knowledges are not quite reified as class or cultures, calling for a more dynamic approach in studying their embodied knowledges. Refugees also are more likely to be in situations of poverty which Zipin et al. (2012) term “abject community” which they define as a place where “poverty is salient and liquidity does not easily allow for formation of cohesive social fabrics” (184). Indeed, the commonalities between the poor across national or regional cultures must not stop at the recognition of a conceptually useless “culture of poverty;” instead, Zipin et al. task the Funds of Knowledge approach to go beyond recognizing the lack of coherence between impoverished and wealthy lives, and to “fund
capacities for (re)imagining modes of social life that do not yet exist but that could exist in social spaces and structures beyond a capitalizing gravity” (187) of other forms of community.

Funds of Knowledge present a relevant framework for this chapter because my informants are in the process of learning to work with each other and re-build connections. Zipin et al. (2012) claim that it is important to “think past the tendency of ‘capital’ discourse to essentialize communities of people as holistic unities of simple affinity based on…social-structural positions” (182). Finally, the Funds of Knowledge framework makes sense for this study because “communities are not ‘thing-like products but living processes wherein socially interactive and communicative people (re)create things and practices and invest them with sense and meaning” (Zipin 2009, 324, emphasis original). This effort also involves redefining the frameworks of value and culture to include a processual view of life-worlds.

In order to act on funds of knowledge, individuals also have to show resilience and resistance. In my data, I saw that the same experiences that allow the U.S.-born social workers and refugees to come together a community of resettlement also motivate their desires to create a better future for themselves and others. This prompts me to follow Zipin et al. to call upon Appadurai’s (2004) framework of aspirations to how funds are channeled by people from different backgrounds to act upon and dream simultaneously of resistance and belonging. Following Turner and Simmon's (2006) simultaneous analysis of resilience and resistance, my informants simultaneously engage in both resilience as an individual process and resistance as a collective process to understand their past and dream of the future.

**Support from family members and teachers**

All my interviewees talked about family members, most commonly because these family members are sources both of their predicament (i.e. being a refugee) and of their desire to do
well and give more. For example, Astha said her father was an activist who worked on behalf of the Nepali minority in Bhutan. For these efforts, he was put in jail for two months, prompting them to leave Bhutan once they could. Similarly, Gertrude, whose family is in both the ethnic and religious minority, said that her father’s work mentoring youth in a church got him in trouble. The poverty in her part of the country led them to move to the main cities, which offered more material resources but were equally restrictive religiously. These fathers’ work advocacy continues to this day in the United States.

Lin speaks of a more far-ranging intergenerational connection that informs her current status and work. Her story goes back three generations when her family was part of the first expulsion of Rakhines, a major ethnic group, from the state of Burma, in 1784. Being part of the Rakhine king’s court at the time, her ancestors were particularly targeted, forcing them and 150 families to flee across the Bay of Bengal in boats towards what is now Bangladesh. She continues:

This kind of genocide is not only starting nowadays, it’s been happening for a few hundred years. The issue was not addressed or resolved by subsequent leaders so it became more and more complicated and this was the situation I was born into. In the past, I didn’t know about Burma. I only knew about the Rakhine nation. That was my grandfather’s life, then my mother’s and now mine.

She told me this story in response to my question about how she “remained strong” in her situation of myriad struggles in multiple government systems that did not seem to have her interest in mind. When I asked her how she has maintained her sense of hope, she was quite explicit about its root.

It’s because of my family, my parents, where I come from. They are also thinking always about society. Without that generational struggle, maybe I’ll be like people who can focus on earning money, going here and there…but with the struggles that I have been through I want to be of service to others.

Lin’s mention of people who “can focus on earning money” is directly reminiscent of capital; in
the space of “earning money,” however, she has her struggles which make her “want to be of service to others.” She explicitly recognizes how her past struggles motivate her current work.

The sentiment of struggle leading to social work also came up in my interviews with U.S.-born social workers who, together with people who were born into or lived in the refugee experience, form the jagged and disparate community of my informants. My informants shape the contours of this new community by speaking of similar experiences from their pasts; the bridge between these communities is built by the ways that they transform past experiences into funds of knowledge and use these funds to fuel their work. For example, in response to a question about what motivates her work with refugees, a service provider, Laura, shared that because she lost many immediate family members during a short period of time, she “has a feel for other people and maybe where they might be facing issues that are unexpected and not of their own accord.” The traumas that refugees have had in their lives are out of their control and this lack of control is a situation she has experienced multiple times, and “it was surprising each time, so [I also have] a sensitivity that like to see people really succeed and if they’re really having a tough time, really provide them with a scaffold that they might need.” This experience is complemented by the travel that her parents liked to do, taking her and her siblings to areas like the Middle East and North Africa on medical mission trips, that sparked her interests in other cultures, an interest she continues with her own children today.

Rehema, an African-American teacher and coordinator of an afterschool program, pinpointed teachers as ones that inspired her to eventually come back to the teaching profession, despite being “disenchanted” and taking a detour from pursuing formal education. Education, despite this initial disenchantment, was “freeing” for her, one that she credits her teachers with creating:
I never forgot the teachers who changed my life, who really loved me in a very literal way. I stumbled into education after a dead-end job and [found that] I love this. Coming into this in that way, it feels very much like I’m honoring and giving reverence to the elders that taught me.

Building on this confidence and presence that she developed from these “elders,” particularly English teachers, she found that she has developed “a speaking style and a presence that got [her] into places that she was not qualified for.” She cites the example of her current job: the job posting called for a Master’s degree and at the time she was in the process of completing her undergraduate studies. However, she believes that she was able to use the “style and presence” that her teachers had encouraged in her in order to secure the position. Thus, for her, “education can be truly transformative” in this tangible way. She continues to say that the learning provided by her teachers is “still happening, the seeds that they planted in me, they’re still growing.”

Another American social worker, Chris, similarly cites a simple but profound way that his mother influenced his current interest in refugee case management:

When I was 15 years old, my mom used to drive a van that had computers in it into the slums and she was shot at a few times in the van, but she tutored this guy who was 84 years old and didn’t know what four times four was. I was there, and he was so happy and he cried a bit that day. She was so happy. It’s educating adults and I think it’s really important.

His mom experienced violence for the her work, but seeing her happy despite these challenges made a lasting impression on Chris about both the work of adult education and of giving back to others. These transformative experiences affirm his belief in the importance of his work.

The presence of the mother’s work in Chris’s life, Laura’s family’s interaction with social services and travel, and Lin’s family’s long history with forced migration drive current social work. In Eh Myo’s case, it is the absence of a family member which added to his struggles but which motivated his social work. Eh Myo explains how, even in the refugee community, his life “isn’t quite the same as other people’s:”
My father died when I was young, and without him, there was no one to help me. I had to stand on my own feet and struggle, including for school. I had to stand on my own feet and struggle, including for school. When I think back to how I tried hard, I empathize with others. When I was young, I had no one to help me. I don’t want other people to suffer like me. That’s why I’m interested in social work.

Eh Myo has walked his talk, even in the refugee camps. Like Lin, the idea of giving back is one that he has entertained and acted on consistently throughout his life. When he was not able to go on to university after high school, he, at the urging of a teacher who knew of his interest in social work, allowed him to help the student in the camp as a tutor. After he arrived in the United States, he used his trilingual – Burmese, Karen, English – abilities to assist newcomers, making flyers in Karen, but only in his free time. Eventually, he transitioned into his current position at the refugee resettlement organization entirely:

I was working at a medical company and the income was good. Here, I can only work part time but there, I got full time or even overtime. I got a lot of money but it wasn’t work I was interested in. I used microscopes to look at things, it was very high tech. Why I started working at this refugee resettlement organization is…in our refugee camp, there were people who did not know how to speak Burmese at all. I empathized with them. When there is just one person – for example, me – here, it’s easier for everyone.

Eh Myo and Lin have both pointed at the connection to family as the motivation for wanting to move beyond the situation that they find themselves in.

Channeling funds for resistance: Aspirations

Building upon the connection with family members as outlined above, my informants also talked about the desire to move forward and help people. Specifically, both refugees and their service workers highlighted previous familial resources as the reasons that they were doing so well and that motivated them to help others to do well too. This consideration is both rooted in the past and oriented towards the future.

This connection between the past and future is related to Arjun Appadurai's (2004) concept of “aspiration,” in which he attempts to reconcile the idea that when people talk about
culture, they take on past-oriented views; however, development is often couched in future-oriented terms; this distinction is important to make because of most development plans’ attempts to pit tradition against progress and the ability to adapt to the future. However, Appadurai’s (2004) intervention is that in the past-oriented ways that people talk about culture, there are shadows of the future because what is mentioned are cultural norms or patterns of behavior that constitute a blueprint for how people will act in the future. By thinking of “the implications of norms as cultural capacity,” we can focus on people’s capacity to aspire - that is, people’s aspirations:

   form parts of wider ethical and metaphysical ideas which derive from larger cultural norms. Aspirations are never simply individual (as the language of wants and choices inclines us to think). They are always formed in interaction and in the thick of social life. (Appadurai 2004, 67)

Additionally, Appadurai argues that “the capacity to aspire is a navigational capacity” and the rich are in a position to use “a map of norms” to aspire because they have had more alternative experiences and more opportunities to imagine. The poor on the other hand have been limited in this navigational capacity and thus have been limited in their capacity to aspire. An important way of redressing this issue is through “changing the terms of recognition,” by people in capable positions. Similarly, Rios-Aguilar, Kiyama, Gravitt and Moll (2011), highlight the importance of students themselves recognizing their own funds of knowledge. Once both students and educators have recognized their funds of knowledge, they can activate and mobilize these funds in order to achieve better educational outcomes.

   It is possible to use this framework to understand the ways that my informants’ live experiences. My informants, as part of their own processes of mobilizing these funds of knowledge, transformed their experiences into aspirations for the future, and talk about ways in which they can navigate their current situations in order to eventually give back. These funds of
knowledge, and eventually their motivations, are informed by their recognition of their experiences. Thus, when my informants began to reframe their experiences as motivation to do good in the future, they engaged in aspirations informed by their life-worlds. Refugees and their social workers, while acknowledging the “dark” funds of knowledge, knowledge that comes from the difficult experiences (Zipin 2009), in their lives and of social forces that try to put them down, focused on resisting these forces.

Eh Myo engages in aspiration based in his life-world when he brings up wanting to uphold what he calls a “lack of discrimination” – for him, the scope of his social work is not bound by his ethnicity or religion, and he refuses to get caught up in the politics of who gets to be called “Burmese” and who is called “Karen.” While he is aware that the nomenclature depends on “the political situation of the country, it doesn’t matter to him because he does “all sorts of the social work,” and even though he is Christian, he likes to “go and talk to the monks at the monastery.” When prompted about why he goes and helps, he says: “When you do social work, you can’t discriminate according to religion. I’m a helper and I want to help everyone.” He jokes that the only barrier to his ability to help more is his lack of knowledge of the high register to talk “politely” to the monk. In addition, Eh Myo extends his social work more widely to others and future generations; that is, he funds his aspiration to build community with experiences that he’s had in the past and his views of the future. For example, in response to a follow-up question which concerned musings about forms of his citizenship status in the future, Eh Myo focused his answer on children as the future. He claims:

I won’t be the one who is helping all the time. Your child, one day might be a doctor, a social worker, policeman, we can’t say. Right now, the parents need my help, but one day, the children of these parents may be the ones who help me.

Using a future-oriented framework to highlight what he sees as the unpredictability of life, he
says that he helps because he knows that eventually, it is a reciprocal process.

Lin showed a similar clarity in how she uses these struggles to aspire for a better future through her advocacy work. In speaking of her experiences, she goes back and forth between what her individual experiences are, and what the greater structures are. For example, she starts off by saying that “[i]n every country…there is class – poor, rich, better-educated, less-educated and there is a lot of discrimination.” From there, she talks about her identity as a (non-Muslim) woman living in a Muslim country.

Even among women, if you are a minority, there’s discrimination against you. You don’t get to do what you want, but I fought a lot. In Bangladesh, I used the media to write about my experiences a lot to make sure that basic human rights will be met and that everyone is equal.

In addition, she was barred from applying to the public university in Bangladesh even though she made the grade cut-off and could not attend private universities because of the high cost. Driven by her personal desire to attain her own education, she raised awareness of the situation of minorities in Bangladesh and advocated the government to implement a quota system for admitting minority students in the university by working with “other political activists and other minorities.” She sums up her current stance on activism and social work as follows:

My priority has always been children, families and mothers, minorities. The opportunities I’ve missed make me have empathy for others.

Once she became a mother herself, she moved from Thailand, where she had furthered her education because of its more accepting laws around documentation and then to the United States because her sons’ lack of documentation meant they would be unable to go to secondary school. She was “passionate [about education] but she didn’t get the chances because [she] was undocumented.” In an attempt to avoid the same fate of limited resources and opportunities in her sons’ lives, she moved to the United States. She marvels at the United States, saying that she
is “grateful” because “even though the U.S. doesn’t fulfill all rights, at least they fulfill the right to education…without discrimination, education is provided.” Education that her three sons receive in Oakland public schools, according to her, is arguably not without “discrimination” – however, having this right upheld here is enough, given that she has had to work very hard in the past, even to get to enter a school. She is motivated to use the resources at her disposal to strive for her and her children to move past their current situation in life.

Former refugees as well as their service providers identified negative life experiences as a conduit to connect with people they work with. For example, Laura also transfers intergenerational learning to her present social work. Although she herself grew up “well-off” with a mother who was a teacher and a father who was a physician, her parents’ lives were full of hardship, prompting her to speak of “understanding a little bit, generationally, from the outside looking in.” There are “those kinds of things that can really affect your life, even if you have the parameters and hallmarks of success – like being a physician – that you can never really surpass…you drag it along with you as part and parcel.” Her father was one of the first food stamp recipients, after losing his own father at a young age, prompting her to make sense of this situation as follows: “I think if people have better structures in place, that their long term outcomes for families will be better. My parents had a lot of social consciousness.” She credits her life experiences with giving her the credo for social service that she upholds:

“One of the things to be successful with social work, when you’re serving people is when you’re looking at them, suspend judgment or belief – when someone is sitting in front of you, not to just judge the book by its cover. Because [even if] someone looks well off or they look whatever those things are, you never really know when they’re just sitting in front of you what’s their background, so you have to start asking them questions. There are a lot of commonalities, maybe traumas.”
Laura uses her own experience as someone who, by external measures, could be considered successful but who has had internal conflicts, in order to come to this conclusion about relating with her constituents.

After critiquing certain structures of citizenship and forced migration, my informants wanted to do something to contribute locally and transnationally. For example, Rehema draws upon her family’s experience when she names her ancestors as the source of her unique inheritance:

“It seems to me that the legacy that my ancestors and that my elders were allowed to pass on was struggle. A lot of triumph but that’s only because of struggle.”

She does not hold this struggle in isolation and instead sees her struggle as a continuation of her ancestors’ struggles; she continues to say that this is a struggle for “education, for socially just societies, for a world that does not ignore the casualties that it creates.” At the same time, putting her experience in conversation with her current work with refugees makes her claim that she is “in a country in a privileged position, teaching people who should never, ever have to sit in front of [her].” She elaborated:

I realize that, especially in many of the refugee communities, are refugees because of powers and influence of the U.S. government, and if not the U.S. government, certainly from U.S. financial interests. So the fact that people are displaced, and are resettled in powerful countries is a very interesting irony, it’s very circular, and it’s not lost on me that I’m a part of that circle. But I’d much rather be going in this direction than in the other way.

This critique of the larger forces that result in her situation can be seen as stemming from her recognition of her position and the experiences that she has gained through her life-world. Rehema juxtaposes her ancestors’ experiences of struggle and her current relative privilege to create a structural critique of international relations.

The “circle of movement” that Rehema mentions, of fleeing from the countries of conflict
to the United States, rather than electively going to these countries from the United States, was also recognized and reframed by a refugee student—she was interested in going in the “other” direction, back to where she started. That is, she talks about wanting to voluntarily return to a land that has expelled her because she wants to help people there. Eh Say is a 10th grader who does well in school and, in her words, “is eager to learn,” and who fled Burma/Karen state when she was a baby. Although she has never been to Burma, she wants to “return” there once she is able to travel. When I asked her why Burma, she said simply that she wants to “see how other people are doing and what things they need.” When prompted to explain further, she says:

My goal is to help my people because even if I did not see with my own eyes, I see in movies or newspapers—a lot of them need help and there are a lot of bad conditions there.

When she talks to older friends who were in the same refugee camp, she finds that there are people who go back to the camps to help. Eh Say wants to be a doctor, “but not to work here and care for my family—I want to travel and help.” She arrived at her decision to become a doctor from different avenues: firstly, her parents while not specifying the course of medicine, encourages her to “do what will be good for your community, your culture, your friends.” Echoing others who spoke of a connectedness in giving back, she sees herself working not just in Burma, claiming that after Burma, “my second goal is in Africa” because she thinks that “Burma and Africa have the same situation, and the same feelings,” showing a sense of identification with others in similarly oppressed situations. She is also optimistic about the opportunities that being in the United States will offer her: “In my country, they say you can only have one goal, but here, I put more than one goal. If I only have doctor as a goal, I might fail, because even though I aim, sometimes, I can miss. I also want to be a social worker because I like to work with people and kids. I also want to be a counselor.” Her aspirations are anchored in the past but
have also incorporated new horizons that her resettlement situation offers.

Eh Say’s description of the “same feelings” between Africa and Asia are also echoed vividly by Rehema. When I asked her how she would identify herself ethnically or racially, she said: “I’m African-American, but more specifically Black.” She explained the distinction as follows:

The difference is that I don’t feel limited to Africa or America. I feel very much connected to Black people, dark people all over the world. Everywhere.

Rehema layers on a personal, emotional way of belonging together beyond borders when she elaborates on this feeling of not being limited to one place:

When I see images of Angkor Wat, and I see images in the stone, and the knotty hair, I totally identify. I see those women dancing with their hands and their hips and the noses and the roundness. It took my breath away the first time I saw them because I didn’t expect to see myself. Even the stone is black. Breathtaking.

The way that Rehema thinks about her place in the world is not confined by national frameworks; instead, she identifies on the imagery and the shared sense of being like “dark people from all over the world.”

My interviewees critically examine materialist structures such as citizenship, money or a well-paying job. These are not “good things” until these resources can be used to help others. A similar stance can be found in the way that Solórzano and Delgado Bernal (2001) defines transformational resistance, a form of resistance that students use to demonstrate a critique of oppression and a desire for social justice. In their research, when students hold “some level of awareness and critique of their oppressive conditions and structures of domination and [are] motivated by a sense of social justice” (317), it is possible to develop transformational resistance, a framework of mind and action through which people strive for social change. With this critical awareness of oppression, people can engage in behaviors and thoughts that challenge the system
but are not self-defeating. This resistance can be both internal - i.e., encompassing hopes and dreams – and external - i.e. exhibiting behaviors that do not conform to expectations.

Refugee resistance in this case also challenges the view of refugees as being passive and assimilation-oriented. Traditional frameworks of resilience focus on the individual’s capacity and detract from a systemic critique. However, in their research that bridges resilience and resistance, Shakya Guruge, Hynie, Htoo, Akbari, Jandu, Murtaza, Spasevski, Berhnae and Forster (2011) found that recently resettled youth balance feeling empowered and exercising their newfound agency with the burdens of learning English and earning money to support their families. Refugees in the process of resettlement are in “liminal spaces” between “sacredly protected national boundaries of citizenship and belonging” (Shakya et al, 2011, 133). In these spaces, governments and policymakers extend limited and often ambivalent policies that control and exclude refugees. Shakya et al. (2011) find in their research that refugees are “firmly critical of the system conditions that shape or limit resilience, and recognize and build political agency not just to cope with stressors but also to transform them” (134).

Similar processes of resilience and resistance arose in my research. For my informants, success is not only measured externally but also internally which involve extending one’s own successes to help others in similar situations. Thus, transformationally resisting citizenship means critically questioning these structures and not accepting what they are purported to protect. Chris, a White American social worker, also exemplifies speaks about this recognition; He talks about how his “identity was attacked” when he was growing up in rural America, “where you couldn’t say anything bad about America.” He, on the other hand, “never really cared for the county at all,” leading him to claim that he felt like his identity was attacked. He elaborates:
I was always one of those people who reads, and actually listens to people…I didn’t feel like I belonged to anything. I didn’t see why belonging to a country was important. It was with this backdrop of alienation that Chris started his work with refugees and realized “how important belonging to a country was.” In a vein parallel to Rehema, his encounter with refugees led to a consciousness that was hidden but not acknowledged or named before this encounter.

Turner and Simmons (2006) who based on their study with Guatemalan refugees, offer a pluralistic framework of resilience and resistance. According to this framework, resilience and resistance go hand in hand. That is, refugees’ “connections involved in resilience (reinforcing common values, standing in solidarity with family interests and well-being) create the potential for collection opposition,” resulting in resistance. At the same time, being able to stand up against systems they see as unjust can also build resilience. Refugee resistance, according to Turner and Simmons, can be understood in a pluralist framework involving adversity and response fields. The adversity field for both the refugees and the social workers in my research stem from similar family and educational experiences; their recognition of these experiences emphasizes “joining with others to assess options for success against oppression and marginalization based on personal and collective experience” (Turner and Simmons 2006, 18).

Moreover, resilience and resistance for my interviewees in this process of building community is not limited to the immediate locale of resettlement. Turner and Simmons urge the focus on transnationalism in “relational resilience,” which refers to how refugees adapt to and accommodate loss, because refugee families often harbor thoughts of those left behind in their original country. Thus, when refugees stand up to oppressive structures, they often do so by establishing community solidarities across boundaries through “transnational bridging.” This might involve dreams of returning to their homeland that allows refugees to maintain hope.
Turner and Simmons expand this idea when they talk about “transnational resistance,” defined as resistance that is not just individual but connected to a bigger community, not just immediate and local but also external and transnational. Refugee resistance “involves family and community solidarities across national boundaries that arise to oppose and overcome threatening institutional power” (7). In my work, I see that “refugee resistance” can be expanded to include not just state-defined refugees but also their U.S.-born social workers who, even though they have not faced forced migration like their constituents, have also faced dislocation of their own.

Conclusion

In this section, I outlined how a Funds of Knowledge approach can help us to understand the experiences of refugees and their social workers working together in order to create new connections during resettlement. I also highlighted how my informants experience resilience and talk about using this resilience to help others. In the next chapter, I bring the reader to the thick of the resettlement work through a snapshot of day-to-day work, successes and frustrations.
Chapter 7: Social Work

Introduction

This chapter describes how people carry out resettlement work and how they understand citizenship in this process. Firstly, I found that a focus on employment may engender an understanding of belonging in the United States limited to a framework of market citizenship: that is, refugees are entitled to services with the end goal of participating economically in the United States. However, different types of resettlement agencies may have different means and consequently, yield different results from this process. For example, Mutual Assistance Agencies (MAA), because of their staffs’ language skills and ability to work longer with constituents, have a certain vantage point that predisposes them to advocate for their clients better than other agencies, whereas national voluntary agencies (called the “volags”) are more likely to leverage their name recognition for funding applications and for attracting corporate partners. Even though MAAs are seen both in my research and from previous studies as the ones that can increase participation and belonging, they have the weakest infrastructure. This lack of infrastructure but closer access to constituents means they try to collaborate with other, bigger organizations to work together in order to achieve successful resettlement.

In the process of collaboration, funding is a key issue. Specifically, my findings show that a cut in funding means that people have to increasingly band together in order to provide services. Different types of organizations also have varying relationships to funding sources, particularly from the state. I discuss how non-profits channel state funding in order to facilitate refugees tapping into welfare sources to acquire education and eventually employment. Finally, I also found that my interviews complement the instrumentalist leanings towards education and employment in these findings by illuminating what people hope education and employment can
eventually be used for. These are ideas that seemed to be lost in the workings of the forum.

Resettlement is a transitional time to re-establish belonging, a condition that cannot be limited to just one sector such as employment or education.

In writing the findings for this section, I struggled with the relative scarcity of cohesive literature on the organizational work of resettlement. This scarcity is likely attributable to two factors: firstly, refugee resettlement is intermittent and generally unpredictable. Each time a new population is resettled, adaptations need to happen to accommodate different languages, educational backgrounds, traumas from different violence, aspects that may require different services, so much of refugee resettlement tends to be reactive, rather than a proactive process of gathering data and improving upon the bureaucratic mechanisms of the past. Additionally, even if this research occurs, changes from these recommendations are taken up very slowly in organizations, especially in terms of legislation. Lastly, the numbers of refugees that get resettled continue to be small in comparison to populations of host countries and of refugee-sending countries. The few refugees that do get resettled are spread across the world; each country has its own social work policies, so in-depth and comprehensive analysis of resettlement processes in one locale may only be analogously related to the U.S. as policies vary cross-nationally.

Thus, this chapter in itself is partly exploratory in nature. I hope to start additional lines of inquiry along the findings that I have from this refugee resettlement forum. There are many forums across the U.S. even in California that carry out this function but the phenomenological nature of my study design – focusing on the individual understanding of his or her life-world and the attendant hopes – precluded my ability to do a comparative analysis of different receiving communities’ and social workers’ interactions with new populations. The findings here, however, provide a framework for further study.
Background

In order to understand resettlement work, it is important to first be acquainted with the its different actors. Refugee resettlement is a multi-agency effort, spanning from international to neighborhood levels. The federal office of refugee resettlement facilitates resettlement efforts by providing funding and encouraging partnerships and collaborations across social service agencies. For example, according to the website of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, entities such as federal agencies (such as the Departments of Homeland Security, State and Health and Human Services), Mutual Assistance Associations (i.e., ethnic-community based organizations), state refugee coordinators, and voluntary agencies, such as the International Rescue Committee and Catholic Charities, work together to disseminate funding and provide services. In the process, they may contract with private non-profit agencies for training and technical assistance.

These efforts are in part facilitated by the existence of refugee resettlement forums which exist in most places where the federal government has awarded some sort of monies to the state. The advantages of such forums are manifold: they offer a place to share best practices, information, expertise and referrals. The forums present an avenue whereby organizations can engage in advocacy efforts, collectively voicing their concerns to state entities. Forums are often facilitated by a stipended coordinator position, and consist of all types of organizations (MAAs, volags, non-profits/service agencies). The forum that I observed in California is in the area where there is the largest resettlement of refugees in the state. The 35 members involved in the forum include organizations that offer legal assistance, healthcare and educational services (especially those focused on language development and employment). I collected two years’ worth of monthly meeting minutes from this forum. The refugee forum coordinator, Laura, whom I interviewed, records and uploads these meeting minutes onto their website.

13 Personal communication with Forum coordinator, plus online resource: http://www.cdss.ca.gov/refugeeprogram/res/pdf/Lists/Listing_of_County_Refugee_Forums.pdf
Bowen (2009) claims that documents are “text providing context” and offer a way of understanding the “conditions that impinge upon the phenomena currently under investigation” (29-30). Specifically, in his analysis of organizational meeting minutes, Bowen found that they “were an artifact of organizational proceedings…they told a story of situations, processes and outcomes in the organization” (35), a situation that was also true for my case. Additionally, the documents also provided a source of triangulation for the themes on similar topics that came up in my interviews. According to Atkinson and Coffey (1997), documents are “‘social facts which are produced, shared and used in socially organized ways” (47); they urge the researcher to be aware of the purpose of the documents and the reason they were produced. The meeting minutes that I analyzed were emailed out to forum participants to approve before the documents were uploaded onto the forum’s website presumably for people to stay informed of affairs despite absences at the meetings.

Similar to Bowen, I first read through the documents to identify any immediate and obvious patterns; afterwards, I defined specific codes to use in parsing through the documents, after which I organized these data excerpts into similar themes and case examples that exemplified these themes. Based on my research questions and the organizational structures and concerns of the forums, I focused my document analyses on the type of organization and specific issues of concern. This focus led me to develop more detailed codes along the lines of employment, ethnic-based organizations, formal education programs (defined as those programs provided or mandated by the state), non-formal education programs (defined as those programs provided by non-profits or community organizations - sometimes these programs had a direct connection to the concerns of formal education such as certification but in most cases, true to the nature of non-formal education, these efforts were guided by the efforts of community members,
addressing community needs), employment and funding. I then investigated the co-occurrences of these codes.

In addition to analyzing meeting minutes to uncover common, documented concerns of the forum, I also compared these themes with the those that emerged from my interviews with people who actively participate in the forum and who attend the meetings. Their responses expand upon the concerns brought up by the forum and also highlight the motivations for these concerns. I explain these responses in the sections below, showcasing how people navigate finding employment and using education, particularly non-formal programs, in order to do so. In the process of helping refugees find employment and education, organizations have to collaborate with each other. I end this section with instances of collaborations in action and of my informants’ responses on the nature of education.

**Employment: Variations in Emphasis**

Employment is crucial for successful resettlement, an issue that cuts across different types of organizations and touches upon education as well. All three types of organizations involved in refugee resettlement – mutual assistance associations (MAA), voluntary agencies and non-profits - play a role in supporting employment for resettled refugees; however, each type of organization brings a different emphasis to their work.

For example, Table 1.1 shows the description of an MAA and its task. In addition to information about background of their clients and the languages their staff speak, the excerpts that mentioned this organization concern their process of employment (e.g. workshops, including ones focusing on technology) and the connections the organization has with different employers (300 active ones). Another thing to note here is the mention of time period; the federally-mandated time period of service is currently eight months but refugees are eligible for services
with this organization up to 60 months. While all organizations focus on rapid employment, MAA1 rely on longer-term community relationships in order to meet this goal. Lastly, MAA1 interfaced not just with clients but also with employers concerning tax credits and on-the-job training, including training for clients who are not yet ready or eligible for paid employment, and by putting on career fairs to connect their clientele with employers. Their presentation at the forum here functions as a way for people to connect with resources.

The second group of actors in employment services comprises the voluntary agencies or volags. Table 1.3 shows how the forum leveraged the connection of a member (i.e. VOLAG2), to directly bring in an employer, a large national restaurant chain. This private company-volag partnership offers a direct conduit for refugees to receive a job placement. In doing so, the way that the organization approaches the workers is notably different. While there is a rationale offered for the benefits of hiring refugees that distinguishes them (“diversity and character”), there is also an attempt to normalize refugees as workers because “the criteria for employment…are the same for every employee.” On the other hand, “safety issues with clients working late, transportation home and housing in bad neighborhoods” that would presumably also cut across non-refugee populations are singled out for refugees. In lieu of the languages or on-the-ground knowledge that the MAA spoke of, we see here that the refugees’ interactions with the employer is mediated in some way by the volag – “a VOLAG2 volunteer who serves as a liaison…the VOLAG2 also prescreens clients before sending them to” the national restaurant chain. Additionally, Table 3.4 illustrates a context where VOLAG2 offers funding for students to pursue a college education. This voluntary agency does not necessarily directly provide oversight of this education but facilitates refugees attaining formal education by setting the eligibility criteria for this scholarship, showing an ability to direct funds based on their own
measures. The VOLAG2 also provides career-based training for motivated refugees in order to increase earning potential.

Finally, non-profits, usually service agencies or local partners, offer employment support to refugees in various fields through trade or language skills training. Table 1.4 shows a health-focused non-profit, another good example of an employment opportunity targeted towards refugees. It “aims to build a culturally and linguistically diverse health care workforce by training immigrants and refugee skills which are contextualized for successful delivery of health care,” with the caveat that workers meet the required English proficiency(?) level. The Language Hub (Table 1.5) also helps to leverage the skills of healthcare workers trained elsewhere. The rest of the employment opportunities come from non-profits that offer training on business enterprises. Table 1.5 shows a presentation from a non-profit that encourages women to take on entrepreneurial roles; this non-profit uses relatable material for their clients such as a home-based DVD series with lessons on “basic entrepreneurial skills, financial literacy and English” with narratives of successful women entrepreneurs from immigrant and refugee backgrounds. Unlike the time-limited services offered by other organizations, their philosophy is “once a client, always a client.” Similarly, the organizations highlighted in Table 1.7 emphasize financial literacy in the process of building a business, such as business skills, financial literacy and “learning American business culture.” Finally, NP-BUS1, a non-profit that supports entrepreneurs from immigrant backgrounds, is a business-centered model of employment, based on a longer term – three years - program of support for new entrepreneurs.

Even though the focus on employment is shared by all organizations, my interviews show disagreement about who and which way is the most effective at these services. Specifically, the role of the MAA comes to the fore as the ones with the most effective in-roads to their clients.
For example, Chris offers the following assessment about the role of MAAs in the refugee resettlement process:

The problem is, if you want a family to be self-sufficient and grow in the long run or whatever, you have to make sure that they have this capacity to do it. You don’t really know what’s going on unless you have the MAAs that speak the own language, that know the background that knows the particular cultural differences, you don’t have that in those larger orgs, nor do they care, because once they get you a job, once they get you into a program, their job is done. And that’s where MAAs can help the whole big cycle.

The first statement about development the capacity of a family to become self-sufficient is held true in all organizations but from my investigation of different organizations’ nature of addressing this concern, the question that arises is what is the best method to carry out effective resettlement. We saw in the documents that MAA1 pulled a lot of weight by following up and having more consistent contact with the client, presumably leveraging the shared language skills with their communities. The volags, on the other hand, provide services for a more defined period of time. Chris provides a first-hand account, and corroboration of this aspect from the documents by honing in on the role of the MAAs.

The on-the-ground interaction that the MAA has with the community provides a unique perspective of an organization because they are able to answer the question of what types of jobs certain refugees get (Table 1.2). In addition to knowing how many people they place, they have the vantage point of seeing which refugees get more “advanced jobs,” and note that they lack the support services for refugees from “professional backgrounds.” Chris highlights this ability of the MAA to have closer contact with their clients as a strength that is unmatched by other organizations.

“Ultimately, the mutual assistance associations are way more important than any of the other organizations. And the reason is, the way organizations work to this day, it’s very quantitative data. They look at how many people you’ve worked with. It’s not just the workers voluntarily saying this. It’s too quantitative. And if you want to actually have a picture of how successful you are, you need qualitative work and you can’t actually sell
that because someone has to interpret the data and I think that’s where the MAA come in, they can get that qualitative data and as a whole MAAs advocate.”

In addition to their language skills that facilitate job placements, their ability to collect and interpret certain data brings another dimension to the MAA’s importance, an ability he ties readily back to advocacy efforts.

Previous studies have critiqued and problematized not only the focus on rapid employment in refugee resettlement but also the role of the service organizations in creating what citizenship means in this process. For example, Nawyn (2011) argues that the focus on employment underscores market citizenship (Brodie 1997), whereby social assistance is made possible for refugees based on their promise of being productive members of their new society, a membership that the state covets. Market citizenship is defined as “dependency on the state emerging from personal shortcomings, rather than a social right provided to members of the state” (Nawyn 2011, 679). Market citizenship is exclusionary because members do not gain a sense of belonging. Resettlement personnel often unwittingly become pigeonholed in the workings of market citizenship, ending up focusing on how they can assist the individual to work hard instead of, as highlighted in the previous chapter, creating connections that extend past instrumental gains of getting a good job purely for self gain. With all of these employment opportunities and connections available, the onus is on the individual to make something of himself or herself to get a job and “belong” in the United States, instead of looking at (Nawyn 2010). For example, Trudeau found that a state refugee coordinator explained that “promoting community engagement is considered to be outside of the purview of government and is something that ‘church groups do’” (pg. 2815). A focus on rapid employment in refugee resettlement can become an opportunity lost in creating deeper ways of belonging that extend beyond getting a job.
In contrast, Nawyn (2011) argues that organizations involved in resettlement, particularly non-profits, can rethink resettlement to “encompass a broad conception of social citizenship in which refugees practice their home culture, build relationships with native-born Americans and feel safe at home in the U.S.” (pg. 690). Certain organizations are better situated to carry out this function than others. Nawyn’s 2010 research found that volags are more likely to plug clients into the stratification of the U.S. labor market. On the other hand, MAAs provide the language support and cultural understanding for refugee clients to explore outside these existing structures. My document data analysis on the roles played by different organizations confirms that MAAs, due to their limited organizational infrastructure, help their clients access services provided by other organizations and also liaise on behalf of their clients with a variety of employers; on the other hand, volags are more involved in a one-size-fits-all model evidenced by the national chain restaurant’s presentation and by doling out funding. Organizations’ varying emphases create different modes of social work and welfare.

While organizational work may be predisposed towards certain mechanisms of resettlement, the bulk of the resettlement work falls onto individual social workers in the agency who have the task of not only providing concrete help with filling out forms and getting a job but also in providing a sense of safety and comfort. For example, Agbenyiga, Barrie, Djelaj and Nawyn (2012) found that agency support is crucial for refugees’ first months in the United States. They explain how social workers in particular play a key role in not only ensuring that refugees achieve self-sufficiency but also in developing social networks to allow refugees to assume leadership positions in their communities. Similarly, Clevenger, Derr, Cadge and Curran (2014) carried out research with service providers of immigrant and refugees and found that social service providers seek to provide social support motivated by “an ethic of refuge” frame
and a “community assets” frame; that is, not only do the social workers in their study carry a moral purpose of helping their clients achieve self-sufficiency but they wish to “enable immigrants to become community assets and give back” (pg. 77).

Similar orientations towards social service provision arose in my interviews. Chris, the American-born social worker, in particular was adamant on his focus on getting a job that transcends the individualist, instrumentalist approach that is prevalent in refugee resettlement.

The biggest problem in this country is, even though I really do think this is one of the best countries in the world for refugees to settle, you’re at more of an advantage than you are if you were in Europe, in Europe, you never actually belong to the country you’re in. They make sure that their laws will say you’ll never get a job, you’ll get benefits for the rest of your life but that’s not important to people. They want a job and they want to belong. When I was working with refugees in 2008, the biggest thing to happen [to me] was also realizing that people’s identity revolved around work.

Chris explains issues of identity and belonging inherent in employment that may not be made explicit in the refugee resettlement; he compares the U.S welfare-to-work pipeline that is prevalent throughout the general population to the policies of Europe. In his perspective, work, not welfare, is the most important conduit to establishing one’s place in a new country, partly because work provides a source of identity:

“Work was important in this country because, when you work, everybody sees you as something. You belong. Every most people in the US, they don’t care, they really don’t care, because the first question is, where do you work, it’s not whose family are you in, they wanna know where you work, they wanna know you have a job because to be a US citizen, to be this American identity, you gotta work. Working is such a big deal, so many people’s identities revolved around work, and having or not having a job. It means whether you belong to society or not. And that’s the advantage here, you are pushed to get a job, you may not have a good one, but you have one, to quote most people at least you have one, you know. I think that’s where people are.”

Chris’s explanation that work is an important component of American identity provides a rationale for why the resettlement work does and should focus primarily on obtaining employment for refugees. In fact, he argues that this focus on work to establish belonging is not
just the perspective of the social workers; the question of when to begin employment is one posed by refugees themselves.

“The second question [that refugees have] was when can my child enroll in school? The second and the third are inter-changeable. The next one is always, I need a job, where can I get a job. The job is essential, they really want to see the kids succeed and a job is essential for them to really feel a part of it.”

Refugees also view their success in work as a way of connecting to their children’s success. This provides a space to extend the focus from children’s education to adult education. Thus, while the temptation to slip into individualistic conceptions of citizenship and employment exists, it is also possible to use employment during the refugee resettlement processes as a conduit for belonging and contributing at the community level. Social workers and their organizations are at the forefront of this work and consequently have a direct hand in how belonging is crafted.

Collaboration

Because organizations have such different expertise and abilities, it is important for them to pool resources in the course of resettlement. In fact, the point of the forum is to provide a venue where these organizations can collaborate with each other. For example, Forrest and Brown (2014) argue for a focus on migration that is “organization-led,” which typifies refugee resettlement. Additionally, Barkdull, Weber, Swartz and Phillips (2014) cite publications from groups like the International Federation of Social Workers that have argued for changes such as more federal involvement, “improved coordination and communication among participation levels across the resettlement service continuum,” and “stronger linkages between domestic and overseas resettlement partners” (pg. 116). Along these lines, my data present examples of the successes and frustrations that arise with collaboration around tight resources, particularly showing that service delivery that is coordinated among different agencies is a source of contention for the forum.
In investigating the ways in which people work together, I found that issues around funding - specifically, a lack of funding - encourage collaboration. Although the scarcity seem to force people to move beyond their own organizations, the collaborations that arise from this unexpected and forceful lack of resources create unsatisfactory partnerships that leave people yearning for better and more resourced modes of collaboration. The most salient example lies in the reactions to the cuts in budget to adult education in California (Table 2.1). A representative of the Adult and Career Education services provides a rationale for redirecting adult education funds to the rest of the school district by emphasizing the mission of the school district, supporting K-12 education, which is already been hard hit in budget. Whatever adult education services will still be offered will be for parents of students enrolled in the school district. This office knows that there is no dedicated agency for this population and attempted to advocate for these adults but because Adult and Career Education has to work within the school district, a lot of the support will be provided through “English language support for parents of 20 OUSD elementary schools through their family literacy program” as a way to align helping adults with the mission of the district’s family literacy program.

In Table 2.1, the state official from the adult education department voices her sympathy for the plight of adult education, without which adults in the community, especially those of immigrant and refugee backgrounds, experience “significant barriers to employment and progress,” which, as is demonstrated by this presentation “places further stress on community resources” by exhorting forum members to carry the weight more (Table 2.1). As the official describes the seizure of services provided to adult education, she makes a point to provide a “list of ESL providers” that their clients can access (Table 2.2). The website will also be of assistance by providing a list of online resources for ESL learners. It appears that the hot potato of
educational support has been tossed again to the partnerships provided by the forum and the dismantling of the services means a scramble to reconnect students with other resources in the community. The concession that this state official makes is indicative of the ways that formal education relies on community resources in ensuring continuity of service. The last note (Table 2.3) points to a call for advocacy to remind the government about the need for ESL programs. Finally, Table 2.4 shows the state official’s report back after her presentation a month or so ago. After advocating on behalf of the refugee population to the Learning and Teaching Sub-Committee of the OUSD school board, OACE might gain additional funds that will support a partnership with a volag to run a vocational ESL class. “Adult school teachers,” who have presumably been laid off because of the budget cuts will be re-designated to teach ESL in community settings.

The budget cut in adult education also spurred other collaborative and advocacy actions such as the reinstatement of the education committee of the forum. Table 2.5 shows an initial call to reconvene the education committee to examine existing adult education resources. The follow-up to the call (Table 2.6) focuses on making sure that whatever funding is left is maintained and distributed well. A staff member of the school district who works directly with refugee students, led this call; from her vantage point, it is also important to recognize that that paraprofessionals and certified interpreters continue to be available, and that pool be flexible based on the shift according to refugee arrival population need. This is a direct call for the “ownership” of these issues so that coordinated efforts may be in place, further underscoring the importance of collaboration and advocacy.

It wasn’t just with the adult education cuts that collaboration was emphasized. Table 2.7 shows another example of when collaboration was spurred on by funding cuts, this time to
general welfare assistance in the state. Issues highlighted include getting information about funds; e.g. there are provisions for refugees transferring from Refugee Cash Assistance to the more general CalWORKS but this information often gets lost in the shuffle, a breakdown in service delivery that the founder and head of an MAA notes because he has experienced that the supposedly automatic transferal does not always happen for his client (Table 2.7). The County Representative for refugees stresses moving away from assistance towards self-sufficiency as quickly as possible but at the same time, it is noted that the transition to self-sufficiency from “conventional welfare to work programs do not help a particular swathe of the population.” The onus returns to the county coordinator to see how to best assist such individuals with “limited conventional education, “echoing notes from the OACE presentation about this population not having a dedicated office of services.

While collaboration does occur, its efficacy does not satisfy the constituents who see a lot of untapped potential for more joint efforts. In my interviews, the topic of collaboration intersects with many other issues, such as information dissemination, funding and power struggles. For example, Laura, the coordinator of the refugee forum, explains that information dissemination is a struggle in obtaining services for refugees:

“A broad array of service providers have not had refugees on their radar, ever. It goes back to having formalized mechanisms, putting the information out. A county refugee coordinator is supposed to fulfill those duties.”

Laura pinpoints the role of the county refugee coordinator, focusing on making information available and on creating more formalized mechanisms, especially since the refugee population is not on service providers’ radars.

The county refugee coordinator becomes implicated in her role that is closest to the state. That is, the refugee coordinator is supposed to be the one pulling together services for refugees
in the county but because of the channels through which the funding for refugee resettlement occurs, the refugee county coordinator is also stretched and confused.

“The funding comes from the federal government, it goes through the state and comes to the county. But the funding for the refugee coordinator always sits in the social services agency, where they turn on the RCA, CalWorks, all the refugee employment program. We have an issue that while this person is tying broader systems together, it seems like duties in our county always get sidelined into other jobs. So the refugee county administrator is only one small percent of the job. Maybe 1% of the job.”

The way that the position of the county refugee coordinator is structured does not place a lot of focus on direct service for the refugee population, especially since the funding for the position is tied to other programs. This detracts from the county coordinator’s role of creating strong support systems.

A lack of effort to create strong systems underscores the recognition again that it is impossible for just one agency to be involved in the process of resettlement, further highlighting the need for effective partnerships.

“People are not, in the refugee resettlement world, we’ve seen in our county, some very serious gaps in the breakdown in service delivery, relationships have been repaired and protocols put into place so that the delivery of service can be a little more seamless because it’s not just one agency, it’s never ever able to meet the needs of the individual in resettlement. But we have to make sure that our main agencies interacting with refugees, like refugee health screening, and health and social services do have very strong structures put in place and I think we’re moving towards that especially and so the case managers can plug away one at a time.”

Explaining the rationale for the efforts in collaborations that show up in the documents, Laura explains that the forum has to be coordinated for “seamless service delivery” to allow for the reality that it is impossible for one agency to accomplish successful resettlement. According to Laura, the most important structures are the ones that work with directly with refugees, such as health services. When the structures are sound, individuals like case managers can be more effective in their work.
Naomi provides an example of successful collaboration based on a funding application. Most of the refugee populations don’t have enough knowledge and abilities to go and write for grants like, we partnered with [the school district] for the refugee school grant. There are grants that are available on US.gov, some of them are general grants, some of them are refugee-specific, but the thing is most refugee programs like catholic charities, IRC they really don’t have the ability to look for and apply for these grants, especially with the mutual assistance agencies. They don’t have the ability to sit down, how to target, how to write the proposal…so I would like to see the county step up and they really have been more willing to do that.

Naomi hones in on a specific way that the organizations could – and should – collaborate, indicting the organizations in the process for not making use of this avenue for mutually beneficial cooperation for funding. She sees the county playing a valuable role in this regard, and cites the evidence of the successful refugee school impact grant as a way in which the county facilitated partnerships between the MAAs and VOLAGs.

In terms of funding, the county refugee coordinator echoes findings from the documents when she talks about adult education as an area where funding is crucial. Particularly, she wants refugees to be present in the system in order to ask for this money.

We don’t have our adult education system - although the state now gave that money [elsewhere] and there’s been a series of meetings here recently as to how to really make sure that refugees get a bite of the apple.

Chris also highlights the importance of adult education, tying it back to the mandate of refugee resettlement, i.e. self-sufficiency. The choice of adult education within the mission of the school district is one that the refugee resettlement community has to contend with.

The adult education that we were talking about, I understand budget cuts and everything but to actually shift education away from adults to children…I understand why children need to be helped, but if the adults aren’t helped, they can’t ever be self-sufficient. They can, but it’s a lot longer time, they’re going to be on public benefits a longer time. If the intention of what we’re doing is to get them off benefits, then we have to focus on parents more than children.
This quote from Chris is an example of the reactions against the decision to cut adult education, highlighted in the document analysis. In the view of refugee resettlement, the focus on self-sufficiency means that it is reasonable to keep the focus on adults instead of children in a family. Chris also takes adult education beyond the instrumentalist gains of employment to the opportunity to help adults belong and thus be a bigger part of the children’s lives.

Many refugee adults, they just want to get a job, and that’s fine, there’s nothing wrong with that. But part of that is also being involved with their children too. And I think all of that is a part of education too, and educating people how to do that, because in a lot of cultures, involvement in your child’s life, you don’t need to do that. I think that’s an important thing, especially [as a part of] adult education, which also means educating adults more.

Adult education can be about employment but can also provide a space for adults to learn how U.S. education works for their children. Encouraging involvement in their children’s education is another reason that adult education should not be ignored.

Torres and Schugurensky (1994) used a strategy of analysis that highlighted how “different actors [regard] adult education as a conflict between two rationales: the individual’s benefits rationale and the society’s need rationale” (132). The tension arises because the personal development of individual adults may be at odds with the goal of using adult education to develop a “disciplined and skills-enhanced labor force acting in conformity to the dominant rules of social behavior” (132). Adult education policies are subject to the state’s justifications about adult education’s benefits to society. In my data, the state policies concern funding, and the efforts for resettlement workers to access funding to create education programs that clients can leverage to get a employment. People in the process must navigate competing concerns and interest at multiple levels.

Collaborations in Action

One specific example of successful collaboration is the Targeted Assistance project that
the county coordinator Naomi also noted as a high point of her time in the position. The Targeted Assistance project attempts to use ORR funding to ensure that refugees gain employment as quickly as possible; funds to individual organizations are performance-based according to this goal of employment. The funding comes directly from the ORR, is administered through the County and MAA1 is the fiscal agent. Five agencies have divided among themselves the duties for employment placement services and social adjustment services. Another goal of the TA project is increasing organizational capacity of the MAAs, a task carried out by trainings which happen every Friday and which pool the expertise of the forum members. Naomi pinpoints this project as a major boon of the forum.

“My favorite memory was when we were able to create the Targeted Assistance program, the TA project, because we were able to kind of address some of those critical points, at the intersections, having that other piece somebody there to really say, ok, here, this is how you really do this. An extra layer, that extra care that they need you know, you’re really struggling, and I really feel like you’re really struggling, so what I’m going to do is to hook you up with Suzie over here…that was like shining moment.”

The TA project directly aligns with Laura’s hopes for effective structures in refugee resettlement; for Naomi, this project reinforces her desire to have people work together to make the best use of the system.

Sure that people who need to be at the table are represented at the table is critical so when we’re talking about refugee relief not from a county perspective but from the population perspective, from the service providers, when you’re designing programs that you get some buy-in from the programs who will be utilizing them, whose lives are impacted by them - this going to work.

The challenges mostly arise from the fact that people are closer or further away from “the table” - depending on this “distance,” people may have different challenges and hopes. The system only works insofar as people get to be a part of the system. Naomi, from her vantage point of the county, believes that it is crucial to get the buy-in and the expertise of the service providers and the refugee population. She continues to champion the possibilities for partnerships and
collaborations. This quote exemplifies her desire for and belief in effective services, playing up the strengths of different types of resettlement organizations.

Another concrete way to collaborate exists in agencies sharing information about funding that their clients can use for getting education and training on the way to employment. Specifically, non-profits not only provide educational resources but also disseminate information about the process of tapping into funding sources to access non-formal education. Many local non-profits partner with state certification programs and community colleges to provide language and vocational classes. Some volags and nonprofits provide individual funding in the form of scholarships, while others illuminate ways in which certain state funding can be used for education. In this way, education programs organized by non-profits and community-based organizations equip refugees with the necessary skills for employment, reaffirming the goal of employment in successful resettlement. Particularly key for the issue of refugee resettlement is the partnership with community-based organizations to provide job placement assistance for an indefinite period of time.

The Language Hub, with its myriad programs and multiple appearances in the forum minutes, is one of the key non-profits that facilitate the link between education and employment. In Table 3.1, the director of the center presents the Career Readiness program, outlining specific criteria such as “high school diploma but no equivalent college degree, documented, and low income” that could all possibly be codes for refugees’ eligibility, especially filling in a hole of adult education as exemplified by the age range of the students in a class (17-60 years old). He goes into detail about the funding sources that can be tapped in order to attend the Center’s classes, noting that it has an office of financial aid to assist with applying for Pell grants and that “once a student has qualified for financial aid at The Language Hub, they will be able to carry it
forward to community college or further university studies.” The program’s emphasis on “career readiness” also means that participants will be able to tap into the Workforce Investment Act. Participants in this program can list this program as part of the “Federal Welfare to Work” requirements with its attendant benefits (such as books, materials, transportation allowances).

Similarly, a health careers-focused non-profit gave a presentation on how to use available funding for education, specifically a “match savings program to help refugee and immigrant clients obtain re-certification in nursing.” (Table 3.2) The non-profit itself does not provide classes but matches students up with community college classes through its selective program. NP-EDUC, a non-profit organization that provides volunteers for academic support and tutoring at OIHS, is another hub in which language support and education come together (Table 3.3). They provide services to refugee adults through a high school which a main hub for refugee students and that my student interviewees attend. NP-Educ aims to provide services to all adults who need it, not limited to the parents of their students, as part of a “full service community model of support.” The services range from ESL to computer literacy and gardening, and even bus passes for the participants of the parent literacy classes.

Trudeau (2008) showed in his work with three refugee resettlement organizations that the state has used “devolution and privatization…to shift responsibility for social service delivery to non-profit community agencies at the local level” (2805). While this is meant to be an empowering move for local agencies, the evidence is conflicting in that most non-profits end up being “junior partners” with “responsibility for and not control of” refugee resettlement. Non-profits carry out a balancing act between the work allowable in the confines of their funding sources and the needs of their clientele. In refugee resettlement, limited funding and information/knowledge about “a complex refugee admission and allocation structure” means that
social service workers bear the brunt of de-mystifying and finding ways of making the most of resources; it also means that different organizations often have unique say over their budgets (Darrow, 2015), a change in social work that the state has encouraged through restructuring of welfare programs that emphasized collaborations, also evidenced by the Office of Refugee Resettlement focus on collaborations and partnerships. In these collaborations, certain NGOs are uniquely placed to challenge state policies, especially around funding, to define what resettlement and citizenship look like. This goes back to Nawyn’s 2010 research which asserts that NGOs “participating in the resettlement program become complicit, albeit unwillingly, in this method of state control, whereas NGOs outside the program have more discursive space to challenge market-based definitions of citizenship.” Nawyn expands on this framework by arguing that different NGOs provide different “opportunity structures,” with those non-profits/NGOs who work outside direct social welfare being able to provide opportunity structures that did not replicate the existing race and gender structures of the labor market. Trudeau’s 2008 work in part confirms this difference in opportunities, a finding that he develops through the lens of autonomy. Specifically, organizations’ relationships with their communities influence how much the organizations exercise their autonomy to stray or not from their funding’s mandate to incorporate the communities’ needs. Non-profits become the government’s “junior partners” because non-profits have “responsibilities for but not control of service delivery.”

Despite the focus on education for employment that can be found in the document data, some of my informants wish to extend the use of education beyond getting skills for employment. For example, Chris talks about having an education that is relevant to the student and local community, naming this as a Freirean approach to education.

“The best education system I can come up with one closer to what Paulo Freire wanted, having an education system where people actually were able to, students were able to
participate and local society can participate and development of whatever nature would work. It’s not just that you sit here and listen to this stuff teachers say and you take this test. It can’t be just tests. If you’re looking at growth of individual, and if you want people to be a part of society and be a part of the state, you have to teach them what they need, you have to teach them the skills to be able to do whatever they want to do, and it’s not particularly pushing them on one way or another.”

In addition to Chris’ vantage point, a U.S.-born social worker, Lin also has an idea of education that extends past instrumentalist gains.

Education isn’t going to school and completing a degree program. Even if someone does that, there is still much more to be learned. I don’t necessarily want my/our sons and daughters to use education to become doctors and lawyers, because if everyone became doctors and lawyers, there would be too many of them! I’m not against the professions, these are good jobs, but I want my/our sons and daughters to become people to help alleviate the world’s and society’s problems, not receive an education separate from that purpose.

Chris articulates a challenge towards employment as a livelihood, and instead using employment to change the world – a clear tool of resistance, echoing my findings in the previous chapter.

**Conclusion**

This chapter focused on the role of different organizations in refugee resettlement and how these organizations worked together. The focus of refugee resettlement is employment but different agencies use different capacities to help refugees get work. The MAAs stand out as ones who challenge existing market structures the most. Additionally, individual social workers have a say in how they think refugees should orient themselves towards employment. That is, work can extend beyond being individualistic to being community-oriented. The second theme I developed here is how a lack of funding, especially in education, can force organizations to collaborate. There is disagreement about the extent to which these collaborations are occurring although the general consensus is that it is important to bring people to the table at key points during the collaboration. Finally, I raise the question of funding and autonomy for non-profits that carry out the work of the state in resettlement.
MAJOR THEME: Employment

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Key concepts</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>- <strong>MAA 1</strong> offers employment services, vocational training, social adjustment and cultural orientation, and other services for Burmese and Bhutanese refugees. <strong>MAA1</strong> serves more than 130 refugees a year, and the staff speaks more than 15 different languages. - When refugees first arrive, they meet with an employment counselor who refers them to in-house services or services provided by their partners. The employment counselor develops an individual employment plan with each refugee client. The clients are enrolled in vocational ESL and employment workshops. The employment workshops introduce clients to a variety of common employment practices, including the use of technology to communicate. Workshop instructors and employment counselors help clients set up email and use the Internet. <strong>MAA1</strong> has a computer lab accessible to clients. Once the clients complete their employment training, they are referred to employment opportunities. - Once the refugee client enters employment, the employment counselor follows up with the client after one week, 30 days, 60 days, and 90 days. Refugees are eligible for employment services for up to 60 months. The goal of refugee employment services is to help refugees reach self-sufficiency as soon as possible. - <strong>MAA1</strong> currently has a list of 300 active employers. They work closely with employers to write job descriptions, facilitate communication, file tax credits for employers who hire CalWORKS clients and former offenders, among other things. Also, in collaboration with willing employers, <strong>MAA1</strong> facilitates subsidized on-the-job training for promising clients. - <strong>MAA 1</strong> would like Forum participants to encourage their clients to enroll in employment services as soon as they arrive so that clients will be in the job market before their cash assistance is terminated.</td>
<td>Employment counselors Timeline Employers Training Termination of cash assistance</td>
<td>April 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 | - What types of jobs are refugees currently getting? The **MAA1** clients are going into manufacturing/production jobs. Some of the Bhutanese clients are getting more advanced jobs.  
- Does **MAA1** have any employment services for refugees with professional backgrounds? Not yet.  
- What assessments do you have in place for clients who may have different disabilities that prevent them from getting a job? For clients with physical disabilities, **MAA1** makes referrals to the state’s disability services.  
- **MAA1** will hold monthly career fairs on the first Saturday of the month. The next career fair will be held on Saturday, December 4.  
- **MAA1** has a youth employment program for those aged 16-21 for free services to help with direct job placement, job readiness training, paid and unpaid work experience, job shadowing, and more.  
- **MAA1** has clients interested in volunteer work experience and urges agencies to create a job description and send to MAA1 for a match up. You must supervise and provide training to clients in need of work experience. | Types of jobs  
Different abilities  
Career fair | October 19, 2010

1.3 | - VOLAG2 has built an extensive relationship with **RESTAURANT** that now extends to VOLAG2 offices around the country. VOLAG2 in SF/Bayside works with 15 **RESTAURANTs** in the Bay Area.  
- What do you think are the advantages of hiring refugees? Refugees’ work ethic and appreciation for the opportunity to work with **RESTAURANT**. Hiring refugees brings diversity and character to the restaurants. Provides a different energy level when working with so many different backgrounds. Some of their employees who are refugees from Burma are preparing to be service managers…The CEO of **RESTAURANT** has met many of the refugee employees and has been very impressed. Refugees are also smart, motivated, hard working, driven, and compassionate.  
- What has your experience with hiring refugees been like? Great success working with refugees  
- What are some first impressions that you look for when interviewing refugees? When Paul interviews, he talks to the interviewee – he doesn’t just | VOLAG2  
**RESTAURANT/private** | November 16, 2010
ask questions. This strategy works well with refugees. As he is also from Burma, he has a very compassionate view of refugee clients. The used to have a mentor from the community who served as a liaison during the interview process (usually an VOLAG2 volunteer). This mentor would help walk the individual through the interview process and then help to train them. This process seemed to work really well.

- Are there language/cultural barriers? If so, how do you deal with them?
  There are always linguistic barriers…conversations with employees is key. Getting to know them and having the opportunity to explain expectations is vital. VOLAG2 also prescreens clients before sending them to RESTAURANT, which helps to eliminate some of the barriers. There are also safety issues with clients working late, transportation home, and housing in bad neighborhoods.

- Are there ways we can better prepare our clients for your work culture?
  Employment service providers should be selective about what jobs they place clients in. Don’t place clients in a job you wouldn’t take yourself.

| 1.4 | - NP-HEALTH aims to build a culturally competent and linguistically diverse health care workforce by training immigrants and refugees skills which are contextualized for successful delivery of health care. It offers case management, communication skills classes, job search and interviewing skills, assistance in understanding various program entry requirements, referral into jobs and internships as well as job shadowing programs, childcare and transportation referral, and advising for health care employees interested in moving up the health care career ladder.  
  - Pre-requisites include an early intermediate level of English proficiency and a desire to enter into the delivery of health care or advance within current career.  
  - The Language Hub is also offering employment counseling for foreign trained healthcare workers who want to get back into the field. The Language Hub also serves as one of the six one-stop career centers in Bayside. | Skills contextualized for June 18, 2013 |
| 1.5 | - NP-BUS2’s mission (Non-profit) is to create economic opportunities for low-income immigrant and refugee women. Towards this end, NP-BUS2 provides instruction in English, communications and entrepreneurial skills, and financial literacy. They also provide their clients with valuable mentoring/coaching and access to the resources needed to start their own businesses.  
- NP-BUS2 created a very successful curriculum for their program called the Grand Cafe, a home-based DVD series that introduces clients to basic entrepreneurial skills, financial literacy, and vocational English through the lives of four immigrant women who want to start their own businesses. The program is designed for intermediate or higher English language learners. NP-BUS2 offers workshops in person in Bayside and San Jose as well as online. All of NP-BUS2’s instructors are highly qualified vocational ESL trainers. NP-BUS2 would like to invite Forum participants to share information about their program with their clients and other networks and communities.  
- We are pleased to share information with you about Grand Cafe, our educational soap opera series DVD that imparts financial literacy and entrepreneurship information. At C.E.O. Women, we also embrace the sentiment "once a client, always a client." We provide ongoing support services including business coaching and access to capital to help women start and expand successful businesses. | Economic opportunities  
Entrepreneurial skills,  
financial literacy and vocational English  
Ongoing support | April 20, 2010 |
| 1.6 | - This organization’s mission is to help entrepreneurs acceded business education, resources and capital to sustainably grow their microenterprises. They provide seed money to underprivileged for microentreprise. Have MBA advisors from Mills, Presidio, USF, UCBerkeley, SFSate, and work with various agencies to include NP-BUS2.  
- Organization has short term financial literacy program, helps with budget create budget, basic financial terminology, acquiring credit, increasing savings, basic financial decision making skills, helps entrepreneur define vision, mission, purpose, objectives, learn American business culture.  
- At end of this fee for service program, students obtain a certificate that may help them obtain future funding for businesses. | Business education  
MBA advisors  
Fee for service program | July 19, 2011 |
NP-BUS1 Community Corporation aims to serve first generation immigrants and refugees, and promote long term economic empowerment through a three year program of support for new entrepreneurs. They use an ABC model which teaches asset building, business incubation, and community understanding and engagement to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the fundamentals of financial literacy and entrepreneurship. This includes group education and individual planning. Classes of 15-20 students are taught one night each week for a period of time and are offered in Spanish, Vietnamese and English. For those participating in English, the participant must possess a low advanced level or higher. Classes are ongoing with new ones starting in September. A flat fee of $200.00 is collected for the three year program, half of which is due before the first training class and balance due mid way through the course. NP-BUS1 invites agencies to let clients know about their organization and the comprehensive approach they take to ensure financial literacy and economic stability for new comers.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Key concepts</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1   | - In February of 2009, State legislation was passed dramatically changing the way adult education is funded in the State. Before 2009, adult education programming had a protected funding stream; funding went straight from the State to local adult education programs. After February 2009, the protected funding stream, which was already cut by 20%, was made more flexible and shared with the rest of the school district (adult education is located in the district’s k-12 administration). There were budget cuts in May that significantly reduced early education programming. With the adult education funding now flexible, the school district was forced to choose between adult education and early childhood education. The district chose to prioritize young children and their families. Therefore, the ACE program has experienced an 83% cut in funding ($10 million dollars).  
- The priority and core mission of the school district is, of course, k-12 education; not adult education. The current funding level for the school district is at the same level as the 2001/2002 school year, and per pupil funding has been significantly reduced. Therefore, the school district is struggling just to sustain vital k-12 programming. Therefore, in the past 18 months, the school district has decided to redirect funding to support core programming. These decisions, however, have completely decimated the adult education program.  
- ACE will use their remaining resources to support the core mission of the Bayside Unified School District (SCHOOL DISTRICT). Therefore, ACE will provide English language support for parents of children in 20 SCHOOL DISTRICT elementary schools through their family literacy program. The programs will be multi-level and will be aligned with the district’s family literacy program. The program will be offered to family members of children in the SCHOOL DISTRICT system.  
- The ACE will also continue to offer the following: High School Diploma completion, GED Testing and Studies, GED Spanish Testing and Studies, Citizenship Preparation classes, and Career Technical Education. Beyond August 17, 2010 |
that, there will be very little resources to collaborate with community-based organizations.

| 2.2 | - STATE OFFICIAL suggested that agencies research other adult school options before referring clients, as other adult schools in County are having similar cuts. The fees at other adult schools are also increasing.  
- In the end, the cuts to adult education undermine the refugee resettlement program, as the resettlement program is based on the assumption that other essential services in the community will be provided. In this case, it is not.  
- STATE OFFICIAL made a commitment to send a list of ESL providers in the Forum to some of their former students (about 7,000 to 8,000 students).  
- There are high quality materials online for self-directed ESL learning. Some of the ACE staff is putting together an online resource list that agencies could use to support their ESL programs. ACE is also willing to talk to Forum agencies to discuss ways that ACE can support their ESL programs. Strategic partnership and collaboration are necessary, and as much as ACE would like to run programs in partner agencies, they will not have the funds to do that this year.  
- ACE does not currently have a referral system in place, but they are willing to discuss this with partners. They also have postcards that they will be sending to former students letting them know of alternative resources in the community. | August 17, 2010 |

| 2.3 | - STATE OFFICIAL expressed a devoted commitment to the refugee community in Bayside. She also expressed great turmoil over the district’s decision. She understands the district’s need to meet the core mission of the district, but at the same time, there is no local or county agency that’s sole mission is to support low-income, low-educated adults in the community.  
- There needs to be a concerted effort to conduct outreach about the importance of adult education programming in the midst of the service vacuum. Overtime, the impact of the cuts will be significantly felt. ACE is encouraging partners to advocate on behalf of low-income, low-educated adults at all levels of government. The message that ACE wants the | August 17, 2010 |
government to hear is that there is no designated agency mandated with the mission to provide for the educational needs of the underserved adult population.

| 2.4 | On Monday, December 6, STATE OFFICIAL, Director of Bayside Adult and Career Education, spoke to the Learning and Teaching Sub-Committee of the SCHOOL DISTRICT School Board. With the possibility of additional funds, STATE OFFICIAL stated that more classes might be opened, including vocational ESL in partnership with Catholic Charities. She is also committed to allowing adult school teachers to request re-designation to teach ESL if community partners provide space. | November 16, 2011 |
| 2.5 | Official from SCHOOL DISTRICT Refugee & Asylee Student Assistance Program GOVT interested in rejuvenating education committee to examine existing adult ed. resources and safeguard those in place while identifying and full-filling unmet needs. Initial meeting for those interested to be arranged. | September 18, 2012 |
| 2.6 | Official from SCHOOL DISTRICT Refugee and Asylee Student Assistance Program GOVT calls for the revitalization of the education committee. Decimation of adult ed. with future funding improvements unlikely necessitate committee work to better examine available and mandated funding pockets, building better communication and referral structure to streamline clients, keep programs working in place, and strengthen services overall. Interpretation and translation noted as huge necessities across various system boards, perhaps as its own sub-committee. Ownership of language access issues requires leadership and coordinated effort to put in place paraprofessionals as well as certified interpreters which could be utilized across systems (including education) from a common pool and shift according to refugee arrival/population need. | October 16, 2012 |
| 2.7 | - Forum members raised considerations and questions: PERSON1 urged case managers set up a tickler system to be aware and notify clients when all assistance will be exhausted. PERSON2 asked whether refugees will be given any special consideration. SSA says refugees will not be given any special consideration. THIHA asked SSA if RCA client transitioning to CalWORKS needs to apply for it. Technically, No. Refugees will be moved into CalWORKS by the county automatically. However, THIHA noted a July 19, 2011 |
disconnect between programs means that clients often need to apply on their own for CalWORKS after RCA.
- NAOMI told case managers to please stress self-sufficiency so clients understand parameters of program. She noted that supportive services will continue for one year after discontinuation to include ancillary services such as tools, classroom supplies, uniforms, licensing fees and that clients can ask for specific support from a program specialist. It was noted that conventional welfare to work programs are of little help to the Burmese population w/limited English and little transferrable skills. The county is now looking at options for those with limited conventional education.

| 2.8 | The Targeted Assistance (TA) Project is a collaborative service model that assists refugees and asylees in finding sustainable employment. TA Funds are granted by the Office of Refugee Resettlement and administered by County Social Services in conjunction with refugee employment and social adjustment providers.
- This project draws on the combined strengths of FORUM member agencies and includes intensive employment services, Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL) classes, social adjustment, and cultural orientation for newly arrived refugees who have been in the U.S. for five years or less.
- Participating agencies providing employment services include VOLAG2 and MAA1. Staff from MAA2 as well as a Bhutanese community staff member with VOLAG2 provide social adjustment services to any new arrival (refugee or asylee from any country of origin who may be in need of extra navigational support to access services and to learn how western systems work. (Minutes from May 15, 2012)
- Project is collaboration among 5 agencies with the FORUM as the coordinating body. Funding is approximately $230,000 per year and comes from the Targeted Assistance grant from the Office of Refugee Resettlement to the State and then County Social Services contracting with FORUM with VOLAG1 as the fiscal agent. MAA1, VOLAG1, and VA-VOLAG1 serve as employment placement agencies while Burma Refugee Family Network (BRFN) and Bhutanese Community in California (BCC) provide social adjustment services. BRFN and BCC provide social adjustment services in an | September 18, 2012 |
FORUM/TA office located at VA-VOLAG1.
- Goal of TA Funding is to find jobs for refugees in the shortest time frame possible. Funds are strictly performance based and allocated to employment agencies according to enrollment of client, placement, and then 30 and 90 day retention. 95 clients enrolled in the first 7 months in employment placement services which includes a vessel requirement while 51 clients from 13 different countries enrolled in social adjustment. The project is on track to meet the overall goal of 100 clients served, 50 placed annually.
- Majority of jobs in food industry for $9.00 hour. County notes that refugees in program are outperforming non refugee clients within welfare-to-work program. Biggest barrier to employment opportunities remains lack of sufficient English and short time frame mandated for placement.
- Project increases capacity of MAAs thru trainings( which have included health care system, public benefits, domestic violence, parenting in the U.S., financial aid and community college, family reunification process) given thru program and open to other Forum members. FORUM/TA thanks all agencies lending time and expertise to such trainings.
MAJOR THEME: Collaborations in Action

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Key concepts</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>- The Career Readiness Program at The Language Hub is an eight month program, 22 hour a week commitment, with eight levels of proficiency. Generally, students must have a high school diploma but no equivalent college degree (English Center will check equivalency), must be documented, and low income. If a refugee possesses an equivalent degree, some funds may be available through WIA funds instead of the traditional Pell grant. - The Language Hub has an office of financial aid to assist students in applying via a FAFSA form for PELL grants to cover the cost of the tuition. If a client states that they will not be able to attend even with a Pell grant, The Language Hub now has a Rob Beckley Scholarship Fund to help cover almost all of the related costs and also eliminate the job deposit fee. Once a student has qualified for financial aid at The Language Hub, they will be able to carry it forward to community college or further university studies. - Also notable, The Language Hub program meets and is on the approved list for the Federal Welfare to Work requirements. In order to have supportive services such as books, materials, transportation, or childcare covered, a client have The Language Hub written in their Welfare to Work Plan beginning the program. - Course content includes but is not limited to intensive English, computer, career skills, speaking and listening, grammar, community English, pronunciation, and American culture. Instructors all have masters degrees. Because it is a vocational program, a career counselor assists in job development and placement for each student. - The Language Hub Summer A session will begin in May. Also, if you have suggestions for how to better recruit the community of refugees and asylees, please us him know.</td>
<td>August 16, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NP-HEALTH has a match savings program to help refugee and immigrant clients obtain re-certification in nursing. NP-HEALTH will assist participants</td>
<td>July 19, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in selecting appropriate courses at local community colleges along with the match savings plan. NP-HEALTH will initially select 10 individuals to assist with recertification.

| 3.3 | **- Handout given on SCHOOL DISTRICT family literacy school site programs now running.**  
**- NP-EDUC has contracted with Bayside International High School to run parent literacy classes M-Th. Bus passes will be available. Enrollment begins on August 30th for parents of SCHOOL DISTRICT students.**  
**- Bayside International High School is currently expanding its programs to provide a full service community model of support. Presently, a client does not need to have a child enrolled at the school. The fall will bring: the opening of a family learning center, computer lab for use during periods throughout the day and evening, home language library, 3 days of ESL provided by NP-EDUC, 2 days of computer literacy classes, gardening in conjunction with local partners. All OIHS classes are free. Bus passes for enrolled participants may provide transportation relief but budget for this still under revision.** | March 20, 2012 |

| 3.4 | **- Academic Scholarship for Refugees and Asylees: VOLAG2 is offering a college scholarship program intended to provide scholarships between $1,000 to $5,000 for refugee and asylee students.**  
**- VOLAG2 provides short-term career-based training for highly motivated refugees. The goal of the training program is to increase refugees’ earning potential.** | March 16, 2010 |
Chapter 8: Conclusion and Discussion

Summary of findings

I have guided the reader through the trajectory of the refugee resettlement process, beginning with the moment of rupture from the country of origin, to interacting with social workers in the U.S. and finally, to using employment and education as ways to establish themselves in their new country. I have highlighted the importance of regaining citizenship in a nation-state, an effort that involves my interviewees developing particular funds of knowledge from overcoming past adversities and espousing a desire to be both resilient and resistant. The focus on how people work together then brings us to the quotidian elements of refugee resettlement, a theme that I develop through analyzing organizational meeting minutes and interviews primarily with social workers.

The questions that I sought to answer are: 1) How do refugees and their social workers experience citizenship? 2) How are non-formal education programs in refugee resettlement used to construct ideas of citizenship? Firstly, I found that refugees experience citizenship on the move, a situation that highlights the importance of local experiences that are informed by international governance. This interstitial citizenship engenders ambivalence towards structures of citizenship, questioning the scale of solidarity for refugees, especially when considering that local organizations, in partnership with federal entities, play an important role in disseminating funding and information about educational programs in refugee resettlement. The relevance of the local also extends to the experiences of education in the country of resettlement. Refugees’ experiences with non-formal education programs particularly through various social work programs highlight the importance of interpersonal interactions between U.S. social workers and
refugees, especially when it comes to connecting with one another using similar past experiences.

**Elusive Citizenship: The question of social citizenship in the interstices**

Refugees experience citizenship from a place of irony and ambivalence in their state of in-between citizenship or citizenship on the move. Refugees have lost their citizenship in their original nation-state through the workings of ethno-nationalist states, as in Lin’s and Astha’s cases, or through shortcomings in bureaucracy like Eh Say. The solution to their predicament is regaining citizenship in another nation-state, a situation that they access through appealing to the international system in an individualized narrative which is at odds with their persecution based on group membership. Ethno-nationalism, as opposed to civic nationalism, is also an important point to bring up in the context of this finding. The ethno-nationalist sense of the Karen and other refugee populations is problematic because of their embeddedness in a political community, whether it be Burmese or Bhutanese. These modern nation-states confer with “other similarly constituted groups [with] territoriality, borders, sovereignty and equality” (520) in the international order. For my informants, the existence of the nation-states in the international order has served to uphold social/human rights but not political rights. This ambivalent situation of seeking to “go back” or to extend their membership to other countries was particularly salient in Eh Say’s mention of the “same feelings” that she has “for Africa and Burma,” and in Eh Myo’s questions about the ability to carry out social work with or without citizenship.

However, in this family of nations, simply “returning” to a homeland is also insufficient (Malkki 1992). In the process of resettlement, refugees grow different connections (for example, with U.S.-born social workers or with refugees from other nations) and imagine their homelands in other ways. My interviewees’ ambivalence towards citizenship comes from this temporary status of caught between nation-state boundaries. In these spaces, the refugee has a document
that substantiates his or her existence from the U.N. but does not have political rights in this organization. When Eh Say and Rehema speak about “the same feelings” they have from and for different places in the world, they call upon a connection that transcends the boundaries of nation-states, connected to what Rehema calls “a citizenship of humanity.”

This “citizenship of humanity,” or citizenship that is rooted to the place that people find themselves in and that they access through a framework of human rights, is needed to support their existence in transition from one nation-state to another. The concept of in-between spaces underscores the need to belong in a nation-state container in what Liisa Malkki (1992) calls a “family of nations.” She argues that this discourse is almost a sort of moral common sense and if the morality of the world is sedentary, the refugee is not moral because theirs is an alternative nationalist metaphysics that builds coalitions across boundaries and is rooted in identification with others who are oppressed. This sort of moralizing discourse is echoed also in U.N. discourses that assert a moral obligation to intervene in sovereign states that commit crimes against humanity (Soguk, 1999). Fujiwara (2008) also talk about how “immigrant rights are human rights,” pointing out the overlay of a moral argument on top of a legal one. The in-between citizenship is a place where the morality of human rights comes into play to activate the necessary access to refugees’ safety, including social rights.

Bhatia, Beehler and Birman (2006) criticize orientations towards social work that assume an inability on the part of the individual, being helped to “help himself or oneself” (51). Cautioning against the rhetoric of “pulling oneself by the bootstraps” and ensuing shaming of the individual, Bhatia et al. (2006) suggest approaching social work through a human-rights and social justice approach. Because the individual has a right to certain services such as housing, education and health, the social worker can fulfill the role not just of a direct service provider,
filling out forms and such, but also as a human rights advocate. This approach also highlights the interdependent nature of the world in that human rights advocates or social workers can identity with global movements that alleviate suffering at any level.

**Relevance of the local**

Within the dictates of citizenship under the nation-state, I found that there is a pronounced relevance of the local for my interviewees, especially when it comes to how social work programs are implemented. Stemming from the encounter between social workers and refugees, my findings on social work show the frustrations and successes of resettlement work, especially around funding cuts, collaborations, employment and education. The implications of the different types of organizations’ varying emphases on social work and of the need for collaboration lie in the forms of citizenship that can be created in scales beyond the nation-state (Varsanyi, 2006). Baubock (2003) argues that people in cities should be able to get citizenship that is independent of the citizenship that is granted by the nation-state. He argues that in this space, transnational affiliations can be better supported. However, Varsanyi (2006) rebuts that even local or urban citizenship is administrated by national governments. In this study, I find the importance of accessing citizenship through different types of state and non-state entities. That is, local citizenship, rooted in the collaborations between organizations and peoples from different backgrounds, create a space for refugees during resettlement to build connections. For example, the three different types of organizations - the MAAs, the volags and non-profits - have varying expertise and access to the government funding. The collaborations that they carry out, especially in terms of disseminating information and funding from the federal level to individual refugees, are key in the process of resettlement. The relevance of the local is borne out in both interpersonal and organizational work. In the interpersonal arena, the Funds of Knowledge framework shows the importance of moments of contact and connection. At the organizational
level, social workers’ focused approach to ensuring that their clients can access social citizenship
privileges local mechanisms, with local organizations (as opposed to national-level
organizations) holding importance in the allocation specifically information about available
funding.

Additionally, mutual Assistance Agencies take on the role of education asked for by their
constituents and thus create a form of popular education. These programs take into account
educational projects (such as certifications) that are already in place. They thus step in when the
county or the school system can no longer meet certain needs. MAAs are built from ethnic
communities, which also fosters an immediate sense of connection and identity. In situations
where the state is unable to reach all of its population, the communities themselves have
addressed the need not only for basic literacy skills but also for a sense of belonging. As one of
my interviewees, Zaw, asserted, “They want to ask questions but are not sure what questions to
ask. Then there is also the language barrier and the fear that comes from speaking up.” The
presence of community centers, with various out-of-school programming, seem to serve a vital
need of individual communities, and hence, the nation as a whole. Regardless of the extent of
globalization and the international extension of the state, a focus on assets of small
neighborhoods and communities will require access to spaces of identity formation outside of
formal mechanisms.

In investigating non-profits in refugee resettlement, the location of the educative spaces
outside of the state is important to note. Torres asserts that the “tension between centralized
planning in education and decentralized interests of local communities” (124). The emergence of
the role of non-profits in my findings necessitates a discussion on the role of civil society. It
appears that where the state is lacking (for example, in my case, adult education funding), non-
profits step in to fill the role of workforce development by providing language and vocational trainings. The role of teachers or in the case of this study, social workers, then takes on a precedence, especially as teachers can come from a community and participate in state mechanisms of schooling in order to get their teacher education; they thus bridge the state with the lived experiences of their respective community. According to Torres (2009), teachers are state employees whose interactions with children may transmit ideas about national identity. The public employees in the resettlement agencies can fulfill a similar role to their constituents, highlighting the interactions between individuals in all organizations.

At the interpersonal level, people’s prior experiences that they bring to the table are equally important. The U.S.-born social workers have citizenship and are attempting to assist others who have violently lost their status through a rupture. Citizenship has the possibility to be leveling but can only be so if people allow it to be. To this end, the Funds of Knowledge framework attempts to encapsulate a way in which people can come together to carry out social work. In attempting to bring together the perspectives of American-born social workers and refugees, it is important to note that I am not attempting to conglomerate social oppressions; my aim instead is to offer evidence on how people can come together, and a framework for understanding how they do so. Bacchi and Beaseley (2007) introduce the “political metaphor” of social flesh to explain how people from different statuses – citizens and not-yet-full citizens - can come together in a way that is leveling. Social flesh emphasizes the shared connection and fate of people in the caring-cared for relationship and is an attempt to “challenge [the] neo-liberal conceptions of the autonomous self” (107). In this framework, everyone is recognized as the receivers and givers. According to Beasely and Bacchi (2007), the concept of social flesh “highlights interdependence” and “draws attention to shared embodied reliance, mutual reliance,
of people across the globe on social space, infrastructure and resources” (280).

My analysis that brings interviews from together, along with shared sense of resilience and resistance, resonates with tenets of community psychology which argues that issues at the individual psychological level have interactional causes; social work within a community psychology framework is “based on a set of values which seeks to address inequalities and acknowledges the political nature of this way of working” (Webster and Robertson, 2007, 156). This view of social work asks practitioners to construct problems from the point of view of the clients, especially relevant in the refugee community where individuals may struggle with trust issues in their own communities. There is also the issue of escaping discrimination and violence in their home countries but still facing other issues of violence in their country of resettlement. Fundamentally, problems that social workers encounter on the ground, within individual cases, have social and interactional causes and should be analyzed at the macro level (Webster and Robertson 2007). Thus, in order to serve refugees, social workers take into account community psychology approaches that “engage with wider political and social context, and challenge structures that maintain potentially damaging conditions” (157). In this way, social workers not only address individual cases but also place their work in the larger context of achieving social justice.

In my development of a Funds of Knowledge framework and bringing together voices from different starting points, the encounter between the American-born social workers and the refugees present an opportunity to consider how difference functions. Benhabib (1994), using the work of Lyotard and Derrida (year) who sought to deconstruct language, suggests looking at the moment of the encounter between differences – le differend – in order to more accurately describe democratic processes of citizenship. She questions who the “we” in sovereignty,
particularly in the U.S. Constitution, really encompasses: it is a “we” that comes into being only upon recognizing the other in a public sphere. This line of reasoning can be expanded from the national public spheres to global ones. For example, Ellis (2010) describes global citizenship and cosmopolitanism as involving duties to justice. She claims that “societally-complex world requires pluralistic public spheres … and an international civil society within multi-level nested citizenship” (7). Thus, in a sense, Ellis also argues for a broad focus on *le differend*, the moment of encounter between multiple public spheres within an international civil society.

Especially in the case of the United States, this is problematic as there has been a history of racial tensions masked by laws steeped in the same liberal justice that brought the refugees over. For example, Arizona is infamous for its treatment of Mexican immigrants but it is also one of the top five refugee resettlement states. Jason DeParle of the New York Times reports that Arizona’s state senator, Russell Pearce, claims that Arizona is not anti-immigrant because of the high number of refugees that it takes into its social services. Blatantly using a foreign policy/humanitarian policy to justify ill treatment of undocumented immigrants, Arizona policymakers put service providers in the cross fire and more importantly, pit the two types of immigrants against each other. Ironically, both groups claim a chance at livelihood to immigrant and refugees, in fleeing persecution, have been illegal immigrants in other countries as well, but they have been slow to sympathize with undocumented immigrants. In my research, the hyperdocumented refugees show ambivalence towards their political participation: do they become a citizen to participate or do they go back in order to help people back home or in other situations? On the other hand, there is much mobilization from the undocumented populations,

---

particularly students, to acquire U.S. citizenship, discourses that are framed around both legal and affective reasons.

**Limitations and Future Research**

A phenomenological study will always be just one description by one researcher and many such descriptions may exist (van Manen, 1990). Thus, this study is not meant to produce findings that may be generalized to other contexts; however, the phenomena that I present here provides a description of the life-world of the individuals that I interviewed. Beyond this, the limitations in my data may stem from the fact that I was able to interview only one person from each organization so multiple perspectives from the same organization were not captured. Finally, some students wanted to practice their English with me and thus we conducted the interview in English; I honored their requests and because even if their responses are not as extensive as others due to their lack of English proficiency, they were are still meaningful.

In Chapters 6 and 7, I looked at community by examining how people of different backgrounds find common ground. A related research question would be to look at how these issues persist across different forums in California. From there, this framework of collaborations and funding can be extended to resettlement networks in other parts of the United States. A comparative case study across these sites using a phenomenological approach would bring an in-depth understanding of how local context matters in terms of immigrant acceptance, especially for refugees, a population that the United States voluntarily welcomes into this country. The relevance of local, multilayered citizenship would also be expanded upon in this line of research.

Extending the framework of the state and citizenship to examine the experiences of undocumented students in the United States and the citizenship ideals that they espouse. The refugee and the undocumented person represent opposite ends of the immigrant spectrum in terms of welcome and denial in political discourse and public opinion, with refugees seen as
persons to be “saved” and undocumented individuals seen as infringing upon benefits. Research indicates that both populations see education (especially public education) as a means to advance socially (cf. Abrego, 2006); thus, investigating this theoretical and practical tension will be valuable in advancing theory and informing immigrant education policy. Looking at different school-districts with heavy refugee student reception – for example, the winners of the refugee school impact grant – would also uncover best practices for educating former refugees in schools during resettlement.

From there, a cross-national comparison of citizenship and difference focusing on the four biggest regions of refugee resettlement (the U.S., Canada, the European Union, and Australia) would shed light on the global nature forced migration and citizenship. As entire island nations begin to disappear, Australia and New Zealand contend specifically with environmental refugees. The E.U, on the other hand, has seen an influx of transnational adoption, while Canada continues extend its welcome to immigrants through multicultural policies. A comparison amongst these different reception contexts would shed light on the variability of citizenship.

**Final Words**

As I finished writing this dissertation in 2014-2015, two events occurred that brought refugees to the media limelight\(^{15}\). The first is the escalation of the Rohingya refugee crisis in Southeast Asia. The Rohingyas live in the borderlands between Bangladesh and Burma. They practice Islam and speak Burmese but Burma has consistently denied them citizenship, instead urging Bangladesh to accept the Rohingya as citizens. As the newly democratic Myanmar moved towards self-definition as a country, this definition that is predicated upon bloodline and religion
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and not on presence on the land, resulting in the expulsion of the Rohingya who drift in the Pacific Ocean in makeshift vessels. Echoing this search for human security, a boat carrying refugees from the Middle East/North Africa region capsized in the Mediterranean Sea in April 2015, resulting in the deaths of at least 900 people. Additionally, the movement of children and families across the U.S. border from Central America has brought legal attention to the fact that women and children who are seeking asylum in the U.S. have been put without trial in detention centers. These event signals how ongoing conflicts in one part of the world impacts other regions, highlighting that containing humanity and the consequences of its actions in distinct nations is becoming more impossible than ever. The challenge then is to rethink structures from the interstices of citizenship that build upon people’s lived experiences.
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Appendix A: Adult Consent Form

University of California, Los Angeles

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Dilemmas of Citizenship and Education in Immigrant and Refugee Resettlement

Winmar Way, M.A., from the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) is conducting a research study.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you recently moved to the United States and are participating in Refugee Transitions/International Rescue Committee programs. Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

Why is this study being done?

This study seeks to understand how you think about citizenship in the countries that you have lived in and in the United States. I am interested in hearing about how you have maintained your cultural and educational practices in each of the countries you have lived in and why your culture and education are important to you.

What will happen if I take part in this research study?

If you volunteer to participate in this study, the researcher will ask you to answer questions in an interview.

How long will I be in the research study?

Participation will take a total of about an hour.

Are there any potential risks or discomforts that I can expect from this study?

You may feel uncomfortable sharing some aspects of your life; if this is the case, you can choose not to answer those questions that cause you discomfort.

Are there any potential benefits if I participate?

You may benefit from the study by being able to share your story in the way that you would like it to be told. The results of the research may help programs like the one you are participating in provide better services to people of your background.

Will information about me and my participation be kept confidential?

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify you will remain confidential. It will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by means of using pseudonyms and password-protecting your answers on my computer. Only I will be able to see what answers you gave to the questions.

What are my rights if I take part in this study?
• You can choose whether or not you want to be in this study, and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time.
• Whatever decision you make, there will be no penalty to you, and no loss of benefits to which you were otherwise entitled.
• You may refuse to answer any questions that you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

Who can I contact if I have questions about this study?

• **The research team:**
  If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to one of the researchers. Please contact:
  Winmar Way  
  (909) 767-1496  
  way@ucla.edu  
  Faculty Sponsor:  
  Carlos Alberto Torres, PhD  
  Professor, Department of Education, UCLA  
  Email: catnovoa@aol.com  
  Phone: (310) 206-5791

• **UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program (OHRPP):**
  If you have questions about your rights while taking part in this study, or you have concerns or suggestions and you want to talk to someone other than the researchers about the study, please call the OHRPP at (310) 825-7122 or write to:

  UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program  
  11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 211, Box 951694  
  Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694

*You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.*

**SIGNATURE OF STUDY PARTICIPANT**

______________________________
Name of Participant

______________________________
Signature of Participant Date

**SIGNATURE OF PERSON OBTAINING CONSENT**

______________________________  909-767-1496
Winmar Way Name of Person Obtaining Consent Contact Number

______________________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent Date
Appendix B: Adolescent Assent Form

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

ADOLESCENT ASSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Dilemmas of Citizenship and Education in Refugee Resettlement

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Winmar Way, M.A. and associates from the Graduate School of Education at the University of California, Los Angeles. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you recently moved to the United States and attend school or after-school programs here. Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

Why is this study being done?

I am interested in hearing your story about where you lived, what schools you went to, what activities you like doing and what your hopes and dreams are for the future. Your story, along with stories from other children like you, will help teachers and government officials understand better how to help you and other children like you.

What will happen if I take part in this research study?

Please talk this over with your parents before you decide whether or not to participate. We will also ask your parents to give their permission for you to take part in this study. But even if your parents say “yes” you can still decide not to do this.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, the researcher will ask you to answer a few questions in an interview.

How long will I be in the research study?

Participation in the study will take a total of about 1 hour.

Are there any potential risks or discomforts that I can expect from this study?

You might encounter some questions that you do not feel comfortable answering. In this case, you can choose not to answer those questions and you will not be in trouble.

Are there any potential benefits if I participate?

You may benefit from the study by being able to share your story in the way that you would like it to be told. The results of this study will be helpful for teachers and schools to understand the experiences of immigrant children like you.

Will I receive any payment if I participate in this study?

You will not receive any payment from participating in this study.

Will information about me and my participation be kept confidential?
Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that identify you will remain confidential. It will be shared only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by means of using a different name and keeping your responses under password protection on my computer. Only I will be able to see what answers you gave.

**What are my rights if I take part in this study?**

You may withdraw your assent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty or loss of benefits to which you were otherwise entitled.

You can choose whether or not you want to be in this study. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may leave the study at any time without consequences of any kind. You are not waiving any of your legal rights if you choose to be in this research study. You may refuse to answer any questions that you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

**Who can answer questions I might have about this study?**

In the event of a research related injury, please immediately contact one of the researchers listed below. If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to the one of the researchers. Please contact Winmar Way at (909) 767-1496 or way@ucla.edu.

If you wish to ask questions about your rights as a research participant or if you wish to voice any problems or concerns you may have about the study to someone other than the researchers, please call the Office of the Human Research Protection Program at (310) 825-7122 or write to Office of the Human Research Protection Program, UCLA, 11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 102, Box 951694, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694.

**SIGNATURE OF STUDY PARTICIPANT**

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

__________________________
Name of Participant

__________________________  __________________________
Signature of Participant  Date

**SIGNATURE OF PERSON OBTAINING ASSENT**

In my judgment the participant is voluntarily and knowingly agreeing to participate in this research study.

__________________________  909-767-1496
Winmar Way  Contact Number

__________________________
Name of Person Obtaining Assent

__________________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Assent  Date
Appendix C: Parental Consent Form

University of California, Los Angeles

PARENT PERMISSION FOR MINOR TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Dilemmas of Citizenship and Education in Immigrant and Refugee Resettlement

Winmar Way, from the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) is conducting a research study.

Your child was selected as a possible participant in this study because he or she moved to the U.S. recently. Your child’s participation in this research study is voluntary.

Why is this study being done?
This study is to understand the experiences of children like yours, who have moved across different countries as a refugee or immigrant child who makes use of public services (such as school and other benefits). Your child’s experiences with school will be useful to teachers and service providers to create better ways of teaching children from similar backgrounds.

What will happen if my child takes part in this research study?
If you agree to allow your child to participate in this study, we would ask him/her to answer a few questions about their experiences in school, their likes and dislikes, their aspirations and challenges. This conversation with the researcher will take place at the office or at school, after classes or during lunchtime.

How long will my child be in the research study?
Participation will take a total of about an hour after school or during lunchtime.

Are there any potential risks or discomforts that my child can expect from this study?
Your child may be asked questions about his or her past that he or she does not want to remember; if this is the case, he or she can tell me that they do not want to talk about this issue. Your child can also stop participating in this study at any time.

Are there any potential benefits to my child if he or she participates?
Your child may benefit from the study from being able to tell his or her story in a way that makes them feel comfortable and valued. The results of the research may inform teachers, policy makers and other persons about how to create better policies and schools where children like yours can thrive.

Will information about my child’s participation be kept confidential?
Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify your child will remain confidential. It will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Your child’s name will never directly be used; only the researcher will know that he or she participated. No one else will have access to the interview.

What are my and my child’s rights if he or she takes part in this study?
• You can choose whether or not you want your child to be in this study, and you may withdraw your permission and discontinue your child’s participation at any time.
• Whatever decision you make, there will be no penalty to you or your child, and no loss of benefits to which you or your child were otherwise entitled.
• Your child may refuse to answer any questions that he/she does not want to answer and still remain in the study.

Who can I contact if I have questions about this study?

• The research team:
  If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to the one of the researchers. Please contact:

  Winmar Way  
  way@ucla.edu  
  (909) 767-1496

Faculty Sponsor:  
Carlos Alberto Torres, PhD  
Professor, Department of Education, UCLA  
Email: catnovoa@aol.com  
Phone: (310) 206-5791

• UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program (OHRPP):
  If you have questions about your child’s rights while taking part in this study, or you have concerns or suggestions and you want to talk to someone other than the researchers about the study, please call the OHRPP at (310) 825-7122 or write to:

  UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program  
  11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 211, Box 951694  
  Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

SIGNATURE OF PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN

________________________________________
Name of Child

________________________________________
Name of Parent or Legal Guardian

________________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Parent or Legal Guardian  Date

SIGNATURE OF PERSON OBTAINING CONSENT

________________________________________  _________________________  
Winmar Way  909-767-1496  Contact Number

________________________________________
Name of Person Obtaining Consent

________________________________________  _________________________  
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent  Date