
Analysing ‘Migrant’ Membership Frames through Education Policy Discourse: an example of restrictive ‘integration’ policy within Europe

FARAH DUBOIS-SHAIK

*Université Catholique de Louvain,
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium*

ABSTRACT This article proposes combining discourse theory and perspectives on political membership developments in Western European societies. It combines theories and examples of policy discourses about ‘migrant integration’ in the Swiss national context in the sphere of education. This examination aims to deconstruct specific membership framing within Europe and boundary setting between inclusion and exclusion of certain groups in policy sectors such as education. Analysing discourse through understandings within language enables us to see the way categories and frames are constructed and contribute to the signifying of membership. Bounded problematisations, in this case about ‘migrants’, framed by political orientations and discourses, require policy ‘solutions’. Actors then make sense of this policy and interpret ‘solutions’ in distinctive ways. This article aims at disclosing how membership practices in Western European countries such as Switzerland may remain restrictive because ‘migration’ is problematised.

Introduction: analysing political membership frames through integration policy discourse

This article examines theoretically and empirically whether nationally and socially entrenched ideologies on membership (Benhabib, 2004) can potentially be disclosed through examining policy discourses (Wodak & Meyer, 2009; Fairclough, 2009) such as ‘integration’. During the last decade, ‘integration’ policies have appeared on the political agendas of many Western European nation-states. Often, integration policy discourses weave powerful narratives about national project building (Mitchell, 2003) and introduce social democratic standards of equality, in answer to controversial political debates about (im-)migration and managing what are politicised as multicultural societies. Questions arise about whether and how integration policy contributes to the development of the signifying of membership (Benhabib, 2004). Local policy actors make sense of and translate integration and migration, which constantly forges policy as discourse. Through the perspective of policy created and constructed by discourse (Fairclough & Wodak, 2008) you can reveal how membership practices are woven through language and structures (Benhabib, 2004). Thus, an analysis of integration policy discourse can potentially reveal the modalities of membership practices that shape boundaries and spaces of belonging. Membership practices in Western European countries such as Switzerland may remain restrictive because ‘migration’ is problematised.

Through the lens of critical discourse analysis (CDA), the very view of migration as a ‘problem’ is in itself problematic (Bacchi, 1999), because it often produces cosmetic reform agendas in answer to a deeply complex and controversial ideological discourse about membership. The perceived ‘problem’ of migration itself or the contentious, ‘problematised’ debate around ‘culture’,

is used as a platform to serve the (neo-)liberal state (Mitchell, 2003). We could therefore speak about a process of *bounded* problematisation (March, 1978), in which certain ‘problems’ are set and defined and then require policy ‘solutions’. The problem with ‘problematisation’ is that its boundedness locks the evolution of its very objective; here, the argument is made that membership practices remain restrictive because ‘migration’ is problematised. Moreover, this boundedness continues to persist in the integration policy processes through translation (Freeman, 2009) into public sectors.

An example of this problematisation (Callon, 1986) is given in the Swiss case and its translation into the educational sector, which is assigned as one of the spheres of the implementation of the integration programme. During the last three decades, many students with ‘migrant’ background were and still are institutionalised as being a special group with special needs, and this creates a powerful structural challenge for introducing integration measures (Dubois-Shaik & Dupriez, 2013). Moreover, the overarching Swiss federal integration policy is addressed to ‘migrants’ as newly immigrated groups, and does not include naturalisation or educational and socio-economic progression/mobility as part of its key aims (Dubois-Shaik, 2011). Integration policy could be restricting the development of membership because of the way in which it is discursively operated and what kind of governance measures are adopted. The example of integration in education policy can show how discursive categories such as ‘migrant background’ of students are shaped and influenced by the federal integration agenda and by international standards of comparison and new ‘soft’ forms of governance (Lawn, 2006).

This article also emphasises the struggle of Western European countries (politicians and policy makers) to reconcile stringent migration agendas with their endeavour of being part of a transnational European space. In this struggle, education is attributed the role of ‘integrating’ and changing structures towards a logic of social democracy; however, this is to serve the economic purpose of being part of the global/European market. The concern is that this may lead to a weakening and non-development of citizenry and membership in Western European democracies, and on the individual level, to a restriction in identity development (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2008). Moreover, it shows how education could be increasingly contributing to these weakening membership processes by being caught up in contradictory forces.

Three elementary parts of this article aim at presenting a particular theoretical and analytical framework towards deconstructing membership in ‘integration’ discourses.

(a) In a first step, political membership theory (Kofman, 1995; Benhabib, 2004) will be linked to discourse theory (Ball, 1994; Jessop, 2004; Rizvi, 2006; Fairclough, 2009). This section will comprise an elaboration of how research on (political) membership can be operationalised by discourse, adopting the perspective of policy *as discourse*.

(b) In a second step, the role of education in ‘integration’ policy is discussed. It introduces the idea of the translation (Freeman, 2009) of integration in education policy discourses through the problematisation of ‘migrant background’ as a student differentiation category. The proposed policy solution of integration is in its turn intricately related to processes of Europeanisation in education policy and to the use of international standards of comparison (Steiner-Khamsi, 2002; Grek et al, 2009).

(c) And third, the above (a and b) will be underpinned with some examples of ‘integration’ discourse examined in Swiss federal and cross-cantonal policy.[1]

This study draws on Fairclough’s (2009) dialectical-relational framework on CDA and aspects from other discourse theorists (Ball, 1994; Rizvi, 2006; Jessop et al, 2008), combined with Benhabib’s (2004) exploration of contemporary modalities of membership in Western European nation-states. This constructs an overarching perspective and broad theoretical and methodological space of analysis, rather than a mechanism for the detailed textual analysis of the empirical and secondary data collected in this study.[2] The important theoretical and analytical angle proposed in this article is the perspective of policy as discourse, containing the potential for disclosing contemporary changes and challenges of nation-states in the regulation of modalities of membership.

Linking Political Membership and Discourse Theory

Modalities of Membership

The post-war economic boom in Western Europe, the subsequent foreign labour force employment in receiving countries and a decrease in skilled labour forces in sending countries have had profound effects on the way in which migrants are perceived today in countries such as Switzerland or Germany (Geddes, 2003). Immigration and residency policies changed in order to facilitate these labour demands, although migration was viewed as short-term or transitory (Gaine, 2008). But this had unforeseen consequences in the eventual permanent settlement of foreign workers in these receiving countries. As a consequence, notions of preserving local culture or political stability are debates which reappear in current political discourses. A recent example is that in February 2014, a majority of Swiss voters approved an anti-immigration initiative launched by the Swiss People's Party (SVP) which imposes ceilings on EU circulation of persons into Swiss territory. This local decision launched a massive wave of international media and political discourse regarding the questions of free circulation of persons and national border control. Nation-states strive to guard their borders, to establish a sense of national identity and to retain this old idea of unity within the nation (Benhabib, 2004). The ideas that implicitly and explicitly inform a society's perception of who 'belongs', who constitutes 'us', and hence its acceptance of 'difference', its public attitudes and prejudices (or politicians' beliefs about them) powerfully inform social policy (Gaine, 2008).

The study from which this article is drawn is based on the following question outlined by Benhabib (2004, 2009): what is the status of citizenship today, in a world of increasingly deterritorialised politics? There is a disaggregation effect with reference to the rights regimes of the contemporary European Union (EU), in which the rights of citizens of member countries of the EU are sharply delineated from those of third-country nationals, i.e. members of countries which are not within the EU and who are immigrating to EU countries, within a patchwork of local, national and supranational rights regimes (Benhabib, 2004). This argument can be extended to include the idea of Europe not only in the sense of the EU, but also as a transnational space of common and shared ideas (Lawn, 2006) that travel and that create interdependencies and trends of deterritorialised politics in other European countries, such as in the case of Switzerland (Dubois-Shaik, 2011). The unitary model, which combined continuous residency upon a given territory with a shared national identity, the enjoyment of political rights, and subjection to a common administrative jurisdiction, is coming apart (Benhabib, 2004; Bauböck & Guiraudon, 2009). One can have one set of rights without being a national; more commonly, though, one has social rights and benefits by virtue of being a foreign worker, without either sharing in the same collective identity or having the privileges of full membership. The danger in this situation is that of 'permanent alienage' – namely, the creation of a group in society that partakes of property rights and civil society without having access to political rights (Benhabib, 2004, p. 146). Furthermore, there could be important restrictions in civil rights, such as in terms of educational and professional access and opportunities, and socio-economic progression (Dubois-Shaik & Dupriez, 2013). On the individual level, it may lead to alienation and dis-identification of certain groups of people. According to Baumann (2004, in Gewirtz & Cribb, 2008, p. 38), in large part, individuals actively choose and negotiate their identities. But these choices are limited by the discourses that are available to them. For some these choices are far more limited than for others because processes of identity construction take place within networks of power and differential access to economic, social and cultural – and to this one could add political – resources (Bauman, 2004, in Gewirtz & Cribb, 2008, p. 38).

There is an underlying idea here that defining the 'identity' or 'identities' (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2008), or the 'culture', of the sovereign nation is itself a process of fluid, open and contentious public debate or, in other words, that it is operating through discourse. The hybrid nature of identity means that new identities are frequently created through the combination of different discursive elements (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2008, p. 41). Often the 'lines separating "we and you", "us and them", rest on unexamined prejudices, ancient battles, historical injustices, and sheer administrative fiat' (Benhabib, 2004, p. 178). Outsiders are thus not at the borders of the polity, but *within* it. In fact, the very binarism or dichotomy between nationals and foreigners, citizens and

migrants, is sociologically inadequate and the reality is much more fluid, since many citizens are of migrant origin, and many nationals themselves are foreign-born. The practices of migration and multiculturalism in contemporary democracies flow into one another (see Benhabib, 2002): the constitution of 'we, the people' is a very fluid, contentious, contested and dynamic process, and a vision of peoples as self-enclosed moral universes is not only empirically but also normatively flawed (Benhabib, 2004).

In the Swiss case, since 2008, federal policy of migrant 'integration' remains one of the main features of party-political electoral arenas and is promoted as a means of changing society – for example, through assigning 'integration' measures to specific public sectors, such as the labour market and education. The subject of 'integration' is strongly linked to political integration (see Benhabib, 2004, p. 121) and whether and how countries grant citizenship rights to newcomers. In Germany, and similarly in Switzerland, the idea that migration is a transitory phenomenon seems to have had the perpetuating effect that migrants – non-Swiss nationality passport holders currently entering the fourth generation – are routinely refused citizenship and political rights (Friedberg & Hunt, 1995). They are granted legal rights and welfare state membership, or so-called denizenship, 'which can be understood as legal and social rights linked to legal residence falling short of full citizenship' (Geddes, 2003, p. 15). However, Castles and Davidson (2000) point out that this incomplete membership status of denizenship is problematic because partial citizenship creates expectations and cannot be regarded as a static condition. The next natural step, he argues, is for migrants with this status either to leave the country or to be allowed to become full citizens. However, a less stringent or soft 'solution' the Swiss state opts for is the introduction of 'integration' as a reform agenda to be implemented across different state sectors. According to Bauböck and Guiraudon (2009), the emphasis on civic duties and positive conceptions of shared values and practices has recently come back with a vengeance in European countries in the urge to define what it is that migrants are expected to integrate into.

According to Prodolliet (2006) [3], the federal policy differentiates 'three pillars of integration politics', which are important for the distinctions made in this article. They are: *structural integration*, via institutions such as education and further education, social security, health care etc.; *political integration*, which can be ensured by the possibility of political participation, such as electoral and voting rights and naturalisation; and *social and cultural integration*, which applies primarily to everyday and recreational life (Prodolliet, 2006, p. 3). However, policy which restricts 'integration' to structural, social and cultural integration (in themselves restrictive) is incomplete, because it does not take into account the engagement of persons in forming democracy through political and civic membership practices (Benhabib, 2004). Moreover, as is shown in this article, even structural integration in the sense of equity in education and access to professional opportunities (Dubois-Shaik & Dupriez, 2013) is not ensured through integration policy in its current form.

According to Bauböck and Giraudon (2009) and Joppke (2007), the countervailing logics behind EU non-discrimination law and civic integration policies deserve close attention. Integration courses and contracts oblige individuals to become economically self-sufficient and promote cultural assimilation, whereas anti-discrimination policies have evolved towards increasing recognition of group distinctions in an attempt to secure access to opportunities for disadvantaged groups. Undisputed as 'integration' may be among the span of Swiss political parties, the *extent* and the understanding of the term remain persistently varied, as public and Swiss political discourse reveal (Prodolliet, 2006). Conceptually, claims in political discourse are that Swiss society has attempted to move away from traditional approaches, such as assimilation and segregation or separation, towards a multicultural society. In contrast, integration signifies that majority and minority groups retain aspects of their respective cultures and take up new elements of the other cultural groups at the same time (Berry et al, 1992). However, 'integration' policy discourse may reveal that the concept in Switzerland is still largely rooted in a civic republican assimilationist model of citizenship (Kofman, 1995; Dubois-Shaik, 2011), which favours rigid naturalisation procedures, focuses on economic and cultural attributes of persons, and continues to restrict political and civic membership. Moreover, as shown in this article, this restriction of membership practices can take place through discursive devices such as problematisations and categories deeply embedded in institutional processes that lead to institutional discrimination and exclusion (Gomolla & Radtke, 2002).

A theoretical connection can be made between the approach of analysing membership through discourse and Benhabib's (2004) work on political membership. The meaning of 'political membership' that is adopted in this study derives from Benhabib's definition, that is: '[all] principles and practices for incorporating aliens and strangers, immigrants and newcomers, refugees and asylum seekers, into existing polities' (2004, p. 1). This is different from political *integration*, which implies only the political aspects of citizenship – namely, voting and electoral power.

I favour Benhabib's (2004) understanding of the conflicts of political membership discourses in contemporary states for a number of reasons; not only does she base her arguments for political membership as a human right on a thorough review and constructive critique of theorists such as Kant (cosmopolitan right), Arendt (the right of having rights) and Rawls (law of peoples, distributive justice and migrations), but she also introduces the concept of 'democratic iterations' (Derrida, 1985/1991), which in my own understanding is strongly linked to a discursive approach. Her approach builds on previous normative political ideology of membership, such as already exists in contemporary democracies, and expands critically on this ideology by transdisciplinary research on political sociology of the state (see also Guiraudon & Favell, 2011).

Benhabib (2004) proposes that practices of political membership can best be analysed through an internal reconstruction of multiple commitments of the state – for example, the commitments to 'traditional territorial' functions [4] and the simultaneous opening of borders for market purposes. I propose that such an internal reconstruction of commitments can be done by examining discourses of 'integration'. There are three arguments linking membership and discourse theory that could underpin how 'integration' policy may be restricting membership practices, and for which there are some discursive examples below.

(a) First, in the federal integration policy, the negotiated notion of cultural difference is problematised in the sphere of policy discourse by using assimilationist 'cultural integration' frames which spread the idea of a standard culture and the in-tegration into 'Swiss' culture, distinct and identifiable from other cultures. Moreover, in educational terms, 'migrant background' is categorised as *special needs* and cultural difference is hence seen as a deficit or as in need of special requirements. Although integration policy now challenges this educational segregation of students with 'migrant background', there is a continuity of institutional processes that problematise 'cultural difference' and the 'migrant' (Dubois-Shaik & Dupriez, 2013).

Arguably such a problematisation of cultural difference is in tension with the social democratic ideal of citizenship and participation because it doesn't reflect the 'civic' nature of membership, and because it contributes to educational segregation and institutional discrimination (Gomolla & Radtke 2002).

(b) Second, Jessop (2000) speaks about a 'reconciling' effect of an economic market-driven model of the state, which has resulted in a political project (of 'integration') with social democratic as well as conservationists acting through a neo-liberal umbrella. There is a hegemonic economic logic (Benhabib, 2004) that drives the creation of secondary structural measures through policy – such as in education through an economic conceptualisation of integration – which ultimately continues to curtail membership rights in response to economic agendas with neo-liberal influences and pressures. Hence, there is no real interest in re-signifying membership for long-settled migrants – or, indeed, any persons classified as migrants – as it does not serve the economic and political agenda of the state. This, it could be argued, is leading to a closure of public debate and civic involvement and a weakening of democracy (Jessop, 2000; Fairclough, 2005).

(c) Third, this policy is also regressive relative to the extended transnational interests. If nation-states are extending their interests through participation in European or transnational migration and human rights agreements and other transnational policy spaces, then the restriction of membership rights relative to these extended interests is contradictory. It could be considered a breach of human rights for people in a social democracy, who are a part of the nation and contributing to economic stability and social development (Benhabib, 2004). We are particularly looking at the long-term presence of third- and fourth-generation migrants who are routinely refused membership rights, and who are often submerged in 'integration' policy language, which tends to portray migration as a relatively 'new' phenomenon, requiring 'special' measures for 'special needs' of a newly immigrated group of people. This, we argue, is a form of problematisation of migration, which becomes institutionalised (Dubois-Shaik & Dupriez, 2013).

Arguably, with such bounded problematisations, membership is not developing in relation to the other commitments nation-states are making by claiming to be liberal social democracies.

An Adapted Analytical Approach to CDA

I draw on the dialectical-relational approach (DRA) to CDA, due to its perspective of seeing every social practice as having a semiotic element (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Social fields, institutions and organisations (such as in education) are constituted as networks of social practice (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, in Fairclough, 2009, pp. 162-187).

Discourses can be understood as semiotic ways of construing aspects of the world, which can be identified with different perspectives of different groups of social actors. In this study, these are located within a relatively 'loose' network of 'integration' policy. This includes people working in federal ministry departments and cross-cantonal governmental education officials, as well as persons responsible for delivering data for policy-informing purposes. The term 'policy brokers', according to Grek et al (2009, p. 6), could be applied to these actors, who are located in some sense at an interface level and who 'translate' (Freeman, 2009) national data into policy terms (Cooren, 2004) or interpret European developments into the national and cantonal space.

In this study, the sense-making of policy actors about integration can reflect the modalities of membership. Here, dialectical relationships (hence, *dialectical-relational*) are woven between different discursive elements within migrant 'integration' policy – namely, policy texts [5] about 'integration' that are referred to by actors (Cooren, 2004); sources of 'knowledge' referenced in spoken and written policy texts, such as the PISA [6] study data about migrant and local students' educational performance; and the narratives and representations of policy actors involved in policy processes located in various cantons and regions within Switzerland.

According to Ball (1994), the effects of policy are primarily discursive, because discourse changes the possibilities that one has for thinking 'otherwise'. It limits what he calls 'our responses to change and leads us to misunderstand what policy is by misunderstanding what it does' (1994, p. 14). Although 'integration' at a glance may imply a change in federal and cantonal orientations, its present form may conceal and entertain a superficial and strategic treating of complex membership processes. This connects to the idea of 'dominant' discourses (Ball, 1994; Jessop, 2004; Rizvi, 2006; Fairclough, 2009) within policy. These knowledge–power relations within these dominant discourses are achieved, according to Foucault, by the construction of 'truths' about the social and natural world [7] – truths that become taken-for-granted definitions and categories by which governments rule and monitor their populations and by which members of communities define themselves and others (Foucault, 1972, in Luke, 1996; Howarth, 2010).

The key objective of CDA (Fairclough, 1992) is about disclosing existing power relations. Howarth (2010) speaks about how power can consist of radical acts of institution which involve the elaboration of political frontiers and the drawing of lines of inclusion and exclusion. In this sense, the exercise of power constitutes and produces practices and social relations. But, Howarth explains,

it is also involved in the sedimentation and reproduction of social relations via the mobilization of various techniques of political management, and through the elaboration of ideologies. The function of the latter is to conceal the radical contingency of social relations and to *naturalize* relations of domination. (Howarth, 2010, pp. 309-310)

The aim of critical discourse analysis is therefore the *de*-naturalisation or deconstruction of these concealed relations.

The Role of Education in 'Integration' Policy

This article works with the idea of 'integration' in its translation (Freeman, 2009) into education policy. The concept lends itself to discursive analysis (Fairclough & Wodak, 2008) because it contains the transfer or strategic attribution of meaning to socio-political ideas such as 'culture', 'national identity' or ideas of access to 'equal opportunities', according to the representations of policy actors.

Education is attributed a specific role in 'solving' a 'problematised' understanding of migration. This may be attempted through a form of 'soft' governance in education (Lawn, 2006). Here is an understanding of changing forms of governance in Europe linked to the growth of comparison and measurement through education data (Grek et al, 2009), such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). PISA has become one of the key international comparative measures of the effectiveness of schooling systems, and its data sets are heavily used by the EU and by its member states (Grek et al, 2009). Nóvoa and Yariv-Mashal (2003) observe that such a politics of mutual accountability and the political intervention of the EU may have been legitimised by a system of comparison, with the argument of voluntary participation of nation-states. It is not only the member states of the EU that have been affected by these kinds of agreements, as the case of Switzerland can demonstrate.[8]

As examples of integration discourse, first, I deconstruct the federal migrant integration agenda by looking at the understanding and framing of 'integration' in federal actors' discourse, often referring to federal policy texts. Second, I approach the question of how *education* is framed in 'integration' policy discourse. How does it address or demarcate political membership? Education as a social sector is assigned the role to 'integrate' students with migrant background into cantonal systems. However, the meaning of 'integration' in the schooling context is intimately related to the broader 'integration' political agenda and membership ideologies. Cantons translate national and international policy into local practices in specific ways through the sense making (Weick, 1995) of actors involved in the policy process. Thus, third, I asked policy makers what kind of knowledge they use to inform integration policy and legitimise the introduction of this policy.

We can examine this by looking at how the PISA studies have had a profound impact on how migrant students are spoken of and referred to in cross-cantonal integration policy discourse. PISA results rendered visible a large performance gap between migrant and local Swiss students. National follow-up studies using PISA data for cross-cantonal research on these performance gaps show that irregular schooling and streaming mechanisms lie at the heart of high allocation rates of migrant students into 'special classes for children with learning difficulties' [9], thus explaining the large performance gaps (Kronig et al, 2000). Thus, the category of student differentiation on the basis of 'migrant background' is being channelled structurally through special educational needs (SEN) provisions, which pertain to the idea of students requiring specialised measures for what are considered special needs. Students with a migrant background were allocated to these special provisions (special classes) in disproportionate and discriminate numbers, with no consistency or regularity in allocation patterns and decision-making processes (Kronig et al, 2000). This triggers distinctive national responses of actors in policy processes which construct, diffuse and institutionalise shared ideas of 'integration' as a solution to what is seen as an institutional and social problem of educational segregation. Justifications are given by actors in policy discourses in favour of 'integration approaches' to education (legitimation) in the context of these three aspects.

Examples of 'Integration' Policy Discourse in the Swiss Case

A series of examples of Swiss 'integration' policy discourse will be presented in this section. The empirical approach based on policy discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2009) included the following elements: (a) locating networks of policy makers and brokers (Grek et al, 2009) in federal and cross-cantonal spheres [10] and in semi-structured interviews (24 in total), examining their understanding and contribution to discourses on integration; and (b) examining their referencing of policy-informing evidence and knowledge of particular kinds (Arnott & Ozga, 2010). The idea of undertaking semi-structured interviews was to examine the understanding of integration from different policy-actor perspectives on different governing levels (federal, cantonal and local) in a form of 'loose network' of integration policy.

'Economic' and 'Cultural' rather than 'Civic' Integration

Many policy actors [11] interviewed for this study, in both federal and cantonal (Zurich) spheres of 'integration' in the context of education, spoke about a pivotal ideological appraisal of how migration is perceived by Swiss authorities, or simply about a general change in the national outlook towards migration as such (Dubois-Shaik, 2011). This is seen to have occurred with the arrival and settlement of families of labour migrants. On the federal level, the following interviewee holds a senior position in the Federal Office for Migration (BFM) and is a key player in the generating of a cross-departmental and cantonal-level integration advancement mandate (integration report and plan). The BFM is a large network of officials within the federal administration in the Federal Department for Police and Justice, dealing specifically with the regulation of migration/integration state matters. This interviewee also represented what is called the Interdepartmental Working Group for Migration (IAM), specifically dealing with integration measures. In his narrative, he brings to notice conceptual changes in the way migration was perceived and how 'integration' is viewed and dealt with by the state:

Interviewee A: An important change was that the state became an integration actor itself and it has to develop its structures, which means education, the school system, the labour market, the health area, all federal areas in such a way that it is also accessible for all foreigners.

The re-structuring of various public sectors for a heightened 'accessibility' for 'foreigners' and equality of opportunities is presented as a main goal of integration, which corresponds to the content of the federal law on integration.[12] The actor speaks about the 'exact equal place' of the 'entire foreign population' and then goes on in his narrative about the plurality of society and about religious and cultural diversity. Mitchell (2003) argues how contemporary political progressives and conservatives within nations have found common ground in the utilisation of multiculturalism. Although the idea of a pluralist society seems to have been taken into account by the interviewee, it appeared significant in the way migrants were referred to as a particular group with particular needs, requiring public-sector accessibility through a new orientation towards 'integration'.

Interviewee A: We understand integration as equality of opportunities. Integration is successful when foreigners from a comparable social stratum and background achieve similar success in the areas of structural and social integration, well participation. This means not increased unemployment rates, not increased social benefits dependency, and not increased criminality; when one has comparable results. And the legislator has actually named three criteria, which we try to implement everywhere. The first is from the point of view of the foreigner; the adherence to the legal order and the recognition of the basic principles of the federal constitution. That we acknowledge the diversity, for example, when it is about clothing rules, but that [acknowledging] diversity has its limits when, for example, out of cultural reasons, girls are circumcised or if any kind of violence is justified. It is very strongly about principles, therefore legal order. Where one is actually requiring assimilation. The second criterion is the path of language attainment, as a requirement for the process of integration. However, one does also acknowledge even there that there is such a thing as a socially accepted segregation.... The state interferes there, where negative costs are generated; unemployment funds, social benefit funds etc. But language attainment is surely important as a second point. Thirdly, that one makes an effort to participate in the economic life, in the educational life, to be financially independent. That one reaches a minimum [degree] of education, which is important for integration.

It is interesting to note the negative wording '*not* increased unemployment rates, *not* increased social benefits dependency, and *not* increased criminality; when one has comparable results'. Later he explains that 'the state interferes there, where negative costs are generated; unemployment funds, social benefit funds etc.' The choice of wording of 'negative costs' could point to a strong economic-orientated view of integration from a federal point of view.

The interviewee remarks that the state should acknowledge a certain 'socially accepted segregation', which could be linked to a multicultural view of society. This view is often coupled with the vision of clearly delineable cultural frontiers (Benhabib, 2004), in which cultural groups are seen to live separately within their cultural norms, which are, to a certain extent, seen to be tolerated by the state, if they do not infringe upon the legal order.

However, he moves on to explain that it is required on the part of the individual to 'make an effort to participate in the economic life and in the educational life, to make an active effort to be financially independent', which would facilitate acquiring permanent residence. It could be argued anew that integration as portrayed here is geared towards a newly immigrated group. First, cultural differences are seen to be static and thus not acquiring any hybrid forms. And moreover, there is no talk about granting citizenship or naturalisation as such for the larger numbers of second- and third-generation, soon fourth-generation migrants. Requirements for integration refer to economic and educational integration with the aim of gaining economic independence and the adherence to the principles of the legal order within the country. The first aim of economic independence, it would seem, is to avoid negative costs for the state. The second aim of adherence to the local order is a reference to civic attitudes or 'law-abiding', but mainly that of obligations rather than rights on behalf of the migrants. Rights would require political participation, arguably not an aim of integration. In order to facilitate these two aims, the state would provide integration measures based on these criteria.

Mainly, it would seem, it is thought this should be done through providing language advancement or the structures to ensure equality of opportunities in terms of the economic and social class the migrants are *currently* placed in. Arguably, a *progression*, economic, educational and civic (through naturalisation), is not really broached or referred to. The terminology of 'equal chances or opportunities' is expressly used in a social-democratic language, also frequently quoted within the current integration standards in education policy orientated towards the Bologna reform and the Lisbon agenda (see Rizvi, 2006; Dubois-Shaik, 2011). It could be argued that the idea of 'equal opportunities' is coupled with a notion of 'economic integration'. The theme of membership (Benhabib, 2004), is narrowly conceptualised for migrants as being 'a part of the Swiss society with equal chances comparable to Swiss in a similar economic and social stratus'.^[13] This particular vision of membership restricts large groups of people to specific labour sectors with the potential for limited economic progression.

According to this membership framework, integration measures as conceptualised by the Swiss federal government and required by migrants classified as 'foreigners' are highly structural. The notion of what integration actually means for the individual is loosely held (Dubois-Shaik, 2011). The basis of this framework is immigration – and more recently, asylum law, with the general tendency to be orientated towards the notion of migrants as 'foreign', 'guest', 'new', 'a separate group', and until recently as 'transitory', 'influx or access-orientated' (Gaine, 2008, p. 24; Dubois-Shaik, 2011). In other words, as a relatively young phenomenon, which now requires a provision from the state. This changed perception, in contrast to the preceding years, occurred, as Prodolliet (2006) suggests, because many social problems are linked in the political debate to an alleged integration deficit of the migrant population. This is the way in which 'the migrant' becomes problematised in a distinctive way, which requires a policy solution of 'integration'.

In many ways, this problematisation is reflected in the education sector, with many students with a migrant background being streamed into lower achievement classes and limited professional opportunities, as will be addressed in the following section.

The 'Dichotomising' of Migrants and Swiss Students

In this section of the article, we examine examples of integration discourse in cross-cantonal education policy actors' narratives. The education part of the integration discourse revolves around the streaming of students with a migrant background into special-needs classes, which lead to lower school achievements and opportunities (Marks, 2005). On the one hand, it is about the classification of 'migrant' or 'cultural difference' as 'special needs', and on the other hand it is about the policy solution of 'integration', which proposes decreasing or diminishing special-needs structures within regular schooling. Interviewees B and C attempt to explain what 'integration' means from their organisational point of view. A major part of this discourse is also about the way PISA data have unveiled institutional discrimination of migrant students and how integration could be an answer to educational inequalities.

Interviewee B: 'The EDK [14] attempts a narrowing down of the term integration without making a claim that it could be a definition.... Well, the traditional content of integration is the

integration of disabled children, therefore in a special needs sense. However, later the discussion around integration ran under the label of 'inclusion' ... In parallel, the migration area and the special needs area took up this question simultaneously. Still, the special needs pedagogy has a much longer tradition and this one has to always make clear, because one has extreme overlaps. When speaking about the difficulty of the special classes (for children with learning difficulties), there one can find segregation of any form of disability, which is nearly a bit too much. Learning disabled, behaviourally disabled and so on. And then there is also a discussion about an overrepresentation of migrants in these special classes, who are classified as disabled due to cultural behaviour. (Migration Appointee, affiliated with the Federal Commission for Foreigners [now called the Federal Commission for Migration] in the Education Directors Conference [EDK])

Interviewee C: Well, I do think that if we embed the discourse in that about migrants and put an emphasis on integration – if one thinks about equal chances, then I do think that this reform movement now is meaningful, because where else should integration begin if not in school; there is where it starts. I draw hope from it that it is a good contribution towards equality of chances. Well for me the change in ideology comes in fact afterwards. I endorse these integration efforts, which one could also call 'inclusion'. Also from the angle that we cannot continue in this way; this dichotomizing of Swiss and Foreigners. Well, I actually come from this branch, the awareness of this absurd separation. We have now in the school system of Canton Zurich, Secondary C classes for foreigners (with low achievement requirements). Under the disguise of school structures one has the foreigners, but in principle, it becomes more and more evident that we have the less desired children with migration background in this Secondary School Level. (Researcher and lecturer at the Zurich College for Curative or Therapeutic Pedagogy (Heilpaedagogik), whose work on special education and integration measures has widespread cross-cantonal reference)

These interviewees speak about the idea of integration associated with education, giving it the meaning of 'inclusion', because school is 'where it starts'. Integration is understood as equality of chances. Often, in education discourse, actors use 'integration' synonymously with 'inclusion', although conceptually there are differences between these two policies, although some actors point specifically to the divergence in meaning. According to Armstrong et al (2011), 'integration' in educational terms refers to technical and administrative arrangements which are made in relation to an individual child or small groups of children with what are perceived as learning difficulties or requiring 'special educational needs' to attend a mainstream school. Thus, integration makes no requirement for the school to effect radical change in its culture and organisation. Education actors often speak about 'inclusion' instead, which targets all students as having the right to inclusive schooling, rather than focusing on migrant children only. The dichotomy between 'foreigner' and 'Swiss' is seen to be restricting children with migrant background into lower educational opportunities (Dubois-Shaik & Dupriez, 2013).

Integration Policy Informing Evidence: the use of data with respect to migrants

A third analytical example of 'integration' discourse is about the referencing of particular education data to inform policy. The missive of 'equality of opportunity' in the federal integration framework uses denominators such as 'migrant-Swiss' background of students within school systems, drawn from the OECD's PISA study. As explained earlier, low school achievement of migrant students has often been quoted as a reference for a 'lack of sufficient integration' of migrants in Swiss regular education structures. However, the way in which PISA data have featured within the integration agenda is significant because of a lack of national data pertaining to other classifications than 'migrant' or 'Swiss'.

Interviewee E: Yes, there is the idea to compare equality of opportunity, to speak in simple terms, the group one wants to integrate with the local population. To look what it is and then one can establish if there are deficits. Integration would imply that the chances of one group are beneath that of the local. This sparks off large discussions about what the comparison groups are. One cannot simply compare the entire Swiss population, in which there are different social

classes, with some other migrant group. One has to reflect a lot on how to compare. One can say 'to compare same with same'. Swiss from the same social class, but how does one define this? When one generally looks at what kinds of integration measures are being offered, not just from BFM, but also Cantonal and Communal, then one always has this simplistic comparison between 'foreigners' and 'Swiss'. It may be an initial indication or information, and if you are lucky then one can subgroup the foreigners in different nationality groups. But for me this is very dissatisfactory, if you actually want to disclose the equality of opportunity. There are massive problems there, and this is internationally always the discussion, how one can compare and how can one present this. One has to have very detailed data, at least to know [what] the level of education is for everyone. Well, one has to at first separately identify the naturalized Swiss, because as soon as someone acquires Swiss nationality, this person gets submerged in the number of Swiss, and then it is longer considered a problem. And there is not only the problem of coverage of the persons with migrant background but also the local, because there would be a lot of attributes, which would be important in order to identify groups. ... The question of the socio-economic background is effectively also a problem of data, because one cannot measure this in Switzerland. The educational background of a person cannot be identified out of any registry. Job, current activity, this is not in any registry; there have to be other surveys or sources. Then I am actually losing a lot of information, which I cannot even retrieve. (Statistician of the Federal Statistical Office [BFS]: main generator and supplier of state- and Swiss population-related data for governmental planning and the private market sector/policy advisor for the BFM [Federal Migration Department], for migration population data [DEM –Democracy and Migration]).

This interviewee highlights what in his view are the problems around the measurement of data involving 'equality of opportunity'. The difficulties are seen to lie on different levels – on the one hand, in pinning down what one is actually measuring. Then there seems to be a problem that certain types of data are not retrievable in Switzerland, because all that is available is the simplistic comparison Swiss–Foreigner. The profession or educational background of a person is not retrievable. Moreover, even the distinction between different migrant groups or nationalities is not made; the classification of the 'migrant' thus homogenises all different non-Swiss nationality groups. Gewirtz and Cribb (2008) speak about how ethnic monitoring necessarily involves oversimplifying in ways that do not reflect the complexity of people's actual identities. Such policies, therefore, can constantly produce frustrations and frictions in the life worlds of the people they are supposed to benefit (Bonnett & Carrington, 2000, in Gewirtz & Cribb, 2008) by making essentialist or reductionist assumptions and thereby 'fixing' people's identities. They propose that policy makers, with support from policy scholars and others, need to be reflexive about such conflicts inherent in working with diverse student identities and to be aware that policies which tackle certain forms of inequality (here, what is seen as a lack of integration) or misrecognition may lead to other forms. However, accessing other aspects of inequality which may be relevant can sometimes be beset with technical problems.

Then there is also the question about how data are presented:

Interviewee E: You see that the role of the BFS in the whole integration discussion is more ad hoc. Honestly, we have not dealt with this theme scientifically. We had to get in external knowledge towards this theme. But the aim is that we can specify individual attributes, which we do not base on internal knowledge but that we get external expertise. We have to invest more and methodologically put more thought into this. In international comparison, Switzerland sees itself primarily as data producer [and] that is the perception of BFS, that we produce and provide data. All this exceeds whatever we have done so far, and it is a challenge to engage with this and to do justice to these challenges.

The interviewee sheds light on the considerations in the use and presentation of data, and how this features within the integration report. Note the statement that the BFS 'have not dealt with this theme scientifically', but rather had to bring in external knowledge. This would explain why, for example, PISA data have featured prominently within the integration report, and as a backdrop to the role of education in this report, in the integration agenda; it would then provide the main policy-informing evidence, which 'problematizes' the migrant. As it is difficult to make any

distinctive national data statements on why there is inequality within the Swiss education system – for example, regarding socio-economic background – ‘the migrant’ versus ‘Swiss’ is all that the data distinction can offer. ‘The migrant’ thus becomes a main denominator for measuring inequality or inequity perpetuating the bounded problematisation.

Conclusion

Examples of policy discourse in policy narratives and the policy referencing of particular kinds of knowledge can demonstrate a restrictive understanding of ‘integration’ and representation of people in policy. CDA allows a deconstruction of dominant membership ideologies that underlie the current integration policy in written and spoken texts. Thus, discursive analysis can be married to political membership theories which view membership practices as imbricated in and enacted through policy. This means that policy can demarcate frames of membership through the enacting or sense-making of actors in the field, with the assistance and agency (Cooren, 2004) of federal integration policy texts.

First, the negotiated notion of *difference* is dichotomised into ‘migrant’ and ‘Swiss’, and all non-Swiss nationality groups are homogenised into the group ‘migrant’. Second, they are problematised as a group with special requirements, both in federal as well as in cross-cantonal education policy discourse (Dubois-Shaik & Dupriez, 2013). The notion of special needs in this sense could be linked to a perception of a *newly* immigrated ‘foreign’ group and of an integration *deficit* of this group due to vaguely defined cultural reasons. The differentiation between newly immigrated persons and second-, third- and fourth-generation migrants is not made, and civic integration is virtually absent from the integration discourse. There is no normalisation of what is perceived as difference, but rather a problematisation of difference. This leads to what can be called a *bounded problematisation* of migration. This particular bounded understanding is then diffused and translated into institutional practices and may establish a kind of invisible continuity, thus restraining the democratic evolution and iteration of political membership forms and the widening of discursive identity choices.

Translation of integration policy into the educational sphere is linked to an involvement in international educational studies that has affected the way school systems are perceived by policy actors in the Swiss case study; PISA plays a significant role as policy-informing evidence for the integration policy texts, reports and policy makers’ discourse in legitimising integration policy. PISA figures serve the political purpose of demonstrating to the local audience that the local school system is highly discriminatory and thus needs a structural change to challenge SEN provisions and separating measures. Integration policy is thus proposed as a soft policy. I would propose that this solution is soft because it is not imposed and the SEN schooling system still remains intact. Rather, it tries to introduce voluntary participation of schools to adhere to remedial measures and cooperate with the SEN system. The policy is also a form of soft governance (Lawn, 2006) because it mainly operates through a loose network of policy actors at different junctions of the educational policy sphere.

The suggested policy solution is a shift away from separating structures through the introduction of integration structures which work with remedial measures to integrate children classified as having learning difficulties, allowing them to be supported within the same regular (non-special-needs) class. The classification of ‘migrant’ as ‘special needs’ itself is not challenged by this structural reform and, moreover, the cantons continue to have the choice and scope to limit measures in their school systems (Dubois-Shaik & Dupriez, 2013). Thus, the restrictive approach to migration, integration and ‘culture’ may remain much the same and continue to exclude students with a ‘migrant’ background, even if they happen to be third- or fourth-generation migrants. Although change may be indicated by the introduction of so-called social democratic standards (such as equality of opportunity in education), the way in which these concepts are politicised and instrumentalised is highly structural and caters to the needs of economic capital, rather than leading to a progression of membership and social democracy. Thus, education is caught up in contradictory commitments of the state and its policy measures, which reflect the tension involved in reconciling nationalistic closure towards migrants, efforts to be involved in Europeanising processes and federal economic interests.

Notes

- [1] These examples are drawn from a doctoral study conducted from 2008 to 2011 at Moray House School of Education, University of Edinburgh, UK.
- [2] For the detailed textual analysis of semi-structured interview and policy texts, what could be termed traditional sociological methods, such as thematic coding and narrative analysis, were used (Czarniawska, 2004; Holloway & Jefferson, 2000). However, it can be emphasised that these methods are compatible with the understanding and framework of CDA, as explored by different discourse theorists, such as Ball (1994), Luke (1996), Jessop (2004), Rizvi (2006) and Fairclough (2009).
- [3] Prodoliet is the current president of EKA, the Federal Commission on Foreigners, an important body in the area of migration concerns that was founded as an expert commission of the Federal Council in 1970. Acting more *in the interests of the resident migrant population*, it reinforces the idea that Switzerland should naturalise migrants who feel close to local institutions, to encourage their participation in public life, and to enhance so-called citizen dialogue (Bürgergespräch) (Rey-von Allmen, 1998, quoted in Reichenbach, 1998).
- [4] By restrictive naturalisation policies on the one hand and tight border control on the other.
- [5] The textual agency approach, according to Cooren (2004), suggests that what constitutes an organisation is a hybrid of human and nonhuman contributions. Signs, memos and contracts display a form of agency by doing things that humans alone could not do. Created by human beings, these texts participate in the channelling of behaviours, constitute and stabilise organizational pathways, and broadcast information/orders.
- [6] Programme for International Student Assessment (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] study testing 14-year-olds' skills in mathematics, sciences and reading).
- [7] One of the mysteries of the dialectics of discourse is the process in which what begins as self-conscious rhetorical deployment becomes 'ownership' – how people become unconsciously positioned within a discourse (Fairclough, 2009, in Wodak & Meyer, 2009).
- [8] Switzerland joined the Bologna Process in 2003. Aligning with its logic, the education reform introduced in 2008 in Switzerland bears the trademark of 'HARMOS' or Harmonising of Public Schools throughout the Swiss Cantons. Its core principles are strongly based on a design to heighten the employability and mobility of citizens, similar to the Bologna Declaration, but also with the referencing of OECD data and agenda setting through the Lisbon Council (Dubois-Shaik, 2011).
- [9] In the canton of Zurich; German term: *Sonderklassen*.
- [10] The empirical part of this study was conducted at Swiss federal migration departmental levels and at cross-cantonal policy levels. The authority over the Swiss education system lies with the twenty-six cantons; thus, there are twenty-six different systems of education. The examples of narratives in this article pertain to policy actors who are at the intersection level of education policy across the different cantons, such as cross-cantonal education authorities, or working groups. The federal level was targeted in this research to access the federal cross-cutting agenda of 'integration', and also to address the topic of types of policy informing evidence.
- [11] These examples of understandings of 'integration' from different policy actors' perspectives were extracted from semi-structured interviews conducted in the doctoral study between 2008 and 2009. They were localised on different governing levels (federal and cantonal), and took the form of a 'loose network of integration policy', located and cooperating in and across different departments.
- [12] Federal Law on Foreigners: Art. 4, Bundesgesetz über die Ausländerinnen und Ausländer, AuG, 16. December, 2005
- [13] See note 12.
- [14] This is an inter-cantonal educational body consisting of all the education ministers of every canton as a directorate and also encompassing around 500 employees in what appears to be a large network of education policy administrators, researchers, policy brokers and ministerial bureaucrats. However, it is also associated with and represented by some federal authorities, education authorities within cantons and local authorities alike.

References

- Armstrong, D., Armstrong, A.C. & Spandagou, I. (2011) Inclusion: by choice or chance?, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(1), 29-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2010.496192>
- Arnott, M. & Ozga, J. (2010) Education and Nationalism: the discourse of education policy in Scotland, *Discourse*, 31(3), 335-351. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01596301003786951>
- Bacchi, C.L. (1999) *Women, Policy and Politics: the construction of policy problems*. London: SAGE.
- Ball, S. (1994) *Education Reform: a critical and post-structural approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bauböck, R. & Guiraudon, V. (2009) Introduction. Realignment of Citizenship: reassessing rights in the age of plural memberships and multi-level governance, *Citizenship Studies*, 13(5), 439-450. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13621020903174613>
- Benhabib, S. (2002) *The Claims of Culture: equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Benhabib, S. (2004) *The Rights of Others: aliens, residents and citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511790799>
- Benhabib, S. (2009) Book Review: *The Rights of Others: aliens, residents and citizens*. S. Benhabib. (2004), *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, 4(2), 55-58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511790799>
- Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., Segall, M.H. & Dasen, P.R. (1992) *Cross-cultural Psychology: research and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Callon, Michel (1986) Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay, in J. Law (Ed.) *Power, Action and Belief: a new sociology of knowledge*, pp. 196-233. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Castles, S. & Davidson, A. (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: globalization and the politics of belonging*. London: Macmillan.
- Cooren, F. (2004) Textual Agency: how texts do things in organizational settings, *Organization*, 11, 373. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1350508404041998>
- Czarniawska, B. (2004) *Narratives in Social Science Research: introducing qualitative methods*. London: SAGE.
- Derrida, J. (1985/1991) Signature, Event, Context, in P. Kamuf (Ed.) *A Derrida Reader: between the blinds*, pp. 80-111. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dubois-Shaik, F. (2011) Education, Governance and Frames of Political Membership: migrant 'integration' policy as discourse in the Swiss case within Europe. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Dubois-Shaik, F. & Dupriez, V. (2013) Les défis structurels, organisationnels et cognitifs liés à la gestion de l'hétérogénéité des élèves dans les systèmes éducatifs, *Revue Suisse des sciences de l'éducation* (special issue: l'hétérogénéité: des approches différenciées pour appréhender un phénomène complexe), 35, 113-127.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2005) Governance, Partnership and Participation: cooperation and conflict. Paper given at the Conference of the International Association for Dialogue Analysis, Bucharest, Romania.
- Fairclough, N. (2009) A Dialectical-relational Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis in Social Research, in R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds) *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis (Introducing Qualitative Methods)*, pp. 162-187. London: SAGE.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (2008) The Bologna Process and the Knowledge-based Economy: a critical discourse analysis approach, in B. Jessop, N. Fairclough & R. Wodak (Eds) *Education and the Knowledge-based Economy in Europe*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Freeman, R. (2006) The Work the Document Does: research, policy, and equity in health, *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 31(1), 51-70.
- Freeman, R. (2009) What is Translation?, *Evidence and Policy*, 5(4), 429-447. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1332/174426409X478770>
- Friedberg, R.M. & Hunt, J. (1995) The Impact of Immigrants on Host Country Wages, Employment and Growth, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2), 23-44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jep.9.2.23>
- Gaine, C. (2008) Race, Ethnicity and Difference versus Imagined Homogeneity within the European Union, *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(1), 23-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eej.2008.7.1.23>
- Geddes, A. (2003) *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*. London: SAGE. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446280492>
- Gewirtz, S. & Cribb, A. (2008) Taking Identity Seriously: dilemmas for education policy and practice, *European Education Research Journal*, 7(1), 39-49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eej.2008.7.1.39>

- Gomolla, M. & Radtke, F.-O. (2002) *Institutionelle Diskriminierung. Die Herstellung ethnischer Differenz in der Schule*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Grek, S., Lawn, M., Lingard, B., Ozga, J., Rinne, R., Segerholm, C. & Simola, H. (2009) National Policy Brokering and the Construction of the European Education Space in England, Sweden, Finland and Scotland, *Comparative Education*, 45(1), 5-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03050060802661378>
- Guiraudon, V. & Favell, A. (Eds) (2011) *Sociology of the European Union*. London: Palgrave.
- Holloway, W. & Jefferson, T. (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research Differently: free association, narrative and the interview method*. London: SAGE.
- Howarth, D. (2010) Power, Discourse, and Policy: articulating a hegemony approach to critical policy studies, *Critical Policy Studies*, 3(3-4), 309-335.
- Jessop, B. (2004) Critical Semiotic Analysis and Cultural Political Economy, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(2), 159-174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17405900410001674506>
- Jessop, B., Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (2008) *The Knowledge-based Economy and Higher Education in Europe*. London: Sense.
- Jessop, R.D. (2000) The State and Contradictions of the Knowledge-driven Economy, in J.R. Bryson, P.W. Daniels, N.D. Henry & J. Pollard (Eds) *Knowledge, Space, Economy*, pp. 63-78. London: Routledge.
- Joppke, C. (2007) Transformation of Immigrant Integration in Western Europe: civic integration and antidiscrimination policies in the Netherlands, France, and Germany, *World Politics*, 59(2), 243-273. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/wp.2007.0022>
- Kofman, E. (1995) Citizenship For Some But Not For Others: spaces of citizenship in contemporary Europe, *Political Geography*, 14(2), 121-137. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0962-6298\(95\)91660-V](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0962-6298(95)91660-V)
- Kronig, W., Haerberlin, U. & Eckhart, M. (2000) *Immigrantenkinder und schulische Selektion: Paedagogische Visionen, theoretische Erklarungen und empirische Untersuchungen zur Wirkung integrierender and separierender Schulformen in den Grundschuljahren*. Bern: Haupt.
- Lawn, M. (2006) Soft Governance and the Learning Spaces of Europe, *Comparative European Politics*, 4(2), 272-288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.cep.6110081>
- Luke, A. (1996) Text and Discourse in Education: an introduction to critical discourse analysis, *Review of Research in Education*, 21, 3-48.
- March, J. (1978) Bounded rationality, ambiguity, and the engineering of choice. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 9, 578-608. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3003600>
- Marks, G.N. (2005) Accounting for Immigrant Non-immigrant Differences in Reading and Mathematics in Twenty Countries, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(5), 925-946. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870500158943>
- Mitchell, K. (2003) Educating the National Citizen in Neoliberal Times: from the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS, 387-403.
- Nóvoa, A. & Yariv-Mashal, T. (2003) Comparative Research in Education: a mode of governance or a historical journey?, *Comparative Education*, 39(4), 423-438. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305006032000162002>
- Prodoliet, S. (2006) Eidgenössische Kommission für Ausländer, *Speech: Zauberwort 'Integration' – Paradigmenwechsel in der schweizerischen Politik?* https://www.ekm.admin.ch/content/dam/data/ekm/themen/ref_prs_paradigma.pdf
- Reichenbach, R. (1998) Hard Times for the Ghost of the Polis. Civic Education in Liberal Mass Democracies. http://egora.unimuester.de/ew/persoendlich/reichenbach/q_onlinepublikationen.shtml
- Rizvi, F. (2006) Imagination and the Globalisation of Educational Policy Research, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 193-205.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2002) Reterritorialising Educational Import, in A. Nóvoa & M. Lawn (Eds) *Fabricating Europe: the formation of an education space*, pp. 69-86. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Weick, K. (1995) *Sensemaking in Organisations: foundations for organisational science*. London: SAGE.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009) *Critical Discourse Analysis: history, agenda, theory and methodology*. London: SAGE.

FARAH DUBOIS-SHAIK is a postdoctoral researcher currently working on an EU FP7 project, GARCIA, at the Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL), Belgium, She also was part of an Incoming Postdoctoral Fellowship co-funded by Marie Curie Actions of the European Commission/Fonds Speciaux de Recherche UCL, which examined transformations to social and cultural differentiation processes in the framework of recent ‘integration’ and ‘inclusion’ migration and education policy orientations and discourses in Belgium and Switzerland. This article is also based on her doctoral work, completed May 2011 at the University of Edinburgh, on Education, Governance and Frames of Political Membership: Migrant ‘Integration’ Policy as Discourse in the Swiss case within Europe. *Correspondence:* farah.shaik@uclouvain.be