**Agencement, Second Language Education and Becoming: A Deleuzian Take on Citizenship**

**This article reports a novel use of the Deleuzo-Guattarian concepts of *becoming* and *agencement* in framing qualitative research on how youth from second language immigrant families conceptualize citizenship. Using secondary school classroom observations, an in-depth focus group and one-on-one interviews as well as an analysis of curricula and course documents, this study found that the participants exhibited a mixture of conceptualizations of citizenship. Some of these aligned with dominant trends in citizenship education, but others presented dimensions of citizenship that were unexpected, intensive, and situated in the lived experiences of the participants. The findings demonstrate the usefulness of Deleuzo-Guattarian concepts in framing research in this context and provide concrete suggestions on how teachers can help second language youth navigate the complex relationships between competing discourses on citizenship.**
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**Introduction**

This in order to explore In short, we ask how second language students from immigrant families enrolled in English language secondary schools view the multiplicities of citizenship in terms of the constitutive elements and the *agencements* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) of multiculturalism, language learning, cultural icons and civic life.

in using an

As illustrative of our approach, this article presents research based on the data collected as part of a multi-year Canadian Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) funded collaborative study that examined how second language children and youth perceived literacies, information and communication technologies (ICTs), pop culture and citizenship. Our respondents belonged to second language families who had immigrated to Canada within the prior fifteen years and attended an English 11 class in one of the largest inner-city secondary schools in Ottawa, Ontario. All of the respondents were between 16 and 18 years of age.

In terms of pedagogical practice, we contend that concrete classroom experiences are essential to the multiple processes of becoming informed and mature citizens in the context of secondary school education. In other words, it is not enough to teach citizenship as iconic subject matter. One must also be cognizant of how citizenship is produced pedagogically.

More significantly, however,

we argue that the experiences of our participants shed light on the problematic relationship between nation-state and global citizenship within linguistic contexts and that Deleuzian theory can help us conceptualize these relationships more fully. As we outline in our literature review below, the dominant citizenship education frameworks in the research literature rarely problematize the nation-state. We hold this to be true, even with Westheimer and Kahne’s seminal (2004) framework, which argues for a notion they term the “justice-orientated” citizen. Deleuzian concepts help us expand such notions so that the notions of subjectivity and citizenship can be liberated from the nation-state.

In this article, we first provide a brief literature review of how the construction of subjectivity is related to citizenship theory. This is followed by an outline the relationship between citizenship and the Deleuzo-Guattarian concepts of *agencement* and *becoming* that we argue address shortcoming in the literature. Tis then provided empirical that we use for illustrative purposes. Using the Deleuzo-Guattarian concepts discussed earlier, we then present three analytic mappings of data from the study. The findings from our study are interweaved in this mapping. We conclude with a brief discussion of the implications of our study in terms of the concrete teaching practices for immigrant second language youth and, more substantially, in relationship to Second Language Education (SLE) theory.

**Citizenship and the Construction of Subjectivity**

Making connections between citizenship and the construction of subjectivity has long been a preoccupation within modern academic discourse since citizenship emerged as a separate discipline. Marshall (1950), one of the most influential of the field’s theorists, argued that by conferring equal legal status to all members of society, citizenship obfuscates inequalities of class and thus prevents poorer members of society from perceiving the real nature of their relationship with the state. Since Marshall, citizenship theory has moved into a deeper concern with group rights informed by the identity politics and the emerging forces of globalization and intensified migration (Isin & Wood, 1999). These forces have concretely reshaped most nation states throughout the world into either actual or formally recognized multicultural and multilingual entities (Guiraudon & Joppke, 2001). Although some scholars in citizenship studies have predicted the end of citizenship in an age of globalization (Falk, 2000), many other scholars (Boli & Thomas, 1999; Campbell & Rew,1999; Mathews, 2000) have declared that citizenship is now acquiring a transnational dimension that has replaced its old ties to exclusive territoriality. Some of this new scholarship is recasting citizenship as a form of caring (White & Hunt, 2000), peoplehood (Smith, 2001), or in special reference to class (Crow & Longford, 2000), gender intimacy (Plummer, 2001) or queer theory (Seidman & Alexander, 2001). This scholarship is increasingly marked by concerns over how being a citizen can be actively taken up as a participatory role, rather than as a passive status simply conferred by a nation state (Kennedy, 2007; Print, 2007; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Thinking about the nature of the relationship between citizenship and the construction of subjectivity requires that we also consider the evolution of the macro level sociopolitical structures within which such relationships are situated. Castells (2009), in fact, argues that the sources of power in the world have not fundamentally changed from the ways it has been long been analyzed in philosophical and sociological discourse. However, in what he terms the *global network society*, the *terrain* has shifted. Power is now “articulated” between the local and the global and is organized around *networks*. Individual nation states can no longer exercise power (and legitimized violence) without networking with other nation states. In addition, discourses of power operate through processes of what he calls *switching* and *programming*.

More critically, Hardt and Negri (2000) describe the new form of Empire in the post-modern age. Empire is founded on a juridical basis that has exceeded the limits of individual nation-states. It has *not* arisen spontaneously, out of a naturalistic logic based on the market. Rather, Empire has arisen out of the need for the powers that be to control things beyond an international order to a new world order. Moreover, this control exerts itself into individual subjectivity, which can only now be defined in terms of this new world order. However, they also contend that Empire cannot resolve the contradictions inherent in notions of peace and justice within its own framework. These contradictions will set in motion various forms of corruption (political and metaphysical) that will ultimately tear the Empire apart.

The notion of *internationalism* has become popular in academic circles, given the great amount of rhetoric within institutions of higher learning to the effect that they are engaged in reciprocal processes that involve making international linkages. These processes, it is argued, are equitable and in no way similar to those that could be considered neocolonial. However, Beck (2012) problematized these claims in reporting a study conducted with international students at a Canadian university. He showed that the students in question became marginalized and had to fit into the dominant paradigms within the institution in order to be considered successful. These students did benefit from their experiences in terms of gaining new perspectives and moving towards a cosmopolitan identity. However, the benefits for the university were slight because little was put in place to learn from these international students. Essentially, the university administration and faculty assumed that simply having the students on campus was enough. Beck argues that critical evaluations of teaching and learning in this context are necessary if internationalization is to be truly reciprocal and equitable.

Tully (2008) claims that there are two contested ways of conceptualizing global citizenship: modern and diverse. The first is founded on the modern nation state and is operationalized through notions of *status* and *liberties* (rights and responsibilities). These liberties are composed of four tiers: the sanctity of private property; representative government; social and economic rights; and minority rights. He emphasizes how struggle (civil disobedience) has historically extended the limits of these rights (especially in terms of the latter three). Tully makes the case that modern citizenship has slowly extended to a global version that is based on the rights of trade and extra-national organizations. Tully argues that these two rights are the “Trojan Horse of western imperialism” and have been spread by settler countries, indirect imperial rule and free trade. He outlines the international organizations (such as NATO, GATT and the World Bank) that have led this development. Tully then argues that diverse conceptualizations of citizenship run counter to those that are modern. Diverse citizenship involves processes of negotiation between local actors and different ways of organizing citizenship practices. Citizens are defined as those who actively participate in civic activities in reciprocal and non-hierarchical relationships. These relationships are equitable and free form external interference. The way to realize diverse citizenship is through countering “informal imperialism”, the spread of global relationships between the global “north” and “south” and international venues such as the World Social Forum.

What is common to this scholarship is its post-structural nature. The citizen is no longer a static and unitary figure who has a highly individualistic relationship with the state. The citizen is increasingly being viewed as a multifaceted figure with complex allegiances to various identity groupings both within and outside of the particular state in which they live (Peck, 2010; Osler & Starkey, 2003). As Schmidt (1998) emphasizes, “identity must be understood as having multiple facets: It is constitutive and relational, contextual and mutable, ambiguous and contestable” (p.51).

Macintosh and Loutzenheiser (2006) use a critical evaluation of queer theory to show how the multiplicity of identity is linked to schooling and regimes of power. These authors first go over aspects of queer theory and point out how it unsettles the notion of normality. They discuss the importance of the theory to schooling and how it opens up all kinds of pedagogical opportunities. In short, Macintosh and Loutzenheiser argue that “queer theories and queer bodies offer multiple ways to re/read the language of inclusivity and dominant political norms” (p.98). However, they are concerned that gay and lesbian concerns are often treated in schools as isolated “issues” that strengthen and perpetuate the “otherness” of LBGT citizens. Citing Warner (2000), they also are concerned with how heteronormality produces “a queer body that is private, hidden and hypersexualized in both the private and public realm (p. 100).” Macintosh and Loutzenheiser complain that queer theory has been silent on the interconnections between race and social class. They conclude with the argument that schools should not only accord the same rights as heteronormative bodies, but also “make visible the mechanisms of its subjection” (p.102).

Conceptualizing how becoming a citizen of a modern nation state requires an understanding of how subjectivities are formed within the overall contexts of dominant and counter-discursive discourses. These discourses, naturally enough, are expressed through language: “a core aspect of personal identity, [which] become(s) a highly explosive fuel motivating political conflict in struggles over collective identity” (Schmidt, 1998, p. 51). As Author argue (2012), the processes by which subjectivity is connected to nation states linguistically are best seen as sites of subjugation, engagement, conflict, contradiction and change.

Although concerns surrounding citizenship have been central to much of the research pertaining to Canadian second-language provision (Derwing, 1992; Thomson & Derwing, 2004; Joshee & Derwing, 2005), the academic literature in this field has not examined how subjectivity emerges in complex ways that are specific to the second-language immigrant experience. Most scholarship in this field still conceptualizes citizenship as a static relationship with the nation state that corresponds to the unified Cartesian subject.

**Agencements and Becoming**

Deleuze was an influential French philosopher who wrote extensively on literature, film, and fine art. He died in 1995. Most notably in co-authorship with Felix Guatarri, he developed concepts derived from Spinoza, Nietzsche and Bergson into an orientation towards philosophy he called *transcendental empiricism.* Essentially, Deleuze argued that raw experience is not categorized in the manner suggested by Kant. Rather, different experiences break down our preconceived concepts of reality and make new ways of thinking possible. As we argue below, our participants thought of citizenship in new ways thanks to their raw experiences in terms of immigration and second language acquisition.

Deleuze emphasized that his thought was not intended to be an overarching “complete” philosophy along the lines developed by Hegel or Marx. Instead, he suggested that the value found in his thought was realized in the ways in which he developed particular concepts. Two of these concepts pertinent to our study are his concepts of *agencement* and *becoming* that he developed with Felix Guattari (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

The notion of becoming is, of course, as old as the Greeks. Plato, for example, used the term to contrast ephemeral states with *being*: those states that are idealized forms. Deleuze’s particular take on becoming “proposes novel ontological commitments that exceptionally accommodate dynamic complex phenomena” (Weinbaum, 2011, p. 2), and is particularly useful for the exploration of the complexity of citizenship in today’s information-based society. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), reality is primarily productive and cannot be separated from its actualizations (e.g. agencement) that emerge through the ways in which elements of the world come together and transform (e.g. becoming). Exploring the interrelationships between elements of the world and the ways they participate in actualizations of reality are more important than specific or isolated representations and identifications (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Weinbaum, 2011).

As conceptualized by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), existence is made of the actual, the virtual and the intensive. The actual refers to the observable reality made up of fully constituted multiplicities (individuations). The virtual is the space that takes on the appearance of the actual and includes patterns of becoming. The intensive is between the actual and the virtual and involves processes of the production of actualizations that are guided by virtual patterns (Weinbaum, 2011). Significantly, Deleuze emphasizes that the virtual has just as much reality as the actual and *potential* is used to describe the virtual realm, rather than possibility. The term *possible* would give the ontological suggestion that what happens or what can be realized is limited or determined by what has come before. In contrast, potential signals the [uniqueness](file:///C:\Users\mowat4\Documents\PhD%20stuff\Dissertation%20FINAL_April%2027_2011.doc#Untimely) of each actualization, which in Deleuze’s (1968/1994) own words, “…is always a genuine creation. It does not result from any limitation of a pre-existing possibility” (p.212). The interaction between the virtual and actual produces new and completely unexpected configurations, which is important to our inquiries in this paper as it enables, for example, *potentially* different forms of citizenship and different kinds of citizens to realize. Such configurations are conceptualized as agencements.

Within such a perspective, the concept of *agencement*, typically translated as *assemblage* in English, is considered as conglomerations of multiplicities that include the forces, flows and intensities that affect their constitutive elements (Weinbaum, 2011). According to Deleuze and Guattari (1987), an agencement comprises two axes. The first axis includes two segments – one of content, the other of expression. On one hand, the first axis is an agencement of bodies, of actions and passions that are reacting to one another; on the other hand, it is an agencement of enunciation and of acts, statements and transformations. On the second axis, the agencement “has both territorial sides, or reterritorialized sides, which stabilize it, and cutting edges of deterritorialization, which carry it away” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 88). In fact, the concept of *agencement*, shows us how institutions, organizations, bodies, practices and habits make and unmake each other, intersecting and transforming: creating territories and then unmaking them, deterritorializing, opening line of flights as a potential of any agencement but also shutting them down (Macgregor Wise, 2005, p. 86).

Additionally, a study of citizenship and education framed as *agencement* must account for *rhizomatic* links within and beyond the school. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) use the concept of the rhizome[[1]](#endnote-1) to refer to the connectivity both within and between agencements. Rhizomes are plants that propagate through massive and complex root systems that spread in multiple and unpredictable directions. Rhizomes in this sense constantly establish connections within and between agencements, as there are no fixed points or inflexible positions in a rhizome like those found in a structure, a tree or a root; rather, there are only lines that can freely establish connections among themselves. Deleuze and Guattari highlighted three types of lines. The first, “the molar or rigid line of segmentarity; in no sense is it dead, for it occupies and pervades our life, and always seems to prevail in the end” (p. 195). The second, the line of molecular segmentation “the segments of which are like quanta of deterritorialization” (p. 196), and the third, the line of flight that “no longer tolerates segments; rather, it is like an exploding of the two segmentary series. She has broken through the wall; she has gotten out of the black holes. She has attained a kind of absolute deterritorialization” (p. 197). Therefore, navigating through agencements means travelling through molar, molecular and lines of flight that “continually intermingle” (p.197).

**Agencements, Becoming, and Nomad Citizenship**

In this article, we draw specifically on Deleuze and Guattari’s dissolution of the Cartesian subject, such that individuals (for example, citizens) “cease to be subjects to become events, in assemblages [agencements]” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 262). The citizen, in other words, is a dynamic becoming-citizen who is in constant processes of change. The experiences of youth are central to these processes (Print, 2007). In fact, an understanding of how second-language youth in pedagogical settings experience becoming-citizens is a key aspect in conceptualizing the dynamics of nation state formation.

Also inspired by the conceptual repertoire of Deleuze and Guattari, Holland (2006, 2011) has articulated a form of citizenship that might be associated with these contingent becoming-citizens, namely, *nomad citizenship.* “‘Nomos’ is the name that Deleuze gives to the way of arranging elements – whether they are people, thoughts or space itself – that does not rely up on an organisation or permanent structure” (Roffe, 2010, p. 189). Thus nomad citizenship echoes the concept of agencements described earlier, that is, as particular arrangements of elements (i.e. citizens). “Nomads are moved by the immanent relations between individuals and thus Holland’s (2006) nomad citizenship is characterised by constantly shifting local and global social affiliations and the proliferation of immanent connections through porous borders and across difference” (Author 2, 2011, p. 245). Nomad citizenship is opposed to the logic of any predetermining, transcendent principle (logos) such as state-based citizenship. To exemplify the functioning of nomadic social organization that underpins this new kind of citizenship Holland (2011) offers improvisational jazz as an example: “coherence is generated internally and immanently, from bottom up, instead of being imposed in top-down fashion from on high.” (p.65). Here nomad citizenship becomes the effect of a self-organizing group based on a network of relations between individuals, the interconnected and interacting content and expression of an agencement. In contrast, he describes more familiar formulations of citizenship relative to an overarching nation-state “on high,” likened to a traditional orchestra in which all members agree to submit to the direction of the conductor. He reiterates the improvisational and immanent character of nomad citizenship as follows: From all the recurring movement and change, order can emerge, to be sure, and often does – but this order is totally unchoreographed, unscripted, unscored, and unplanned. In other words, the ‘complex order’ of city life is self-organizing, and hence is much less like ballet and more like improvisational jazz. Such order can emerge but cannot be guaranteed to do so (Holland, 2011). Holland further argues that the usefulness of the concept of nomad citizenship is that “it presents a mode of multiple citizenship and distributed sovereignty not limited to politics and the State” (p.84).

The shift from state-logos-citizenship to immanent-nomad-citizenship has implications for relations of power and thus ensures a socio-political dimension to this conceptualization of citizenship. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) make an essential distinction between two forms of power; “the first would be defined precisely by the power (*pouvoir*) of constants, the second by the power (*puissance*) of variation” (p.101). In terms of citizenship, these powers correspond respectively to the State’s power (pouvoir) to fix a particular political definition of a citizen and delimit what is possible, versus the nomad’s power (puissance) to disrupt those fixations, to create new relations, to become and thereby offer up potentially different forms of citizenship. Bringing Deleuze and Guattari into conversation with Mary Parker Follett’s organizational theory, Holland (2011) also makes on an important distinction between power-over, associated with State citizenship and molar lines, and power-with, associated with immanent nomad-citizenship, molecular and lines of flight. In the latter case, power-with would arise

from participatory democracy and the self-coordinating articulation of differences to the mutual benefit of all concerned; they [the multiple group allegiances of nomad citizens] would serve and foster the enrichment of life internally or locally rather than thrive on and foster external threats to it, as the transcendent allegiance of State citizenship does (Holland, 2006, p. 202)

Holland insists on the necessity of developing “immanent power-with, on small as well as large scales, as the crucial alterative to power-over” (p.98).

The concept of nomad citizenship, fundamentally premised on relationality, and the notion of continual becoming as a product of the rhizomatic connections between diverse elements of an agencement, both bodies and language (i.e., content and expression), furnish new ways of mapping citizenship that are particularly relevant with respect to the complex experiences of immigrant youth in Canadian schools.

1. **The Study**

**Socio-cultural Context**

The city in which this study took place, Ottawa, is unique in terms of the political, linguistic and immigrant forces at play within it. It is the national capital and has historically had a bilingual (English/French) make up. Moreover, as noted below, there is a significant immigrant and refugee population within the city and the surrounding region. As such, Ottawa affords a valuable context within which to examine the intersections of immigration and language.

In order for the reader to understand the full context of the study we report here, it is necessary to provide some pertinent demographic information about the city. Immigration is an extremely important aspect of the demographic trends pertaining to Ottawa. The city is the fourth largest city in Canada with an overall metropolitan population of 1,148,800. Residents born outside of Canada constitute 22.3% percent of the population, with the largest source nations being China, Lebanon, northeast Africa, Somalia, Iran, and the Balkans. Visible minorities account for 20.2% of the total. Self-identified English-only speakers make up 59.9% of the city’s residents. Bilingual French/English speakers make up 37.2%. Other monolinguals (including French-only) make up less than 3%. Self-identified speakers of non-English or French mother tongues account for 21.6% of the population (all figures, Statistics Canada, 2010).

It is important to note that Ottawa receives more refugee newcomers than any other urban center in Canada. According to the Social Planning Council of Ottawa (SPCO, 2010), Ottawa receives 29% of all refugees admitted to Canada (as opposed to 9% in Vancouver, 10% in Toronto and 19% in Montreal).

Currently, 70,500 recent immigrants live in the metropolitan region, the fourth highest concentration in the nation (City of Ottawa, 2013). The official city plan predicts an overall population growth rate growth of 37% for the next decade, well above that for the province of Ontario or for Canada as a whole. The largest factor driving this growth rate is immigration. Ottawa, in fact, has the third highest growth rate for immigrants in Canada, only slightly behind Toronto and Vancouver. As can be seen by the list of source countries above, the vast majority of these recent immigrants leave locales where neither English nor French are dominant.

In a report published in 2010, the Social Planning Council of Ottawa (SPCO) noted that newcomers faced major challenges linked to a lack of access to meaningful employment, affordable housing and language learning opportunities. Significantly, immigrant parents commonly experienced difficulties in communicating with the staff and teachers working in their children’s’ schools. These difficulties were often described as being based on differing cultural and language norms.

**(2) Methodology as Agencement**

The research reported in this article was a qualitative case study that formed part of a larger investigation as to how second language immigrant secondary and middle high school students conceptualized the interrelationship between literacy and the processes of becoming Canadian citizens in the contexts of pop culture, technology, school, home and community. Four secondary and middle schools, two English and two French, were the sites for this multi-year SSHRC-funded collaborative project.

The immigrant-family students in one teacher’s course at each school were video recorded to capture their classroom interaction and interviewed one-on-one and in focus groups. In addition, for the purposes of understanding the pedagogical contexts, curricular documents and classroom materials were examined. The teachers and multicultural support workers for each of the classes in question were also interviewed.

The data interwoven into our theory-practice mappings here was collected in one of the largest public English secondary schools in the Ottawa-Carleton region with a significant second language immigrant population. The teacher’s course in question was a mainstream English 11 class with approximately thirty students. Of the twelve students from immigrant second language family backgrounds in the class, ten volunteered to participate in the study. Although all were from immigrant families, some of our participants were born in Canada.

The Ethics Boards for the University of Ottawa and the Ottawa-Carleton School District approved this research beforehand. We obtained formal written informed consent from the participants and their parents or legal guardians.

Thus far we have presented the particulars of where, how, and with whom our data were collected and we have done so in a conventional way that is the familiar territory of contemporary qualitative research practices. However our data analysis approach is unconventional in so far as it aligns with our conceptual framework, effecting a dual redeployment of agencement as both (1) object of study and (2) mode of analysis, namely, rhizoanalytic.

Firstly, the concept of agencement, described in the conceptual framework above, describes our object of study. Consequently, to study citizenship and becoming involves an analysis of content and expression constituting the agencement: bodies constituting the system (E.g., teachers, students, classroom spaces, Canadian flag hung there, etc.), and statements and acts that circulate in the system (E.g., in curricula and textbooks, student assignments, emails, text messages, in-class discussions, etc.). This analysis of an agencement attends to the power-over, top-down form of citizenship with its banal State symbols as it interacts with power-with, bottom-up forms of citizenship created in daily classroom life. In addition we consider the lines that shape the agencement: the molar lines that delimit it, the molecular lines that introduce difference and allow becoming, and the lines of flight that potentially transform citizenship or invent a nomad citizenship in a particular school space. Deleuze (1993) explains that such a method called “by different names – schizoanazlysis, micropolitics, pragmatics, diagrammatism, rhizomatics, cartography – has no other object than the study of these lines” (Deleuze, 1993, p.226).

Secondly, considering the mode of analysis, we recognize that the research itself is an agencement, a system constituted by relations of bodies (content: research participants, researchers, research assistants, school spaces, university spaces, Transana qualitative analysis software, etc.), and statements and acts (reading data sources, thinking with conceptual frameworks, conversations, writing analytic notes, Emails, recorded Skype discussions, etc.). These heterogeneous elements arrange and function in particular ways. Agencements “are complex constellations of objects, bodies, expressions, qualities, and territories that come together for varying periods of time to ideally create new ways of functioning” (Livesey, 2010, p.18). Therefore, thinking of research as an agencement amounts to making an onto-epistemological claim that does not view data analysis as a predetermined process, but rather a creative experimentation that functions differently each time a research agencement forms. Deleuzian scholar Semetsky (2009) focuses on the *experience* of inquiry to describe the dynamic nature of knowledge creation in which the researcher is dislodged as the primary controlling subject of a hierarchical analytic process and instead emphasizes connections, interactions, and *affects* between elements of the agencement (of which the researcher is but one element).

For Deleuze, knowledge is irreducible to a static body of facts but constitutes a dynamic process of inquiry as an experimental and practical art embedded in experience. Thus experience is not confined to a personal Cogito of a Cartesian subject but represents an experiment with the environing world: we can, and should, learn from experience. Experience is that quasi-objective *milieu* which provides us with the capacity to affect and to be affected (Semetsky, 2009). As such, the results of our experimentations together in this research project and in this research paper are not presented as a fixed representation of pre-existing knowledge discovered through research, but rather as a dynamic rhizo-thinking produced out of this particular research agencement.

Finally, in light of the onto-epistemological claims we have just made about our rhizoanalytic approach, we offer *mappings* of the data and concepts in lieu of findings . Mapping is a rhizoanalytic strategy that threads through the chapters comprising Coleman and Ringrose’s (2013) edited collection *Deleuze and Research Methodologies.* “Mapping as a methodology for research has been developed through concepts of rhizomatic movement (e.g. Alvermann, 2000) to highlight connectivity, the middles, becomings and difference in research processes, where mapping is distinguished from repetition and tracing patterns” (Ringrose & Coleman, 2013, p. 128). The distinction they are making between mapping and tracing reflects the epistemological distinction between thinking and knowing, between creation and representation. In sum, “mapping connections is not only the task of investigating what there is, then, but is also concerned with unpacking what might be” (Ringrose & Coleman, 2013, p.125); in our case, what new ways of thinking about citizenship as it is experienced by immigrant youth in schools.

**Rhizoanalytic Mappings**

Five mappings were produced from our analysis: coming to Canada; multiculturalism and respect; language learning; cultural icons and democracy. These are presented below in order with exemplary excerpts from the data.

**Mapping 1: Coming to Canada.**

Each interview began with a discussion about why the students and/or their families came to Canada. The students commonly talked about feeling safer and more secure within Canada based on the rule of law. They also talked about family members having gained better access to meaningful employment through immigration. Although these students were negotiating their legal statuses as citizens, each positioned themselves as Canadian. In these ways, the students described their family’s immigration experiences in very personal terms.

***Excerpts from the data.***

*there’s a lot more security in Canada; like you feel kind of safe here, ah, and then back in, home where like I’m from… it’s really like there’s civil war kinda going on… you get scared, getting killed in the middle of the night;*

*I’d say a Canadian is who understands the constitution and rights of Canada and understands* ***our****, well* ***our*** *general freedom, compared to other countries.*

**Mapping 2: Multiculturalism and respect.**

Each interview then proceeded to a discussion of the experiences of these students during the classroom activities that we observed. While in the class, we noted that the teacher had designed activities and projects that were based on origin of life myths from a variety of sources; as she herself noted, her intent was to illustrate how many cultures have similar stories and values. The students responded quite positively to these activities and projects and commonly spoke about how these activities stressed the importance of being respect towards subaltern groups within Canada, even if this could sometimes be difficult. These sentiments were often talked about in terms of how multiculturalism provided them with a sense of belonging and allowed them to fit easily into Canadian society.

***Excerpts from the data***

*I disagree* [with requiring women to remove burkas in public]; *it’s part of their religion and, unless, it can be a threat somehow, but I don’t see how that could be a threat*;

*Here you have such a multicultural society, many different beliefs with many different you know, personal beliefs and everything, it makes it more difficult for people to agree or disagree, but, I mean, I think that’s the point of democracy; it is working here, it’s been working for a long time, and it’s still working now, so I think it’s good*;

[Being Canadian means] *respect each other, ah respect others, people’s religions, be a multicultural accepting society*.

**Mapping 3: Language learning.**

Each student was then asked about their language learning. All expressed a desire to retain their first language. Interesting, however, without exception our respondents described their first languages as being important culturally rather than economically.

The students commonly noted that it was important to be fluent in English and to be as fluent as possible in French. Being bilingual in both of Canada’s official languages was an ideal in terms of defining one’s relationship to citizenship. Bilingualism was not seen as a threat to their abilities in their first language or as a nuisance to be tolerated, rather, it was also seen as an asset in terms of future employment.

***Excerpts from the data.***

*Canada is a bilingual country. It’s French and English, so I think, depends on the people, if they like to speak French, or learn French, yeah, French is better, but if they want to study for the English, yeah, definitely English*;

*English and French is a part of citizenship;* *[A Canadian] yeah, and ah, mostly, hmm, speak English or French;*

*I’m actually taking French right now and I believe it’s well, like Chinese it gives you an advantage for getting a job… [being fully bilingual] that’s Ottawa… no it’s Ontario, it’s only Ontario.*

**Mapping 4: Cultural icons.**

Students were then asked about what being Canadian meant to them. Our respondents named a number of things that they felt symbolized being Canadian. The most common of these were beavertails (a local Ottawa pastry), the national anthem and flag. Interestingly, even though the teacher had not covered sports in class, hockey and other winter activities were also popular choices for describing what it meant to be a Canadian.

When probed further, the students commonly made ambivalent comments about how national symbols related to them personally.

***Excerpts from the data.***

*You’ve got like know about culture, know about food, like beavertails and pancake*s;

*Beavertails and ah, Rideau canal if you’re going to do something in the winter, like skating;*

*It is very Canadian, play hockey*;

*A lot of Canadians watching these [hockey games], so famous here…okay, hockey is the best game in Canada… but for me like, personally, I like basketball better.*

**Mapping 5: Democracy.**

The interviews revealed that the participants saw Canada as a democratic country. They commonly contrasted the political systems Canada and their family country of origin. Significantly, democracy was rarely spoken about in the abstract. Concrete acts such as community involvement was stressed. Voting was commonly seen as an attribute of being an informed mature adult.

***Excerpts from the data.***

*democracy is working here, it’s been working for a long time, and it’s still working now so I think it’s good;*

*in [my first country] they say that they have democracy, but I don’t think they do… there’s so much corruption;*

*[it will be exciting to vote] cuz like it’s, you feel like an adult then, cuz you know that it’s time for you to make a decision…[it’s] required you have to understand what’s happening, like with elections and everything and then you can make an appropriate decision;*

*[my church] they do a lot in the community.*

**(4) Discussion and Implications**

The students in this study rarely talked about subjects commonly covered in second language curricula related to citizenship, such as current affairs, Canadian geography, history or literature. Instead, they focused on personal concerns related to multiculturalism and respecting difference, bilingualism, access to future employment, the security provided by the rule of law and the importance of having a voice through democratic institutions and community involvement.

Citizenship was an important component of how these participants viewed their relationship to the larger community. This was seen as something connected to a form of legal status and to a sense of becoming mature.

To express it in Deleuzian terms: students in this context view citizenship as an important aspect of *becoming*. The *deterritorialisation* of previous family experiences as children was linked to particular countries of origin and a *reterritorialisation* of new identities as mature adults in their families’ adopted country.

In terms of the practical implications of this study, it is clear to us that concrete classroom experiences are essential for secondary students if they are to become citizens. Moreover, citizenship cannot be viewed simply as subject matter for formal classroom treatment. We must also be cognizant of how our students “live” citizenship in their everyday lives. As is the case in the examples given here, classroom activities can successfully link ethical values with principles related to citizenship. These activities have a special importance for second language youth from immigrant families.

The theoretical implications of this study pertain to how the recent academic literature has focused on the so-called globalization of citizenship. Currently, there is a plethora of platitudes (“humbug and false piety”) that come out of the mouths of intellectuals, journalists, activists and politicians of all stripes. Conceptualizations of global citizenship are wrapped around a shallow liberalism that puts great stock in individualized notions of “niceness”. Analyses of systemic sources of oppression and ecological degradation are ignored in favor of admonishments to recycle more, drive cars less, correct sexist language, tolerate alternative choices in bathroom signage and donate to charities. Although well and good, these admonishments are little more than band-aids that appeal to middle-class guilt. In these conceptualizations, global citizenship is seen as a natural extension of bourgeoisie values that arise out of western “democratic” nation states.

Robertson (2007) argues that four trends have “disturbed” the once axiomatic linkage between citizenship education and the nation-state. These are: shifts in how education is governed; the commodification of education; changes in the labour that teachers perform; and the recognition of the multitudinous nature of identities as they pertain to schooling.

As Pike (2008) notes, citizenship education and global education have followed very different intellectual paths. As his review of the literature reveals, there have been many arguments advanced against educating global citizens that range from the ideological to the pragmatic. The ideological arguments center on the contradiction of using such a traditionally nation-state-bound term for a concept that runs directly counter to sovereign national entities. The pragmatic arguments center on the impossibility of reconciling how citizenship is interpreted in authoritative or religious-based states with those based on western forms of democracy. Indeed, Pike argues that the contentious nature of these debates has led to rather vague interpretations as to what a *global citizen* actually might be. Pike argues that teachers have a special responsibility to ensure that global citizenship education is linked to social justice. In fact, for Pike, social justice is central to any conceptualization of global citizenry. Robertson (2007) calls for more research and a shift away from what she calls the “excessive economism and the poverty of neo-liberalism”.

The Deleuzian concepts of becoming and agencement are valuable in the sense that they help us understand how complex the relationships are between an individual and citizenship. There are plethoras of agencements that contribute to what we think of citizenship that are forever changing and becoming in unpredictable ways. Our participants give us valuable insights into this complexity because they are in a particular school environment, on the cusp of adulthood and within the complex set of relations that constitute immigration. As we have mapped them out, these lines of relationships run through schools, specific classrooms, curriculum practices and bodies. In assessing such problematic terms as “global citizenship”, we have to take into account this complexity and how it is manifested in particular contexts with particular individuals.
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