Course Description and Goals

Immigration control is a central concern and hotly contested matter of public debate at present. This course provides an opportunity to think sociologically about the normative, practical and human dimensions of efforts to control immigration at and within the borders of states. This is an important exercise given that elections are increasingly being fought over policy proposals such as: the building of a wall on the US-Mexico border; the deportation of long-term undocumented residents from the US; restrictions on the entry of “Muslims”, including refugees, to numerous states; the restriction of EU citizens’ rights to enter, work, and remain the UK; and the screening of immigrants for their fit with prevailing “liberal values” and other aspects of receiving societies.

In academic terms, this course introduces students to a range of theoretical approaches to understanding and researching immigration control and the state’s role in it. It encourages students to explore the ways in which the narrower literature on immigration control intersects with broader efforts to conceptualize states and social control in political sociology. What does control mean? Where does control take place, and by what means? Is immigration control possible? What exactly is the state, and how does it exercise control? To what extent do we need to look outside the state in order to understand immigration control? In order to answer these questions, the course will touch on a range of topics, including: 1) the role of states in creating and managing border crossing and residency; 2) migration governance at the international, national, regional and local levels; 3) the social construction of admissibility/inadmissibility in immigration policy in historical perspective; 4) immigration bureaucracies, policymaking and policy implementation; and 5) controlling through legal status and its absence (precariousness and illegality).

In addition to these substantive aims, this course is designed to further graduate-level academic professionalization, by incorporating exercises that are relevant to: preparing for area exams; writing literature reviews for dissertation proposals and publishing; and facilitating discussion on conference panels.

Required Course Materials
Most of the required readings for this course are available either as e-books, on the McGill library website, or as 3-hour course reserves at the Humanities and Social Sciences Library (https://mcgill.on.worldcat.org/courseReserves/course/id/14124635). McGill provides
free electronic access to all journal articles on this syllabus. The few readings that are not available through these channels can be found on MyCourses.

Learning Outcomes
At the end of this course, students will:

1) Be able to describe key theoretical currents underpinning analyses of states’ efforts to control immigration and their relationship to broader concerns in political (and cultural) sociology.

2) Have practiced critical reading skills at the level required for area exams, research proposals and academic publications.

3) Be able to begin conducting a literature review of the kind required to successfully complete area exams and write research proposals.

4) Have gained experience performing the role of discussant in an academic setting.

Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Component</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>% of final grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reviews (2)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>30% (2 x 15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Discussant in a Session</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review Assignment</td>
<td>April 15th</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>January 22nd – April 8th</td>
<td>10% (10 x 1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Component Details & Accommodation

1) *Critical reviews (2 x 15% = 30% of final grade)*

Students are asked to select five (5) sessions from weeks three to eleven, in order of preference. From these five, I will assign two (2) to each student and ask that they prepare a critical review for each of those two sessions. A critical review usually contains the following (not necessarily in order, and not necessarily the full roster): a summary of the general themes connecting the entire set of readings; a statement of the questions (or theses) that the readings either raise or purport to answer; an assessment of how well questions are answered or theses are supported; indications of how the readings for one week relate the readings and issues explored in other weeks; a consideration of issues that are not covered and would need to be addressed to round out a body of knowledge. Generally, good reviews pay minimal attention to summarizing the readings; they focus instead on the big picture, i.e. on comparing and contrasting underlying theoretical stances/approaches, on identifying commonalities, disparities and gaps at the
theoretical/methodological/empirical level. This is generally how one uses readings when preparing for area exams and literature reviews.

In order to assist classroom discussion, the authors of the critical reviews for any given session will distribute them to the class prior to the relevant session. All students are required to read the critical reviews, along with the assigned readings, before coming to class. Come prepared to give feedback, ask questions, and build on analysis offered in the reviews.

**Format:** Reviews should be roughly 3-4 pages in length, double-spaced, written in 12-point Times New Roman font, and fully justified. Readings must be cited properly in a recognized style, and a bibliography must be included. Your name, the date, and the topic of the review should appear in the top, right-hand corner of the first page.

**Due Dates:** Reviews must be distributed to all course participants by 9:00 am on the Monday preceding the session it covers.

**Accommodation:** Late reviews will receive a 5% late penalty per hour, starting at 9:05 on the due date, to reflect the inconvenience caused to fellow students – particularly the discussant – by a late submission. A list of topics and due dates will be generated during the first week of class, and students are responsible for discussing any possible scheduling issues with the instructor at that time.

2) **Role of Discussant in a Session (10% of final grade)**

Each session, one student who did not write a critical review will be required to lead the discussion of readings and the critical reviews of others. In doing so, the discussant is expected to: engage with the readings; engage with the assessments presented in the critical reviews for that week, by indicating points on which they agree/disagree with the assessment; and, as appropriate, offer alternative interpretations of the material. This is generally how one goes about performing the role of discussant on panels at academic conferences.

**Accommodation:** There is no accommodation for missing an assigned discussion. A list of dates and topics will be generated during the first week of class, and students are responsible for discussing any possible scheduling issues with the instructor at that time.

3) **Annual Review Paper (50% of final grade)**

Students are required to submit a substantial paper, written in the style of an annual review article. This paper must be written on a subject that you have not researched for another course. Typically, “annual review” articles survey an entire sub-field or a specific topic in a field of study, in order to assess the state of knowledge production. The review should identify what we know (or think we know), contested issues, and promising areas for further research. It should be comprehensive (i.e. it must go beyond the readings in the
syllabus) and up to date. Typically, it will use “comparison and contrast” to isolate similarities and differences among different schools of thought and research traditions. Two methods are sometimes used to do this. The first is historical, describing the evolution of a research question over time along with an effort to interpret the reasons for change. The second is analytic, highlighting key differences in analytical assumptions that underlie different schools of research. In writing your annual review paper, you should consider the extent to which the immigration control literature in your chosen sub-area has engaged with broader, related literatures in sociology/political science. Students should focus on making their papers into what economists call a “public good,” written as an aid to others in the profession (in this case, especially your fellow students). Readers – even ones outside the field – should be able to use your paper to get an overview of the main theoretical debates/issues, the state of empirical research in the area you are writing about, etc.

I will ask you to meet with me to discuss one or more possible topics and then to turn in a one-page sketch of what you intend to do, complete with 5 references, no later February 12th. The final paper is due April 15th. Your research paper will be graded on 1) quality and thoroughness of analysis; 2) incorporation of research from academic and other relevant sources; and 3) clarity and organization of presentation.

Format: The annual review paper should be 15-20 pages in length (including bibliography), be double spaced, use 12pt Times New Roman font, and have standard margins.

Due Dates, Late Penalty & Accommodation: The annual review paper is to be uploaded to MyCourses by 12:00pm (noon) on Wednesday, April 15th. The late penalty is 5% per day, starting at 12:05 pm on the due date (i.e. a paper handed in on April 16th would lose 10%). Annual reviews submitted after 12:00 pm on April 22nd will not be accepted for grading and will receive a mark of 0. Final grades for the annual review paper and the course will be submitted on Minerva by the final grade submission deadline; please do not contact me before that date to inquire about your grades. No ‘K’ grades will be given in this course.

4) Attendance & Participation (10% of final grade - 1% per day from Session 3 to Session 13)

Since this is a seminar, not a lecture, how much you take away from the course will depend on how much effort you put into engaging with the course materials and the contributions of your fellow students. The instructor will not lecture to make up for an absence of student contributions. Attendance and participation will not be counted during the first two sessions of the course, as these fall within the add/drop period. From session #3 onward, attendance and participation in the course will be worth 1% per session, for up to ten sessions (out of eleven). As a courtesy to fellow students, every effort should be made to attend sessions 12 and 13, in which students will present the findings of their annual review paper. Being a good academic citizen is an important part of success in the academic world!
Accommodation: Attendance and participation marks will be counted for 10/11 teaching weeks from session 3 to session 13, inclusive. This allows each student one absence during that time without penalty, as well as twice during the add/drop period. No further accommodation will be provided.

Course Outline (Subject to change at the discretion of the instructor)
** It is recommended that student read each session’s required readings in order of appearance on the syllabus

PART I – POWER & IMMIGRATION POLICYMAKING

Session #1 (January 8th) – Introduction
- Critical Reading PDF (MyCourses)

Session #2 – (January 15th) - Overview of field & society-centred (pluralist) approaches

Session #3 (January 22nd) – Society-centred (structural) approaches

Session #4 (January 29th) – Institutionalist approaches

**Session #5 (February 5th) – State-centred approaches**

**PART II – MEANS, SITES AND LIMITATIONS OF CONTROL**

**Session #6 (February 12th) – Controlling through Categories & Social Norms**

*** All students must have turned in a one-page sketch of their annual review paper and met with the instructor to discuss it by this date at the latest.

**Session #7 (February 19th) – Negotiating Categories as a Social Process**

**Session #8 (February 26th) – Bureaucracy**

**READING WEEK (MARCH 2ND – 6TH) NO CLASS**

Session #9 (March 11th) – Geography of control

Session #10 (March 18th) – Control through legal status and its absence

Session #11 (March 25th) – Demographic selectivity of “universal” immigration policies

Session #12 (April 1st) – Paper presentations
- No readings. Come prepared to listen to and discuss your classmates’ presentations.

Session #13 (April 8th) – Paper presentations & Wrap-Up
- No readings. Come prepared to listen to and discuss your classmates’ presentations.
The Fine Print

**Undergraduate Participants**
This is a graduate-level (MA/PhD) course to which advanced undergraduate students may be admitted, exceptionally, at the discretion of the instructor. In order to be considered for admission, undergraduate students will generally: 1) have completed another course with the instructor and achieved a high grade in that course; 2) have a GPA of 3.7 or higher; 3) have a strong interest in the issue of immigration, as indicated by the completion of other courses on the subject and/or the completion of internships or other extracurricular activities related to the field; and 4) have strong writing and analytical skills as demonstrated in a writing sample. Undergraduates who request admission to the course, submit the relevant documentation to the instructor, and are considered to be a good fit for the course will be placed on a waiting list. Admissions decisions will be made during the add/drop period..Priority in enrolment will be given to graduate students in sociology and closely related disciplines. Undergraduate participants are expected to fulfill the same course requirements as graduate students, and their work will be graded according to the same criteria.

**Language of Evaluation**
"In accord with McGill University’s Charter of Students’ Rights, students in this course have the right to submit in English or in French any written work that is to be graded.”
(approved by Senate on 21 January 2009 – see also the section in this document on Assignments and evaluation.)
«Conformément à la Charte des droits de l’étudiant de l’Université McGill, chaque étudiant a le droit de soumettre en français ou en anglais tout travail écrit devant être noté (sauf dans le cas des cours dont l’un des objets est la maîtrise d’une langue).»

**Academic Integrity**
McGill University values academic integrity. Therefore, all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures (see www.mcgill.ca/students/srr/honest/ for more information). (approved by Senate on 29 January 2003)
«L’université McGill attache une haute importance à l’honnêteté académique. Il incombe par conséquent à tous les étudiants de comprendre ce que l’on entend par tricherie, plagiat et autres infractions académiques, ainsi que les conséquences que peuvent avoir de telles actions, selon le Code de conduite de l’étudiant et des procédures disciplinaires (pour de plus amples renseignements, veuillez consulter le site www.mcgill.ca/students/srr/honest/).»

**Policy Concerning the Rights of Students with Disabilities**
If you need any accommodation please contact the Office for Students with Disabilities (http://www.mcgill.ca/osd/ 398-6009). You may also contact me directly. I will make every reasonable effort to accommodate you.
Copyright
Instructor generated course materials (e.g. Power Point slides, handouts, notes, summaries, exam questions, etc.) are protected by law and may not be copied or distributed in any form or in any medium without explicit permission of the instructor. Note that infringements of copyright can be subject to follow up by the University under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures. Recording and distributing recordings of lectures and seminars is prohibited unless the instructor gives written consent.

Course Changes in Extraordinary Circumstances
In the event of extraordinary circumstances beyond the University’s control, the content and/or evaluation scheme in this course is subject to change.

Grade appeals
Instructors and teaching assistants take the marking of assignments very seriously, and we work diligently to be fair, consistent, and accurate. Nonetheless, mistakes and oversights occasionally happen. If you believe that to be the case, you must adhere to the following rules:

- If it is a mathematical error simply alert the instructor.
- In the case of more substantive appeals, you must:
  - Wait at least 24 hours after receiving your mark;
  - Carefully re-read your paper/assignment/test, all guidelines and marking schemes, and the grader’s comments.
  - Within 10 working days after results are available, submit to the instructor a one-page explanation of why you think your grade should be changed. Please note statements such as “Because I worked very hard on this” and “I need a higher grade to apply to X” are not compelling.
  - Make an appointment to meet with the instructor during office hours, at which time the instructor will give you a decision on the appeal and explain the outcome. After that, students are entitled to a re-read or re-assessment by a professor not teaching the course should they request it.
  - Please note that upon re-grade your mark may go down, stay the same, or go up.