

Chapter 7 shows how these young people's religiosity (or lack thereof) is strongly influenced by family. The close similarity between a large majority of respondents' religious views and those of their mother and considerable influence of scriptures and religious leaders found is particularly striking.

Chapters 8 and 9 deal with friends, schools and the community. The authors are sensitive to the entangled relationship between ethnicity, culture and religion. They tackle questions of segregation and cohesion. Perhaps counterintuitively, students at schools with the greatest ethnic mix 'tended to have the least positive attitudes towards religion'. Yet they did have 'more friendships across faith boundaries' (p. 210).

Over the course of the book Islam emerges as distinctive, not only in terms of degree of public visibility and negative perceptions felt, but in including relatively high numbers of 'Strict Adherents' (Chapter 4) and those reporting feelings of pressure to conform, especially young Muslim women (Chapter 6). The internal diversity of Islam is flagged, but I would have welcomed more on intra-religious diversity. The detail of how one respondent simply wrote 'Islam' on their consent form, and yet described themselves as an 'agnostic Muslim' in conversation nicely illustrates the value of combining methods: accessing the subtlety of lived identities.

The data are framed by classic sociological theorizing about modernity, alongside other ideas including contact theory, Putnam's work on bridging/bonding capital and Davie's on believing and belonging. In the final chapter Madge et al. follow Davie in concluding that they are observing a shift from obligation to consumption. This is associated with westernization. They find a negative correlation between various indicators of religion and number of family members born in the UK suggesting that the British context affects religiosity, despite differences between groups.

The authors highlight the need for further research seeking teachers', parents' and communities' views as well in order to check the gap between rhetoric and reality. Such work could nuance the contrast between the West and other places drawn by participants and adopted by the team. However, one study cannot cover everything, and this is an insightful, thorough and rich new resource on young people's religious and non-religious identities.

The concluding call to listen to young people's own views on what will work in terms of Religious Education, cohesion and integration is a powerful one.

Reference

Catto R (2014) What can we say about today's British religious young person? Findings from the AHRC/ESRC Religion and Society Programme. *Religion* 44(1): 1–27.

Aoileann Ní Mhurchú

Ambiguous Citizenship in an Age of Global Migration

Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014, £70 hbk (ISBN: 9780748692774), 280 pp.

Reviewed by: Chris Moreh, *Northumbria University, UK*

Aoileann Ní Mhurchú's first book is an ambitious contribution to 'critical citizenship studies' – where the author herself places the work, alongside the oeuvre of Étienne

Balibar, Engin Isin and RBJ Walker, the book's main intellectual influences – shifting our thinking back to the ontological foundations of 'citizen'. Dominant contemporary debates – the book argues – do not make justice to the various political possibilities of citizenship by simplistically opposing a 'particular exclusivist model' (p. 29) – resting on the continued legitimacy of the nation-state – to a 'universal inclusivist model' (p. 32) promoting trans-national and post-national perspectives. The author's critique is primarily aimed at the latter position, which, while presenting itself at the critical edge of citizenship scholarship, 'continues to be based on sovereign autonomous subjectivity in the last instance' (p. 20). As such – the argument goes – the difference between 'exclusivist' and 'inclusivist' approaches is merely one of scale, with both continuing to define citizenship 'in terms of the relations *between* individuals (or groups of individuals) and the sub-/supra-/super-state, and therefore in terms of sovereignty and autonomy' (p. 37). Instead, the author seeks to theorise 'less-than sovereign' political identity through 'experiences of being caught somewhere between inclusion and exclusion, citizenship and migration' (p. 6), what she refers to as 'ambiguous citizenship'.

The author's argumentation is built up around a well-chosen case study of the 2004 Irish citizenship referendum, which ended unconditional birthright citizenship in the Republic of Ireland. The previously mentioned shortcomings of the different dominant approaches to citizenship are highlighted in the referendum debates, and a convincing argument is formulated regarding the need for a 'child-centred focus' in citizenship scholarship more broadly. The 'complex ambiguous subjectivity' of citizen children born to migrant parents provides a very relevant empirical grounding for the theoretical ambitions of the book, especially 'because such children are neither "included in" or "excluded from" the state as individuals, but in between both positions' (p. 12).

In exploring how alternative understandings of subjectivity may be conceivable, the book appeals to the psychoanalytic theory of Julia Kristeva, contrasting her notion of 'maternal time' with that of 'national time'. This contrast is meant to 'destabilise' the spatio-temporal fixity of the 'self' as posited in the linear progressive vision of 'national time', through an understanding of motherhood that makes it difficult to separate 'self' from 'the Other'. The boundary lines between the two cease to serve divisive purposes, becoming 'significant in their own right' as 'a location of and for politics' (p. 203). Finally, the author outlines her understanding of citizenship as 'trace', through which the experiences of such 'ambiguous citizens' as migrants' children can be better understood. Their experiences of citizenship – the author suggests – are 'defined through boundary lines, creating and re-creating fragmented and overlapping traces of us–them, inside–outside, inclusion–exclusion, nationality–humanity' (p. 209). This concept of 'contingent trace' is also aimed to provide 'a much-needed alternative metaphorical starting point' (p. 17) in critical citizenship research.

While the core proposition of the book is robustly developed, it is inevitably bound to attract both praise and scepticism. Placing itself within the '(broadly conceived) post-structuralist tradition' (p. 135), it is unlikely to convince those who profess a 'responsibility *to act*' as opposed to 'a responsibility *to otherness* ... openness to difference, dissonance and ambiguity' – as d'Entreves (1997: 2, emphases in original) distinguished the two camps taking sides in the wider debate instigated by Habermas's *Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. The various instances where the latter set of responsibilities are

manifestly overshadowing the former are enough to make mild ‘modernists’ uncomfortable even if they are otherwise sympathetic to the bold proposition of an indeed ‘much-needed alternative’ vision. Considering the practice of defining second- and later-generation children ‘as “excluded”, “disadvantaged” or “marginalised” subjects who need to be included in ... society’ as ‘at best highly problematical’ (p. 122), while legitimate from the perspective of the book’s aims, would be itself seen as problematic by some readers of *Sociology*. Others may deem that the author overstates the degree to which ‘ambiguous’ experiences ‘cannot be quantified, qualified, disaggregated, measured and calculated’ (p. 212, emphasis in original). Those writing in a normative vein, on the other hand, may see their expectations unmet by the author’s decision not to expand the ‘more robust ontology’ developed in the book into an argument that it ‘necessarily gives us a better politics’ (p. 216). Nevertheless, a more constructive approach would be for them to take up this challenge themselves.

Indeed, the book will have achieved its highest aim if all those working on migration and citizenship from various disciplinary perspectives take account of and engage with the challenge of understanding ‘ambiguous’ forms of citizenship.

Reference

- Passerin d’Entreves M (1997) Introduction. In: Passerin d’Entreves M and Benhabib S (eds) *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity: Critical Essays on the Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–37.

Sam Friedman

Comedy and Distinction: The Cultural Currency of a ‘Good’ Sense of Humour
Abingdon: Routledge, 2014, £85 hbk (ISBN: 9780415855037), 228 pp.

Reviewed by: Simon Weaver, Brunel University London, UK

Being the first sustained Bourdieusian analysis of comedy, this is an important text that will contribute to the mainstreaming of comedy studies in the academy. Friedman, through a study of the 2009 Edinburgh Festival Fringe, shows that British comedy taste is stratified by class with ‘intellectual’ performers, such as Stuart Lee, holding favour with bourgeois consumers and observational or ‘vulgar’ acts appealing to those deemed to have low levels of cultural capital. In short, Friedman discovers that ‘universally strong distinctions exist in the patterning of comedy taste’ (p. 4). High cultural capital individuals also have the knack of consuming high comedy with a set of embodied dispositions that further distinguish themselves and mirror the Kantian aesthetic of disinterestedness. Omnivorousness, in relation to social mobility, is not discovered in this study. Friedman describes ‘only partial signs of omnivorousness’ (p. 4) – that those who have mixed taste caused by some social mobility often express this as ‘a hindrance rather than a form of capital’ (p. 4).

Friedman provides one of the most accessible descriptions of Bourdieusian theory I have encountered and the book should be useful to students who wish to apply Bourdieu