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Citizenship has emerged only recently as an important topic of research on migration and migrant integration. Before the late 1980s there was little connection between migration research and the legal literature on nationality laws or political theories and sociological analyses of citizenship in a broader sense. In traditional overseas countries of immigration immigrants’ access to citizenship and eventual naturalisation was taken for granted as a step in a broader process of assimilation, while in Europe the largest immigration contingents had emerged from the recruitment of guest workers who had been invited to stay only temporarily and were never perceived as future citizens.

Both expectations were eventually undermined when the dynamics of the migration process interacted with political developments to generate more inclusive conceptions of citizenship. Family reunification turned guest workers into settled immigrants. Many among these, however, maintained strong ties to their countries of origin. For these migrants, retaining the nationality of origin was a natural choice both for its instrumental value as a bundle of rights and for its symbolic value as a marker of ethno-national identity. At the same time, the rights of permanent residents in major democratic receiving states were upgraded in many areas or even equalised with those of citizens. Finally, more and more countries of immigration abandoned the consensus in international law that those who naturalise have to renounce their previous nationality and a growing number of sending countries also accepted multiple nationality among their expatriates. All these developments have blurred the previously bright line separating aliens from citizens. While some observers welcomed these trends as heralding a new cosmopolitan era in which state-bound citizenship would eventually be overcome, others were concerned about migrants’ multiple loyalties, their apparent free ride on citizenship rights without corresponding duties and about the political mobilisation of ethnic or religious identities.
1. Three core concepts

In this chapter we trace the main steps in these developments and highlight areas of agreement and controversy among researchers. We have identified three analytical concepts that provide common reference points for our analyses.

The first among these concepts is a society’s political opportunity structure. This concept has been widely used in research on migrants’ political behaviour and activities, including voter turnout and representation in political bodies, membership in political parties and organizations, lobbying, public claims-making and protest movements. A political opportunity structure consists of laws that allocate different statuses and rights to various groups of migrants and formally constrain or enable their activities, of institutions of government and public administration in which migrants are or are not represented, of public policies that address migrants’ claims, concerns and interests or do not, and of a public culture that is inclusive and accepts diversity or that supports national homogeneity and a myth of shared ancestry. In describing all these elements of a political system as an opportunity structure we emphasise that migrants are not only objects of laws, policies and discourses but also agents who pursue their interests individually or collectively. The point of analysing a political opportunity structure is to identify institutional incentives and disincentives that help to explain migrants’ political choices and strategies. This need not imply that these choices are always rational ones or that they generally achieve their goals.

A second core concept is political integration. Integration in a broad sense refers to a condition of societal cohesion as well as to a process of inclusion of outsiders or newcomers. Integration in the latter sense is generally regarded as a two-way interaction between the institutions of a ‘receiving society’ and those who gain access that will also result in changing the institutional framework and the modes of societal cohesion. Integration thus brings together the two perspectives on opportunity structures under the umbrella of the more normatively accentuated concept of societal cohesion. The concept of integration is open for both transitive and intransitive use. On the one hand, political integration is an aspect of a broader process of structural integration. In this sense it refers to access to political status, rights, opportunities and representation for immigrants and to an equalisation of these conditions between native and immigrant populations. On the other hand, political integration is also about migrants’ activities and participation and their acceptance of the laws, institutional framework and political values that ‘integrate’ a political system. The political integration of immigrants can be broken down into four dimensions: political rights,
identification, norms and values, and participation. The more rights they enjoy, the more they identify with the society where they live, the more they share its political values and norms, and the more they participate and are represented in the political system, the better integrated they are.

Research on migrants’ political integration focuses on the post-migration stage in the receiving society. Circular migration patterns, immigrants’ links to their countries of origin, and these countries’ policies towards their expatriates may be taken into account as external factors but are generally regarded as obstacles for integration. This is a serious limitation that can be overcome by expanding research towards transnational arenas and activities. Political transnationalism is thus the third core concept that informs our approach to the migration-citizenship nexus. Studies on migrant transnationalism challenge the separation between migration and integration stages. Research on political transnationalism has focused mostly on migrants’ political identities and activities in relation to their countries of origin. However, the concept applies also to the status of external citizenship and to sending country policies vis-à-vis emigrant communities and the destination state. Finally, transnational citizenship has been interpreted as a broader transformation of political membership in migration contexts. This is most visible in the proliferation of multiple nationality but pertains also to the separation of citizenship rights from formal citizenship status and the emergence of a residential citizenship for foreign nationals in democratic immigration countries (Bauböck 1994).

2. Citizenship status, rights and obligations

Citizenship is a very old concept that has undergone many transformations. Since the times of ancient Athenian democracy its core meaning has been a status of membership in a self-governing political community. Today, citizenship has acquired many other meanings ranging from the legal status of nationality to the virtues of the ‘good citizen’ who contributes to the community. In this section, we will focus on a broad political conception of citizenship that refers to individual membership, rights and participation in a polity. In migration contexts, citizenship marks a distinction between members and outsiders based on their different relations to particular states. Free movement within state territories and the right to readmission to this territory have become a hallmark of modern citizenship. Yet in the international arena citizenship serves as a control device that strictly limits state obligations towards foreigners and permits governments to keep them out of, or remove them from, their jurisdiction. A migration perspective therefore
highlights the boundaries of citizenship and political control over entry and exit as well as the fact that foreign residents remain in most countries deprived of the core rights of political participation.

**Nationality as a filter for regulating migration**

From an international perspective, citizenship is a sorting device for allocating human populations to sovereign states. The basic principle in international law pertaining to citizenship is self-determination. Apart from very few constraints, states are free to determine under their own laws who their citizens are. Such self-determination inevitably generates conflicts when international migration produces large numbers of expatriates living outside their states of origin and of foreign nationals in destination countries. A major area of research is to study how norms of international law and domestic state law and practices in this area have changed in response to migration. Trends and causes for convergence with regard to rules for the acquisition and loss of nationality and the toleration of multiple citizenship will be discussed in the following section. Here we want to emphasise how the determination of nationality is important for state capacities in regulating migration flows. Democratic states are committed to free emigration, but all sovereign states claim a right to control their borders. In this respect, citizenship operates as a filter in two basic ways. First, states are obliged to (re)admit their own nationals to their territory. These include nationals born abroad who have inherited their parents’ citizenship. Second, states may impose specific restrictions on certain nationals (e.g. through visa requirements) while opening their borders for others (such as European Union citizens migrating to other member states).

Several states (among others Israel, Italy, Japan, Germany, Greece, Spain and Portugal) have also adopted preferences for foreign nationals whom they consider as part of a larger ethnic nation or as cultural and linguistic relatives who will more easily integrate in the destination country. With some notable exceptions (e.g. Thränhardt 2000; Levy & Weiss 2002; Münz & Ohliger 2003; Joppke 2005), ethnic immigration preferences are a rather neglected topic in comparative migration research. This may partly be due to the fact that co-ethnic immigration does not fit well into dominant migration theories that focus on economic push and pull factors and on the sociology of migration networks. From these perspectives, it is not easy to understand why states would encourage the immigration of co-ethnics who crowd out other migrants with better skills and – in the German, Israeli and Japanese cases – are sometimes not even familiar with the destination state’s language. There is also a normative puzzle, which has not been fully explored, concerning the legitimacy of such distinctions. In the 1960s
and 1970s, the exclusion of particular ethnic and racial groups from immigration was abandoned in the US, Canada and Australia and it is also generally regarded as illegitimate in today’s European immigration states. The question of whether preferential admission on similar grounds, which is still widespread and potentially growing, also amounts to discrimination is disputed and requires further clarification. Migration research must be combined with studies of nation-building and nationalism for explaining the persistence of such preferential treatment as well as for evaluating it.

Membership, ties and belonging

There is an emerging literature on modes of belonging that focuses on migrants’ constructions of their own identities in relation to different places, groups and countries (e.g. Christiansen & Hedetoft 2004; Rummens 2003; Sicakkan & Lithman 2005). Seen from a different angle, such affiliations may be called ties or stakes. The notion of migrants’ social, cultural, economic and political ties focuses our attention less on identities and more on social relations and practices that structure individual lives and can be directly observed. Such ties may be called ‘stakes’ once we consider them as linking individual interests with those of other persons and communities, including large-scale political communities.

Of these three modes of affiliation, ‘belonging’ is the most flexible and open-ended one. Migrants may not only develop a sense of belonging to several societies, regions, cities, ethnic and cultural traditions or religious and political movements; they can also feel to belong to imagined communities located in a distant past or future. Modes of belonging will, however, not be purely subjective since they always refer to some socially constructed entity and are shaped by discourses within these about who belongs and who does not. Migrating between distinct societies also creates multiple social ties and political and economic stakes. Different from a sense of belonging, these ties and stakes express how migrants’ opportunities structurally depend on their affiliations.

Citizenship is a more discriminating concept than both ties and belonging because it is a status of membership granted by an established or aspiring political community. Citizenship is neither a purely subjective phenomenon (as is a sense of belonging) nor is it objective in the sense that it can be inferred from external observation of a person’s social circumstances and activities. Citizenship is instead based on a quasi-contractual relation between an individual and a collectivity. In contrast with belonging and ties, membership is also a binary concept that marks a boundary between insiders and outsiders. This boundary may
be permeable or impermeable, it may be stable or shifting, and it may be clearly marked or become somewhat blurred. But it is always recognisable as a threshold. If you cross it, your status, rights and obligations in relation to a political community change as a consequence.

These considerations point to two different tasks for research. There is an agenda for empirical research on ‘misalignments’ (Sicakkan & Lithman 2005; Hampshire 2005) between citizenship, ties and belonging. And there is a task for comparative as well as normative legal and political analysis of political institutions and practices to examine how migrants’ multiple and shifting affiliations are taken into account in determining their membership status (see e.g. Castles & Davidson 2000).

**Rights and duties**

In a famous lecture the British sociologist T. H. Marshall (1949/1965) identified civil, political and social rights as three dimensions of citizenship. Marshall’s analytical model has raised interesting questions for migration research. A first question concerns foreign nationals’ access to the three bundles of rights. Even irregular migrants can formally claim certain basic rights of civil citizenship that are considered human rights, e.g. due process rights in court or elementary social rights such as emergency health care or public schooling for their children. On the one hand, these rights are obviously precarious since they effectively depend on a right to residence and because most states of immigration accept only few constraints on their discretionary powers of deportation and expulsion of migrants in irregular status. On the other hand, regularisation measures have been frequent in all Mediterranean EU states and have also been occasionally implemented in traditional immigration states, such as France or the USA.

Immigrants in regular status have access to additional rights. On the civil rights dimension, freedom of speech, association and assembly was strongly restricted for foreign nationals in most democratic countries before World War II. There are remaining limitations in certain states concerning political activities, e.g. public demonstrations or the right to form political parties and to sit on their boards. However, by and large, core civil rights have been extended to legal foreign residents, again with the important exception of migration-related rights such as protection against expulsion, the right to return from abroad, and family reunification in the country of residence.

On the social citizenship dimension, in democratic states with a longer history of immigration, there is nowadays comparatively little legal exclusion of foreign nationals in the provision of public education, health and housing and from financial benefits such as social insur-
ance payments in cases of unemployment, sickness, work accidents or retirement. The pattern is very different in needs-based and means-tested public welfare systems where foreign nationals are frequently excluded or receive reduced benefits. The rationale behind this discrimination is that immigrants are supposed to be either self-supporting or to be supported by their sponsors. In contrast with virtually all other citizenship rights, inclusion of migrants into social citizenship is also not an irreversible process. In the 1990s, legal residents in the US and in Australia were deprived of welfare benefits (Aleinikoff 2000; Zappala & Castles 2000). In a broader conception of social citizenship, one should include not merely legal equality of public entitlements but also protection against discrimination in employment, housing, education and health. The anti-discrimination directives of the European Union have obliged member states to expand and harmonise their policies in this area without, however, covering discrimination on grounds of third country nationality. An even more substantive conception of social citizenship would look at unequal rates of poverty or opportunities for upward social mobility. In this respect, the gaps in achieving full social citizenship for immigrants are obviously still very large.

Political participation and representation is the dimension of citizenship from which foreign nationals remain generally excluded. However, even in this area we find patterns of partial inclusion. Currently non-citizen voting rights in political elections exist, or are explicitly provided for in the national constitution without having been implemented, in 45 democracies (Bauböck 2005). Often such alien franchise is only granted to citizens of specific countries or is limited to regional and local elections. Active voting rights in national elections for all immigrants with a certain period of residence exist in Chile, New Zealand, Uruguay and Malawi. In Europe, Ireland, the UK and Portugal grant voting rights in national elections to privileged categories of nationals. Another significant European development is the emergence of a ‘residential citizenship’ with voting rights at municipal level disconnected from nationality in 14 of the 25 EU states. Additionally, all EU citizens residing in another member state enjoy the franchise in local and European Parliament elections. This development may be interpreted as a gradual emancipation of local citizenship from nation-state citizenship, with the former becoming more open than the latter for the inclusion of immigrants (see Aleinikoff & Klusmeyer 2002, chapter 3).

Comparative analyses of the rights of foreign nationals that go beyond documenting legal developments are still rare. A comprehensive and reliable set of standardised indicators for citizenship inclusion of migrants could be of great importance for researchers and policymakers alike. Ideally, these indicators should be applied to a large sam-
Measuring is not explaining, but it must be the basis for testing various explanatory hypotheses suggested by Freeman (1998), Guiraudon (1998), Guiraudon and Lahav (2000) and Hansen (2002) among others. These include the influence of migrant lobby and advocacy groups, a judiciary relatively insulated from politics, path dependency of rights accumulation within a particular constitutional framework and the nature of ‘policy arenas’ where decisions are exposed to the public or made behind closed doors and in a consensual or competitive setting. Hypotheses about such factors have been used to explain the general expansion of rights for foreign residents, as well as the specific differences and time lags between countries and different types of rights. We may need to consider other factors when analysing recent backlashes in several European countries where political imperatives of immigration control and assimilation have spilled over into restrictions of rights of settled foreign residents, e.g. with regard to family reunification.

Comparative studies on migrants’ access to citizenship and rights as foreign residents will allow testing of two widespread assumptions that we may call the convergence and liberalisation hypotheses. The former claims that citizenship policies of democratic countries of immigration are moving closer to each other. This might be explained as a result of, first, spontaneous policy transfers through learning from successful examples, second, integration into international and supra-national institutions, such as the Council of Europe and the European Union, which then develop a harmonisation agenda with regard to citizenship policies and, third, globalisation that increases interdependencies between states, limits their sovereignty and exposes them to similar immigration flows from a growing diversity of origins. The liberalisation hypothesis assumes furthermore that such convergence is towards more liberal standards of inclusion. This direction has been attributed either to the emergence of a global human rights discourse (Soysal 1994) or to the growing impact of constitutional courts that share interpretations of legal norms across national boundaries (Joppke 2001). The convergence and liberalisation hypotheses have so far been generally defended based on anecdotal evidence from a limited number of case studies. A much more comprehensive and methodologically sophisticated approach would be needed.

While there are many studies on ‘denizenship’ rights (Hammar 1990), less research has been carried out on other forms of ‘quasi-citizenship’ that are not based on residence but on special bilateral rela-
tions with other states or on cultural and ethnic preferences for certain immigrants. The most prominent example of this is, of course, EU citizenship. Other cases include Commonwealth citizens in the UK, Nordic citizens in the Nordic states and Latin Americans in the Iberian Peninsula.

Liberal theories of citizenship from World War II to the 1980s prioritised rights over duties. More recently, republican and communitarian discourses have re-emphasised moral obligations and responsibilities as well as legal duties of citizenship. Are there specific patterns how these apply to non-citizen immigrants? Duties of education and paying taxes or social security contributions are not attached to nationality but to residence, income and employment. By contrast, military and jury service are generally regarded as linked to citizenship status since these duties have historically been at the very core of ancient and early modern notions of citizenship. Even this is, however, not a universal pattern. Although international law does not allow forcing foreign nationals into the army, permanent residents in the US would be liable to perform military service if the government decided to reintroduce the draft.

Citizenship duties are thus applied to migrants in a less gradual and differentiated way than citizenship rights. Yet receiving countries have periodically asserted a specific obligation of immigrants to assimilate or integrate and have used the naturalisation process as an occasion for asserting a duty of loyalty that remains at best implicit for native citizens. Austria, Denmark, Germany, Finland, the Netherlands and Sweden have introduced integration courses for newcomers that consist mainly of language training with some additional practical orientation and information on the legal and political system of the receiving country. The trend in this area is towards mandatory participation for wider categories, higher fees and stiffer penalties for failing to participate or to pass the exam. Government institutions in the states concerned have commissioned comparative studies on the experience in other countries or evaluation reports where such programmes have been in place for some time (e.g. Entzinger 2004; Michalowski 2004). There is also a new political theory literature that addresses the normative question whether or how immigrants should have to learn the language of the receiving society (Kymlicka & Patten 2003). What is missing so far are policy analyses that explain this new orientation in the integration policies of European states.
3. Access to nationality

Migrants’ access to nationality has been studied from various perspectives. A first research agenda compares variations in legal rules for acquisition at birth or through naturalisation and their practical implementation over time and across countries. This can be done from a perspective of positive law, from a political science view that seeks to explain policy decisions and outcomes, or from a normative perspective that considers how principles of equality, inclusion or freedom of choice apply to this policy domain. A second set of research questions focuses on migrants’ preferences and decisions concerning naturalisation. What are their motives and how are their choices shaped by policies and structural incentives? How can we explain variations in the propensity to naturalise over time and between different migrant groups? What are the impacts of naturalisation for migrants’ opportunities in the wider society and for patterns of economic, social and cultural integration? These questions generally require sociological approaches and quantitative methods of statistical analysis as well as qualitative research on motivations.

Comparing naturalisation regimes

With regard to the former set of questions, there are a number of comparative legal, historical and political case studies of smaller or larger samples of countries. What has been missing so far are systematic comparisons of legal rules that allow for more rigorous testing of the convergence and liberalisation hypotheses by going beyond contextual analyses of individual countries. As far as attempts to explain citizenship policies are concerned, there are two contrasting sets of hypotheses. One affirms that citizenship policy is not merely one aspect of a general migrant integration policy but expresses different conceptions and traditions of national identity. An alternative hypothesis suggests that citizenship, even more so than other areas of migrant integration policy, is a lawyers’ rather than a politicians’ domain. According to this view, convergence has its roots in an ‘epistemic community’ of legal scholars and judges who use similar approaches even when starting from divergent constitutional traditions (Galbreath 2004). In order to be able to test hypotheses of this kind we need not only more precise data that allow for an international comparison of laws and their implementation, but we need also additional studies on the policy making process that explore the arenas and networks of actors involved.

Existing comparative analyses (e.g. Hansen & Weil 2001a) and data collected in a recent project (Bauböck et al. 2006) show that there is still a remarkable diversity between European nationality laws concern-
ing conditions for acquisition of citizenship by birth as well as by naturalisation. To the extent that there is convergence, it appears to be rather slow. This is, on the one hand, due to a lack of EU competency for harmonisation or setting of minimum standards. On the other hand, policy imitation across countries seems to be also less developed than in other areas of integration policy.

*Migrants’ choices of legal status and their consequences*

When we consider the second set of questions, there is, first, a problem with statistical data on naturalisation, of which there are four types: (1) Administrative data on naturalisation, i.e. naturalisation statistics, which in most Western countries provide breakdowns for gender, age and former nationality; (2) census data, which would be a very reliable and rich source but unfortunately rarely contain information on naturalisation and naturalised persons; (3) population registers that may contain information on naturalised persons and can sometimes (e.g. in the Nordic countries) be linked to a variety of other data sets containing socio-economic indicators, which makes them particularly useful for answering the question of whether naturalisation improves socio-economic opportunities; (4) survey data, which may provide additional information on topics often not covered by official statistics, such as the migrants’ intention to naturalise, their expectations about citizenship acquisition and whether toleration of dual nationality changes their propensity to naturalise (see Council of Europe 1995; Eurostat 2002).4

The most often used indicators for measuring citizenship acquisition are naturalisation rates, i.e. numbers of naturalisations in a given year divided by the foreign population at the beginning of the year. These are in fact demographic transition rates that measure the decline of the foreign population through naturalisation. Often they are, however, interpreted as indicators for either the restrictiveness or generosity of nationality laws, or for the propensity of different migrant groups to acquire citizenship. While both factors obviously influence naturalisation rates, these are also determined by a number of other variables, such as net immigration rates that inflate the denominator. Where data on immigration cohorts (i.e. those arriving in the same year) are available, these can be used for rough estimates of numbers of persons eligible for naturalisation. Naturalisation rates are also hard to compare between *ius soli* and *ius sanguinis* regimes because the native-born second and third generations will be counted as foreign population in the latter, but will also be more likely to naturalise and can thereby increase the numerator, too (see Waldrauch & Çinar 2003).
Turning to migrants’ motivations for naturalising, one must take into account institutional factors in countries of residence and origin as well as characteristics of migrant groups eligible for naturalisation. Legal obstacles or incentives for naturalisation are not only to be found in nationality laws and decrees for their implementation, but also in the regulation of the status of foreign nationals in the country of residence and of expatriates as defined by the sending state. For example, reforms that deprive resident foreigners of some of their rights to social welfare or to family reunification have often triggered a rush towards naturalisation. The impact of rules in the country of origin depends largely on the toleration of multiple nationality in the receiving state. If naturalisation requires renouncing a previous citizenship, then a loss of external rights to inheritance or property in land and, most importantly, the right to readmission, may act as an important deterrent. One must, however, also consider that, in a world with huge economic inequalities and large zones of great political instability, the citizenship of wealthy and democratic states has a strong instrumental value. There is empirical evidence that migrants from crisis-ridden regions holding a Western citizenship are more likely to take the risks of return than their counterparts with a lesser legal status (Fink-Nielsen et al. 2004; Kibreab 2003).

Among the characteristics of migrants themselves that influence their decision to naturalise are the time of residence, socio-demographic characteristics such as sex, age, occupational status and place of birth (in country or abroad) as well as future migration plans, knowledge about naturalisation options and the presence of emotional, social or family ties to the country of residence and country of origin (see Diehl & Blohm 2003). Such decisions are also not purely individual ones, but are often taken collectively within a family and they may be strongly influenced by attitudes within an ethnic community. Whether a desire for political participation in the country of residence is a relevant motive will depend on the political opportunity structure in a broad sense (i.e. not merely on the right to vote, but on the expected representation of migrants’ interests).

An emerging issue of research, little studied so far in Europe but with important pioneering studies in the US and Canada, is the question of whether the acquisition of citizenship has a positive impact on the naturalised person’s socio-economic integration. In Europe, detailed datasets (with longitudinal data) that permit an in-depth analysis of socio-economic consequences of naturalisation matching North American research are available only in Scandinavia, the Netherlands and Belgium. One of the main issues is how to interpret empirical results that often show naturalised immigrants in better socio-economic positions than non-naturalised ones in the same migration cohort. The
question is whether this outcome is a consequence of the change of status or of a process of self-selection (Rallu 2004). Is naturalisation the cause of upward mobility or are those migrants with a greater potential for upward mobility also more likely to naturalise?

Qualitative studies with in-depth interviews or focus groups can shed some light on questions that are difficult to answer on the basis of statistical data. They can, on the one hand, explore migrants’ knowledge, instrumental motives and emotional attitudes towards naturalisation, and, on the other hand, compare experiences of discrimination or social mobility between those who have naturalised and those who have not (see Wunderlich 2005).

4. Transnational and external citizenship

Relations between migrants and countries, regions or local communities of origin have been at the centre of studies on transnational migration. In its broadest sense, this term signals a paradigm change in migration research from a traditional approach of regarding migration as a unidirectional movement that ends with settlement and assimilation in the destination society. Transnational migration studies emphasise instead: that migration is often a process of going back and forth several times between different countries, that even immigrants who are long-term residents may retain strong ties to countries of origin and participate in these countries’ developments, e.g. by sending home remittances, and that also sedentary populations who never migrate themselves participate in transnational networks and activities when they are linked to migrants through family and ethnic networks. The Oxford-based transnational communities project, led by Steven Vertovec, and several other scholars (e.g. Glick Schiller et al. 1995; Pries 1997; Faist 2000; Portes 2001; Levitt 2001; Nyberg-Sørensen & Olwig 2002; Guarnizo 2003) have established migrant transnationalism as an important and growing field of theoretical and empirical research.

Claims about the importance of this phenomenon are, however, disputed by scholars who emphasise, on the one hand, that transnationalism is not a historically new phenomenon and, on the other hand, that active involvement in transnational practices may be quite limited among first generation migrants and will gradually fade away over subsequent generations.

Political theorists who have combined the concepts of transnationalism and citizenship have interpreted the term transnationalism in a somewhat broader sense than most of the sociological and anthropological literature (Bauböck 1994, 2003; Kleger 1997). Transnational citi-
zenship refers not only to migrants’ political activities directed towards their countries of origin but also to institutional changes and new conceptions of citizenship in states linked to each other through migration chains. Transnational citizenship may be described as overlapping memberships between separate territorial jurisdictions that blur their political boundaries to a certain extent. This phenomenon includes external citizenship rights in states of origin, denizenship and cultural minority rights in states of migrant settlement, and multiple nationality. Empirical research in this field ought to study, on the one hand, how migrants combine or choose between various political identities and statuses and, on the other hand, how the policies of the states involved impact on each other.

**External citizenship policies of sending states**

While there is a substantial body of theoretical literature of empirical case studies on migrants’ access to rights in destination countries, much less attention has been devoted to external citizenship rights that migrants enjoy in their countries of origin. These include minimally the right to return and to diplomatic protection. Sending states differ with regard to property rights concerning inheritance and property in land, which are of particular importance for migrants who want to keep their return options open. Finally, external citizenship may also include certain welfare benefits, cultural support and the right to vote. A growing number of sending states have introduced absentee ballots and some (among them Colombia, France, Italy and Portugal) have even reserved seats in parliament for the expatriate constituency (Itzigsohn 2000; Bauböck 2005). Long-distance voting raises a number of normative problems. Should expatriates be represented in parliaments whose legislation will not apply to them? Should they have a vote even if they have not been exposed to public debates about the candidates and issues (López-Guerra 2005)? A stakeholder approach to citizenship may allow affirmative answers for those migrants whose ongoing ties to their ‘homelands’ involve them deeply in its present political life and future destiny.

Many sending states have also set up specialised administrative entities dealing with nationals, and sometimes also former nationals, abroad. This is often an explicit acknowledgement of the valuable contributions external citizens make to the national economy through their remittances and to the state more generally, but it is also motivated by efforts, in particular in more authoritarian states, to keep a certain level of control over emigrants. From the perspective of both migrants and the state, the maintenance of external citizenship ties may also reflect broader symbolic and cultural concerns. Sending gov-
ernments often encourage citizens abroad to retain their citizenship and transmit their nationality to their descendants. Other states do not even permit their citizens to renounce their nationality. Both policies contribute to the increasing incidence of dual nationality. In several Mediterranean and Eastern European countries a conscious effort is often made to re-establish links with relatively old migrant diasporas abroad, mainly by facilitating and encouraging the reacquisition of citizenship (see on Poland Górný et al. 2004).

External citizenship poses several tasks for future research. How do citizenship policies of sending and receiving states interact with each other? Why and how do states encourage their citizens abroad to retain their nationality? Which rights and duties of citizenship are deterritorialised and linked to external citizenship? The lack of comparative and normative studies on external citizenship rights is a major gap in current research. Closing it is also important from a ‘receiving state’ perspective since sending-state policies in this area are a major factor determining immigrants’ choices between return migration, permanent settlement as foreign residents and naturalisation.

Multiple citizenship

In international law, multiple nationality is not a new concern. What has dramatically changed since the mid-1980s is the previously widely accepted doctrine that this phenomenon is an evil to be avoided as far as possible. This traditional view rested on several assumptions. From a domestic perspective all states were assumed to have an interest in the undivided loyalty of their citizens and from an international perspective overlapping membership was regarded as source of conflict between states. Second, dual nationality was also seen as detrimental for the individual concerned since it could lead to the imposition of multiple obligations such as military service or to a lack of diplomatic protection in the country of second citizenship. Conversely, the accumulation of rights in several countries was regarded as an unfair privilege not enjoyed by the native ‘singular’ citizens. Finally, dual citizenship was seen as an impediment to immigrant integration by encouraging attachment to a foreign country and culture of origin (Hansen & Weil 2002: 7). In recent years there has been a new academic interest in dual nationality (e.g. Hammar 1985; Martin & Hailbronner 2003; Hansen & Weil 2001b; Faist et al. 2004; Howard 2005) stirred by empirical evidence about the growth of the phenomenon, by new legislation in a number of states that abandoned renunciation requirements as a condition for naturalisation and by public debates in other countries. There are clear signs of increased toleration of dual nationality notwith-
standing the fact that token opposition to dual nationality has remained widespread.

A major part of the phenomenon is due to dual acquisition of nationality at birth by children born in mixed marriages or in countries with ius soli provisions. The more controversial mechanism is the retaining of a previous nationality in naturalisations. While the legal and normative arguments pro and contra multiple nationality have been extensively stated, there is still a lack of hypotheses and comparative research on the conditions under which dual nationality is likely to be accepted and on the driving forces behind changes of citizenship policy. From the available evidence, however, it seems that the explicit acceptance of dual nationality in Europe is very much driven by native elites and emigrant citizens, and involves immigrant groups mainly as clients rather than as actors.

The impact of sending state policies on dual citizenship has been generally neglected. Sending states may contribute to the proliferation not merely through ius sanguinis rules, but also when they either refuse to release persons who naturalise abroad or when they encourage them to retain or reacquire their previous citizenship. The opposite impact may be expected when countries of origin make expatriation less costly in terms of procedures, fees and loss of rights, as Turkey did in 1995. Such effects may, however, be largely offset by emotional attachments and by instrumental advantages of holding two passports.

There is little quantitative evidence on dual nationality. Even the plausible claim that this phenomenon is increasing is hard to document since states generally register only their own citizenship. Occasionally, multiple nationality is included in census or survey data, but reliable statistics would have to be international rather than national ones.

5. Migrant citizenship in the European Union

There is abundant research on the impact of European integration on migration and refugee policies. Social scientists have been fascinated by the question how a supra-national union of states engaged in building an area of free movement deals with member state prerogatives in determining the admission and rights of third country nationals. And the EU has channelled research funding towards such questions since these were deemed of great political relevance for the Commission's projects. A lot of ink has also been spilled on the question of whether citizenship of the Union formally introduced in the Maastricht Treaty represents a move towards new postnational or cosmopolitan conceptions of citizenship or is, instead, nothing more than a symbolic sweet-
ener for the ongoing transfer of sovereignty towards a largely unaccountable European bureaucracy. These two topics have, however, rarely been linked systematically by asking how citizenship at the European level has affected the status of third country nationals.

There are three major research tasks in this area. A first one concerns the evolution of EU citizenship itself as essentially a bundle of rights for internal migrants within the Union who are nationals of a member state. A second issue concerns the access of third country nationals to this status, and a third is about the benefits of a general harmonisation of fundamental rights and anti-discrimination policies for third country nationals and about the emergence of an alternative status of residential or civic citizenship for long-term resident third country nationals disconnected from their nationality.

The evolution of Union citizenship

The roots of Union citizenship can be traced back to the 1970s when Community politicians first began to discuss ‘European identity’. Initial concepts merely included student mobility, the exchange of teachers and the harmonisation of diplomas. A broader approach emerged at the 1973 Copenhagen summit where the European Commission suggested to introduce a ‘passport union’ as well as ‘special rights’ for citizens of member states (Wiener 1997). In 1975 the Heads of Government of Belgium and Italy for the first time proposed to enfranchise all Community nationals on the local level. The Commission’s technical report on special rights went even further by stating that these ‘first and foremost’ imply ‘the rights to vote, to stand for election and to become a public official at local, regional and national levels’ (Connolly et al. 2005: 6-8). In the 1980s, the prevailing political paradigm changed towards economic integration and the rights associated with freedom of movement. This new focus pushed political participation to the background of debates on European Union citizenship. It was only in 1992 that the Treaty of Maastricht established citizenship of the Union as one of the three pillars of European political union in Article 8-8e (now Art. 17-22) of the EC Treaty.

These provisions created a new type of citizenship that departs in significant ways from the well-known pattern of nested citizenship in federal states, whose nationals are both citizens of a constituent unit (a province, region, canton or state) and of the larger federation. Apart from the right to vote in European Parliament elections, EU citizenship is of little significance for persons living within a member state whose nationals they are. The main beneficiaries are internal migrants who take up residence in another member state. Union citizens possess civil, social and political rights (and duties) with regard to the nation-
state whose nationality they hold and they enjoy residential and social rights, but not the full range of political rights, vis-à-vis a second member state in which they reside. Voting rights are only granted at local and European levels but not for national elections in another member state. Furthermore, rights of Union citizenship, particularly the right of residence, may still be revoked in case of a threat to public order. Third country nationals enjoy social rights, providing that they are members of the labour force, but few other rights comparable to those of Union citizens and no political rights at all. Thus the current form of Union citizenship, although extending the rights of Union citizens in other member states, has not overcome the boundaries of state-based nationality. On the contrary, it has cemented the clear divide between nationals, Union citizens from another member state and third-country nationals. It is also remarkable that the content of rights attached to EU citizenship has remained unchanged since 1992 although the drafting of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and of the Constitutional Treaty had provided ample opportunities for redefining and expanding it.

Whereas the strategies of political actors involved in the making of European migration policies have been studied to some extent (Favell 2001, Geddes & Guiraudon 2002, Guiraudon 2001, 2003), research on the politics of European citizenship policy is still quite limited. This research gap contributes to the low level of visibility of the issue in the public discourse on European integration. In particular, too little attention has been devoted to the role of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in the development of Union citizenship. In a 2001 decision the ECJ stated that ‘Union citizenship is destined to be the fundamental status of nationals of the member states, enabling those who find themselves in the same situation to enjoy the same treatment in law irrespective of their nationality, subject to such exceptions as expressly provided for.’ This could indicate that, in the absence of consensus at the political level, the ECJ’s interpretation of Union citizenship might trigger a further evolution of the concept. A similar development occurred in the past with regard to the expansion of rights of Community workers towards rights attached to residence in another member state. For the time being, however, EU citizenship still is like a glove turned inside out: ‘It cannot act within the territory of nationality but only outside it though it purports to express citizen rights’ (Guild 2004: 14).

As no reporting procedure has been implemented, there is no comprehensive information available on how citizens of the Union make use of their political rights. With regard to elections to the European Parliament, the available data show a significantly lower turnout of Union citizens living in a second member state as compared to nationals of this state. There are no data on turnout rates for municipal elections...
available, but the low number of non-nationals elected to municipal councils reported to the Commission clearly shows that Union citizens are not well represented in local councils (Connolly et al. 2005: 16).

Access to Union citizenship and member state nationality

One peculiar feature of Union citizenship is that the institutions of European polity to which this membership refers have no power to confer or withdraw the status. The Amsterdam Treaty stated that ‘Citizenship of the Union shall complement and not replace national citizenship’ (now Art. 17 TEC). The former is therefore directly derived from the latter. Moreover, the member states’ nationality laws, which indirectly regulate the acquisition and loss of EU citizenship, fall outside Union competence and differ dramatically from each other (Preuss et al. 2003). In the Micheletti and Chen cases the ECJ has stated that the competence of each member state to lay down the conditions for the acquisition and loss of nationality must be exercised with due regard to Community law. However, this reservation has not had a major impact so far (cf. Guild 1996: 45; De Groot 2003: 19). As long as member states continue to hold the sole right to regulate acquisition and loss of citizenship, they can even undermine Union policies with regard to the integration of immigrants by raising the requirements for naturalisation.

From a theoretical and normative perspective, the elements and dynamics of this peculiar European architecture of citizenship have been evaluated differently and there is still need for conceptual debate and clarification in this area. It has been suggested that Union citizenship should be fully disconnected from member state nationality, or should at least be directly accessible for third country nationals who have resided in the Union for a certain number of years (Migrants Forum 1996). Some researchers have gone further in proposing that at the level of member states, too, immigrants should be turned into citizens automatically without having to naturalise (Rubio-Marín 2000; Kostakopoulos 2003). One way of clarifying these issues is to distinguish the linkage between Union citizenship and member state nationality (i.e. each Union citizen is a national of a member state and vice versa) from the mode of derivation (of Union citizenship from member state nationality instead of other way round) and from inequality in conditions of acquisition and loss (of Union citizenship because of the lack of harmonisation of nationality laws). Rejecting any of these elements in the present architecture has specific implications for reform that need to be spelled out.
Civic citizenship and European rights for third country nationals

While the EU has failed to use its own citizenship as an instrument for political integration of third country nationals, it has to a certain extent embraced the alternative option of harmonising the legal status and rights of long-term third country nationals. The 1998 Amsterdam Treaty opened this possibility by bringing migration under Community competence. In 1999 the Tampere European Council outlined this agenda by stating that long-term resident third country nationals should enjoy ‘rights and obligations comparable to those of EU citizens’, that their legal status ‘should be approximated to that of member states’ nationals’ and they should be granted in their country of residence ‘a set of uniform rights which are as near as possible to those enjoyed by EU citizens’ (Presidency Conclusions, Tampere European Council 15 and 16 October 1999). Although this conclusion was weaker than the initial draft, which had used the term equal rights, against the background of widespread legal discrimination against third country nationals in most member states, this was still a fairly strong statement. The Commission took up the ball by drafting directives on admission of third country nationals for employment, on family reunification and the legal status of long-term residents. Due to considerable resistance from several member states, the former proposal was shelved while the latter two directives were adopted in substantially watered down versions.

In 2000, the Commission introduced the new concept of civic citizenship: ‘The legal status granted to third country nationals would be based on the principle of providing sets of rights and responsibilities on a basis of equality with those of nationals but differentiated according to the length of stay while providing for progression to permanent status. In the longer term this could extend to offering a form of civic citizenship, based on the EC Treaty and inspired by the Charter of Fundamental Rights, consisting of a set of rights and duties offered to third country nationals’ (COM (2000) 757 final: 21). In a later communication the Commission specifically included under this heading local voting rights for third-country nationals. It also outlined for the first time European standards for member state’s nationality laws by suggesting that ‘naturalization should be rapid, secure and non-discretionary’ and that for second and third generation immigrants ‘nationality laws should provide automatic or semi-automatic access’ to citizenship (COM (2003) 336 final: 22). Civic citizenship is described as a status that helps immigrants to settle successfully but also as ‘a first step towards acquiring the nationality of the member state concerned’ (ibid: 23). Proposals along similar lines had been previously made by aca-
ademic researchers, e.g. Philippe Schmitter’s suggestion to introduce a European denizenship (Schmitter 2000).

While civic citizenship has so far remained an aspiration more than a manifest development, immigrants have gained important civic rights through European legislation with regard to protection against discrimination. By introducing a new Article 13 into the TEC, the Treaty of Amsterdam for the first time supplied the European Union with competence in the field of fighting discrimination based on ‘race’ and ethnic origin (Bell 2002a, b; Geddes & Guiraudon 2002; Liegl et al. 2004: 13-17). This change was achieved after the European Parliament and NGOs campaigning for migrants’ rights (Chopin & Niessen 2001) had exerted pressure. Despite previous deferments by some member states, the Council agreed in 2000 on two directives implementing measures against discrimination based on ethnic origin – the Racial Equality Directive10 and the Employment Equality Directive11. The adoption of these directives was ironically accelerated by the inclusion of the extreme right-wing Freedom Party into government in Austria and the subsequent diplomatic ostracism against Austria, which convinced European governments that they had to take a stance against ethnic and racial discrimination (Tyson 2001).

Although they differ in scope – discrimination outside working life is only prohibited with regard to ‘race’ and ethnic origin – both directives provide protection against four different forms of discrimination: direct and indirect discrimination, discriminatory harassment, and instruction to discriminate. The protection against discrimination conferred by the directives applies to all persons who are on the territory of one of the EU member states, irrespective of their nationality (Liegl et al. 2004: 9). Despite the reluctance of the member states to implement the directives, it is likely that decisions of the ECJ will eventually harmonise the protection against racial discrimination and discrimination based on ethnic origin.

The exclusion of discrimination based on nationality and the different scope of protection in the two directives are major weaknesses of EU anti-discrimination regulations. Future research will have to examine the usage of the concept of indirect discrimination at European and member state levels and its potential to also prevent discrimination based on nationality of migrants from outside the EU. Furthermore, thorough studies on the adequacy and efficiency of the implementation system will be necessary to develop clear criteria for evaluating the quality of anti-discrimination systems (Perchinig 2003).

There is rather broad agreement among political and legal theorists on normative arguments in favour of civic citizenship and comprehensive protection against discrimination. More controversial debates about affirmative action for specifically disadvantaged groups of immi-
grants have not yet been fully addressed at European level. There is, however, a clear need for further studies of the European policy making process with regard to rights for third-country nationals, whose lack of political representation in the member states means that they have little leverage in the European arenas as well.

6. Political participation

Citizenship is not merely a legal status and a bundle of rights and duties, but refers also to the active involvement and passive representation of citizens in politics. In many EU countries, large numbers of immigrants first arrived in the 1960s and 1970s as ‘guest workers’ who were not regarded as potential citizens. Their task was to contribute to building the economy, but not to interfere with their hosts’ political affairs. This has changed, at least in those European countries that have already witnessed several waves of immigration in the past five decades. Here, political mobilisation, participation and representation of ethnic immigrant minorities have become topical issues, especially at the local and city levels.

Participation, mobilisation and representation

Political participation is the active dimension of citizenship. It refers to the various ways in which individuals take part in the management of collective affairs of a political community. Studying political participation must not be restricted to conventional forms such as voting or running for elections, as is often the case in political science. It also covers political activities such as protests, demonstrations, sit-ins, hunger strikes, boycotts, etc. These less conventional and extra-parliamentary forms of political participation generally presuppose the formation of a collective actor characterised by a shared identity and some degree of organisation through a mobilisation process. In the context of non-conventional participation, political mobilisation refers to this process of building collective identity and agency. By contrast, in conventional participation, mobilisation occurs within a previously structured set of political institutions. In general terms, participation can be individual or collective in both types of arenas. An individual may stage a hunger strike and ethnic mobilisation may turn the individual act of voting into a collective action. In other words, while the focus is usually on individual participation in conventional arenas and on collective mobilisation in non-conventional ones, these distinctions must be kept open for all possible combinations.
In modern democracies, political power is usually exercised by persons whose legitimacy to govern has its source in free and competitive elections. Through their vote, citizens mandate these persons to govern on their behalf. Political representation refers to this legitimation process and its results, i.e. the relation between representatives and their constituency. While the institutions of representative democracy are broadly endorsed in European societies, there are still important controversies over the meaning of the concept that are highly relevant for the representation of immigrant ethnic, racial or religious minorities. For some theories, the role of citizens is restricted to electing representatives whom they trust and to recall them when their trust is betrayed. For others, representatives are not free to decide as they think is best, but are bound to defend the interests of their voters even against their own convictions. A third position goes a step further and argues that representative bodies such as parliaments should also mirror the social composition of the electorate in terms of stable identities such as gender, class or ethnicity. Although this latter demand for ‘descriptive representation’ has been generally rejected by political theorists (e.g. Pitkin 1967), some have argued for ‘affirmative representation’ for specifically disadvantaged groups under conditions of pervasive discrimination and lack of trust between groups (Phillips 1995; Mansbridge 2001).

Migrants’ political opportunities

As has been pointed out above, in contrast with civil liberties and many social welfare entitlements, political participation rights are still significantly attached to the legal status of nationality. However, European Union citizenship and the introduction of local voting rights independent of nationality in currently 12 of the 25 member states (as well as in Norway and in four Swiss cantons) illustrate a gradual decoupling at the municipal level. In many countries where there is no local franchise for third-country nationals, cities have experimented with consultative bodies. These are either appointed by the municipal authorities, or composed of delegates of immigrant associations, or emerge from elections in the migrant communities. Political scientists have generally criticised the idea of special consultative bodies because of their limited influence and because even elected bodies entrench the democratic disparity through setting up separate electoral constituencies and representative bodies for citizens and non-citizens. However, recently, a new initiative from the Council of Europe has put the promotion of these institutions again on the table (Gsir & Martiniello 2004). There are hundreds of consultative bodies for immigrants across Europe. The idea of the Council of Europe is to develop a manual of common prin-
ciples and guidelines that could be used by cities interested in creating such bodies.

In national elections immigrants still have to pass through the gate of naturalisation in order to achieve equal representation in nearly all countries. From a democratic perspective, it is clearly problematic to exclude long-term residents, who will be fully subjected to the laws and have a stake in the future of the society, from representation in the making of these laws. The question that is still disputed among theorists is whether this deficit should be overcome by facilitating and encouraging the naturalisation of immigrants or by extending voting rights also to foreign nationals.

A second research task is to study the institutional avenues, incentives and obstacles for political participation and representation of those migrants who do enjoy equal political rights. These include formal and legal aspects, such as different systems of automatic or voluntary voter registration, rules for drawing and revising constituency boundaries and proportional or majoritarian electoral systems, as well as informal elements such as the numbers and political orientation of parties, styles of political campaigning and the openness of a public political culture for ethnic diversity and the immigrant voice. While there have been studies in Europe and the US on how these institutional features affect participation and representation of women or of African Americans, so far there has been very little systematic comparative research on the political opportunity structures for immigrants in Europe.

**Migrants’ political behaviour**

The third task is to examine and explain variations in migrants’ political behaviour within a given opportunity structure. The oldest conjecture in this field may be called the migrant quiescence thesis (Martiniello 1997). It assumes that migrant groups have special characteristics that explain why they tend to be politically less involved than native citizens. This hypothesis has been argued from contrasting sides of the political spectrum. Some Marxist scholars regarded migrant workers only as a labour force imported to undermine the collective mobilisation of native workers and assumed that these workers were primarily interested in achieving short-term economic goals. On the other side, we find culturalist explanations that regard migrants as shaped by pre-modern and non-democratic values of their societies of origin and with little experience and interest in democratic politics. Both approaches have obvious weaknesses in their underlying premises that either deny migrants’ agency or ignore their exposure and adaptation to the destination society through the very process of migra-
tion itself. They are also flawed in being selective with regard to supporting empirical evidence. In many cases, such as emigration from Spain and Greece during dictatorship, migrant workers were actually politicised in their country of origin before their departure and migration was a way to escape authoritarian regimes. Furthermore, both explanations confuse quiescence or passivity with apolitical attitudes. When avenues of political participation are restricted, passivity can be a transitional waiting position for better days and future opportunities for participation. Finally, immigrants may often participate more effectively outside the conventional arenas of representative democracy in unions and other interest organisations or by forming their own associations.

Where there are sufficient opportunities, the extent to which immigrants and their offspring seize them depends on several variables such as: their political ideas and values, their previous involvement in politics (including experiences in the country of origin), the degree of ‘institutional completeness’ of the immigrant ethnic community, the vision they have of their presence in the country of residence as permanent or temporary, their feeling of belonging to the societies of settlement and origin, their knowledge of the political system and institutions, the social capital and density of immigrant associational networks, plus all the usual determinants of political behaviour such as level of education, linguistic skills, socio-economic status, gender, age or generational cohort.

Recent research on immigrants’ social capital has shown that the research on this question has often been strongly shaped by specific national themes and paradigms and has rarely used a broad comparative perspective. In France, there is extensive research on the second-generation immigrants’ extra-parliamentary mobilisation in the 1980s and on the sans-papiers movement of the 1990s (Simeant 1997; Wihtol de Wenden 1988). Very recently the religious-political mobilisation during the debate on secularism and the ban of ostentatious religious signs in public schools has drawn much attention. Only a few authors have also focused on the political representation of immigrants (e.g. Geisser 1997 on immigrant local councillors). In the UK, the issue of the electoral power of ethnic minorities as well as the political colour of each ethnic minority is discussed in all elections. Historically, West Indians and Asians were largely pro-Labour but recently their votes have become a little more evenly distributed across parties. The representation of minorities in elected assemblies has also been rather extensively studied (e.g. Anwar 1986; Geddes 1998; Saggar 1998). In the Netherlands and in Scandinavia there have been precise studies on the electoral behaviour of immigrants (e.g. Tillie 1998; Fennema & Tillie 2001; Soini-
nen 1999). Swedish studies tried to explain the decline of immigrant voter turnout in local elections over the past decade. The Dutch research team linked migrant participation in local elections to data about the density of their associational networks and found positive correlations between these variables. This group has recently organised a comparative study of immigrant participation in ten European cities that tests the social capital approach in a broader setting.

Transnational political participation

With a few notable exceptions (e.g. Østergaard-Nielsen 2003) research on migrants’ transnational political participation is rather underdeveloped in Europe. In this field the task is, first, to study the political opportunity structure for political participation in the country of origin. This includes the dimensions of legal rights for expatriates already discussed above (to retain or reacquire citizenship status, to cast votes in elections and to special representation) and sending countries’ policies towards this group. These may either try to strictly control political activities abroad and to channel them towards support for a current regime, or regard emigrants as an irrelevant group that has cut its ties with the homeland, or, alternatively, encourage them to stay connected and get involved in the political process (Bauböck 2003). In the latter category we find not only sending country governments, but also political parties and candidates in elections that sometimes carry their campaigns abroad to mobilise absentee ballots or to collect campaign funds among those who have no voting rights.

Migrants’ political orientations towards their country of origin may, however, also be fundamentally opposed to a present regime. Just as governments try to control emigrants, so rebels try to recruit fighters and supporters among diasporas. Migrants who have at least partly political motives for leaving their country often show highly divergent attitudes. Some groups want to disconnect themselves as fully as possible and are more ready to assimilate in their host country than other immigrants. This was a typical pattern among refugees from Communist Central and Eastern Europe who settled in the US during the Cold War. Others, however, maintain a much stronger commitment towards their country of origin because they conceive of themselves as diasporas with an aspiration to return. Involvement in ‘homeland politics’ that may persist across several generations is often fuelled by unresolved conflicts about national self-determination.

The broad range of variation between both sending state attitudes towards expatriates and migrant groups’ orientations towards their countries of origin calls for systematic comparative studies that go beyond the description of single cases. This is a broad field for future research.
It is also of great importance for societies of immigration. Ultimately, political transnationalism is not merely about an external relation between migrants and homelands, but about the broader opportunity structure for migrant political activity that emerges from the interaction between institutions and policies in sending and receiving states. Understanding this mutual impact and growing interdependence may be crucial for promoting the political integration of immigrants in the country of settlement but also for resolving festering political crises and promoting democratic transitions in many source countries.

7. Conclusions

We have identified large gaps in research on migrants’ citizenship and a number of promising avenues for a future research agenda. In the most general way our main tasks can be described as follows: (1) to compare institutions and policies of citizenship that respond to migration within and across countries; (2) to assess the consistency of these responses with legal norms, their legitimacy in terms of political norms and their consequences and effectiveness in achieving policy goals; (3) to study the impact of migration on changes of institutional arrangements and policies; and (4) to analyse migrant attitudes, ties and practices with regard to citizenship: their sense of belonging to political communities, their involvement in different polities through social, economic, cultural and political ties, their choices with regard to alternative statuses of citizenship, their use of rights and their political activities.

This research agenda emerges from our focus on the three core concepts explained in section 1.

1. Research that focuses on institutional opportunity structures for political participation must be combined with analyses of social capital generated within migrants’ associations and networks. Furthermore, two alternative perspectives on opportunity structures should be more systematically linked to each other. Some regard these structures as explanatory ‘independent variables’ while others focus instead on their change over time or their variation across countries, regions and cities. This latter approach includes not only institutionalist approaches but also normative political theories, comparative law and political discourse and policy making analyses. Combining the two perspectives helps to understand feedback loops, i.e. changes in an opportunity structure as a result of migrants’ political choices and activities. Such interactions between structure and agency have been at the centre of much contemporary sociological theory, but making these relevant for empirical research
requires bringing together researchers who work predominantly
within one of the two perspectives.

2. Immigrant political integration is a major concern in public
discourses in many European states, where it is generally interpreted
as a need to strengthen immigrants’ identification with their host
societies, their assimilation in linguistic and cultural terms and
their acceptance of democratic core values and norms. The other
crucial dimensions of political integration, i.e. access to political sta-
tus, rights and opportunities and incentives for political participa-
tion tend to be neglected or even overtly rejected. The concept of in-
tegration has unavoidable normative overtones even when used in
academic research. These normative aspects of integration should
always be made explicit and they may sometimes for good reasons
be challenged. For an unbiased research agenda it is important to
reject a nationalist perspective, from which immigrants raise an in-
tegration problem whenever they do not fit a preconceived defini-
tion of national community. At the same time, we have to be aware
that immigrant exclusion and social marginalisation may breed
forms of political radicalism and religious fanaticism that create ser-
ious threats for democratic polities. In Europe, political integration
has yet another meaning that refers to the pooling or transfer of
state sovereignty within the European Union. As we have discussed
in this chapter, the significance of Union citizenship and the direct
impact of European integration on citizenship policies of the mem-
ber states are quite limited. However, there is a nascent European
citizenship regime that has historically emerged from rights of free
movement for nationals of the member states and now hesitantly
embraces the harmonisation of legal status, rights and integration
policies for third country nationals.

3. We have suggested that the emerging research field of political
transnationalism should similarly combine two perspectives by ana-
lysing not merely migrants’ political activities across international
borders, but also the transformation of policies and political institu-
tions in both receiving and sending countries in response to mi-
grants’ transnational ties. While a transnational research perspective
transcends a focus on integration in the receiving society, it can also
be used to broaden the notion of political opportunity structures so
that it includes states of origin as well as transnational migrant net-
works and geographically dispersed diasporic communities.

Studying these phenomena requires a plurality of methods and multi-
disciplinary perspectives. Research within the IMISCOE network can
be classified into two main groups of research questions and methodo-
logical approaches: (1) comparative studies and normative theories of
political institutions, laws and policies; and (2) quantitative and qualitative case studies of migrants’ attitudes and behaviour and their participation in mainstream or minority organisations and movements.

The topic of migration and citizenship is at the heart of many public debates and public policy making. It is not necessarily the task of academic research to intervene in these debates and to give advice to policymakers. But sound theory-guided arguments and solid empirical evidence can certainly help to improve the quality of media discourses and of decision making. The IMISCOE network aspires to contribute to this task by bringing together researchers from various disciplines and countries and offering a platform for dialogue between researchers, journalists and policymakers.

Notes

1 This chapter is a summary compiled by Rainer Bauböck from a longer co-authored report published separately on the IMISCOE website at: www.imiscoe.org.

2 Along similar lines, Glick Schiller (2003) and Glick Schiller and Levitt (2004) distinguish between transnational ways of belonging and ways of being, with the latter referring to actual social relations and practices rather than to identities associated with these.

3 In the US, some of the initial decisions in the 1996 welfare reform that deprived permanent residents of federal welfare benefits were subsequently reversed or compensated by state-based welfare.

4 The German Socio-Economic Panel may be cited as an example for such a survey.

5 See Scott (2004) and Bevelander and Veenmann (2004) for European case studies based on relatively comprehensive data. Kogan’s (2003) comparative analysis of the consequences of naturalisation for ex-Yugoslavs in Austria and Sweden shows that research on the ‘economics of citizenship’ can to a certain extent also be done on the basis of more limited data.

6 This claim is broadly supported by historical research on migration, e.g. Hoerder (2002) and Moch (1992).


9 See Bauböck (2004) for an argument that affirms the former two elements as adequate for the present stage of political integration in the Union while rejecting the latter as not only detrimental for the integration of immigrants but also devaluing the meaning of citizenship at the level of the Union.


12 Using a social capital approach, Fennema and Tillie have argued that dense associational networks within ethnic groups enhance political trust and participation (Fennema & Tillie 2001, 2004; Jacobs & Tillie 2004; Heelsum 2004).
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