Dr. Eunike Piwoni

Lehrstuhl für Soziologie
Chair of Sociology

UNIVERSITÄT PASSAU

Philosophische Fakultät

Dr. Eunike Piwoni - Universität Passau - 94030 Passau

Zentrales Prüfungssekretariat
MA Governance and Public Policy

Innstraße 41
94032 Passau

Telefon	0851 509-2689
Telefax	
e-mail	eunike.piwoni@uni-passau.de
Zeichen	
Datum	31.05.2022

Gutachten zur Masterarbeit von Frau Ana Carolina Richter, Matrikel-Nr. 101441, zum Thema: „Dual citizenship and the question of belonging: The perspectives of dual citizens living in Europe"

In der vorliegenden Arbeit theoretisiert und analysiert Frau Richter die Zugehörigkeitsgefühle von nach Europa migrierten Personen mit doppelter Staatsbürgerschaft. Diese Analyse basiert auf einer explorativen Studie, für die sie qualitative, semi-strukturierte Interviews mit insgesamt sieben in Brasilien geborenen Personen, die zum Zeitpunkt des Interviews eine doppelte Staatsbürgerschaft hatten und in insgesamt sieben verschiedenen europäischen Staaten lebten, im Herbst 2021 durchgeführt hat. Mit ihrer Arbeit adressiert Frau Richter eine wichtige Forschungslücke, da die Zugehörigkeitsgefühle von Migrierten mit doppelter Staatsbürgerschaft und insbesondere die Rolle, die der Besitz von zwei Staatsbürgerschaften für die Entwicklung dieser Gefühle und Fragen von Selbstidentifikation spielen, kaum erforscht sind.

Die Arbeit beginnt mit einem profunden Literaturüberblick, der die theoretische und empirische Debatte zum Thema Citizenship skizziert (S. 3-17). Im Anschuss an diesen Überblick führt die Arbeit in die zentralen Konzepte der Arbeit ein: Belonging, Feelings of Belonging, Politics of Belonging und Self-identification (S. 17-23). Im darauffolgenden Kapitel werden Forschungsarbeiten besprochen, die die Trias Citizenship-Immigration-Belonging adressieren und damit unmittelbar relevant sind für die empirische Studie, die die Arbeit vorlegt (S. 23-25). Die empirische Studie selbst wird vorgestellt, indem zunächst auf Methoden der Datenerhebung und -analyse eingegangen und das Sample vorgestellt wird (S. 26-29). Die folgenden Seiten sind den Ergebnissen der Analyse gewidmet—hier stellt Frau Richter drei Typen vor, die sich durch ihre Zugehörigkeitsgefühle und Selbstverständnisse mit Blick auf ihre Staatsbürgerschaft(en) unterscheiden (S. 30-39). In einem abschließenden Kapitel werden die Ergebnisse vor dem Hintergrund der bestehenden Literatur interpretiert und Limitationen der vorgelegten Studie diskutiert (S. 39-44).

Frau Richter ist durch ihre Studie in der Lage, drei Typen zu identifizieren: Während einige der von ihr Interviewten durch die doppelte Staatsbürgerschaft (genauer: durch den Erwerb einer zweiten Staatsbürgerschaft) ein „Zuhause finden", ist „Zuhause" für eine zweite Gruppe von Interviewten eher temporär (home in progress) und ambivalent konnotiert. Diese beiden Zugänge unterscheiden sich wiederum von der Konzeption eines „pragmatischen Zuhauses" einer weiteren Interviewten. Im Fall dieser Interviewten ist die Staatsbürgerschaft nicht an Gefühle von Zugehörigkeit oder spezifische (nationale oder kosmopolitische) Selbstbeschreibungen gebunden. Insgesamt kann Frau Richter zeigen, dass der differenzierte und differenzierende Zugriff auf Gefühle von Zugehörigkeit auf der einen Seite und Fragen von Selbstidentifizierung auf der anderen notwendig ist, um die (Nicht-)Bedeutung von Staatsbürgerschaft für Migrierte, die in Besitz von zwei Staatsbürgerschaften sind, adäquat zu erfassen. Dies ist ein wichtiger Beitrag, der die bestehende Literatur nicht nur erweitert, sondern in zukünftiger Forschung systematisch, d.h. konzeptionell implementiert werden sollte.

Formalia (Sprache, Formatierung, Zitation und Bibliografie)
Die Wortwahl und der Ausdruck sind sachlich und angemessen, die Absatzgestaltung entspricht gängigen Standards, Zitierweise und Bibliographie sind formal korrekt und einheitlich.

Fragestellung, Aufbau und Struktur der Arbeit sowie Leserführung
Die Fragestellungen bzw. das Thema der Arbeit sind klar formuliert, der Aufbau der Arbeit ist folgerichtig und der „rote Faden" der Arbeit ist jederzeit erkennbar. Sowohl in die bestehende Literatur als auch in die zentralen Konzepte der Arbeit wird genau, ausführlich und immer mit Blick auf das Forschungsinteresse eingeführt.

Umgang mit der Literatur
Die Arbeit bezieht sich durchgängig auf relevante und einschlägige Literatur. Das Ausmaß der rezipierten Literatur beeindruckt. Ferner erreicht die gründliche und immer das Wesentliche erfassende Auseinandersetzung mit der Literatur (und nicht zuletzt die eloquente Diskussion derselben) ein für eine Abschlussarbeit ungewöhnlich hohes Niveau.

Empirie
Die Arbeit legt die Ergebnisse einer eigenständig und mit äußerster Sorgfalt durchgeführten Interviewstudie vor. Frau Richter reflektiert sowohl ihre eigene Position als Interviewerin als auch weitere Faktoren, die den Interviewprozess beeinflusst haben könnten. Die Darstellung der Methoden der Datenerhebung und -analyse entspricht allerhöchsten Standards. Dasselbe gilt für die Vorstellung der Ergebnisse und die Diskussion derselben, die vor dem Hintergrund der Literatur erfolgt und immer im Dialog mit bestehender Forschung stattfindet.

Eigenständigkeit und Urteilsfähigkeit
Die Arbeit beeindruckt durch Originalität (im Hinblick auf Themenwahl und Konzeption), Eigenständigkeit (im Hinblick auf die Ausführung) und die unter Beweis gestellte weit überdurchschnittliche Urteilsfähigkeit (im Hinblick auf den Umgang mit der bestehenden Literatur und die Diskussion der eigenen Ergebnisse). Ich ermutige Frau Richter mit Nachdruck, ihre Arbeit für die Publikation in einer internationalen Fachzeitschrift (z.B. Identities) aufzubereiten.

Ich bewerte die Arbeit mit der Note sehr gut (1,0).

Eunike Piwoni

University of Passau

Chair of Sociology

Prof. Dr. Karin Stögner

Master's Thesis

Winter semester 2021–2022

Supervisor: Dr. Eunike Piwoni

Dual citizenship and the question of belonging:

The perspectives of dual citizens living in Europe

Name: Ana Carolina Richter

Matriculation number: 101441

anarichter@protonmail.com

MA Governance and Public Policy (Version 2015)

Date of submission: 28.03.2022

"tanto [céu e] mar
me dê vento e vela
ou razão para ficar"

"so much [sky and] sea
give me wind and sail
or reason to stay"[1]

[1] Herbert Vianna (Une Chanson Triste, own translation).
In brackets, what I have hitherto thought to be part of the lyrics.

Writing this thesis has proven to be what I anticipated it would be – a mess. First, because every term paper I have written during the master's was a too difficult process (as in *zu*, not *sehr*). This is just how I am, or who I am. (About that, these are the first words I am jotting down in the file called "Thesis"; I must have lost it to start it like that.) But throughout this period, I was also lucky enough to run into an academic literature that made my eyes light up, whether in enthusiasm, astonishment and/or scepticism. Roughly speaking, it was a literature about international migration and "nationalisms". And this leads me to the next point: if, at first, I was seemingly intrigued by a theoretical discussion, or one that was at least at a safe distance from myself, soon it got entangled in my personal experience. It became explicit when going through the literature on the sense of belonging, I unexpectedly identified with Antonsich's words: "The absence of this sense of place-belongingness is not exclusion, as scholars usually tend to say […], the absence of [it] is a sense of loneliness, isolation, alienation, and dis-placement" (Antonsich 2010, 649). Oh well.

This file's name now reads "Searching home". Not me: them, their.

(just realised it makes sense)

Contents

Introduction

Citizenship, understood as a legal status, corresponds to full membership in a nation-state. It is the fundamental link that connects an individual to a state and determines the access to the set of rights in this polity. How about when this fundamental link is not an exclusive one? Dual citizenship was actively condemned for most of the twentieth century until suddenly it became an inevitable phenomenon – the increasing global movement of people put too much a strain on the 'demographic-boundary maintenance regime' that had prevailed up to that moment (Koslowski 2001). Against this background, scholars were absorbed in theoretical discussions, focused, for instance, on explaining the reasons behind the abrupt shift in the approach of states (Faist, Gerdes, and Rieple 2004; Sejersen 2008) and on what this new order would entail from a macro perspective (Hansen and Weil 2002). On the other hand, what dual citizenship meant for individuals and how it impacted their lives remained an overlooked matter.

Recently, in the especial issue of the Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, *Strategic Citizenship: Negotiating Membership in the Age of Dual Nationality*, Harpaz and Mateos (2019) called scholars to engage with the subject from a micro perspective to shed light on its practices on the ground and help academia 'rethink the meaning of nationality' in present times. Interestingly, however, even in the debate involving the individual level, dual citizenship has predominantly been conceived of as disconnected from international migration, and studies have sought to uncover people's motivations for pursuing a second citizenship as an external citizenship (without the actual intention of leaving their countries of origin) (Harpaz 2019; Knott 2019; Leuchter 2014; Pogonyi 2019). These are important contributions to help academia understand its meanings for individuals, nevertheless, they have limited analytical purchase in the context of increasing international movement of people and global mobility. To be sure, "[t]he idea of the citizen who spent most of his or her life in one country and shared a common national identity is losing ground" (Castles and Davidson 2000, viii), and it has drawn much scholarly attention. But then, the research is primarily concerned with the place of the foreigner in host societies and does not directly address the subject of dual citizenship. These studies include, for instance, those on the postnational citizenship, transnational practices, and processes of naturalisation (Badenhoop 2021; Hainmueller, Hangartner, and Pietrantuono 2017; Soysal 1994; Witte 2014). Thus, while 'dual citizenship has never been as important as it is today as a sociological fact' (Spiro 2016, 9), little is understood about instances in which, more than holding the status, individuals have also crossed borders.

Citizenship is important insofar as it is the 'the definite answer to the question 'who belongs?'' (Harpaz and Mateos 2019, 848), but how it is linked to life experiences remains largely unaddressed in the academic literature (Bloemraad 2017) – let alone in terms of the dyad dual citizenship and immigration. Nonetheless, a few studies have delved into this question and revealed remarkable elements of this dynamic. Yanasmayan (2015) showed how the tolerance of dual citizenship opens new possibilities of belonging among Turkish immigrants in Europe, and Erdal, Doeland, and Tellander (2018) demonstrated that citizenship takes an explicit form of 'secure belonging' among people with an immigration background in Norway. Following these investigations, my study focuses on citizenship as a status traditionally conceived in political terms, but to inquiry into its sociological impacts against the background of global mobility. Importantly, however, I approach the question of belonging in a more elaborate way, which, to my knowledge, has not been previously done in this context. Yanasmayan (2015), for instance, pointed out that previous empirical studies do not disentangle attachment to citizenship from national identification (her own study focuses on the former), and the research conducted by Erdal, Doeland, and Tellander (2018) considers belonging in a more generic manner.

When it comes to the phenomenon considered in the present study (dual citizenship connected with international migration), two points are salient, namely the crossing of territorial borders and the crossing of the borders of a national community – however closed its symbolic boundaries may be, because, based exclusively on the perspective of formal membership, they are disconnected. These two "movements" are embedded in a sea of unresolved issues in the academic debate, and for this reason, I navigate the theoretical background with a rather gradual discussion of the topic along with the literature review. The theoretical background considers both the strand of literature on dual citizenship and belonging to help me investigate how a group of young professionals from Brazil living in Europe make sense of their status as dual citizens, and how it relates to their feelings of belonging and self-identification. The study is based on in-depth interviews conducted with seven Brazilians currently living in different countries within Europe, who acquired dual citizenship through different paths. The aim is not to provide a saturated picture of the experience of dual citizens who immigrated to Europe but instead to advance the empirical debate a little and shed some light on the wh-questions of the significance of dual citizenship in the context of immigration. As Hedetoft and Hjort argue, "there is a great need for detailed scholarly work on the different processes that are instrumental in reconfiguring the contexts, meanings, and objects of belonging in the contemporary world" (2002, xx) – and, as my findings will show, dual citizenship is one such important instrumental process in grounding the feeling of belonging among the group I interviewed.

Theoretical background

Citizenship is a broad field of research and encompasses many subjects, yet certain notions are always intertwined. This theoretical background introduces this web, from the general theoretical discussion involving the concept of citizenship (*First, citizenship*) to delineating its specific form associated with the rise of dual citizenship (*The thin facet of citizenship*) and how the academic literature has made sense of this phenomenon so far – from both macro and micro perspectives. This approach is not pointless. As Bosniak (2002, 995) argues, "we remain faced with a multiplicity of disparate claims about the meaning and significance of plural nationality", which, often 'asserted somewhat offhandedly', blur the very academic debate. Therefore, my aim with this literature review is to point out its contributions and lacunas while being careful not to muddle concepts and analyses. The section *Dual citizenship, a macro phenomenon* shows how this subject has predominantly followed a normative, state-centred approach (in line with the strict concern over political membership among political philosophers discussing citizenship more broadly). Given the turning point represented by the growing tolerance of dual citizenship, which opened a 'new dimension of how humans organise themselves', this section also includes a brief historical account of it. In the discussion of how the topic has been studied from a micro-level (*Dual citizenship, focus on the individual*), it becomes striking how the literature has been dismissive of the scenario that seems to be the most consequential of our times: dual citizenship combined with immigration. Therefore, the last part of the theoretical background discusses the strand of the literature on belonging (*Belonging*). With a special consideration to global mobility and international immigration, three approaches are elaborated in an outline that seeks to inform the empirical analysis carried out in my exploratory study, namely *feeling of belonging, politics of belonging*, and *self-identification*. At last, a few empirical studies attentive to citizenship in connection to immigration are considered.

. First, citizenship

Particularly throughout the 1990s and the beginning of the 2000s, scholars were emphatically pointing to the surge of interest in "citizenship": take pretty much any publication or article on the subject and it is there[1]. But even more recently, the introductory chapter of the Oxford

---

[1] It gets especially interesting when it is accompanied by a qualification: Hansen and Weil, for instance, assert that scholars' attention towards citizenship had become 'almost an obsession' (2002, 1).

Handbook of Citizenship asserts that "[c]ontrary to predictions that it would become increasingly unimportant in a globalizing world, citizenship is back with a vengeance" (Shachar et al. 2017, 3). However, equally important is that there is no single, agreed definition of this concept. Even though much of the literature is anchored in the understanding that citizenship is ultimately about membership in a community, not only different political traditions rely on different perspectives of what to be a citizen means/entails[2], but also scholars investigate multiple topics through its lens and engage with the subject in diverse ways (Isin and Turner 2002, 5). In other words, "[t]he term has an extraordinarily broad range of uses" (Bosniak 2000, 450). And it can also be a 'problematic concept' (Steenbergen 1994, 1).

It is important to note that this field of research gained prominence when societal transformations were unfolding at a fast pace, like the new paradigms linked to globalization and those associated with geopolitical transitions (including the dismemberment of the Soviet Union, the German reunification, and the strengthening of the European integration) (Habermas 1994; Isin and Turner 2002, 1–2; Turner 1994, 156). Thus, several studies delving into questions such as the substance and subjects of citizenship appear as a natural consequence of this context (see Bosniak 2000, 453), and attempting to lock either one definition or approach to it would likely be "a hopeless task or a sectarian project" (Shachar et al. 2017, 5). For instance, while the concept was appealing to political theorists because it encompassed ideas of individual rights as well as of attachment to a community (central to the debate between liberals and communitarians), it also became a powerful tool for framing social issues linked to unequal access to rights despite one's status as citizen (Isin and Turner 2002, 2–3; Kymlicka and Norman 1994, 352; Steenbergen 1994, 1). However, one should not lose sight of the fact that it becomes problematic if – when – academics debate over citizenship but are essentially talking about different notions (see Kymlicka and Norman 1994, 354). Before turning to the specific meaning of citizenship underlying this study, I believe it is worth introducing more concretely what this field is about:

T.H. Marshall provided the most influential conceptualisation of citizenship of the post-war period, informing most studies in the field (Bosniak 2000, 464; Kymlicka and Norman 1994, 354; Sejersen 2008, 525)[3]. Even to this day, academics commonly refer to his collection

---

[2] The main theoretical strands can traditionally be divided in liberalism, communitarianism, and republicanism. While liberals are mostly concerned with personal liberties, and communitarians with collective identity and cohesion in a society, republicans or democratic theorists emphasize active participation and the role of contest in the expansion of rights (Cohen 1999, 248; Isin and Turner 2002, 4).

[3] Moreover, first published in the 1950s, it sustained an academic authority throughout decades of little scholarly attention to the field (Hansen and Weil 2002, 1).

of essays, *Citizenship and Social Class*, for he advanced a view of citizenship that transcends any strict political definition and encompasses a broader sociological concern (Steenbergen 1994, 2). Marshall presented a systematic analysis of the evolution of citizenship against the expansion of capitalism in England, noting that rights had been gradually incorporated into it over the centuries. It was the last set of rights in this evolution that gave citizenship its social dimension, infusing it with the understanding that to be a citizen is to be a full member of the society, or to enjoy the right "to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society" (Marshall 1950, 11)[4]. It is in this sense that the concept of citizenship implies a 'basic human equality' (ibid., 8). Regarding the locus of citizenship, Marshall explicitly stated that his analysis concerned a national (the English) community (at a time when the nation-state was gaining prominence rapidly), but he recognised that citizenship was not exclusive to the national realm – and examples of 'genuine and equal citizenship' could also be found in some medieval societies (ibid., 12). It is important to note, however, that, for him, the institution of citizenship in a national territory did not require a bond of kinship nor 'the fiction of common descent', but instead a sense of community membership or the 'loyalty of free men protected by a common law' (ibid., 40–41). Nowadays, prevalent understandings of citizenship are categorically attached to the nation-state. So much so that when a statement or thesis posits a different notion, it is readily criticised. (When M. Nussbaum declared herself a citizen of the world, she received sharp responses claiming that citizenship is intrinsic to and an exclusive feature of nation-states (see Bosniak 2000, 447–48)). Nevertheless, some scholars advocate the importance of going beyond the national territory in examining the subject of membership in a society, for, they argue, the division between citizens and noncitizens has become blurred with the advance of the international human rights discourse (see Soysal's postnational citizenship thesis (1994)[5].

And how do scholars organise the different understandings surrounding citizenship? Bosniak points out that there are useful analytical efforts to compile the various ways of

---

[4] Multiple scholars draw on Marshall's work; some propose attaching new dimensions to it, others point to "imperfections" in it. For just a couple of examples: Fraser and Gordon (1994, 93) argue that the analysis was based only on the experience of white working men, presupposing and, at the same time, rendering invisible questions of gender and race; and Habermas (1994, 31) contends that the model does not conform the impact of active citizenship, in which individuals can pursue changes in their own political status (see also Kymlicka and Norman 1994, 355).

[5] One caveat is in order here: Soysal does point to a 'dialectical tension' in what she calls the reconfiguration of membership in a globalised world. According to the author, there is no new scheme behind the implementation of rights, nor has the nation-state become obsolete as the central institution organising membership: while the basis and legitimation of rights are enacted in the international arena, they are still sanctioned and implemented by national states. Hence, the global framework advances two apparently contradictory principles: universal human rights and national sovereignty (Soysal 1994, 7–8).

interpreting citizenship – however, they are not systematic, fixed (2000, 455). Thus, academics employ different categorisations depending on the purpose that their theoretical argument takes. The dimensions that Bosniak (2000) reviews in her own study are very similar to the outline provided by Bloemraad (2017), who contends that citizenship can be broken down into: legal status, rights, (political) participation, and collective identity/membership (2017, 526). Kymlicka and Norman (1994), for their part, draw attention to two concepts encompassed by the political literature: citizenship-as-legal-status and citizenship-as-desirable-activity. While the former refers to formal membership in a political community – a thin conception of citizenship –, the latter concerns the political engagement of individuals associated with democratic quality in liberal democracies – a thick conception of it (Kymlicka and Norman 1994, 353–54). On the other hand, Benhabib (2002) offers a distinction that cuts across these examples, namely citizenship as a normative concern and as a sociological category. According to the author, the subject has been discussed within political philosophy essentially on normative lines, underlying its concern with 'the duties of democratic citizenship' – but in a 'sociological vacuum'. As a result, while the privileges of political membership are commonly in the spotlight in these writings, two other dimensions are found wanting, that of collective identity and that of entitlement to rights and benefits. Benhabib argues that "[p]olitical philosophers paid little attention to citizenship as a sociological category and as a social practice that inserts people into a complex network", and, that way, "[p]olitical philosophy and the political sociology of citizenship went their separate ways" (Benhabib 2002, 94–95)[6].

Take all this into account – that is, Marshall's ground-breaking study, major events developing at the global level, and contributions pointing to the intricacies related to the subject in different disciplines –, and it is easy to see how the notion of citizenship "has split". In summary, while it is true that citizenship studies have increased manyfold over the 1990s and beyond, it also becomes clear that they encompass different focuses. The overview provided in this section presented different forms that citizenship can take in 'a very chaotic field' (Bosniak 2000, 455). The intention in doing so is to enrich the discussion on dual citizenship, which is a fascinating phenomenon not only because it is embedded in the context of increasing global mobility, but also because it combines critical dimensions of the political and sociological debates

---

[6] Benhabib brings to the foreground the 'unprecedent' movement of people in the contemporary world, as "individuals no longer enter their societies at birth and exit them at death" (2002, 95). Interestingly, Kymlicka and Norman openly refrain from including in their work the question of immigration and naturalisation (see Kymlicka and Norman 1994, 353).

in a way less addressed by the academic literature. Following, the meaning of "citizenship" in "dual citizenship" is explained.

. The thin facet of citizenship

To study dual citizenship is to talk about citizenship in a rather straight-forward sense and there is no need to pick one among competing intellectual political traditions[7]. Citizenship is understood as a legal status – a status that corresponds to full membership in a political community (Kymlicka and Norman 1994, 353). In this respect, Joppke asserts that "[c]itizenship by nature is thin citizenship. It unites people not in shared beliefs and purposes but in a common legal framework" (2019, 863). However, to stick to 'political community' in the basic definition, while not misleading, is also not completely forthright. It concerns the modern state: the sovereign institution rightfully in charge of granting and legislating such status (and the criteria required to acquire it; the rules of membership) according to the principle of exclusive competence (Faist, Gerdes, and Rieple 2004, 917). Therefore, citizenship-as-legal-status is a national enterprise – and one that has been traditionally understood in political terms.

Such formal, legal recognition embodies the fundamental link between an individual and the state and safeguards one's entitlement to the whole set of rights in the polity, in contrast to those with an incomplete connection to that state, or no connection at all (Hansen and Weil 2002, 11). Generally speaking, in this context, "[t]o be a citizen is to possess the legal status of a citizen" (Bosniak 2000, 456). The principles according to which citizenship is granted vary between states and reflect historical differences in the ways national identity has been traditionally perceived; essentially, they are jus soli (based on birth in the territory), jus sanguinis (based on descent or ancestral lineage), and naturalisation (Sejersen 2008, 529)[8]. While the United States is commonly referred to as a classical example of jus soli, Germany has been historically associated with the model jus sanguinis. However, there have been substantial changes in national regulations in recent decades, and in practice states rely on a combination of these principles. For instance, "*ius soli* countries use the *ius sanguinis* principle to confer citizenship on children of their citizens born overseas" (Castles and Davidson 2000, 85). Naturalisation, in its turn, depends on a minimum number of years of residence in the host

[7] Twice of something that cannot be easily defined would not make sense.
[8] There has been an increasing debate over investment-based citizenship (ius pecuniae), the so-called passports for sale programmes. For a detailed academic account of this phenomenon, see J. Džankić's *The Global Market for Investor Citizenship* (2019).

country and a number of other conditions determined by each state, which normally include proof of employment, language test, civic knowledge test, and evidence of "good character" (Benhabib 2002, 100–101)[9].

It is based on this "thin" facet of citizenship that many criticisms of the postnational citizenship thesis emerge, because while formal citizenship is no longer needed for an individual to access a variety of civil and social rights – instead, legal residence is –, it continues to be fundamental when it comes to political rights (see Soysal 1994, 127–29). But Bosniak raises yet another nuanced, important aspect of the place of the alien – even if a postnational citizen – in a polity: "When citizenship is understood as formal legal membership […], aliens remain outsiders to citizenship: they reside in the host country only at the country's discretion" (2000, 461). Therefore, it is, interestingly, in the context of immigration that citizenship as a status becomes more visible. As the editors of the Oxford Handbook of Citizenship aptly note, "[c]itizenship, or its lack, is often felt most sharply by those who move across borders, as individuals and families run a gauntlet of passports, visas, technological scans, and officials tasked with enforcing borders" (Shachar et al. 2017, 5).

From these remarks, it is possible to derive two important points. First, one of the ambiguities of citizenship is that it implies exclusion as much as inclusion (Castles and Davidson 2000, 11). Or in Cohen's words, "[citizenship] always establishes privilege insofar as it endows members with particular rights denied to non-members" (1999, 252). And second, a fundamental property of formal membership is that it "secures a place to live and offers protection against expulsion" (Bloemraad 2017, 524; see also Bauböck 2019, 1017). This right to 'unconditional residence and (re)admission to the territory' is frequently mentioned by scholars, however, rather superficially. Lenard (2018) offers an expressive exception. The author argues that the very foundation of citizenship is the right to residential security (even before the right to vote and to hold a passport), which "[protects] the strong interests that individuals have in staying where they are" and "[underpins] the confidence they need to build their life in a place, with the expectation that they can continue to do so" (Lenard 2018, 99–100). Therefore, while it is true that, on the one hand, the notion of citizenship has been expanded within

---

[9] Fehér and Heller point out that the term naturalisation is routinely used to indicate the process of accepting immigrants as citizens in/of a particular nation-sate; however, it is done so unreflectively, and the term has some problematic 'shades of meaning', like 'melting' the immigrant into the collective 'body' of the host state, or regarding a certain society's order and mores as 'the natural' ones (1994, 135–36). The authors argue – in a provocative essay about multiculturalism – that "culturalization" would be better suited to define the process, because culturalization is a strategy of group cohesion that allows 'assimilation without forcible dissimilation'. In this regard, "[w]e can only have but one 'nature' or 'body' but we can indeed have several cultures which do not necessarily exclude each other" (ibid., 137).

academia to include various instances of social struggles – to the extent that its possession does not automatically translate into equal access to rights and opportunities – and, on the other hand, more rights are granted to non-citizen residents – as a product of the international discourse on human rights and universalistic conceptions of personhood –, as a status, citizenship is consequential (see Spiro 2010, 127).

But why, and how exactly does the thin facet of citizenship matter from the individual point of view? As Bloemraad underlines, this is primarily an empirical question: "Does holding citizenship status affect individuals' life experiences?" (2017, 525). Answers, however, are often elaborated in normative terms and debated as political claims. For instance, contrast the question just quoted with the following statement: "The pivotal right is that of participation in law-making and government, for it is this which makes the active citizen, who is supposed to be the basis of popular sovereignty" (Castles and Davidson 2000, vii). (This is in line with Benhabib's reflection, mentioned in the previous section, on the normative concerns that political philosophers have.) To be sure, there are theoretical clues to appreciate the importance of full membership in modern democratic states and some empirical studies associate positive outcomes in a person's life with their citizenship status (see Bloemraad 2004, 544). However, the academic literature still lacks theoretical considerations of the mechanisms through which citizenship can be linked to life experiences, and existing research "provides little direction in understanding when, where, for whom, and—critically—why citizenship matters in some cases but not others" (Bloemraad 2017, 526).

The following two sections delve into the topic of dual citizenship proper; the first elucidates how dual citizenship went from an undesirable 'anomaly' within the international system – appalling and condemned by many political actors – to a rising phenomenon – insofar uncontrollable, if not embraced, conditionally accepted. The second engages with the micro level and outlines how academia has empirically investigated, or hovered around, the question of how dual citizenship interacts with people's lives.

. Dual citizenship, a macro phenomenon

Dual citizenship means that individuals have legal status as citizens in two sovereign states[10]. It is a striking development because, while it had been regarded during most of the twentieth

---

[10] Individuals can become dual citizens at birth – generally, a child has two citizenships if born in a state that grants jus soli citizenship, and whose parents are legal citizens of a foreign state that grants the status under the

century as "an anomaly, at best, and an abomination, at worst" (Spiro 2010, 111), it is now inevitable. Therefore, it is remarkable that despite the attention that the topic of citizenship has received in academia in the past decades, the same was not true of dual citizenship. Hansen and Weil highlighted that their volume, *Dual nationality, social rights, and federal citizenship in the U.S. and Europe*, was the first over decades to focus on dual citizenship (2002, 1). The authors noted that "[a]lthough intellectual curiosity and a professional need for publication tend to exhaust all aspects of whatever topic fires academic imagination, the massive interest in citizenship has not spilled over into a concern for dual nationality" (ibid.) [11]. This notwithstanding an increasing number of people with the status amid a growing acceptance of dual citizenship – scholars were barely grasping the phenomenon, and it already became multiple in nature. While the academic landscape has changed since then, with gradually more publications being devoted to the topic, it is still 'dominated by normative and state-centred macrostructural approaches', such as studies focusing on state citizenship laws and comparative analyses [12] (Pogonyi 2019, 976). Against this background, academics often contemplate 'problems and possibilities' of dual citizenship embedded in macro-political concerns that underlie much of the theoretical and normative debate: What does dual citizenship mean for the sovereignty of a state and the international system? Can genuine links between the state and individuals be maintained in this condition? (What are genuine links?) Does this status undermine basic democratic principles? Should dual citizenship be considered a human right?[13]

To better elucidate the significance of the evolution of dual citizenship, a brief historical account follows:

In the past, nation-states condemned and actively sought to prevent the occurrence of dual citizenship, which was considered a threat to the world order. The paradigm that prevailed was that of exclusive allegiance (especially with the conflicts that afflicted the world in the twentieth

---

principle of jus sanguinis (Hansen and Weil 2002) – or else later in life, provided that there are no rules against multiple citizenship – for example, through naturalisation, marriage, or on the basis of ancestry (whereby descendants of emigrants claim the (re)acquisition of a given citizenship) (Koslowski 2001, 203; Sejersen 2008, 528–29).

[11] Almost apologetically, Hansen and Weil also advised that, considering the 'novelty of debate', their publication dealt predominantly with historical accounts and normative issues (2002, 1).

[12] Recently, the Global Citizenship Observatory released the GLOBALCIT Citizenship Law Dataset. It gathers and systematises data on the rules concerning citizenship acquisition and revocation around the world – available in https://globalcit.eu/databases/globalcit-citizenship-law-dataset/ (accessed February 2, 2022).

[13] Due to limited space, this study does not delve specifically into normative claims surrounding the debate. For this, see the first part of the volume edited by Hansen and Weil (2002); Franck (1996); Joppke (2019); Pogonyi (2011); Bauböck (2019); or contributions by Spiro, a leading expert and staunch advocate of dual citizenship (who became a dual citizen himself in 2013 and recounts this in *At home in two countries: The past and future of dual citizenship* (2016, 1–3)).

century) and multilateral conventions were established to reinforce this notion (Harpaz and Mateos 2019, 846; Koslowski 2001, 207)[14]. It is interesting to note, however, that the status itself was not 'illegal'; and despite the strong discourse against dual citizenship, no international regime to govern the practice followed (Spiro 2010, 114). Although those multilateral conventions were not binding, they guided domestic laws and two general rules dictated citizenship practices until the Cold War: the acquisition of a new citizenship implied the loss of the original one and, when dual citizenship could not be avoided altogether, the 'optional rule' was enforced (so those born dual citizens would have to choose between the two citizenships upon reaching the majority age) (Faist, Gerdes, and Rieple 2004, 923)[15]. Koslowski (2001) makes the interesting point that the international arrangement against dual citizenship established a 'demographic boundary maintenance regime' – the international system of nation-states has delineated not only a geographical, but also a demographic jurisdiction. However, rising international migration and globalisation made the tolerance of dual citizenship unavoidable over time and, as increasingly more people 'found themselves caught between two states', that demographic regime grew challenged (Koslowski 2001, 204, 207–8).

As a result, there has been since the 1990s a dramatic shift towards the acceptance of dual citizenship[16] – and today, the global average of countries with a permissive stance is 76% (Global Dual Citizenship Database 2020). Harpaz and Mateos call this the 'post-exclusive turn in citizenship'[17] (2019, 846). It is interesting to point that many states revised their policies towards the toleration of dual citizenship in the pursue of national interests: on the one hand, migrant-sending states sought to strengthen ties with their citizens living abroad and benefit from their economic and political influence; on the other hand, receiving states were ready to allow dual citizenship, since this increases the propensity of immigrants to naturalise – which, in turn, is a tool for social integration (Spiro 2016, 133). To be sure, all this took place within a

---

[14] As the preamble of the 1930 League of Nations Convention reads: "it is in the general interest of the international community to secure that all its members should recognise that every person should have a nationality and *should have one nationality only*" (League of Nations 1930 emphasis added). Later in 1963, this idea was reiterated with the Council of Europe's Convention on the Reduction of Cases of Multiple Nationality (Pogonyi 2011, 689).

[15] Spiro argues that in the absence of an international *regime*, legal resolutions were virtually ineffective in curbing the incidence of dual citizenship – domestic mechanisms 'were inevitably leaky'. Hence, dual citizenship also became the object of moral condemnation under the pretext of alleged disloyalty (Spiro 2010, 114–15).

[16] Notably, in 1997 the Council of Europe updated the previous 1963 Convention to allow each country to decide on the issue of dual citizenship. It was the first time that most European states 'took a rather neutral, instead of negative, stance toward allowing dual citizenship' (Ronkainen 2011, 251).

[17] The authors report that tens of millions have citizenship in more than one country (Harpaz and Mateos 2019, 843), but unfortunately there is no specific statistical data on these numbers (Spiro 2010, 112). Furthermore, it is also worth mentioning that while some states do not officially recognise dual citizenship, they overlook it in practice (Koslowski 2001, 204; Sejersen 2008, 531).

more secure international environment and amongst more gender-equal legislations, which ensured that mothers, too, could transmit their citizenship to their children (Faist, Gerdes, and Rieple 2004, 921–22; Koslowski 2001, 210–14; Pogonyi 2011, 689; Sejersen 2008, 539, 542–43; Spiro 2016, 90–91). Importantly, once set in motion, this change in policies was unlikely to reverse – Faist, Gerdes, and Rieple explain this as a 'path-dependent process' (2004, 916).

Although the 'fundamental link' connecting individual-state conferred by formal membership is not an exclusive one in cases of dual citizenship – and, as such, dual citizens may experience its substance in multifaceted ways –, this does not challenge the sovereignty of the nation-state per se. In this sense, Bosniak asserts that "[t]he rise of multiple nationality simply does not represent a 'shattering' of citizenship, nor the harbinger of a 'borderless world'" (2002, 1003). This is easily corroborated by the fact that granting citizenship remains under the discretion and control of the state. Likewise, the post-exclusive shift since the 1990s did not – and does not – presuppose any kind of 'world parliament or global demos' (Shachar et al. 2017, 6; see also Bosniak 2002, 997–98). What has changed is that the demographic boundary-maintenance regime no longer holds: "A graphic representation of citizenship status would now be much more complex than a territorial map" (Spiro 2016, 140). As Bauböck points out, while 'land cannot belong to two states at the same time', people indeed can (2019, 1020); and from the individual perspective, "there is nothing strange about having multiple but still genuine links to several states" (ibid., 1024–25). Thus, in this new landscape, while the nation-state maintains its authority, citizens are no longer 'tethered to particular states' as before (Bosniak 2002, 997).

Before turning to the micro perspective and empirical studies conducted in the context of dual citizenship, yet another theoretical consideration warrants attention: the terms (dual) citizenship and nationality are not in themselves without complication. In general, they are accepted as synonyms and often treated as such, but scholars writing about the topic normally opt to include a footnote mentioning their preferred choice or how the legal practice has treated this matter[18]. Rarely, however, the terminological ambiguity is raised. Discussing the modern paradigm of citizenship, Cohen bluntly points out the ambiguity contained in the term *national*: "it is used both as a synonym for a state's citizenry (to be a French national is to be a French citizen) and, at the very least, as a cultural category of collective identity" (1999, 254). This issue

---

[18] There are a few cases where scholars do build their study based on the differentiation of these terms. In Bosniak (2002), for instance, nationality means formal legal membership, whereas citizenship is a plural concept, which encompasses a variety of social institutions/practices and where postnational theses can be claimed (ibid., 980, 1001).

can take on a deeper level when the context of dual citizenship is taken into account. Even if political communities do not consist of 'nationally or ethnically homogenous groups' (Benhabib 2002, 96), these communities are exclusionary nonetheless, and accepting one as a formal member is a decision that rests with the sovereign state. In this respect, Cohen argues that in practice, "[e]ven if citizenship laws are open and 'civic', even if civic patriotism is all that is legally required of new and old citizens, [...] national citizenship tends to 'thicken' and to take on a cultural connotation and identity over time" (1999, 254). In the context of dual citizenship coupled with immigration, where does that leave the individual? Does one identify oneself with both nation-states? Can such identification be developed? Once one naturalises, is s/he now part of "us" and/or "them"?[19] These are questions at which the literature offers few hints. (My own 'intellectual curiosity' concerns "first-generation" immigrants who are dual citizens, and this is the context I have in mind when I think of these questions. This topic is discussed in more detail in the section/subsection *Belonging/Self-identification*).

As the principles of citizenship were based on exclusivity and territoriality, one can understand that the dramatic transformation of dual citizenship practices has stirred a strong theoretical-political interest. Nonetheless, equally important is to investigate the meanings that this status assumes among those who actually hold it.

. Dual citizenship, focus on the individual

The post-exclusive turn in citizenship "suggests new dimensions of how humans organize themselves on a changing global landscape" (Spiro 2016, 10). As citizenship as legal status still regulates who is part of a polity and, at the same time, notions of exclusive national allegiance have been losing ground, new patterns – and possibilities – of belonging emerge (Castles and Davidson 2000, 101; Sejersen 2008, 524). While simultaneous 'vertical' or 'nested' memberships have traditionally been considered normal[20], the widespread acceptance of dual citizenship adds to this plurality by giving rise to multiple horizontal memberships among nation-states (Bosniak 2002, 1004).

Within the theoretical debate, and hinting at the individual level, Koslowski (2001) raises an important point to be considered: not only the interest in the acquisition of dual citizenship

---

[19] These questions make it difficult to read certain remarks about the national domain, such as this: "Fellow nationals are almost invariably referred to as 'we,' while all others are described as 'foreigners'" (Somerville 1997, 237).

[20] Take, for instance, Nussbaum's (2002) presentation of the Stoic metaphor of the concentric circles.

by individuals may not correspond to the expectation of states (see, for instance, the motives behind domestic policies among migrant-sending and receiving states mentioned in the previous section), but also, it may have different meanings for each person (2001, 214–15, 217)[21]. Besides that, some scholars glance at the individual perspective by criticising T. M. Franck's interpretation of the shift towards the legitimisation of dual citizenship: an advocate of the right of individuals to freely choose their affiliations and compose their own personal identities, the author saw the growing acceptance of the status by modern states as a reflection of such consciousness (Franck 1996, 359–60). Hence, scholars have tended to limit themselves to one part of Franck's thesis, leaving unexplored the suggestion that individuals might (want to) develop multiple horizontal identifications during the course of their lives.

Few studies, however, have looked at the meanings that dual citizenship takes on the ground. When it comes to 'systematic attempts' to investigate the 'everyday reality' of the post-exclusive turn, Harpaz and Mateos note in a special issue of the Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies (*Strategic Citizenship: Negotiating Membership in the Age of Dual Nationality*) that there has been none (2019, 844). In fact, within the context of immigration, the analytical focus on the individual level has concentrated mainly on *transnational living* rather than formal membership (Sejersen 2008, 527). It is important to bear in mind, however, that dual citizenship, even in the context of immigration, does not necessarily entail transnational lives – and, as such, they are neither synonyms nor automatically congruent phenomena. Moreover, transnationalism relates more to practices connecting one's life spread across different territorialities – which can offer insights into one's sense of belonging (or lack thereof) but not into its connection with citizenship as legal status[22]. Alternatively, more attention has been paid to the contemporary process of *naturalisation*, and three important strands surround these empirical studies (examples follow in brackets): first, the impact that naturalisation has on immigrant integration (the literature is largely concerned with the impact on economic performance[23], but Hainmueller, Hangartner, and Pietrantuono (2017) seize a particularity of the naturalisation process in Switzerland, which until 2003 included secret ballot referendums to decide which applicants would be granted citizenship, and found that receiving it improved

---

[21] However, the author focuses then on multiple political identities – challenging conventional understandings of undivided loyalties but still devoted to the political interpretation of the phenomenon.

[22] A rare empirical endeavour to investigate transnational practices and identifications among dual citizens (but not only) was conducted by Conway, Potter, and St Bernard (2008), who interviewed 'returning Trinidadians' (highly skilled professionals who used to live in North America and the United Kingdom before deciding to move back "to the island of their birth, or of their parents' birth'" (ibid., 374)). The report, however, is not systematic, and the authors group the individuals' narratives into six different categories.

[23] e.g., Mazzolari's *Dual citizenship rights: Do they make more and richer citizens?* (2009).

long-term social integration – and the positive effect was larger when the naturalisation occurred earlier); second, the disposition of immigrants to undertake naturalisation (for instance, Witte (2014, 2018) investigates the case of Turkish immigrants residing in Germany who, despite their eligibility, opt not to naturalise); and, finally, studies about the naturalisation process itself (Badenhoop (2021) argues that naturalisation constitutes a tool of subject-formation – the 'Super Citizen' – and identifies three type of responses among people undergoing the process in Germany and the UK: embrace, contestation, and disaffection). These are valuable contributions that shed some light on the vast array of people's experiences in the context of immigration and address nagging questions pertaining to the place of the foreigner in host societies; nevertheless, they do not delve into the significance of dual citizenship and its connection to feelings of belonging and self-understandings (admittedly, Badenhoop's research does reveal interesting aspects of the interplay between the naturalisation process itself and perceptions of belonging among immigrants). It is noteworthy, for example, that Hainmueller, Hangartner, and Pietrantuono are specifically concerned with immigrants' social integration, and the scale they use to measure it does not to speak to one's sense of belonging (2017, 257, 266); and that dual citizenship was not tolerated in the case studied by Witte: naturalising would imply the loss of original citizenship for those Turkish immigrants (2014, 23, 2018, 16, 18).

In relation to empirical research around dual citizenship, the focus has been on *non-residence dual citizenship*. Harpaz (2019), for instance, is interested in what he calls the global forces shaping the dynamics of dual citizenship and the corresponding rise of individual instrumentalism within it. In this regard, he assesses the value of national citizenships around the world and identifies a three-tiered hierarchy. This stratification engenders a specific pattern in the demand for long-distance naturalisation: people living in middle-tiered states seek the highly valuable "Western citizenship". The background is a global market in which citizenship is a commodity, or a 'portable good' whose value is unrelated to the specific nation-state that issues the formal membership (Harpaz and Mateos 2019, 850). Harpaz calls this the compensatory citizenship: it is sought after as a 'practical investment' (Harpaz 2015, 2087), primarily related to potential rather than actual benefits, whereby "the value of the second citizenship does not depend on sentimental attachment to the granting country or a wish to call it *home*" (Harpaz 2019, 900 emphasis added). These cases are most predominant among Latin Americans and Eastern Europeans, who obtain citizenship from EU states drawing on their ancestry or ethnic identity[24]. For Harpaz, the sociological implication of the broad tolerance of dual citizenship is

---

[24] Eighteen EU states have facilitated naturalisation rules on such basis (Harpaz 2015, 2082).

the consolidation of a privileged elite in countries 'in the middle of the global distribution', who become owners of a first-class citizenship (Harpaz 2019, 908–9). On the other hand, Pogonyi shows that such form of late acquisition of a second citizenship among non-residents may also be imbued with symbolic and identitarian meanings (Pogonyi 2019, 977). By interviewing people who had recently naturalised as Hungarians, the author found that naturalisation strengthened an already existent ethno-national kin identification as it symbolised, for them, the official 'proof' of their belonging (ibid., 987). In a similar vein but broadening the interpretation scope of the pursuit of dual citizenship, Knott (2019) challenges the traditional dualism between the instrumental and identity dimensions prevailing in the debate. The author is interested in the case of Moldova, where most of the population is entitled to Romanian citizenship by descent, and conduct interviews to examine why people there choose to acquire the kin-state citizenship (or choose not to). She found not only that the strategic and identity dimensions are not mutually exclusive, but also that they do not exhaust people's motivations: dual citizenship is also framed as "a right to be recovered", and the author calls this the legitimate dimension (Knott 2019, 995, 998). Lastly, Leuchter (2014) elucidates yet another meaning that non-residents attach to their second citizenship: as a large proportion of the Jewish population in Israel is entitled to a second (and sometimes third) citizenship, many seek to secure a European passport, disconnected from any emotional attachment to the country that confer the status. However, for them, dual citizenship symbolises the "opportunity *to choose to be an Israeli* through imaginative acts of other life options" (Leuchter 2014, 786 emphasis added). As one interviewee stated: "knowing that I can leave this place, even though I'm never going to, […] it changes everything. […] it allowed me to remember that I belong here and that I want to be here" (ibid., 784–85).

While scholars have elucidated what dual citizenship means for individuals who have acquired it as an 'external citizenship' (Joppke 2019), that is, mainly disconnected from international migration and even the intention to relocate, this does not answer questions related to one of the key sociological developments in contemporary societies, namely increased (and increasing) global mobility. This is where the academic literature on belonging can add to this field of research – by helping to elucidate the meanings that dual citizenship takes on among individuals who have chosen to leave their country of origin. But even within this context, it is important to acknowledge the variety of circumstances surrounding the phenomenon, as people may have acquired dual citizenship before immigration, after, or even along with it; people may live in the country of their second citizenship or still elsewhere (an option exacerbated by the EU citizenship-cum-passport). Very few empirical studies address (dual) citizenship in the

context of immigration, but while scattered, they are important contributions to the field. I refer to them as I turn now to the subject of belonging and after that, in a short section before presenting my own study.

. *Belonging*

In reviewing how the concept of belonging has been employed in the recent academic debate, Lähdesmäki et al. (2016) uncovered a wide range of meanings associated with it within multiple fields of study. Nonetheless, the authors note that studies debating questions of belonging recurrently refer to 'individual theorists' work', most notably to that of N. Yuval-Davis (Lähdesmäki et al. 2016, 240) – "who has so far produced one of the most comprehensive analytical efforts to study the notion of belonging" (Antonsich 2010, 645). Yuval-Davis' (2006) primary argumentation is the analytical differentiation between belonging and the politics of belonging – which she relates to notions of citizenship in its varied dimensions, evoking Marshall's work. For the topic of this study, which is at a particular crossroads of the political and sociological fields, this proves to be particularly relevant: my exploratory study delves into personal perceptions of belonging among individuals who live in a country different than the one where they were born and socialised, and whose decision to do so is closely related to having (acquired) dual citizenship. Nonetheless, Yuval-Davis' (2006) illustration of belonging itself does not provide an adequate outline to make sense of these individuals' accounts, since the author constructs this concept with a view to relating it to struggles and contestations within the realm of the politics of belonging – "despite her intention to discuss both notions, the article clearly leans toward the politics of belonging" (Antonsich 2010, 647). In view of this, Antonsich sets out to develop the personal dimension of belonging as he builds on Yuval-Davis' outline – a welcome contribution to investigate the individual level in the light of increased mobility in contemporary societies. What follows draws on this framework, but not only: it is divided into feeling of belonging, politics of belonging, and self-identification.

Feeling of belonging (place-belongingness)

In short, feeling of belonging means feeling 'at home' (Antonsich 2010, 647; Yuval-Davis 2006, 197). It relates to an emotional, 'or even ontological' attachment to a place, which is both material and affective, and implies one's feeling 'safe' (Yuval-Davis, Wemyss, and Cassidy 2018,

230). Antonsich's emphasises a territorial dimension that applies to this study as well: "Although belonging can be expressed in relation to a variety of social and spatial terms, this article is particularly concerned with forms of territorial belonging as implicated in the mundane, banal claim '*I belong here*'" (Antonsich 2010, 645 emphasis added – this is why the author calls this dimension 'place-belongingness'). Thus, this meaning is in consonance with the previous observation about the crossing of geographical borders and the need to capture belonging in relation to a spatial context. In this respect, such feeling of belonging does not exist in relation to a cosmopolitan ideal – as Hedetoft and Hjort put it, "belonging requires territorial and historical fixity", criteria in which "the globe does not qualify" (2002, xviii). It is interesting to note that citizenship as status is one of the factors that lead to feelings of belonging, as it provides security for its holders to manage 'unease and uncertainty'[25] (Antonsich 2010, 647–48). In this respect, Yuval-Davis (2006) emphasises the centrality of spatial rights before discussing other citizenship entitlements, that is, "the right to enter a state or any other territory of a political community and, once inside, the right to remain there". Here, the thin facet of citizenship is picked up by sociological analyses and given a new quality, for it now underlies the very development of the sense of belonging[26].

A similar notion to feeling of belonging is Simonsen's (2018) 'belonging in'. The author interviewed children of Middle Eastern immigrants who were born and raised in Denmark and found that, while the question of identification as Danish drew hesitancy among them, the majority feel that they belonged in Denmark – a 'self-evident' feeling from always having lived there and been part of that society; it is in Denmark where they feel at home, at ease, and safe (in contrast to their parents, who migrated from another country and have difficulties with the language or have not really grasped 'the norms of Danish society') (Simonsen 2018, 133–34). While some authors relate this with a 'sense of rootedness' (see Antonsich 2010, 646), it should not imply that "origin" is the natural destiny: "research on home and transnational migration raises important questions that destabilize a sense of home as a stable origin and unsettle the fixity and singularity of a place called home" (Blunt and Dowling 2006, 198). Malkki (1992) offers an enlightening analysis of how the link between people and place is conventionally thought of in naturalising terms, especially botanical ones, and how this leads to a powerful sedentary conception of identity (like a "methodological territorialization", so to speak). The author argues that "[t]his sedentarism is not inert. It actively territorializes our identities, whether cultural or

---

[25] This relates to feeling 'safe' in the definition of belonging – a new dimension to M. Ignatieff's original association to refer to a safeguard against violence (see Antonsich 2010, 648).

[26] Also in line with Lenard's (2018) argument about the significance of residential security.

national" and "it also directly enables a vision of territorial displacement as pathological", for which, her empirical research illustrates, alternative conceptualisations are needed (the focus of her work is, however, on refugees) (Malkki 1992, 31).

If "to belong means *to find* a place where an individual can feel 'at home'" (Antonsich 2010, 646 emphasis added), it does not seem implausible to suppose that the increased voluntarily global mobility also opens up opportunities for individuals "to lead a life that is meaningful, a life worth living, which, according to hooks (2009, 1) is what to find a place where we belong is all about" (ibid., 649). Blunt and Dowling point out that "international movements are also processes of establishing home, as senses of belonging and identity move over space and are created in new places" (2006, 2).

Politics of belonging

Yuval-Davis, Wemyss, and Cassidy assert that the politics of belonging "comprise specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging to particular collectivity/ies, which are themselves being assembled in these projects, within specified boundaries" (2018, 230). This dimension goes hand in hand with the feeling of belonging because the "construction of home is linked to views regarding who has a right to share the home", and in this context, citizenship as legal status is the most common political project of belonging (ibid.). Menjívar, for instance, discusses the situation of 'quasi-legal' immigrants in the United States and notes that "temporary legal statuses proliferate around the world and more immigrants find themselves in new legal interstices", which, instead of paving the way for a future citizenship, are set out to remain temporary (2017, 38–39).

As discussed throughout the initial sections, the phenomenon of dual citizenship is as novel as it is controversial because the possession of citizenship implies formal membership, which, as such, refers to a form of belonging to a nation-state. Hence, regardless of how dual citizenship was acquired, two states recognise the individual as rightfully part of their national community and her/his unconditional right to be there. This is by no means a trivial feature. Such belonging that stems from state recognition is tied in with the arsenal of an authoritative institution that 'seeks to monopolise legitimate symbolic force' by means of 'naming, identifying, categorising, and stating what is what and who is who' (Brubaker and Cooper 2000, 15). As an official status, citizenship is absolute and not dependent on the dialectical interplay between self-identification and external identification (ibid.) or on processes of attachment and othering

(Simonsen 2018) that happens in the everyday life. In this sense, dual citizenship disrupts common-sense understandings related to national identity: the authority of the nation-state and the legitimacy of national territorial boundaries do not produce ethnic cohesion and a homogeneous culture[27]. Therefore, even though Skey (2013) emphasises that the ethnic (and rooted) majority draws benefits related to a dominant position in terms of 'national cultural capital' (which then becomes a source of psychological security in the face of 'intensifying global flows', as well as a tool to fight against it), to assert that they are 'positioned as one who belongs *without question*' is not supported by formal membership (2013, 84, 89, 92 original emphasis)[28]; even when national and domestic borders have been crossed by the foreigner/immigrant, such lines of exclusion and 'asymmetric power relations between those included and those outside' (Pfaff-Czarnecka 2011, 200) cannot be sketched in terms of citizenship as legal status.

On the other hand, formal membership may not be enough for one to feel completely accepted: "the role of political institutions is not sufficient, if the rest of the society fails to 'grant' this recognition" (Antonsich 2010, 650)[29]. Against this background, if and how the status arising from state recognition influences the negotiation that takes place on the ground, whether in terms feelings of belonging or self-identification, is an empirical question. To be sure, if it is a resource, one might expect it to be for those whose citizenship status has not always been taken as given or whose belonging is not always accepted in the 'ordinary ebb and flow of social life' (see Badenhoop 2021; Yanasmayan 2015). In this regard, Erdal, Doeland, and Tellander, for instance, examine whether citizenship influences experiences of belonging among residents in Norway who hold different statuses (i.e., not all are formal members) and develop an analytical framework pointing to the intersection between these two, in which citizenship takes a more implicit/explicit role in relation to a more secure/insecure sense of belonging (2018, 709) (it is important to mention, however, that belonging does not have clear-cut definition in their study). The authors find that citizenship is *implicitly* salient to an indeed *secure* sense of belonging for those who were born in Norway to Norwegian-born parents (that is, it was taken for granted), whereas, for individuals with immigrant background, it took on different meanings depending on each context. Notably, "individuals who are not white draw on Norwegian citizenship in order to prove their legitimate national belonging, even when this is questioned

---

[27] As Haller asserts, "[t]he model of the nation state cannot be considered as an outdated, conservative idea. However, we should not equate this concept with an ethnically homogeneous, closed community" (2021, 37).
[28] Skey (2013) does not delve into the ambiguity of the nation(al) nor explore the question (and politics) of belonging.
[29] The ''dirty work' of boundary maintenance' is carried out by actors other than just the state. Not to mention hostile political discourses and what is implied in them, even when they do not have legal basis (see Crowley 2002, 17, 30).

by on-lookers" (ibid., 719–20); such explicit role of citizenship for a secure sense of belonging was prevalent among dual citizens and those who naturalised as adults (ibid., 714), however, some of them took a more resigned stance: a respondent who had been a naturalised Norwegian for ten years reported the importance of formal membership for him as follows: "It means that, legally, the system has accepted you […] if you accept me that's fine, if you don't accept me, then it doesn't matter because the system doesn't discriminate me. […] Then you're not as easily hurt" (ibid., 718).

Self–identification

It is interesting to remember from the first section that one of the dimensions of citizenship is that of 'collective membership' – this is the dimension that speaks closer to notions of belonging/politics of belonging, and where much conflation between the terms happens (identity, citizenship, belonging) (see Antonsich 2010, 644–45). This dimension lacks theorisation especially in the context of dual citizenship[30], and it is normally discussed in terms of national identity (which can take a strict meaning linked to the idea of a "Nation"[31] or a more ambiguous approach that would fall into Brubaker and Cooper's critique that the concept 'tends to mean too much, too little, or nothing at all' (2000, 1)[32]) or based on looser notions of collective belonging, involving issues such as social integration and solidarity (see Bloemraad 2017, 541–43; Bosniak 2000, 479–82).

In this context, there has been growing criticism against treating belonging and identity as synonyms (Lähdesmäki et al. 2016, 241; Pfaff-Czarnecka 2011; for a critical discussion about these two terms, see Anthias 2013, 3–10). In a narrow sense, when it happens, "belonging to a place becomes one and the same as belonging to a group of people" (Antonsich 2010, 649). But

---

[30] This might be linked to the terminological ambiguity and its complications raised previously in the section "dual citizenship, a macro phenomenon". It is noteworthy that on this topic specifically, Benhabib limits herself to the observation that, analytically, citizenship differs from nationality in that the former refers to membership in a political community, whereas the latter entails membership in a particular (linguistic, ethnic, religious or cultural) group (2002, 95–96). Against this background, Conway, Potter, and St Bernard point that "[o]ur lack of understanding of notions such as […] the interlinked trio of 'dual citizenship', 'dual identity formation' and 'dual nationality', is in large part due to a lack of empirical data and suitably focused research" (2008, 378).

[31] Studies around this identitarian feature include that of Pogonyi (2019), mentioned in the previous section: as the author found, the acquisition of the Hungarian citizenship represented 'a badge of identity' among 'ethnic kin' individuals living elsewhere, thereby reconnecting them to the Hungarian nation and reinforcing its ethno-cultural significance (ibid., 986, 988, 990). In an earlier article, Pogonyi also argued that the practice of offering external citizenship to non-resident diasporas "serves the maintenance of national identification and so could be interpreted as the re-ethnicization of citizenship practices" (2011, 693).

[32] Haller, for instance, outlines five basic assumptions related to identity theory to discuss multiple nationalities in a globalised world (2021, 34–35).

in addition to that, Brubaker and Cooper (2000) criticise the very use of 'identity' within academic research. The authors argue that, for instance, the literature on nationalism occasionally blurs the line between category of analysis and category of practice, understanding identity as a 'collective phenomenon' that implies 'sameness' or as a core aspect/condition that 'is invoked to point to something allegedly *deep, basic, abiding, or foundational*' (ibid., 7 original emphasis)[33]. Nonetheless, given that nationality is more than sporadically regarded as an identity label associated with a certain collectivity (category of practice), whose boundaries are not conceived as easily traversable (if not only for questions of identity itself, then also based on the long prevailing discourse against dual citizenship), it is certainly interesting to investigate empirically what it means to individuals to be assigned this official categorisation: does it affect their self-understandings? (see Brubaker and Cooper 2000, 27). One should expect that not all dual citizens will resemble those Pogonyi (2019) interviewed, for whom dual citizenship intensified a prior identification as Hungarians.

As mentioned previously, Simonsen (2018) examines the question of national belonging among children of Middle Eastern immigrants in Denmark, and proposes analysing it as a two-dimensional notion consisting of *belonging in* and *belonging with*. The author has aptly demonstrated that it is possible for one to 'belong in' without unambiguously identifying as 'Danish' or feeling truly accepted by the ethnic majority as part of the national community – that is, without 'belonging with'. In this way, "boundary perceptions affect only the idea of (not) being part of the Danish national community, whereas the idea of home is unaffected" (Simonsen 2018, 134). While this crucially illuminates the comprehension within social sciences about how individuals experience belonging in the light of international migration (in this case, undertaken by their parents), I fear the construction *belonging with* might indicate a conflation between belonging and identity (between category of practice and of analysis?)[34] In my study, admittedly, there is a fundamental difference in that the people I interviewed have immigrated themselves and did so in adulthood; therefore, what is in the spotlight is a shift that does not happen in Simonsen's case (her interviewees even express the desire to remain in their home, Denmark). Therefore, I opt to investigate this dimension through the notion of self-

---

[33] In a similar vein, Pfaff-Czarnecka calls it 'methodological ethnicisation' (2011, 203).

[34] Alternatively, see Vera-Larrucea (2012). The author found that among second-generation Turks in France and Sweden, the majority of respondents did not believe that one should feel French or Swedish to be part of the society ('belonging and identification did not appear to go together') (Vera-Larrucea 2012, 182). Moreover, her framework accommodates multiple self-identification, and most of the interviewees self-identified as both Swedish/French and Turkish (ibid., 181) (symbolic boundaries were not specifically discussed, but participants "were aware of their foreignness in the eyes of both Turks and Europeans", and regarded this difference as something positive – like a cultural asset) (ibid., 184). (One caveat is necessary: even though the author focuses on dual citizenship, this is not understood as formal status proper and not all participants were dual citizens).

identification, which is one alternative analytical term introduced by Brubaker and Cooper to 'do the theoretical work' of identity: "[a]s a processual, active term, derived from a verb, 'identification' lacks the reifying connotations of 'identity'" (Brubaker and Cooper 2000, 14). Self-identification happens in a dialectical interplay with external identification, and the two may converge or not. Importantly, as a process, it is also situational and contextual – and this understanding allows us to go beyond 'dichotomous characterisations' contained in the concept of identity (see Pfaff-Czarnecka 2011, 203).

. The triad citizenship–immigration–belonging

Empirical investigations have been mentioned throughout the theoretical background as they corresponded more directly to the topic being discussed; none, however, focused specifically on dual citizenship and belonging among international immigrants (Erdal, Doeland, and Tellander (2018) reported on this issue, but only as part of a broader, comparative analytical framework). Here are described three studies that to some extent address the triad dual citizenship-immigration-belonging (feelings of belonging as described in the previous section are not considered in them, though).

Ronkainen (2011) investigates the meaning that dual citizenship takes on among residents in Finland and identifies four 'ideal-types', which are largely related to different migration backgrounds and point to diverse patterns of national attachment. Together, they highlight the 'importance of studying multiple citizenship as a multifaceted practice' (Ronkainen 2011, 261). *Resident-mononationals*, having always or mostly lived in Finland, consider Finnish citizenship the only important one; *expatriate-mononationals*, who normally migrated to Finland as adults, value the Finnish citizenship for the political-juridical rights it confers, but ascribe emotional meaning to the other citizenship they hold; for *hyphenationals*, commonly born into mixed families and cultures, "the traditional content of national citizenship does not change, but rather doubles: they are national citizens of two societies, with somewhat equal emotional and practical meaning" (ibid., 256); and lastly, *shadow-nationals* do not display any specific national identification, but a more cosmopolitan stance.

Here, however, it is necessary to refer to Yanasmayan's (2015) research, *Citizenship on paper or at heart?*, in which the author makes a perceptive observation about Ronkainen's study

(and a couple of others based on interviews with returnees holding dual citizenship[35]): in them, attachment to citizenship as a status itself and national identification are not systematically 'conceptually disentangled' (Yanasmayan 2015, 787). Against this background, Yanasmayan sets out to study how state policies influence individuals' decision-making about naturalising and their narratives on (dual) citizenship. By interviewing highly-educated Turkish immigrants living in countries in Europe with different dual citizenship regimes, the author finds that, when dual citizenship is accepted (like in the United Kingdom), individuals "do not feel the need to re-negotiate the terms of their emotional citizenship attachment, upholding therefore often a thick sense of citizenship" (ibid., 786) – which can be even expanded so to encompass the newly acquired one. On the other hand, when dual citizenship is prohibited (as in the Netherlands), individuals develop a 'thin sense' of the status for having to renounce their Turkish citizenship prior to naturalisation, and it ceases to symbolise emotional belonging altogether – as a result, people assume a rather pragmatic stance of their relationship with the host state. This study, therefore, goes beyond the notion that the tolerance of dual citizenship increases immigrants' disposition to naturalise, and reveals a more nuanced explanation of this phenomenon. Even though Yanasmayan limits herself to examining personal narratives about formal membership, her research indicates that 'positive sentiments' toward it "can be the foundation on which people can build an active engagement or identification with the national community" (ibid., 789). As one interviewee living in the UK and holding dual citizenship summed up: "Here is how I think: Turkey is my homeland and here is my second family. I am very proud to be Turkish […] But I would never say I am not British […] So UK is my second homeland" (ibid., 795).

Finally, Blanchard (2020) offers a comprehensive study about dual citizenship[36] and belonging among Argentines and Chileans of Italian descent settled in Trentino, a region of Italy marked by mass emigration in the past centuries. Particularly in this region, there has been an official rhetoric for the 'return of Italians' (as well as a permissive legal framework for that) and such 'backward movement' has been common since the 1990s, especially among Latin Americans. Against this background, individuals are not only 'returning' to Italy (from Latin America), but also becoming EU resident citizens for the first time (Blanchard 2020, 545–46).

---

[35] i.e., Conway, Potter, and St Bernard (2008) (mentioned in footnote 22) and Skulte-Ouaiss (2013), who examines the view that upper-class Lebanese returnee immigrants, who had lived for a considerable time in Europe, have of their European citizenship.

[36] Blanchard's article is written in French and the author uses the term nationality (nationalité) to refer to the link between an individual and the nation-state, whereas citizenship (citoyenneté) is reserved to address the participation of the individual in a supranational institutional (in her article, specifically the European Union) (Blanchard 2020, 556 endnote 1). I do not follow this distinction in reporting the author's findings.

By studying the lived experience of these individuals and the meaning they ascribe to each citizenship, Blanchard finds that their sense of belonging is felt above all towards their country of birth – that is, Argentina and Chile – and it is to this citizenship that they feel emotionally attached (ibid., 552, 554). They also perceive belonging in relation to the culture of their Italian ancestors (and to a romantic idea of the region from where they came); however, Italian citizenship itself is devoid of any emotional connection. Moreover, when settling in Trentino, these Argentinian and Chilean citizens are confronted with symbolic boundaries and labelled as the 'other' in their local interactions. Therefore, Italian citizenship is valued only as a step to ultimately enjoy membership within the EU, which, for them, represents only a legal community of rights within a structure of opportunities and mobility (ibid., 554–55).

As the theoretical apparatus and empirical research in the field of dual citizenship did not offer substantial clues to explore the meanings it might have in the context of international migration, the discussion on belonging has enriched the framework that underlies my empirical study, designed to investigate how a group of Brazilians residing in Europe make sense of their status as dual citizens. In what follows, I introduce the study, then report the methods and data, the findings, and close the thesis with the discussion/conclusion.

A short study

The present exploratory study sets out to analyse the meanings of dual citizenship among a group of Brazilian immigrants living in Europe. Although it touches upon their emotional attachment to the status itself (see the articles presented in the previous section), I am not as interested in these personal conceptions as I am in their feelings of belonging and self-identification connected to holding dual citizenship. The aim is to advance a little the empirical debate surrounding the micro level of the 'post-exclusive turn', particularly in connection to international immigration. Thus, this investigation brings together a formal status much debated within the political literature with its sociological implications in a landscape marked by increasing global mobility and movement – not of goods and technologies, but people.

In the case considered in this thesis, and in line with the growing acceptance of the status, it is taken for granted that the second citizenship comes in addition to, not at the expense of an original one. When dual citizenship is instrumentally sought and "used" in the context of immigration, it is more than simply having formal membership in the host state (or enjoying practically its full spectrum, by virtue of a European passport). From the individual point of view, it embodies a whole that is not only the sum of two of the same something (as mentioned, not sarcastically, earlier in the paper). Therefore, although the focus of the study is the second citizenship itself as the people that I interviewed emigrated from their "homeland", the term dual citizenship is generally employed along with second or late-acquired citizenship.

Lastly, my study is limited in scope and does not aim at comprehensive findings but intends to be open to nuances that the literature on dual citizenship has not explored yet. The guiding principle is to ask people about their experiences, reason why qualitative interviewing was the most appropriate method. According to Lamont and Swidler, one of its strengths is that "it can combine depth of understanding with purposeful, systematic, analytic research design to answer theoretically motivated questions", as well as "reveal emotional dimensions of social experience" (2014, 159).

Methods and data

7 semi-structured, in-depth interviews were conducted around October–November 2021. There was an effort to achieve a gender-balanced sample, and it was composed of 4 male and 3 female participants. All of them I knew from before – thus, the recruitment of participants was

based on convenience sampling. About that, there are two important notes. First, as "respondents tend to underreport dual citizenship because they are wary, ashamed or unsure of their status" (Harpaz 2015; see also Bloemraad 2004 on self-reported status), having a friendly relationship with the interviewees proved to be an advantage in overcoming these status-related reservations. On the other hand, I had not had contact with most of them for years, and about their current lives, I did not know much more than the country where they live. (In this sense, the interviews were also a nice moment to reconnect.) The conversations were held via Zoom and lasted about one hour; they were all recorded and later transcribed[37].

Everyone in the sample was born and raised in Brazil (and so was I). Reflecting the diversity of the phenomenon, the sample is not homogenous on the channel that led to the acquisition of dual citizenship; in line with the discussion about ancestry-based naturalisation among Latin Americans, this was how most became dual citizens: five participants on the basis of descent and one via naturalisation for residence time. All of them received the status in their adulthood except one, who was a dual citizen at birth – with surprise, I learned that the mother of one interviewee emigrated from Portugal to Brazil, and thus she "was born" Brazilian-Portuguese. Importantly for my study, they are dual citizens from a EU member state living in Europe, and I do not seek definite answers in how specifically they were entitled to their second citizenship. Nowadays, each of them lives in a different country: Czech Republic, England, France, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden; two of them do not reside in the country where they are nationals – the respondent living in Czech Republic has Italian citizenship and the one living in England has the Bulgarian citizenship (he moved from Brazil to England just before Brexit). Their ages ranged from 30 to 34 at the time of the interview, they had at least a bachelor's degree and were employed in high-skilled jobs. Moreover, they had previous experiences residing abroad, albeit some on short-term stays. Six of them lived with partners (of different nationalities, non-Brazilians), and none had children. Table 1 below reports on each participant's gender and age, as well as information about their second citizenship – how, when, from which country it was acquired – and immigration – to which country and in which year.

The interview guide included questions such as where they felt at home, what changed when they acquired their second citizenship, and how they self-identified. It also included a

---

[37] In some interviews, we faced problems with the connection a few times, which momentarily hindered the flow of the conversation. Although I cannot think of any other interviewing medium for this research, and found video calls useful in helping to stay focused while also allowing for the observation of emotional reactions, I regretted not having face-to-face conversations – not being at ease with video calls was not something I could overcome, and I am aware it did not work to the study's advantage (see J. Western in *A Passage to London* on his decision not to tape record the interviews he conducted (Western 1992, xvii)).

hypothetical scenario: had they had to give up the Brazilian citizenship to acquire the second one, would they apply to it anyway? The interview would formally begin with me asking them to give a brief account of their biography; at the end, I would ask if there was anything they still wanted to mention or anything they felt demanded further explanation. One question that was not initially formulated, but which yielded interesting accounts when it emerged, concerned situations in which the participant felt like a foreigner. The transcripts were inductively analysed through several rounds of coding using the software NVivo. First, I established some codes based on the literature – such as the instrumental meaning largely associated with external citizenship and degrees of self-identification following Simonsen (2018) (which she calls 'degrees of belonging': identification, ambivalence, nonidentification, disidentification) – and applied them as they appeared in the transcripts. Along with this, I used the method descriptive coding/sub-coding (see Saldaña 2009) and after organised them into a more analytical structure (see the Appendix for the list of codes). The interviews were conducted in Portuguese, and I translated the excerpts used in the thesis into English myself.

Regarding the question of the insider/outsider position in social research (Young 2004): I was also a Brazilian living abroad and, while I wanted to take advantage of 'a shared sense of comfort and ease in interacting' (see ibid., 198), I did not want to run the risk of having things unsaid on the premise that "I would know how things are" (not least because I probably did not); thus, I had previously reflected on the possible need to ask them to 'explain more fully or further elucidate their views' (see ibid., 196–97). While it was clear to us from the beginning that I was interested in their stories and accounts, I also wondered whether any of them would return me with a question and 'assume the role of the investigator' (see De Andrade 2000, 285) – this happened once, as one participant unexpectedly asked me, "How do you see it?". This leads me to the next point. While conducting the interviews, it was striking how the conversation was a moment of self-reflection and negotiation for most of them, sometimes accompanied by ambivalences. Emblematically, in response to a question about when he identified himself as Brazilian, one interviewee felt he was about to contradict an earlier report he had shared with me: "Wow, all the time, actually. Thinking about it, with this question…"

Lastly, even if I wished to be the miner-interviewer, 'seeking for nuggets of essential meaning', soon it became clear that I was the traveller instead, 'wandering together with' the respondents (see Kvale 1996, 3–5). The interviews provided varied and interesting – if initial – insights into how the dual citizenship status interacts with notions of belonging as well as self-identification among Brazilian immigrants living in Europe. I turn now to the findings.

Table 1. List of participants

	Gender	Age	Acquisition*	Dual citizenship (year)	Residence (year ↓)
Magali	F	33	R	France (2013)	France (2009)
Nimbus	M	30	A	Italy (2013) + Sweden (2019)	Sweden (2013)
Denise	F	34	A	Italy (2017)	Italy (2017)
Horacio	M	32	A	Italy (2018)	Czech Republic (2018)
Eduardo	M	31	A	Spain (2020)	Spain (2018)
Francisco	M	33	A	Bulgaria (2017)	England (2020)
Marina	F	33	B	Portugal	Portugal (2020)

* Second citizenship acquisition mode:
A = ancestry-based (re)acquisition, B = dual citizen at birth, R = naturalisation for residence time.

Findings

During the data analysis, the processual character of self-identification became evident in multiple cases, occasionally taking on an ambivalent form. As I finished coding the transcripts with the different degrees of self-identification (identification, ambivalence, nonidentification, disidentification), I was left with multiple references across most of the transcripts: these degrees were not mutually exclusive. However, three "types" have emerged in terms of feeling of belonging, which I call: found home, home in progress, and pragmatic home. They were not only about the answer to the question 'where do you feel at home?' but also remarkably connected with responses about the hypothetical scenario of surrendering the Brazilian citizenship, the participants' future plans, and the negotiation contained in the process of self-identification. However, within each type, particular meanings of dual citizenship were varied, anchored in personal experiences and narratives. While this categorisation is constitutive of my sample and the interviews we had, it does not represent a complete picture of the experience of dual citizens living in Europe – it is merely tentative in the light of the heterogeneity of the group. Nonetheless, I believe this is one step forward in making sense of dual citizenship from the individual perspective in times of increasing global mobility (this is further discussed in the last section, *Discussion and conclusion*). As the instrumental character of dual citizenship was recurrent in the interviews and is prominent in the literature, this is briefly presented in the next subsection.

The instrumental character of dual citizenship

Dual citizenship assumes different meanings and prompts different "uses", both in relation to feelings of belonging and self-identification. Nonetheless, technically speaking, the instrumental dimension is always present. What is noticeable is how its practical value is also connected to a sense of privilege – not as social differentiation among Brazilian co-nationals (or 'a means of distinction to elevate their status' (see Pogonyi 2019, 988)), but as an opportunity of which they would otherwise be deprived (for reasons that are not resolved).

Nimbus[38] offers the most emblematic example. About to finish his undergraduate studies in Brazil, he was granted admission to a master's programme at a Swedish university, but not the scholarship – as non-European, it meant that he would have to pay the full tuition fee if he accepted the offer, which was unfeasible. However, his family had applied for Italian citizenship when he was a teenager and had not heard of the process in years, so he decided to get in contact with the consulate. Nimbus described receiving the answer: "Yes, it has arrived. Congratulations, you are an Italian citizen" ("Hurrah! Oh gosh, now what?"). Once he checked with the university that it was okay that he was 'approved as a Brazilian, but now was an Italian as well' (they said, "then you do not have to pay anything"), Nimbus rushed to get the paperwork in order; he received his Italian passport on a Friday and travelled to Sweden the following Tuesday. In the middle of the report, he mentioned an odd feeling related to a piece of paper:

> – And what is bizarre about this bizarre feeling you referred to?
> – Ah, that's it. You are actually the same person. I had already been here as a Brazilian, and had to get a visa, and renew the visa because it was wrong… And you are afraid of crossing borders […] But then […] you show that paper and nobody asks you anything ever again, you just go. It's like you become another person. […] It is bizarre how a piece of paper changes everything, even though you are exactly the same person. Crazy.

Although less explicitly, Horacio's clear instrumental motivation in acquiring dual citizenship is intertwined with this notion of place-privilege. He had a good job in Sao Paulo but was willing to live abroad. When he learned he could apply for Italian citizenship, he went to Italy to undertake the naturalisation process there – he said the objective was 'to have the doors opened'.

> – What are these doors you mention?

---

[38] Pseudonyms are used.

    – It's about opportunities […] I could live wherever I wanted, work wherever I wanted, and nobody would need to ask me: '*Can you* do that?'. 'I can because I am a European citizen'

Francisco's grandfather emigrated to Brazil from Bulgaria, and his story is very present in the family (during the interview, Francisco showed me a book they have written about his grandfather's journey). However, while he was mentioning that they went after the Bulgarian citizenship to reconnect with this part of his family's history, Francisco spontaneously added that he knew he "needed a European passport to live in the EU without having to resort to a visa". But noticeably, his account implied that his professional accomplishments would not necessarily be enough to immigrate if he so desired: "[then with citizenship,] based on my professional success and skills, I could come".

    In addition to the stories of those who acquired a second citizenship later in life, it is interesting to see the notion of instrumentality-privilege in Marina's account. Marina is the Brazilian-Portuguese by birth (but not by identification):

    – I always think about how difficult it would have been [without dual citizenship] – and if perhaps I wouldn't have given up [on immigrating] because of that. Because bureaucracy is very, very heavy. I can see that from Timoteo [her partner] […] And I'm kind of neurotic about these things. […] I feel genuinely grateful that I don't have to worry about it.

The instrumental dimension of dual citizenship is observed primarily in the participants' intention to move to Europe; whatever reasons each may have had, it meant having more options, or more doors opened (an expression raised in different accounts). How does dual citizenship interact with their sense of belonging and self-understanding especially now that they have immigrated? The following sub-sections elaborate on this question across the three categories: found home, home in progress, and pragmatic home.

Found home

For this group, the hypothetical scenario of renouncing their Brazilian citizenship to get the other one does not generate any hesitation at first, because, for them, it is a simple matter of being able to stay where they are: this is where they want to be, and where they intend to remain. "Yes", "I think so", "I would". *There*, they feel at home; *there,* they have built their own 'corner of the world', found dear jobs and relationships, and feel at ease with the surroundings. Eduardo, for instance, is struggling with the possibility to move to Germany, where his company's headquarters are, for knowing he would get there "thinking about coming back" (to Spain) – "which is clearly the mindset of someone who wants to stay where s/he is".

And against this background, dual citizenship was the instrument that enabled the feeling of belonging among these individuals, for it afforded them the security necessary to establish themselves and develop meaningful connections. Forcefully, on how he felt about his dual citizenship, Nimbus said:

> – They can't send me away, that's true, they can't send me away. So this changes […] how you feel about your right to be there or not. And to be doing what you're doing or not doing.

Regardless of one's personal thick/thin conception of the status, dual citizenship appears as a resource in which they can claim a place, as well as ground their self-identification. Notably, the participants in this group hold formal membership in the society they are part of now and they are the most open to identifying with the national collectivity. However, far from being straight-forward, this is a negotiation surrounded by symbolic boundaries and boundaries *from within* (for instance, feeling out of place for not sharing the same childhood/adolescent references when this subject comes up among a group of friends or regretting not mastering the language as natives); it is a continuous product of the dialectical interaction between self- and external identification and evolving notions of self-understanding.

Interestingly, when I first talked to Nimbus about his Italian citizenship, he ended up noting that he felt more Swedish than Italian. But when he started explaining it to me, it suddenly seemed easier for him to think about the limits of this identification and to point out the similarities of the Latin cultures. Nonetheless, Nimbus has a strong connection with Sweden (where do you feel at home? "here, more than anywhere else") and after living the required period for naturalising there, he applied for the Swedish citizenship as well ("imagined if Italy… there were once some talks about Italy leaving the EU… and Brexit happening, argh"):

> – They would ask me at the Migration Bureau, 'but *why* are you applying for this?' I said, 'hey, I don't know what's going to happen in the future, and I want to stay here'

Now, 'nobody gets him out of there'. However, Nimbus feels he belongs about "70 per cent":

> – There's still a part of me that is not from here, and people… and I don't think I'll ever feel 100 per cent, and people will never see me as someone from here […] Many people say he is Swedish-Swedish, he became Swedish, or is not Swedish but is Swedish. So, I feel I belong, because I created my life here, and I have my job, and my routine, my neighbourhood, friends, etc. We are the ones who have created this belonging. […] but there is a differentiation between those who were born here and those who were not.

Even though he seeks to distance himself from the status and dismisses it as a "bureaucratic privilege" (he did not attend the naturalisation ceremony, "too nationalist for me"), his citizenship also emerged in our conversation as a *symbolic resource*. When he recently shared with a (native) person very close to him that he found it interesting that 'depending on the

group, he is a different person' (that is, among his immigrant friends, he is a reference as Swedish; and at work, he is the foreigner who speaks the language fluently), this person pointed out that he is not strictly one of them: "Well, on paper it says that I am... then I don't know, you check it with the Migration Bureau". It seemed that he was hurt by such a remark and did not really say that to the person (I was careful in inquiring about this situation, as I sensed it was a delicate matter for him). But importantly, formal membership is a tool that allows him to see himself as any "Swedish-Swedish", despite the "subtle differences" of the everyday life, and potentially more blatant encounters like the one reported here.

Eduardo, on the other hand, has an open emotional attachment to the status – which is why he later added that it would be "horrible" to renounce the Brazilian citizenship –, and values his dual citizenship for both enabling his feeling of belonging in Spain and embodying his self-identification as Spanish. When I asked him what changed when he acquired the dual citizenship, he went on:

> – It's really funny because I felt a sense of belonging […] I think the first feeling is one of tranquillity… joy and tranquillity. […] And [also,] I would look at the street and think, 'oh, do you see that police station? It is mine' (laughs). It changed my conversations, too, […] because now I strive to include myself as a Spaniard. And it's hard […] [but] now I'm Spanish, you know? It's my tax, it's my country. And it's hard because it's been almost twenty-eight years of being Brazilian […] But I make an effort because I think I can contribute

With dual citizenship, besides feeling entitled to the place, Eduardo also mentioned that it is important for him 'to let people know that he thinks he is from there', that he feels like a local. He faced circumstances that made him realise that such identification is not so straight-forward, yet he sees this as a process, one that he actively pursues and that comes naturally over time – as a process, it is similar to Nimbus' account of how he had created his belonging in Sweden. Eduardo shared with me a particular example: he mentioned to colleagues that his mother is Spanish (she is the granddaughter of Spaniards and has Spanish citizenship), but he could not justify her Spanishness when asked further about it:

> – So I think that this situation kind of taught me that I am Brazilian with Spanish nationality. And I… I wouldn't like it to be like that. I'd like to be both. […] I think it's more a question of me wanting it, wanting to be, than what I am, for now. And I think that this will become true over time, you know? For example, today I'm already much more Spanish than I was a year ago. And it's not because it's [only] a goal, it's something that happens naturally.

We had had a long conversation about his foreignness – his own sense of it (which bothers him as it is related to having less 'national cultural capital' (Skey 2013), such as not being as assertive in Spanish as he wished), as well as the one possibly pointed by others in everyday encounters (like a security guard following him in the supermarket: "it doesn't bother me in any serious

way, I don't know, there comes a time when some things no longer bother you") – when I asked him:

> – What about if you had to give up your Brazilian citizenship, would you have done the process anyway?
> – Yes.
> – Why?
> – Because I found myself in this place

I do not believe that such 'ontological attachment to a place', as expressed in this sentence, can be easily defined. But it was in Spain that "things started to work out pretty well" for Eduardo, both professionally ("a great job at a great company") and personally ("a mature relationship").

Denise has a very similar narrative about 'finding herself'. She would simply opt for the Italian citizenship 'if that was the price she would have to pay'; she feels fulfilled in her work, has a healthy relationship, lives by her principles ("all these things I managed to achieve here in Italy. I didn't achieve any of this in Brazil"). In her case, however, self-identification was a process that started even before acquiring dual citizenship: "I started to research my family history and began to feel more and more Italian". To be sure, the process of becoming Italian is also informed by progressively grasping elements of the Italian culture – at the beginning it was challenging, and she could not 'get herself respected' for not speaking Italian well:

> – Would you say that the language was the main element that made you feel more Italian over time?
> – I think so. I think so. Because then... by understanding the language, we can understand the intricacies, let's say... the way they think. I think this change things a lot

Reflecting on the moments in which she feels like a foreigner, she says that "it's normal not to feel one hundred per cent of one thing or another", as she grew up in Brazil. "But anyway, it's very… very weird to think about it, because… well, I'm Brazilian, but I'm also Italian".

Home in progress

Here, the question 'where do you feel at home?' yields uncertainty. Francisco looked both ways before he told me: "Ah, that's a good question, it's difficult…". And Horacio: "phew… this… this is a question, right?". In the end, both replied that they feel at home where they live now (city/country), because this is where they have their homes (dwelling). Although it does not resemble the forceful *I belong here*, or *I found myself here*, this feeling of belonging stems from a familiarity with the place (and satisfaction with their current jobs) that reflects a common

understanding in the literature around a homely, secure space to return to when one is away (Hannerz 2002, 218; Skey 2011): "So when I travel, you know that thing of coming back home, in that… in that cave of yours? For me, this is Prague". Nonetheless, both consider moving to other countries in the medium or long term – Francisco sees himself moving "to the continent" (Germany, for instance), and Horacio has Spain in mind (in the future, he wants to live 'in a place where he feels more identified with').

Would they give their Brazilian citizenship up? One the one hand, their feeling of belonging is not as resolute as that among individuals in the previous category, on the other hand, they do not see themselves returning to Brazil. The answer is ambiguous. It is here that citizenship becomes most salient regarding its property of entitlement to a place within the context of international immigration[39]. To be sure, not because this property is more important to people in this group – it is the very foundation of the reasoning of those who have found home in choosing to renounce their Brazilian citizenship, if necessary –, but because this is where participants reflect most on it when negotiating the response to the hypothetical scenario. The following is Horacio's answer:

> – Um… This is… I don't know, I don't know… If I had… I don't know. […] I think I would do it […] but I'm not sure […] Because it would be either this or having to go through the whole visa process and the difficulties that come with it, the loss of rights. And that would be difficult, it would be difficult.
> – What rights can you think of?
> – The basic right to be able to stay here without having to answer to anyone. […] [otherwise] every change of job must be well-thought-out, you must check with the company if they would give you the support, if they would give you that letter [confirming they sponsor you]. You can't just stay here […] So this is a loss of freedom, I think. […] because you need to be tied to something. It's not just because you are you that you can stay here, you know? I think this is subtle, but I think it's deep in a certain way. […] So, you always depend on someone saying you can, so that you can stay here, so you can live your life. That's heavy, isn't it?

Notably, this quality valued in their dual citizenship is ultimately tied to a passport of the European Union, as neither Horacio nor Francisco lives in the country from which they hold their second citizenship – and this fact also unlocks new forms of interpreting the status in terms of self-identification. These forms are less complicated to the extent that they do not have to be negotiated in the dialectical interaction of everyday life: self-identification is not confronted with symbolic boundaries nor frustratingly put to the test by one's perceived boundaries (boundaries from within), as observed with the participants of the previous category. But I would not go so far as to say that they are always less complex. Sharing his biography with me at the beginning

---

[39] Yuval-Davis (2006)'s spatial rights, or the right to a place regardless of how one's positioned within it, as symbolised by Lenard's (2018) residential security.

of the interview, Francisco mentioned that he undertook an intercultural programme in Germany when he was younger ("back then, I didn't have dual citizenship yet, officially, *although I was*") and later he and his family started the process to apply for the Bulgarian citizenship ("because my grandfather was Bulgarian – *we are Bulgarians*"). I told him that this caught my attention and asked if he already saw himself as a Bulgarian before receiving his dual citizenship:

> – Um, I mean… In the sense that… It was my grandfather, right? He was there, he had a foreigner's accent, he would tell us stories about how he had to flee […] so there was this connection, and we also have family there […] And the process [of naturalisation] was quite long […] And when we went to Bulgaria to undertake the process, you had to say that you were Bulgarian […] So… I don't know, I, I'm Brazilian, but I think that I force myself to say that I'm also Bulgarian – because I am, it's not just a document that open doors, there is a culture behind […] of course, not the present culture […] But I know my grandfather's story, so I think I connect more through this, you know? [his face expression suggested that he was pondering over this last sentence].
>
> – Yeah… Let's say, your grandfather's story is this bridge with Bulgaria for you. And that's how you identify yourself as a Bulgarian. [I felt a little guilty about confronting his identification and tried to help settle the matter]
>
> – Yes. As a Bulgarian, and so being, I identify myself very much as a citizen of the European Union

Francisco then told me that besides feeling connected to the ideal of the EU, being in England during Brexit as part of a community that became excluded reinforced his self-perception as a European. Interestingly, my conversation with Horacio converged on a similar point. He does not identify himself as an Italian – his thick conception of citizenship does not allow him to claim Italianness, since he does not speak the language well and does not have other cultural links –, however,

> – […] living here [in Prague] for a little over three years, I see myself more… and having citizenship… I see myself as Brazilian and partially European. I don't see myself as Italian. I see myself as a Brazilian with European citizenship and European.

I asked him what that identification, as a European but not an Italian, was like. Horacio told me that for him, more than a specific cultural attachment, it is about alignment with the ideals and priorities of a society ("for example, I'd never live in the United States") and choosing to be/being in Europe today.

But "home in progress" does not encompass only individuals who live in one place and plan to relocate in the future. It can also be about seeking the feeling of belonging where one chooses to be. And against this background, it does not mean that citizenship cannot be activated as a symbolic resource inherent to the politics of belonging. Marina has always had dual citizenship, and her relationship with the status is indeed different, but specifically, she refuses

to identify herself as Portuguese (which, when she was younger, created conflicts with her mother): "This citizenship was given to me in a very special circumstance. I am grateful because I think it opened several doors for me, but this is not how I identify myself". Nonetheless, Marina left Brazil in a state of burn-out, relocated to the Netherlands, and more recently moved to Portugal, where she plans to stay. In this complex situation that involves an official status granted at birth versus her self-identification ("Brazilian, one hundred per cent"), her desire to make Portugal her home, and the inferior place of Brazilians in the Portuguese society (see Lesser 2013, 106), Marina also uses her status as a material and symbolic resource in a situation that makes her uncomfortable:

> – We went to buy a car, but the guy wouldn't even look at my face […] And several times I said, 'look, I'm Portuguese, I have Portuguese documents'. When we were about to close the deal, he asked, 'can you explain to me what's your situation here?' I said, 'I'm a Portuguese citizen'. He said, 'but citizen-citizen?' I replied, 'what's the other category? *Half-citizen?* (laughs)

Pragmatic home

In pragmatic home, dual citizenship is a paper that allows one to stay where they are. Its underlying characteristic is again the right of place, but no attachment follows, and it is not used as a resource beyond what it strictly is – a permission. This category was informed by only one interview:

Magali became a dual citizen through naturalisation by residence time (although Nimbus went through this process, it was his third citizenship). Unlike the other respondents, she categorically dismisses any emotional attachment to the status *and* any kind of national or supranational identification (be it as a Brazilian or French). In a way, Magali could be grouped among Ronkainen's *shadow-nationals*, except for the fact that she is not the 'suitcase-type of living in several countries' nor engaged in a transnational life (2011, 257). Thus, she is not exactly a cosmopolitan, and her idea of home is a pragmatic one. Magali moved from Brazil to France to finish her graduate studies many years ago, and she explained to me how natural it was to stay in France as opportunities came (PhD, work); "and then the way back becomes a bit difficult". When I asked how she identified herself, if there was any scale encompassing her being Brazilian or French, the following ensued:

> – No. Citizen of the world. Neither one nor the other. No, there isn't this… this… this sense of belonging to one place or another. No. Neither there, nor here, nor… No.

– And what is... how do you define this belonging? What is it?

– … It's… Maybe closer to a sense of nationalism. Some people are very attached to the values of the country and things like that… and no, I don't… I lost that somewhere or never had it.

I was set aback, and I tried again:

– What if someone asks who you are?

– Ah, nobody asks deep things like that (laughs). When someone asks where I come from, it's because they hear the accent and want to know. Then I say that I'm Brazilian, then they say, 'ah, how about your name?', then I say, 'it's Russian, but I don't speak Russian'. It's a whole sequence (laughs)

– And how does it get to the point 'I'm French' as well?

– It's a paper that allows me to stay here. It's not much more than that. Otherwise, culturally, we adapt. I like to eat bread, the bread here is good, things like that. But no, it's a paper.

I figured we should talk about this paper then…

– So this paper allows you to stay, it recognises that you have the right to be there. What does it change in your life… in your interactions, daily life?

– It's administrative, purely administrative. […] I don't have to go to the Bureau and to worry that when the thing expires, I have to be around, and go to that place, and queue up, and find out how it's going to work, whether they are going to accept me one more time or send me away, and all that indecision. A passport is what gives you the *security to stay* and less administrative work.

In this account, citizenship appears as a bureaucratic circumstance within which life choices are circumscribed, and as right to the place. Does it underpin the development of feeling of belonging as well? Later we talked about where Magali feels at home:

– We adapt. Even around here, if I have to move to another city, it's the same thing as going back to Brazil…

Later she said that adapting is about understanding how things work, grasping the intricacies of daily life. However, she also mentioned that staying in France is influenced by it being aligned with her values (but if this changes, like an ultraconservative government in power, nothing stops her from moving away). Nonetheless, the pragmatic narrative reaches its climax in the hypothetical scenario: "Would you renounce your Brazilian citizenship for the French one?"

– No, no… No, because then all my family, everyone I know is in Brazil. […] I couldn't go back. I would come back as a tourist, but if something happened there… No. *But then I wouldn't stay here either.*

It is the politics of belonging in its raw form.

Lastly, it is interesting to note that Magali is fairly adapted in France (like those who found home, she feels out of place 'when her colleagues sing French summer songs from the

1980s') and participates in the civic life, as she believes it is important to vote for politicians and proposals aligned to her principles[40].

Discussion and conclusion

Global mobility and international immigration bring to citizenship – understood as formal membership, and as such, associated primarily with the political realm – a sociological implication that has not been duly incorporated into the academic debate. Within a macro and normative approach, which has been the centre of the literature on dual citizenship, debaters are essentially concerned with political issues; and these political concerns are transposed to the new scenario of increasing (and increasingly fluid) international movement of people, as if, once determined, they would suffice to resolve all that that matters. Strikingly, however, there is a scarcity of research on the micro perspective – and so the debate abounds with assumptions that may or may not make sense, or it tends to generalise findings without pondering the diverse nature of the phenomenon. Making sense of dual citizenship in the contemporary world requires the enthusiasm of scholars to study this topic as much as a reserve to recognise that it involves multiple circumstances – and more than that, it involves personal narratives entangled in a broader web of meaning-making. Revealingly, Spiro argues that dual citizenship ultimately undermines state-based identities (2016, 131). Even though he is an ardent defender of the tolerance of the status, unlike Franck (1996), he does not conceive of multiple horizontal belongings. Hence, "plural citizenship will almost always involve one citizenship that is dearer than the other" (Spiro 2010, 128). What does *dearer* mean, though? And to which dual citizens?

If dual citizenship is only measured in political terms – or to fit a closed understanding of it –, then the "use" of each one becomes invariably 'asymmetrical' and potentially mutually exclusive. However, people assign meanings to this status on different grounds than those that the literature has traditionally considered (and been willing to fathom). Moving beyond the notion that it is just an instrumental asset, empirical studies have uncovered new dimensions in the way dual citizenship is interpreted within long-distance naturalisations: Knott (2019) found that people simply understand it to be their right, and Leuchter (2014) that, regardless of the motivation to pursue a second citizenship, the status became a tool that strengthens one's

---

[40] This topic came up in a few interviews, but it is not an analytical focus of my research. I report it specifically in Magali's case to emphasise that her pragmatic view of home and her firm stance do not mean detachment from society more generally.

attachment to their country of origin. What about dual citizens who are also immigrants? Are they bound to be only 'legal aliens' enjoying a bureaucratic convenience? Yanasmayan's (2015) brilliant study transcended the conventional construct that allowing immigrants to keep their original citizenship leads to higher rates of naturalisation (and this, in turn, to better social and economics outcomes). It revealed deeper levels of understanding of the impact of dual citizenship on lived experiences: the toleration of the status allowed Turkish immigrants to retain an emotional link with it more generally, paving the way for new experiences of meaningful belonging. My findings point to the same direction: dual citizenship is not about transferring or dividing loyalties, as it is about extending possibilities of belonging – for if dual citizenship is instrumentally used to immigrate or remain in the host state, it is the very pillar of one's feeling of belonging (even if this belonging is perceived differently among people). In this respect, the literature on belonging can play an essential role in illuminating the "wh-questions" of the significance of dual citizenship in the context of immigration, as it provides mechanisms to understand how the status is linked to life experiences in subtle, unexplored ways.

As most of the individuals I interviewed have acquired dual citizenship on the basis of ancestry, I take this clue within the literature to discuss my findings:

> Dual citizenship offered for third-country citizens by various EU member states raises another novel dilemma. […] As critics note, these states 'open back doors' to the EU by generously handing out citizenship to many third-country nationals, who may move and work in any of the EU member states (Pogonyi 2011, 699).

This form of naturalisation is commonly understood as an external citizenship, whose significance is exhausted in being a 'portable good' within a stratified global society (Harpaz 2015, 2019; Harpaz and Mateos 2019). However, if immigration takes place, then Pogonyi's remark is accurate. As my research has shown, these 'back doors to the EU' did open the door to the homes of the people I interviewed.

Regardless of whether Franck's (1996) thesis about the reason behind the growing tolerance of dual citizenship was correct or not, the experiences of the participants in my study are in consonance with his understanding that people can develop multiple national affiliations and possibly 'identities' – and that such multiple belonging may become an essential part of one's personal narrative. The people I interviewed have chosen to immigrate and make their host societies their home – those under 'home in progress', at least for now – and many display aspects of self-identification that reflects an active personal pursuit – even if as 'Europeans'. This path is one that admittedly encounters ambivalences and confrontations. And in this scenario, what becomes salient is the role that citizenship plays, in that it formally grants their right to

stay, permanently, where they are; they do not have to recurrently answer the question "why are you here?" to secure temporary permission with the administrative authorities. In short, they are entitled to the place.

Entitlement to place is present across all three groups and a necessary condition for their sense of security, intrinsic to their feelings of belonging. The participants are much aware of citizenship as a project of the politics of belonging, for it is this property that gives them confidence to 'build their lives [and homes] there, with the expectation that they can continue to do so' (Lenard 2018). In this sense, with the official status, they know that they also 'belong without question' (Skey 2013); citizenship is absolute. For them, formal membership is not 'just another bureaucratic hurdle to make life a little bit easier', like those who respond to 'the call for the Super Citizen' with disaffection in Badenhoop's study (2021, 575) – even for Magali, who naturalised with residence time in France, as she argues that otherwise she would not stay there. This points to a specificity of the sample in this study: they are a young and mobile generation for whom immigration is/becomes an option, not a necessity. It is in this context that a EU passport stands out, as it also allows individuals to settle in different countries within the Union: it would be interesting to compare this with how native Europeans of similar age and educational background make sense of and use their European passport (Blanchard's research, for instance, shows that young Italians born in Italy are engaged in a similar intra-EU mobility as the Argentinian and Chilean dual citizens she studied (2020, 549-550)).

Although this was not the focus of the research, it is interesting to emphasise that all identify themselves as Brazilians (except Magali). They see it as inseparable from their essence and a significant part of their cultural references. At the same time, as the findings have demonstrated, the respondents do not lead transnational lives as they tend to limit their understanding of home to where they reside now. In general, being in Brazil corresponds to familiarity, but also to nostalgia or a 'live museum' of their own lives. Thus, these individuals are not 'longing-to-be' in Brazil, nor have they joined a community of Brazilians in their host societies in the quest to keep "home" close (Hedetoft and Hjort 2002, vii). This leads to the next point. In contrast to children born to immigrant parents in Simonsen's study (2018), the participants moved to their host countries as adults and, as such, they did not always *belong in* these societies; their feeling at home is not 'self-evident' for 'having been born and raised in the country and always lived there' (Simonsen 2018, 133). Importantly, however, in line with Simonsen's findings, mine also show that one does not need to identify with the national collectivity – and be seen as one – to feel at home and feel like staying – after all, they are formally entitled to do so. In this sense, "[p]eople may feel that they belong to something

without necessarily describing this feeling as an identification or identity" (Lähdesmäki et al. 2016, 241). That being said, self-identification, even if as a process with a situational character (or precisely as one), does seem to be an important element for those in "found home". Interestingly, it would seem that Yanasmayan's interviewee, quoted earlier in the thesis, could be included in this group: "UK is my second homeland", "I am proud to be Turkish but would never say I am not British" (Yanasmayan 2015, 795).

Concerning to self-identification, the overall scenario in my study is more ambivalent and blurred. It is important to note that Brazil is an ethnically heterogenous country, with 'historical commitment to racial mixture' (Lamont et al. 2016, 142–43), where waves of European and Asian immigration also informed the construction of national identity (see Lesser 2013). (Additionally, the right to dual citizenship was approved in the country already in 1993 (Levitt 2002, 278).) This may be linked to both the variation in how interviewees respond to the question of self-identification in relation to their second (third) citizenship, and how, in the "found home" group, individuals are inclined to feel or seek identification with the national collectivity. But the extent to which dual citizenship influences self-identification within this group is not clear, for this turns out to be a process: a process of becoming negotiated in the everyday life amid symbolic boundaries from the native-national community – in the question of "who can and cannot be part of the group", symbolically speaking – and boundaries from within – the limits that individuals find in their own repertoire. This is where they differ from Ronkainen's (2011) *hyphenationals*, who were raised 'in-between cultures' and for whom 'the traditional content of national citizenship basically doubles'.

I believe that an important contribution of this study lies in approaching the notions of feeling at home and self-identification separately, and in acknowledging the label of national identity as a (complicated) category of practice but not employing it as a category of analysis. (This is also useful as the respondents live in different countries, and I cannot conduct an analysis based on symbolic boundaries; however, issues of 'national identity' are inevitably contained in the study to the extent that individuals translate elements of this into their self-identification.) Erdal, Doeland, and Tellander (2018)'s topical research revealed fundamental differences in what citizenship represents for people with different statuses and backgrounds; however, in their research, the notion of belonging entangles with 'being recognised as a Norwegian'. Thus, the respondent naturalised Norwegian, quoted previously in the theoretical background, is included in the cluster of people with an 'insecure sense of belonging'. Could it be the case that he has a pragmatic view of home? He says that, as the system has legally accepted him, "there is no systematic discrimination, so I am satisfied" (Erdal, Doeland, and Tellander 2018, 718). It is

important to note that "pragmatic home" does not mean that dual citizens in the group do not face situations in which they feel like foreigners or feel that their presence is questioned by others. Furthermore, that self-identification (and the expectation of recognition from others) is not important in one's narrative does not mean that they are automatically cosmopolitan, nor that they have not tried this at some point in the past. However, I cannot elaborate this question, both because the "pragmatic home" draws on only one interview and because my investigation does not explore whether individuals eventually move between groups.

In terms of limitations, it is important to reiterate that the findings are far from exhaustive – on the contrary, they are intended to provide a first glimpse of the way dual citizenship relates to feelings of belonging and self-identification among a group of young immigrants. However, since the findings are centred on feelings of belonging, I believe they could also encompass the experience of dual citizens from other non-EU countries residing in Europe. In this sense, future studies could shed more light on each category, or eventually add new ones, split them into others. It would be interesting, for example, to get more perspectives on what "home in progress" is, both for dual citizens whose experience is essentially enabled by an EU passport and for those who feel connected to the host country but not enough for an 'ontological attachment' (yet?). Furthermore, I believe there is an interesting scope to study the use of citizenship as a "symbolic resource" – the ultimate word, secured by state legitimisation, in the matter of being on par with natives. What exactly do dual citizens claim through this resource? Is it used to claim the place or is it used to protect one's self-identification in the dialectical interplay with external identification? Are there regular differences between the groups (found home, home in progress, pragmatic home)?

Lastly, as mentioned previously, I do not engage critically with how dual citizenship was obtained. Further research could contribute to the debate by examining whether different acquisition modes have systematic effects on the experience of dual citizens in their host (home?) states (analysing, for instance, whether these routes entail different patterns of self-identification or whether they impact differently one's feeling of belonging). In this connection, the rules of membership are left to the discretion of each sovereign state and there is not much discussion on the topic within the academic literature. There is, however, a shared understanding among scholars that "certain" requirements for the acquisition of dual citizenship must be observed. Hansen and Weil contend the following:

> Those individuals who have been resident in a country the longest have the strongest claim to acquire a member state's nationality while retaining another. The logic is simple: such individuals will have contributed most to the society, have built-up a web of social relations, will be best equipped to

> make informed voting decisions and – importantly – will have to live with the consequences of them […] (Hansen and Weil 2002, 11)

It was not the aim of the thesis to engage with the normative debate, but here may be the place hint at it: Are the meanings of citizenship and its impact on lived experiences fully grasped to justify such claims?

Apart from some individual studies, the limited intellectual creativity within academia concerning dual citizenship clashes with Marshall's own motivation to advance his study on citizenship and the very contribution he is known for in the field. (I would not be surprised if Marshall himself, these days, would be interested in the topic specifically through the lens of the global movement of people.) As the boundaries of the demographic regime become porous and no longer match that of geographical frontiers – not that it ever has, but unquestionably less than ever –, individuals pursue and create new experiences, belongings, and narratives. In this context, the expansion of dual citizenship is not 'a major challenge to the traditional nation-state model' as it is to academia itself (see Castles and Davidson 2000, 88). Today, most nation-states accept the status and, as Bauböck (2019) noted, for individuals, there is nothing strange or wrong with this.

Epilogue. Reading about belonging left me with many unanswered questions. The concept is multidimensional and requires 'carefulness and clarity in its situated applications' (Lähdesmäki et al. 2016, 242). But then, from the perspective of the individual, belonging is generally tacitly experienced, as individuals feel more what it is to belong – or to long for belonging – than they can articulate (Wood and Waite 2011, 201). Or not to belong… I remember laughing nervously when I found out that Erdal, Doeland, and Tellander (2018) started their interviews with broad questions such as 'how do you experience belonging?' I imagined that if I were one of the participants, I would have run away. (Now, in retrospect, I wonder if it would have been a good idea to include this question as it is. Maybe I was afraid to ask because I was afraid to answer it myself.) So, I was becoming convinced that phenomenology was the right method for my investigation into such intriguing human experience – whatever this method was. But 'in seeking understanding, I was seeking for meaning', and I ended up trapped in a dimension between the research and a personal quest. At some point, I felt like J. M. Hull: "I will be all the more sane if I have been able to accept, to include, to harmonise more and more of my experience" (2017, 143). Then I stepped back; the personal journey was still there, but then running parallel.

References

Anthias, Floya. 2013. *Identity and Belonging: Conceptualisations and Political Framings*. Koeln, Germany: Kompetenznetz Lateinamerika. KLA Working Paper Series No. 8. https://kompetenzla.uni-koeln.de/sites/fileadmin2/WP_Anthias.pdf (February 25, 2022).

Antonsich, Marco. 2010. "Searching for Belonging – An Analytical Framework." *Geography Compass* 4(6): 644–59.

Badenhoop, Elisabeth. 2021. "Responding to the Call for the Super Citizen: Migrants' Ambivalent Experiences of Naturalization in Germany and the United Kingdom." *Citizenship Studies* 25(4): 564–82.

Bauböck, Rainer. 2019. "Genuine Links and Useful Passports: Evaluating Strategic Uses of Citizenship." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(6): 1015–26.

Benhabib, Seyla. 2002. "Citizens, Residents, and Aliens in a Changing World: Political Membership in the Global Era." In *The Postnational Self: Belonging and Identity*, Public worlds, eds. Ulf Hedetoft and Mette Hjort. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 85–119.

Blanchard, Mélissa. 2020. "Citoyenneté européenne, nationalité italienne et « mythe institutionnel » du retour : le cas des Argentins et des Chiliens descendants d'émigrés italiens." *Ethnologie française* 50(3): 545–58.

Bloemraad, Irene. 2004. "Who Claims Dual Citizenship? The Limits of Postnationalism, the Possibilities of Transnationalism, and the Persistence of Traditional Citizenship." *The International Migration Review* 38(2): 389–426.

———. 2017. "Does Citizenship Matter?" In *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*, Oxford handbooks, eds. Ayelet Shachar, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad, and Maarten Peter Vink. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 524–50.

Blunt, Alison, and Robyn M. Dowling. 2006. *Home*. New York NY: Routledge.

Bosniak, Linda. 2000. "Citizenship Denationalized." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 7(2): 447–509.

———. 2002. "Multiple Nationality and the Postnational Transformation of Citizenship." *Virginia Journal of International Law* 42(4): 979–1004.

Brubaker, Rogers, and Frederick Cooper. 2000. "Beyond 'Identity.'" *Theory and Society* 29(1): 1–47.

Castles, Stephen, and Alastair Davidson. 2000. *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave.

Cohen, Jean L. 1999. "Changing Paradigms of Citizenship and the Exclusiveness of the Demos." *International Sociology* 14(3): 245–68.

Conway, Dennis, Robert B. Potter, and Godfrey St Bernard. 2008. "Dual Citizenship or Dual Identity? Does 'Transnationalism' Supplant 'Nationalism' among Returning Trinidadians?" *Global Networks* 8(4): 373–97.

Crowley, John. 2002. "The Politics of Belonging: Some Theoretical Considerations." In *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe*, Contemporary trends in European social sciences, eds. Andrew Geddes and Adrian Favell. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 15–41.

De Andrade, Lelia Lomba. 2000. "Negotiating from the inside: Constructing Racial and Ethnic Identity in Qualitative Research." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 29(3): 268–90.

Džankić, Jelena. 2019. *The Global Market for Investor Citizenship*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Erdal, Marta Bivand, Elin Martine Doeland, and Ebba Tellander. 2018. "How Citizenship Matters (or Not): The Citizenship–Belonging Nexus Explored among Residents in Oslo, Norway." *Citizenship Studies* 22(7): 705–24.

Faist, Thomas, Jürgen Gerdes, and Beate Rieple. 2004. "Dual Citizenship as a Path-Dependent Process." *International Migration Review* 38(3): 913–44.

Fehér, Ferenc, and Agnes Heller. 1994. "Naturalization or 'Culturalization'?" In *From Aliens to Citizens: Redefining the Status of Immigrants in Europe*, Public policy and social welfare, ed. Rainer Bauböck. Aldershot: Avebury, 135–48.

Franck, Thomas M. 1996. "Clan and Superclan: Loyalty, Identity and Community in Law and Practice." *American Journal of International Law* 90(3): 359–83.

Fraser, Nancy, and Linda Gordon. 1994. "Civil Citizenship against Social Citizenship? On the Ideology of Contract-versus-Charity." In *The Condition of Citizenship*, Politics and culture, ed. Bart van Steenbergen. London: Sage, 90–107.

"Global Dual Citizenship Database." 2020. *Maastricht Centre for Citizenship, Migration and Development (MACIMIDE)*. https://macimide.maastrichtuniversity.nl/dual-cit-database/ (February 3, 2022).

Habermas, Jürgen. 1994. "Citizenship and National Identity." In *The Condition of Citizenship*, Politics and culture, ed. Bart van Steenbergen. London: Sage, 20–35.

Hainmueller, Jens, Dominik Hangartner, and Giuseppe Pietrantuono. 2017. "Catalyst or Crown: Does Naturalization Promote the Long-Term Social Integration of Immigrants?" *American Political Science Review* 111(2): 256–76.

Haller, Max. 2021. "(Dual) Citizenship and National Identity in a Globalised World: Sociological Perspectives." In *Dual Citizenship and Naturalisation: Global, Comparative and Austrian Perspectives*, Sitzungsberichte / Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, eds. Rainer Bauböck and Max Haller. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 33–58.

Hannerz, Ulf. 2002. "Where We Are and Who We Want to Be." In *The Postnational Self: Belonging and Identity*, Public worlds, eds. Ulf Hedetoft and Mette Hjort. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 217–32.

Hansen, Randall, and Patrick Weil. 2002. "Dual Citizenship in a Changed World: Immigration, Gender and Social Rights." In *Dual Nationality, Social Rights, and Federal Citizenship in the U.S. and Europe: The Reinvention of Citizenship*, eds. Randall Hansen and Patrick Weil. New York: Berghahn Books, 1–15.

Harpaz, Yossi. 2015. "Ancestry into Opportunity: How Global Inequality Drives Demand for Long-Distance European Union Citizenship." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(13): 2081–2104.

———. 2019. "Compensatory Citizenship: Dual Nationality as a Strategy of Global Upward Mobility." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(6): 897–916.

Harpaz, Yossi, and Pablo Mateos. 2019. "Strategic Citizenship: Negotiating Membership in the Age of Dual Nationality." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(6): 843–57.

Hedetoft, Ulf, and Mette Hjort, eds. 2002. *The Postnational Self: Belonging and Identity*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Hull, John M. 2017. *Notes on Blindness: A Journey through the Dark*. London: Profile Books.

Isin, Engin F., and Bryan S. Turner. 2002. "Citizenship Studies: An Introduction." In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE, 1–10.

Joppke, Christian. 2019. "The Instrumental Turn of Citizenship." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(6): 858–78.

Knott, Eleanor. 2019. "Strategy, Identity or Legitimacy? Analysing Engagement with Dual Citizenship from the Bottom-Up." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(6): 994–1014.

Koslowski, Rey. 2001. "Demographic Boundary Maintenance in World Politics: Of International Norms on Dual Nationality." In *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*, Borderlines, eds. Mathias Albert, David Jacobson, and Yosef Lapid. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 203–23.

Kvale, Steinar. 1996. *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

Kymlicka, Will, and Wayne Norman. 1994. "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory." *Ethics* 104(2): 352–81.

Lähdesmäki, Tuuli et al. 2016. "Fluidity and Flexibility of 'Belonging': Uses of the Concept in Contemporary Research." *Acta Sociologica* 59(3): 233–47.

Lamont, Michèle et al., eds. 2016. *Getting Respect: Responding to Stigma and Discrimination in the United States, Brazil, and Israel*. Princeton ; Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Lamont, Michèle, and Ann Swidler. 2014. "Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing." *Qualitative Sociology* 37(2): 153–71.

League of Nations. 1930. *Convention on Certain Questions Relating to the Conflict of Nationality Law*. Treaty Series, vol. 179, p. 89, No. 4137. https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3b00.html (February 3, 2022).

Lenard, Patti Tamara. 2018. "Democratic Citizenship and Denationalization." *American Political Science Review* 112(1): 99–111.

Lesser, Jeff. 2013. *Immigration, Ethnicity, and National Identity in Brazil, 1808 to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leuchter, Noa. 2014. "Creating Other Options: Negotiating the Meanings of Citizenships." *Citizenship Studies* 18(6–7): 776–90.

Levitt, Peggy. 2002. "Variations in Transnational Belonging: Lessons from Brazil and the Dominican Republic." In *Dual Nationality, Social Rights, and Federal Citizenship in the U.S. and Europe: The Reinvention of Citizenship*, eds. Randall Hansen and Patrick Weil. New York: Berghahn Books, 264–89.

Malkki, Liisa. 1992. "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees." *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 24–44.

Marshall, Thomas H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class: And Other Essays*. Cambridge University Press.

Mazzolari, Francesca. 2009. "Dual Citizenship Rights: Do They Make More and Richer Citizens?" *Demography* 46(1): 169–91.

Menjívar, Cecilia. 2017. "Spaces of Legal Ambiguity: Central American Immigrants, 'Street-Level Workers', and Belonging." In *Within and beyond Citizenship: Borders, Membership and Belonging*, eds. Roberto G. Gonzales and Nando Sigona. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 36–52.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 2002. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." In *For Love of Country?*, New democracy forum, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon Press, 3–17.

Pfaff-Czarnecka, Joanna. 2011. "From 'Identity' to 'Belonging' in Social Research: Plurality, Social Boundaries, and the Politics of the Self." In *Etnicidad, Ciudadanía y Pertenencia / Ethnicity, Citizenship and Belonging*, eds. Sarah Albiez, Nelly Castro, Lara Jüssen, and Eva Youkhana. Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft, 199–220.

Pogonyi, Szabolcs. 2011. "Dual Citizenship and Sovereignty." *Nationalities Papers* 39(5): 685–704.

———. 2019. "The Passport as Means of Identity Management: Making and Unmaking Ethnic Boundaries through Citizenship." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(6): 975–93.

Ronkainen, Jussi Kasperi. 2011. "Mononationals, Hyphenationals, and Shadow-Nationals: Multiple Citizenship as Practice." *Citizenship Studies* 15(2): 247–63.

Saldaña, Johnny. 2009. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Los Angeles, Calif: Sage.

Sejersen, Tanja Brøndsted. 2008. "'I Vow to Thee My Countries' – The Expansion of Dual Citizenship in the 21st Century." *International Migration Review* 42(3): 523–49.

Shachar, Ayelet, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad, and Maarten Peter Vink. 2017. "Introduction: Citizenship—Quo Vadis?" In *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*, Oxford handbooks, eds. Ayelet Shachar, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad, and Maarten Peter Vink. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 3–11.

Simonsen, Kristina Bakkaer. 2018. "What It Means to (Not) Belong: A Case Study of How Boundary Perceptions Affect Second-Generation Immigrants' Attachments to the Nation." *Sociological Forum* 33(1): 118–38.

Skey, Michael. 2011. "'Thank God, I'm Back!': (Re)Defining the Nation as a Homely Place in Relation to Journeys Abroad." *Journal of Cultural Geography* 28(2): 233–52.

———. 2013. "Why Do Nations Matter? The Struggle for Belonging and Security in an Uncertain World: Why Do Nations Matter?" *The British Journal of Sociology* 64(1): 81–98.

Skulte-Ouaiss, Jennifer. 2013. "Home Is Where the Heart Is; Citizenship Is Where It Is Safe: Dual Citizenship and Europe." *Identities* 20(2): 133–48.

Somerville, Peter. 1997. "The Social Construction of Home." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 14(3): 226–45.

Soysal, Yasemin Nuhoǧlu. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Spiro, Peter J. 2010. "Dual Citizenship as Human Right." *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 8(1): 111–30.

———. 2016. *At Home in Two Countries: The Past and Future of Dual Citizenship*. New York; London: New York University Press.

Steenbergen, Bart van. 1994. "The Condition of Citizenship: An Introduction." In *The Condition of Citizenship*, Politics and culture, ed. Bart van Steenbergen. London: Sage, 1–9.

Turner, Bryan S. 1994. "Postmodern Culture/Modern Citizens." In *The Condition of Citizenship*, Politics and culture, ed. Bart van Steenbergen. London: Sage, 153–68.

Vera-Larrucea, Constanza. 2012. "Dual Citizenship, Double Membership? Membership and Belonging of Immigrants' Descendants in France and Sweden." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 13(2): 165–86.

Western, John. 1992. *A Passage to England: Barbadian Londoners Speak of Home.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Witte, Nils. 2014. *Legal and Symbolic Membership – Symbolic Boundaries and Naturalization Intentions of Turkish Residents in Germany.* Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. SSRN Scholarly Paper. https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2514362 (July 20, 2021).

———. 2018. *Negotiating the Boundaries of Belonging: The Intricacies of Naturalisation in Germany.* 1st ed. 2018. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden : Imprint: Springer VS.

Wood, Nichola, and Louise Waite. 2011. "Editorial: Scales of Belonging." *Emotion, Space and Society* 4(4): 201–2.

Yanasmayan, Zeynep. 2015. "Citizenship on Paper or at Heart? A Closer Look into the Dual Citizenship Debate in Europe." *Citizenship Studies* 19(6–7): 785–801.

Young Jr., Alford A. 2004. "Experiences in Ethnographic Interviewing about Race: The inside and Outside of It." In *Researching Race and Racism*, eds. Martin Bulmer and John Solomos. London: Routledge, 187–202.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. "Belonging and the Politics of Belonging." *Patterns of Prejudice* 40(3): 197–214.

Yuval-Davis, Nira, Georgie Wemyss, and Kathryn Cassidy. 2018. "Everyday Bordering, Belonging and the Reorientation of British Immigration Legislation." *Sociology* 52(2): 228–44.

Appendix

– List of Codes

Code	Sub-code
Boundaries	From oneself
	Foreign element
	Language
	Past references
	From others
	Why are you here
	You are not one of us
Dual citizenship meaning	Entitlement to place
	Heritage
	Instrumental
	(Symbolic) Resource
Home	Here
	Here and/but…
	Nostalgia/Familiarity (BR)
Hypothetical scenario	Maybe
	No
	Yes
Searching home	Found home
	Home in progress
	Pragmatic home
Self-identification	Ambivalence
	Disidentification
	Identification
	as European
	Nonidentification

Declaration of Authorship

I hereby declare that this thesis has been written solely by me and, therefore, is based entirely on my own work, unless stated otherwise. No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in this thesis. All references and verbatim extracts have been quoted and all sources of information have been specifically acknowledged. Moreover, this thesis has not previously been presented to another examination board or in the context of another course.

Place and Date: Signature:

                                                   Ana Carolina Richter