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In countries adhering to ius soli or ius domicili principles immigrants’ descendants are entitled to become members as any other citizen once they naturalize. But citizenship acquisition by itself does neither ensure full access to membership nor a sense of belonging to a nation-state. A subjective dimension of citizenship becomes relevant when studying the consequences of naturalization in terms of membership. However, the lack of studies about individuals’ understandings of citizenship and their condition as citizens avoids a more dynamic debate giving to citizenship a static framework. By turning to citizens’ perceptions a new picture of citizenship is discovered. The present study pays attention to a group that has not hitherto been central in discussions about citizenship, namely immigrants’ descendants, the so-called “second generation”. This group defies the traditional belonging to the nation-state by having attachments to both their parents’ country and their country of birth. How do people understand citizenship and their role as citizens when having a migrant background? This paper contributes to the debate about how are conceptions of citizenship affected when having dual legal attachments. The study analyzes the understanding of citizenship among second generation Turks in Stockholm and Paris who hold dual citizenship based on Survey data and qualitative interviews. This bottom-up approach to citizenship yields insights into how individuals perceive their membership of and their belonging to two states. One important result is that the respondents’ concepts of citizenship are not framed by their Turkish ethnicity but by the specific understanding of citizenship in their country of residence.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Citizenship, an ever-changing concept

In the past decades, theoretical discussions and legal arrangements pertaining citizenship seem to be under constant change. The uses that researchers, policy-makers, and the civil society assign to the term are multiple. The importance of a delimitation in what is understood as citizenship by normal citizens is rarely visited by theorists. Few studies (e.g. Miller-Idriss, 2006) have tried to construct the concept based on the perceptions and experiences of citizens, those who experience, create and reflect the new dynamics that transcend the legal status. The context and the personal characteristics of citizens might affect what has been called “lived citizenship” (Hall and Williamson, 1999; Lister 1997) i.e. the meaning that people attributes to citizenship which is affected by their cultural and ethnic backgrounds, live conditions, and other contextual and personal features. By turning to individuals’ perceptions, a new picture of citizenship is discovered by incorporating personal approaches of membership. Therefore, one of the aims of this study is to get a redefinition of the concept of citizenship through the experiences of young people with an immigrant background.

Theoretically and empirically, citizenship has experienced changes that are no longer explained by traditional conceptions and practices. Marshall’s definition of citizenship as the relation between an individual and the state is no longer suitable to describe the reality of today’s multicultural societies. Marshall (1950) disregarded the importance of class, gender and ethnicity when configuring the set of citizenship rights (Urry, 2000). In an idealized conception, only the nation-state is the locus of a political community (Carens, 2000). But contemporary citizens are confronted with contradictions that surpass the nation-state framework, like dual citizenship. Massive migration and the raise of minority rights are two of the most powerful forces changing the traditional conception of citizenship towards a broader but at the same time a more confusing concept. “Differentiated citizenship” (Young, 1989), “multicultural citizenship” (Kymlicka, 1995) and “post-national citizenship” (Soysal, 1996) are some of the new forms of membership that transcend the traditional boundaries of the nation-state and considers citizenship as a universalistic condition not based on nationhood. Dual citizenship also challenges the traditional unique bond between the individual and the state. One state. The fact of being legally included in two countries – passively or actively – is problematic for normative political theory. This legal double-belonging has been criticized and defended under the light of several theoretical and practical arguments. But both critics and defenders rarely use empirical data to strengthen their positions.

Immigrants’ descendants represent an interesting group to study the dynamics of citizenship. A particularity of this group is that in countries having liberal access to citizenship they are entitled to both their country of birth and their parents country. Countries having a relative relaxed attitude towards dual citizenship plus liberal access to naturalization made possible for immigrants descendants to retain or to acquire the citizenship of their parents’ country. As Turkey is open for dual citizenship, Turks’ descendants have the possibility to be dual citizens in most of the European countries, with the exception of Germany. Such legal status has an impact in different aspects of their lives. Having an immigrant background presupposes not only entitlements to dual citizenship, but also a different version of being a citizen. Superposed and dual memberships, confused allegiances and a conflictive sense of belonging might be the consequences of a dual status when having immigrants’ parents. Nevertheless, this negative diagnose of dual citizenship is grounded on a traditionalist nation-centred conception of citizenship. But in reality, second generation’s roots - one based on their parents’ country of birth and second generation’s own country of birth - are not static and are possible to combine. The boundaries between these belongings might become blurred when faced with everyday experiences.

Immigrants’ descendants – a group having both ius soli and ius sanguinis entitlements to dual citizenship at birth – are not central neither in theoretical nor political debates. This study intends to situate their experience in a comparative view in the current debates, especially in terms of dual nationality. What is
the conception that second generation Turks have of citizenship compared to people having native parents? Does their Turkish origin affect their understanding of citizenship and recognition of rights and duties? How is citizenship constructed and embraced by dual citizens? These are some of the questions leading this paper which offers some brief descriptive Survey data plus a more detailed content discourse analysis of in-depth interviews. Although Survey data about immigrants’ descendants is available for eight countries, this study is centred in France and Sweden. Both countries are open for dual citizenship and encourage naturalization of immigrants and their descendants, but apart from that France and Sweden represent two sides of the spectrum when it comes to models of inclusion as a heritage of their unique national understandings of citizenship. Sweden has been a pioneer in multicultural policy and by another hand France is one of the stronger defenders of assimilationism with a republican imprint. While the French model denies cultural diversity and after naturalization does not consider other affiliations people might have, Swedish multiculturalism encourages such affiliations and is therefore a better scenario for multicultural practices.

1.2 Method and material
This paper is a part of a broader research about the dimensions of citizenship and the case of second generation Turks. The study follows an “abductive” strategy due to its view of social reality as constructed and interpreted by individuals. This involves developing, constructing or enriching theories that are grounded in everyday activities by describing and deriving categories and concepts that can form the basis for an understanding or explanation of the problem at hand (Blaikie, 2002).

The narrow quantitative descriptive analysis is based on the TIES (The Integration of the European Second Generation) Survey which was created to measure the social and structural aspects of integration of immigrants’ descendants in Europe. The target group is composed of people- between 18 and 35 years old- whose parents were born in Morocco, Turkey and Ex-Yugoslavia, as well as a control group of people with native parents. The survey was carried out in eight European countries using the same questionnaire, which resulted in a large, cross-national dataset.

The qualitative information is based on fieldwork carried out in Paris and Stockholm between September 2008 and March 2009. Individuals who were interviewed for the TIES survey and who agreed to be re-contacted represented the sample. All of them were dual nationals. People with a native background served as a control group in order to measure the role that ethnicity plays in citizenship’s configuration. Thirty one interviews were conducted in Paris and 34 in Stockholm with people of Turkish origin (17 individuals in Paris, 18 individuals in Stockholm) and with native parents (14 individuals in Paris, 16 individuals in Stockholm). The interviews were based on a semi-structured questionnaire relating to citizenship and intervenient thematics such as ethnic origin, everyday life, civic attitudes, integration and multiculturalism. Assuming a “normative view” of citizenship (Kymlicka and Norman, 1997) entailing responsibility and civic virtues, the respondents were asked to describe their experiences as citizens.

1 The TIES survey was carried out by survey bureaus under supervision of the eight research institutes: the Institute for Social and Political Opinion Research [ISPO], University of Leuven, Belgium; the National Institute for Demographic Studies [INED], France; the Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies [SFMI] Switzerland; the Centre for Research in International Migration and Ethnic Relations [CEIFO], University of Stockholm, Sweden; the Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies [IMIS], University of Osnabruck, Germany; the Institute for European Integration Research [EIF], Austrian Academy of Sciences, Austria; The National Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute [NIDI] and the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies [IMES], the Netherlands.
2. Theoretical considerations

2.1 Dual citizens, opponents and defendants

The raise in the number of dual citizens in the recent decades has lead to a reformulation of old principles of membership in order to include transnational practices and dual loyalties. The fact of being a member of two polities - passively or actively - is problematic for normative political theory, but also for (multi)national states. The legal belonging to two states has been criticized under several theoretical and practical arguments.

By law there is a binding contract between the individual and the state. Such a contract suggests exclusivity. But dual citizenship opens the possibility to be a “signer” of two contracts simultaneously. It is a major incentive for transnational practices by allowing the access to rights and duties in two polities. Nevertheless, individuals often live most of the time in only one place. The country of residence is probably the place in which people is more active as a citizen. The second country becomes an external link, also a source of rights, duties, ties and belonging, which encourages transnational practices. Dual citizens might vote, own properties, and maintain social relations in two countries. They might serve as a link of a diaspora with the sending state. But here it is important to note that theoretical debates about dual citizenship consider mostly the first generation immigrants and the difficulties or facilities this legal status presupposes for their integration in the host country or the maintenance of a bond with their country of origin. Meanwhile, the second generation seems to be a newcomer in this thematic.

Dual citizenship illustrates the apparent hybridity to which most second generation immigrants are subjected to. In countries following multicultural or republican regimes of citizenship, the second generation is also entitled to dual citizenship by having the right of birth - *ius soli* - and inheriting the citizenship of their parents through- *ius sanguinis*. They are legally empowered to become political, social and economic actors in two countries. Immigrants’ descendants born with national citizenship or having acquired it later in life are considered regular citizens in a civic dimension. They are allowed to vote, they have the state’s protection and they can be chosen for public administration. However, when they also retain their parents' citizenship, these rights might become diffuse. The retention of Turkish citizenship might imply the loss of nationality e.g. in Germany.

A relevant argument against the possession of dual citizenship is that this hinders integration by allowing the maintenance of the bonds with a second country. First and second generation immigrants could never be fully identified with the country in which they reside if they are still legal subjects in another country. Such objection has been highly relevant for assimilationists. But integration is not necessarily a synonym of identification. What it is endangered here is civil identity. But civil and cultural identity is not a zero-sum game (Hammar, 1985) but an accumulative experience. In fact, allowing dual citizenship has proved to be related with a rise in naturalization process in Europe (Naujocks, 2009).

Opponents to dual citizenship are usually close to an assimilatist view of citizenship. Meanwhile those who defend a dual membership seem to embrace a multicultural view. Having a link with a second country is feared as a hinder towards a deep attachment to the country of residence. Besides, the rights and benefits of being a citizen are overlapped and presented as major conflicts. Diplomatic protection, dual taxation and dual military obligation are among the technical difficulties of being a citizen in two polities (Naujocks, 2009). Nevertheless, most of these conflicts might be solved by treaties among sending and receiving countries. An example of this is the exemption to military service for second generation Turks in Turkey if they have fulfilled an equivalent service in their country of birth.

2 Although state protection is not immediate if a person possess dual citizenship. In the case of being in one of the countries from which a person is a national, the other country cannot offer protection.
An especial socio-political objection to dual citizenship is the possibility of double voting. According to political theorists, this implies to broke the sacred rule “one citizen, one vote”. Such political inconsistence could endanger universal democratic principles.

2.2 Dual citizenship and multiple belongings
Citizenship in its traditional sense is intimately linked to the nation, which configures a whole set of subjective aspects that a typical citizen perceives and makes him/her part of the community. Nevertheless, the nation-state is no longer the only entity to which a citizen might belong and be identified with. A single citizenship does not imply a singular identity or an unbreakable loyalty (Feldblum, 1997: 2).

The possibility of multiple belongings and mixed identities constitutes a major point of departure for the analysis here presented. Belonging to a certain ethnic group or community –being national, racial, sexual or other kinds of groups - does not necessarily imply to identify with that group. A person might feel belonging independently of the identification with one or several communities. Belonging is something earned by the individual. And what makes the term appropriate in this study is that it can be used in plural, suggesting that an individual might have different attachments (Sicakkan & Lithman, 2005:27). Belonging implies a self recognition into a group but also external recognition. It is not the same dynamic of identity in the sense that it has to deal with the alternatives for inclusion and participation in different groups at the same time. When discussing citizenship, it is important to distinguish sense of belonging, because it shows until what extent individuals feel that they take part of the nation to which they are nominally included.

France and Sweden do not embrace an ethnic-oriented conception of citizenship. The republican and multicultural regimes are based on historical conceptions of citizenship which allow for individuals with a non-native ethnic background to become part of the political community. But this may not be translated into an immediate identification as a citizen. The fact of having immigrant parents has a potential negative effect over the identification with the national category. Identity offers an interesting perspective to explore people’s feelings when developing this inner-self. Nevertheless, the concept needs to be treated cautiously. Identity is an over-used concept. As it was described in the theoretical discussion, it assumed different characteristics depending of the discipline and the problem analyzed. This study deals specially with categorical identity. Categorical identities are referred to quasi groups (Freedman, 1976) as the imagined communities that Andersson (1993) mentions when talking about nations and nationality, or Bauman’s “dream communities” defined by gender, class or nation (Bauman, 1995). Thanks to data collected through in-depth interviews this paper analyzed how do second generation Turks approach to those dream communities, if they identify with the national identity or developed different kinds of belonging towards their country of birth and to Turkey.

3. Background information
3.1 Citizenship regimes in Europe: Opportunities to become a citizen for immigrants’ descendants
European countries have attended to their traditional notions on nationhood and membership when configuring modes of inclusion and naturalization of the immigrant population. The heterogeneity of citizenship regimes and integration policies provides different opportunities for citizenship acquisition in the case of immigrants and their descendants in Europe.

The literature considers the German-speaking countries to hold primordial, communitarian, or ethnic citizenship regimes. Citizenship was granted only to those belonging to the ethnic foundational community of the nation. Today, nationality is a premium for successfully integrated immigrants that should not be granted easily. The predominance of ius sanguinis approaches to citizenship for second and third generation migrants exemplifies the differential exclusionist philosophy of integration in Germany,
Austria, and Switzerland. Traditionally, these countries have avoided dual citizenship but exceptions have been introduced in Austria and Switzerland.

**France** is a defined nation, in spite of regional differences. The meaning of citizenship is very unique in this republican context. France is thought to exemplify the republican model of an inclusive, assimilationist, and color-blind treatment of the second generation through the practice of *ius soli*. France is said to have given birth to the modern idea of national citizenship during the French Revolution and imagines it to be a universalist political project allowing no distinction between foreigners and French nationals pertaining rights and duties (Weil, Spire, and Bertossi 2010:1-2). This strong conception of national identity is backed up by the pursuit of a largely mono-cultural philosophy of integration. A native-born child will be French at birth if at least one parent is French or born in France, or will become French automatically at age 18 if neither parent is French or born in France but the child has legally resided in France for at least five years and does not renounce French citizenship. France has long tolerated dual citizenship. Since 1973, maintaining a former citizenship has not been an impediment to becoming a French citizen (Weil, Spire, and Bertossi 2009). In the French case, the question is rather whether the country of the previous citizenship allows dual nationality. Republicanism is reflected in citizenship as well as in integration policies. One of the central principles of French integration policies has been a denial of structured immigrant communities because such institutionalization endangers the unity of the French nation (Simon & Sala Pala, 2009:93). Wieviorka’s was one the firsts scholars who criticized the denial of multiculturalism in France (Wieviorka, 1992; Wieviorka, 1996; Wieviorka, 1997). But as a result Wieviorka himself has been criticized for questioning the validity of French republicanism as a model and its inadequacy for the current French problems (Martiniello, 1998: 911).

**Sweden** embraces a multicultural approach to immigrant incorporation, though it is less frequently discussed than Great Britain or the Netherlands. Initially, Sweden developed its own model toward guest workers (Hammar 2004:11) and was a pioneer in terms of multicultural policies. The vast generosity with immigrants, compared with other Europeans countries is, however, not necessarily grounded in multiculturalism but in the fact the Sweden has developed Europe’s most comprehensive welfare state (Esping-Andersen 1990). Citizenship acquisition is relatively easy for migrants who have lived in Sweden for at least five years. Naturalization rules are, in principle, close to a *ius sanguinis* approach. Nowadays, the conditions to acquire citizenship are based on domicile, on residence grounds. Those who acquire citizenship by birth must have Swedish citizens as parents. Since 1979 a child automatically acquires citizenship if the mother is a Swedish citizen. A child might also acquire Swedish citizenship in their first years if the father is a national. Immigrants’ descendants without naturalized parents become Swedish nationals by notification - a simplified naturalization - after it is corroborated that they have been living in the country for more than five years. In general, people who have permanently lived for at least five years in the country may apply for citizenship. The logic of *ius domicilium* suggests that after five years, a learning process towards civic culture in Sweden has taken place, which makes any person entitled to receive the status of citizen. This does not imply that the new citizen could loose its previous nationality. Sweden developed a de facto toleration of dual nationality through relaxed naturalization requirements and exemptions from renouncing one’s original citizenship (Faist 2007:103) and now legally accepts dual nationality (SFS 2001:82). This reflects the reduced significance of national citizenship for residents of Sweden, a country that seeks to equalize the rights of citizens and long-term residents from abroad. (Lokrantz Bernitz 2009:1). Here it is important to take into account that immigrants in possession of permanent residence are already entitled to most of the rights associated to citizenship, being political participation at a national level and possibility to run for the Parliament, two of the few rights not included in the condition of denizenship – a status conferring citizenship’s social, economic and a large part of the political rights to long-term residents.

Countries tolerating dual citizenship are usually grounded in a colonial past, multicultural policies or both. But in order to be a dual citizen the sending country must also allow for emigrants and their descendants.
to keep their former nationality, or inherited it to their children. In the case of Turkey dual citizenship acquires a major significance for transnational practices of the broad Turkish diaspora around the world. Around six million Turkish citizens live outside Turkey, most of them in Europe. The large Turkish diaspora could be seeing as a cultural, economic and political advantage for Turkey. Therefore, allowing dual citizenship means maintaining a bond with Turkish citizens abroad. Since early 90’s Turkey allow the possession of dual citizenship. This is based on the 1981 law under which dual citizenship became legal so long as the person acquiring a second citizenship informed the government, otherwise their Turkish citizenship might be suspended (Keyman & Içduygu, 2003; Faist, 2007: 128).

3.2 Turkish migration to Europe
The interest in studying second generation Turks is due to the extension of the Turkish diaspora in Europe, which represents the continent’s largest non-occidental community. Turkish migration to Europe started as a massive drive in the 1960s with specific policies to import “guest workers”. The settlement of these immigrants was not initially considered. Family reunification meant another influx in the 1970s. Due to internal disputes, ethnic conflicts and economic disparities, Turkey also became a source of refugees and asylum seekers.

In Sweden, Turkish guest workers were first recruited by the Swedish Employment Agency. Later, chain migration from Turkey to Sweden became so strong that today the majority of Turks are not only from the same region but also from the same town, Kulu, in the Province of Konya. Many of them were of peasant origin (Westin, 2002). Studies show that children are influenced by their parents’ experiences when developing their identity and their school careers (Eyrumulu, 1992; Yazgan, 1983, Yazgán, 1993). Parents from urban areas proved to be more receptive to Swedish society values, while the majority of families from rural areas tried to retain the same social structure and traditions that they were used to in Turkey (Westin, 2003).

Turks arrived as guest workers in France later than in other European countries, beginning with recruitment in 1969. A decade later, this recruitment turned into family reunification. Ethnic Turks migrated from central areas, especially from Anatolia. Studies reveal that the parents of second-generation Turks in France have a modest economic background; a factor that might counteract their offspring’s integration. In terms of school, employment and upward mobility, the Turkish population in France is considered to be one of the least integrated immigrant communities (Çitak, 2010:627). The Turkish community in France is characterized by a strong attachment to Turkey, in spite of religious, political and ethnic divisions (Godard and Taussig, 2007).

3.3 Citizenship status of second generation Turks in Europe
In order to contextualize the position of second generation Turks in France and Sweden, citizenship status is here presented along other countries included in the TIES Survey. Table 1 indicates the shares of national citizens among second generation Turks. An instant relation can be drawn between citizenship regimes and the amount of naturalized individuals. Remarkably, in countries following a multicultural or republican approach the vast majority of the second generation had become naturalized by the time of the survey in young adulthood. In Austria and Switzerland there is a large majority of second generation Turks who declared to be naturalized in the country of birth in spite of the initial reluctance to ius soli principles. Interestingly, both France and Sweden achieved nearly universal citizenship for the second generation despite the fact that France has the most extensive jus soli system in Europe while Sweden never adopted this approach. Actual citizenship practices for the second generation cannot be deduced directly from the national citizenship models and that different forms of ius soli across the countries have different outcomes. Table 2 shows the percentage of second generation Turks having acquired national citizenship at birth which for France and Sweden represents half of those who are today national citizens.
Different citizenship regimes have different dispositions in terms of dual citizenship. But even the strongest conceptions of citizenship, as the German one, offer the possibility - although reduced - to become dual citizens. According to TIES data dual citizens are a majority in France and Sweden. In order to cover all three possibilities – Survey country citizenship, dual citizenship and Turkish citizenship only - the following graph shows the prevalence of dual and mono-citizens among the individuals surveyed.

Figure 1. Citizenship position of second generation Turks in TIES countries

Dual citizenship represents a majority in most countries except Germany and Austria. In The Netherlands and Belgium the vast majority of second generation Turks declared to be dual citizens. In France (54%) and Sweden (57%) a considerable share of second generation Turks is in possession of both their country of birth and their parents’ country citizenship. Dual citizenship appears to be characteristic of the second generation Turks whenever they are able to do so. But to what extent do they recognize this duality in their everyday lives? Is it purely about a legal status or it could become conflictive in terms of allegiances, membership and sense of belonging? Turks’ descendants having dual citizenship where interviewed in order to get an insight over their experiences.
4. Citizens about citizenship

4.1 Citizenship definition

When talking about an ever changing and dynamic concept as citizenship, the participants of a study might not refer to the concept in the same way as the researcher. Due to these methodological and terminological precepts, it was important to clarify how is citizenship conceived and framed by individuals. During the in-depth interviews individuals were asked about their personal definition of citizenship. Confronted with the question what does citizenship mean for you, informants usually referred to the official discourse that surrounds them and later developed an argument that linked their personal experiences with such discourse. A contrast was expected with regard to people with a native background. Nevertheless, the main differences were found when comparing the participants as a whole in France and Sweden rather than ethnic groups (Turks or native ancestry). The first interesting difference noted was the terms used by the informants to express their beliefs and experiences about citizenship. The most repeated words were “respect” (society, the law, the “others”) in France and “belonging” in Sweden. There was also a group in both countries that associated citizenship with the action of “voting”, which is actually not an unexpected answer considering that it is the most visible right acquired after naturalization. A minor group (four individuals) identified citizenship as a paper, as a passport. This last group was the only one identifying citizenship only as a legal status. All the other participants of the study thought of citizenship as something associated to life in community and participation. There were no major differences among ethnic groups. Second generation Turks expressed themselves very similarly about citizenship to people having native parents. The interesting aspect here is that the official discourse of citizenship that France and Sweden have developed overpass gender, age, socioeconomic background and, more interesting for the purposes of this study, ethnicity. Some differences could be found among the level of education and the development of the concept of citizenship. People in possession of higher education or current students were more willing to develop ideas behind the concept and relate it to the national society and their own experiences. This was noted in both groups and in both countries.

In France people count with several symbolic elements included in the notion of French nationhood to develop their ideas. The Republic and its values were mentioned in almost all the narratives when referring to the definition of citizenship, rights, duties and integration.

In Sweden the republican elements were, of course, absent. Here the arguments were more configured around practical issues but also, and more importantly, to a matter of inclusion. In this context, citizenship was often associated to belonging “att tillhöra” by both the target and the reference group. Some common features were the sense of safety – economically, socially and in terms of defence – and access and contribution to the welfare system.

After a careful and thorough codification based on words and associations, the different meanings attributed to citizenship are here classified in four different categories. The following table attempts to synthesize the meaning of citizenship expressed by the participants of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect identified</th>
<th>Elements of the definition</th>
<th>Country of incidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>To respect the law and society and to participate in social life. Respect the “others”</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Belonging to a country, community or even a city.</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal (minor incidence)</td>
<td>Only a legal status, a matter of papers and a passport.</td>
<td>France + Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights (minor incidence)</td>
<td>People’s rights as a consequence of the legal status. Right to vote.</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While in France, citizenship acquired a civic and legal connotation in Sweden it adopted a more personal character. People interviewed in Paris consider citizenship as a kind of civic status with a normative imprint that is understood in terms of socio-political life. Respect was associated to citizenship several times in the interviews, by people with Turkish and native parents. Respect to “others”, respect the law and the rules guiding the French society was constitutive of the concept of citizenship but also expressed as duties.

Citizenship is a right and a duty. A right, the vote right, the right of been very interested in life, in his own country. And it is at the same time, a duty. A duty to vote, a duty make oneself represented. To have a say, and participate in common life. At least in the life of the community. It is not necessarily at the country-level that I would do something. I would also do it for my neighbourhood [at a local level], for the people that surrounds me, at a work-level. To be a citizen is a responsibility. This is citizenship... this is to respect the others...

(Georges, 26, Turkish origin - Paris)

As Georges, most Parisians attributed to citizenship a normative meaning. The words “respect” and “rules” were repeated along the narratives of both groups. People have to “respect the others”, “participate in the political life”, “be interested” in the socio-political life” and so on. Citizenship is mostly a set of civic duties and moral obligations in a context of life in community. The social character of citizenship, the fact that it was often expressed in terms of the others was absent among the respondents in Stockholm who had a more individualistic view of citizenship. Later, the inclination towards socio-political life indicates the extent to which civic life is important in France. The country of protests and strikes seem to be reified by its citizens, in spite of their ethnic origin. The republican regime show its strength when it comes to the socialization of people living in France letting an imprint over the understanding individuals have about citizenship. A certain proud or defence of the foundations of the Republican France can be seeing across the narratives. This is manifested through the many mentions about French history and political life, the republican values, and the importance of political participation. The following quotations express the main meanings recognized by the informants of this study in Paris.

Citizenship... When you say citizenship I immediately think on equality, fraternity. There is a third one but I forgot it. Oh! Liberty, equality and fraternity I believe.

(Daria, 23. Turkish origin- Paris)

To me, citizenship is... hmmm. That makes me think on solidarity... I think on the individual responsibility with regard to what it should be done for others, and the respect for our environment... for what has been foundational, what has been constructed, which works nowadays, in spite of the problems that one can hear.

(Audrey, 21, French origin, Paris)

While Daria, a second generation Turk living in Paris, expresses herself of citizenship thinking on the values of La Republique, Audrey, a young woman of native French origin, mentions solidarity and recognizes that in spite of the failures that French citizenship might carry, it still generates a respect and responsibility towards it. Through her words a certain proud is implicit. The Republican ideals are immersed in both answers.

To me citizenship is something on the papers, something administrative,. It is to have the right to vote. It is to participate in the elections; it is the life in society, following the news, reading the newspaper, things like that. That is citizenship for me.

(Aylin, 23, Turkish origin- Paris)
Aylin declares citizenship is only something about papers but immediately describe that it actually means to be interested in the socio-political life of the country. Her answer reflects what a majority of the respondents in Paris thought to be constitutive of citizenship.

Meanwhile, in Sweden, citizenship is regarded as belonging, in the sense of inclusion and being part of a community. Citizenship in a Swedish context has a more personal meaning, an inclusive meaning. To be a citizen is to be a part of a structure and to be recognized as such. People with and without Turkish ancestry describe citizenship considering what this status implies individually and how it makes a person feel. This is quite different than the case of the Parisian respondents who thought on what do they have to do because of citizenship.

*Citizenship is to belong, to belong to a certain country and to be part of a certain society. It means that you are a part of the population and you have a role to play.*

*(Peter, 23. Turkish origin- Stockholm)*

The most important is that citizenship is carried in the hearth actually…. It is to what one belongs to. So it is not only papers.

*(Merkan, 28. Turkish origin, Stockholm)*

Merkan’s conception of citizenship has a very personal meaning. This turns even more interesting when thinking that she has Turkish parents and is a dual citizen. But, does she feel belonging to both Sweden and Turkey equally for being a citizen in both countries? Later, the issue of dual citizenship is discussed having in mind these conception of citizenship.

There were some exceptions where Parisians answered that citizenship was to belong to a country and feel part of it. But among the respondents in Stockholm citizenship never acquired the civic imprint that characterized most of the material collected in France. In both countries and both groups a minority referred to citizenship merely as something concerning papers, the passport. This would later lead to rights and duties and belonging, but the term itself is- according to these respondents- making reference to a legal document. Nils, a young man of Swedish, origin thinks immediately on a “paper” when asked about the meaning of citizenship. *Citizenship… eh, it is mostly about a paper I believe. A paper (showing) that one has certain rights and duties and so on…*(Nils, 28. Swedish origin). This “paper” or legal status associated is commonly followed by the entitlements that citizenship carries and the belonging implicit behind a specific citizenship as Sehra expresses *What does citizenship means… Hmmm… That you can have a Swedish passport- that you are a national, that you are a part of their… population. One maybe feels that is not a refugee*…(Sehra, 27. Turkish origin- Stockholm). Nils and Sehra associated citizenship only as a passport. But although is only “a paper” it entitles to certain rights and duties and provides with emotional attachment.

The results until now reveal that the meanings adopted by citizenship are very unique to each country. Very few scholars have discussed citizenship from a bottom-up approach. One of these is the study of Miller-Idriss about ordinary Germans’ understandings of citizenship (Miller-Idriss, 2006). Her results show that people constructed understandings of citizenship based on a more *ius soli* approach. Being a German citizen was associated to place of birth and to assimilation processes (Miller-Idriss, 2006:561). With this study, Miller-Idriss shows that young people defeat Germany’s communitarianism, which has been so strongly defended by the past German governments. Miller-Idriss’ results highlight the gap between the institutional approaches from people’s everyday understandings. But in the cases here presented the respondents’ narratives were more inclined to confirm citizenship regimes and integration models more than defeating them.

An important result is that the great majority of the informants with a Turkish parents did not thought of Turkey when describing the personal meaning attributed to citizenship, which would be first and foremost
a condition associated to France and Sweden. When discussing other topics, some respondents talked about Turkey when placing themselves as dual citizens. But it did not come on a first stage. The extent to which they feel close to their Turkish citizenship is different among individuals and highly influenced by their life-history.

4.2 Citizenship in the words of dual citizens

Previously this paper informed of the share of second generation Turks having dual citizenship, which represented a majority in Sweden. All the participants selected for the qualitative part of this study are dual citizens. Therefore it was expected that they reflected this dual status in their narratives. But only a few thought in terms of their Turkish origin when defining citizenship, which actually turned out to be quite symbolic for them.

When the president of the French Republique says “citoyens, citoyennes”\(^3\), I believe he is talking to me... The same [happens] with the president of Turkey. When he starts a speech he says dear Turkish citizens. Then, I know he is talking to me...

(Jim, 23. Turkish origin, Paris)

In some cases, informants having Turkish ancestry used republican values to exemplify the differences between Turkey and France. Liberty and equality are seen as characteristics of France, while fraternity is presented more as a Turkish value. People stated that they missed the sense of fraternity among members of French society. Only a few informants mentioned spontaneously their dual condition. Those who thought on their dual status expressed that in practical or identity terms they feel more close to their condition of citizens in Sweden.

What is citizenship? It is Swedish. I am a dual citizen. But I feel as a Swede.

(Levent, 35. Turkish origin, Stockholm)

Q: Do you feel a Swedish citizenship to the same extent as you feel a Swedish one?
Yes, well. The rights are similar... But it only counts if you know what your rights are... In that case I am Swedish, but by another hand... I do not know how it is actually... Then I feel that I am Swedish that I have a Swedish passport and I belong to the Swedish state in that sense.

(Merkan, 28. Turkish origin, Stockholm)

Merkan and Levent mention two important considerations. Identity and the factual knowledge and possibility to enjoy the rights made them more Swedish citizens than Turks. But there were also a minority of respondents who disregarded citizenship as having anything to do with their identity and allegiances.

It is only papers. Citizenship is only about papers. I mean a person is a person. The cultural heritage one carries has nothing to do with citizenship. So I have two different citizenships. Turkish and Swedish. And what does this mean? It means nothing. The important thing for me is what how I feel, what I have for thoughts on culture and citizenship, and who I am. That is what is most important to me.

(Ender, 24. Turkish origin, Stockholm)

Young people of Turkish origin manifested that to be a French citizen does not necessarily mean to be French. They used the division of everyday life into private and public sphere to develop the idea about being French. The same division was manifested by both individuals with and without Turkish origin. In most of the issues pertaining subjective citizenship- sense of belonging, identification, feeling of equality and significance of the legal status- Parisian respondents used the dichotomy of public and private sphere, always stating the importance of being French in the public life.

You could be a French citizen but do not really be French. To be a French citizen is only on the paper. I am a French citizen. I can vote and etc. To be French citizen is something « sur papier ». But it is in the everyday life- but perhaps not necessary at home. Because at

\(^3\) Citizens in both the male and female connotation according to the French language
my home perhaps I am not French, but outside yes. There, I am French. Because I am [French] in the street and in front of the society.

(Aylin, 23. Turkish origin, Paris)

Among individuals having dual citizenship— the great majority of the interviewees of Turkish ancestry— the fact of having a Turkish passport is more or less a matter of practicality. They do not feel more or less Turks because of the passport.

Q: You have dual citizenship.
Yes I have a double nationality.
Q: Is that important for your identity?
Yes, well not for my Turkish identity but for my identity in general. For me is, I don’t know. It is like a puzzle. Q: Is it important to have another passport or it is something merely symbolic for you?
Well... how can I say this... I wish I had all citizenships if I could... But I would like to say that if one day I would have English or American citizenship or any other citizenship I would say that I am English or American but perhaps that [citizenship] does not come from my parents. It is me who would have acquired. Q: But do you think that there is a relation between your citizenship and your sense of belonging? There is a relation, but... I don’t know. When I am in Turkey, I feel that I belong more to France. Because there are plenty of things in there [Turkey] that I do not agree with. So spontaneously I would say that I am French...

(Marine, 20 years. Turkish origin, Paris)

As Marine express it, there is a symbolic importance attributed to Turkish citizenship. Nevertheless, it is because it is linked to her parents. It is something that she has inherited from them. As most of the respondents Marine does not feel more Turkish only because she has a Turkish passport. She feels mostly French. In Stockholm, those who were not born as Turkish citizens voluntarily decided later in life to acquire Turkish nationality. But their decision was not necessarily influenced by a feeling of belonging to Turkey. Some respondents also thought in practicalities when getting a Turkish citizenship.

Q: Do you have dual citizenship?
Yes I do. I have always been a Swedish citizen. But I got Turkish citizenship five years ago. It was only because we drove to Turkey. Both ways. And in the Balkans countries it is very.... Well... if they see that we have a European passport and drive license then [they ask for] haggles... it gets difficult. that is why we apply for Turkish citizenship. It is much easier in those circumstances...

(Pia, 20. Turkish origin, Stockholm)

The case of Pia show that in some circumstances is more beneficial to be a Turkish citizen. But that was the only reason behind her wish for naturalization. Although dual citizenship it is important in practical and symbolic terms, second generation Turks does not assign to it a higher value than their Swedish citizenship. In both France and Sweden people do not consider that a legal attachment with Turkey is something fundamental for their everyday lives. Being a Turk is something more influenced by the culture they got at home than the legal status.

Another important feature observed in the narratives referred to a double legal status expressed in both languages and as only one condition (La double nationalité; dubbelt medborgarskap), which led to people believing in citizenship as one category that applied to two countries and not to two different statuses. This follows the dynamic introduced by postnational citizenship regarding the universality of citizenship over national contexts. Interestingly, the narratives relating to more detailed aspects of citizenship, as the ones analyzed in the next section, refuted this idea, since the country’s specific status was regarded as the most practised and recognized.
4.3 Rights and duties

From the classical conceptions of citizenship until more contemporary versions, rights and duties have been important elements associated to the term. By another hand, one of the main arguments defended by the opponents to dual citizenship is the overlapping of rights and duties which made people never be neither fully identified nor a proper member in neither polis. In this study, individuals representing the target group do not fulfill with the traditional image of a citizen. They have a migrant background and many of them are dual nationals. Therefore, they were asked about their rights and duties as citizens in an effort to explore this dichotomy in comparison with those who are only citizens in the country of birth.

Following a similar pattern as when describing the meaning of citizenship the rights and duties attributed to citizenship as a legal status appeared to be similar among the respondents of both groups but different across countries. Nevertheless, dual nationals were asked further about their commitments towards Turkey. The purpose when asking about rights and duties was not only to examine the characteristics of their membership in two countries, but also people’s awareness of their status as dual citizens in everyday life, far from the legal aspect.

If the data collected pertaining the definition of citizenship presented almost no difference among ethnic groups, the discussion about rights and duties became slightly more distinctive for each group. Second generation Turks proved to be more aware of their attributions as citizens. In some cases they recognized their rights and duties faster than people with native French/Swedish background. However, the answers regarding the same elements in Turkey were confusing. People acknowledge having rights in Turkey, but it is difficult to recognize specific rights. Besides, they believe they have “more or more substantial” rights in the country they are living.

In France liberty and equality were constantly mentioned, doing a comparison among the two countries. In Sweden the logic was similar. Describing rights and duties made possible for people to give proof of their type of affiliation. This turned to be, again, linked to the adopted citizenship regimes in each country, but also to historical notions on the construction of a nation. In France to vote, liberty of expression, liberty of speech and freedom in general were the rights more frequently mentioned. France’s patriotic elements appear often expressed as rights. France as “the country of human rights”, as “the place in the world where the rights of the men and the citizen were proclaimed”, was often mentioned along with rights. There was also a constant allusion to the universal character of their rights. On the papers, the rights are the same for everybody. It is not an “ethnic thing”... It is something inherent to people...(Demir, 37. Turkish origin, Paris). In this context the rights would not be attached to a country but to mankind. Nevertheless, most participants of the study did identify specific rights associated to each country.

In Sweden, the most mentioned rights by the informants were social support (in the form of social help, “to be cared”, healthcare), education and other elements associated to the welfare system. In general, people named as rights elements related to the welfare system. Liberty of speech was often mentioned as a typical right of a Swedish citizen.

My rights... uf, I have so many here in Sweden... Social help, if you have problems, the state helps you, not only economically but also socially. Support is a major right in a country that cares more to respect rights.

(Sandra, 23. Turkish origin, Stockholm)

I have plenty of rights as a Swedish citizen. Have I not? In Sweden one expects to have right to healthcare, one has care for children, places at school, daycare; one has the right to make one’s voice heard in political issues; It is after all a democracy, it has to be available.

(Monika, 35. Swedish origin, Stockholm)
Sandra and Monika highlighted aspects often implied in the narratives of the respondents in Sweden. It is not only a matter of being entitled to rights. It is mostly about the respect, recognition and the availability of such rights. These narratives reflect the importance of not only having rights but also accessing to such rights. While people in France tend to speak more generally about rights that they were entitled to have, respondents in Sweden offer more practical examples, rights that they receive in their everyday lives. As Monika, many other women with and without Turkish background, have a say about the child-care system and welfare directed to woman and mothers. In this sense, respondents in Sweden, especially woman were more aware of their rights than the respondents in France. There was a general agreement of what constitutes citizenship’s rights and duties among people with native and Turkish ancestry. However, the same tendency as in the previous section was noted. There were differences among the respondents in France and Sweden letting know the unique type of affiliation that citizenship presuppose for each country. The main results pertaining rights and duties are resumed in Table 2.

**Table 2. Rights and duties associated to France and Sweden**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Stockholm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights</strong></td>
<td>To vote</td>
<td>Social care system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberties (expression, speech...)</td>
<td>Liberty of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duties</strong></td>
<td>To vote</td>
<td>To pay taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etre en regle</td>
<td>To work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To participate in the socio-political life.</td>
<td>Personal development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the duties that people declared to have as citizens, these were similar in both countries. The difference was mainly in the priorities that respondents attribute to these duties. Three elements seem to be fundamental for individuals independently of the national context, ethnic origin, socioeconomic position, or legal status. These are to vote, to pay taxes and to respect the law. It was the order attributed that varied among countries. In Sweden to pay taxes was mentioned by all but three of the respondents. To work and to get an education was also mentioned as a duty. Paying taxes is seen as contribution to everybody’s welfare. The several benefits of the social system were often stated. Those benefits were placed as the results of everyone’s taxes.

*Those who do not pay taxes hurt themselves, because taxes sustain us all in Sweden.*
*(Boran, 24, Turkish origin. Stockholm)*

*Everybody can work, in no matter what. I really cannot understand why people do not want to work. I pay my taxes, my father pay taxes his whole life, and now we are feeding this people [people not looking for a job]. And that should not continue. It makes me angry and frustrated.*
*(Selma, 27, Turkish origin- Stockholm)*

The whole narrative is constructed as a mutual obligation among people and the state. Later, when talking about the importance of legal citizenship, a third of the respondents with Turkish background expressed that it is not relevant to be a member of society, as long as a person works and pays taxes.

In France, respect to the laws was mentioned in the first place by a majority of the informants and later to vote. The civic approach is clear when individuals also mentioned the participation in the political and social life as a duty.

*Duties as a citizen... Well to participate of the life in society by, for example, being informed of the political life of France.*
*(Salim, 23. Turkish origin, Paris)*

*To know the law and respect it. To pay taxes and, well, more importantly, to respect the French culture.*
*(Emre, 37. Turkish origin, Paris)*
The respect to some social and “unwritten but common” rules was also relevant for them, and it was also mentioned when talking about integration. Those rules, that “everybody knows but nobody teaches you”, were emphasized by them as being a part of France. Something that they know but their parents did not when they arrived to the country. As most of the respondents having Turkish origin were also citizens in Turkey, they are also entitled to the same rights and the same duties as in their country of birth. Nevertheless, they never mentioned their rights and duties in Turkey spontaneously. They needed to be specifically requested about this. This was presented as a conflictive aspect of having a dual attachment.

In general, the respondents were less aware or less eager to find out which are their rights and duties as Turkish citizens. Moreover, second generation Turks do not consider that their rights in Turkey have the same importance as their rights as citizens in France or Sweden. I live here. I have my rights here, in Sweden. I am in Turkey only two or three weeks per year. I do not need rights down there. (Elif, 23. Turkish origin- Stockholm).

The few elements recognized when analyzing the narratives are synthesized in Table 3.

### Table 3. Rights and duties associated to Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Stockholm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights in Turkey</td>
<td>To live and settle down there. Access to inheritance</td>
<td>The same but “less substantial”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties in Turkey</td>
<td>Military Service</td>
<td>Military Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the male respondents mentioned that it was their parents who asked them to acquire or to retain Turkish citizenship, because this will allow them to have the necessary rights to track their inheritance. In this sense, such rights are necessary to continue with their parents economic interests in Turkey.

Q: Is you Turkish citizenship important for you
No, not at all.

Q: Is it only about papers? No, it is just my father who asked for it. And then he wanted me to keep it because my parents come from a farming family. And my father is the older brother of the family, and he possesses land over there. He said to me: My son, if you want to keep track of your inheritance, you have to take the dual nationality. Otherwise, you could refuse to all and there is no problem...

(Karam, 21. Turkish origin, Paris)

For Karam his Turkish citizenship is more a way to please his father and a practicality for the future than a factual membership. It does not have a consequence for his identity or sense of belonging. But the fact that his Turkish citizenship entails to be a land-owner might in the future change the feelings of Karam towards Turkey. Here it is necessary to think in the young age of the respondents. Most of them were students and they might turn to Turkey in the future. Then, their Turkish citizenship might be of great help.

The rights and duties spontaneously recognized by the informants do not express the characteristics of being a dual citizen or having dual attachments. Instead, this topic reflected the citizenship regimes and the public discourse on integration in the respective countries. In France people answered as republican citizens, emphasizing the importance of the law and the respect for social rules and political participation. While in Sweden they proved to be the perfect inhabitants of a Nordic Welfare State by stating capital importance to paying taxes and referring to welfare as a right they receive.

### 4.4 Being a citizen, being an equal

Turks’ descendants in this study expressed themselves more as citizens of the country in which they are living than Turkish citizens. Their membership seems to be regarded as only one, in spite of their legal status. This could presuppose that individuals having a migrant background are successfully integrated...
into the political community of their country of residence. However, the fact of expressing themselves preferring one country over the other does not necessarily mean that they feel as equals in a country in which they do not belong to the ethnic majority.

The respondents were asked: Do you feel that you are a citizen equal to any other in France/Sweden? On a first instance, a great majority of the respondents tend to say that they belong to the society in which they are living. Jim and Zuzu reflects the two different attitudes that respondents with Turkish origin assume with respect to what is to be “a citizen as any other”. Jim (22 years, student) believes that in order to feel as a normal citizen people need to act typically French in order to be accepted.

Well, that depends on what do you mean as a normal citizen. For instance, if a person – as anybody else- means to do what everybody else does or practices French traditions, [as] the French society wants [then] I would not be a person who... a French person. But if one is integrated to the society, works, is able to discuss with other people, be a part of... [then] I would say I am totally integrated

(Jim, 22. Turkish origin, Paris)

Jim separates to belonging from identification. He does not define himself as a French as the society wants him to be. He believes that he belongs to the context because he is integrated in structural and social terms.

Zuzu (19) believes that she is as any other French citizen, but there are some exceptions that make her feel as a foreigner.

Well, yes. I mean most of the time. But there is certain people who have different ideas. I think on the National Front 4 then I hesitate... If us... I believe that in their program in the presidential elections. There as an issue... a proposition based on the idea of forbid naturalization for foreign people. In the same program there were discriminatory elements for example, [a proposition] saying that it was necessary that French people should be prioritized when it comes to housing. But I would say that most people... most people here in Paris at least... In Paris, as there are loads of foreigners in fact. And therefore I believe that yes... I believe that even people who have a different origin are seeing as French citizens.

(Zuzu, 19. Turkish origin, Paris)

Zuzu uses a socio-political phenomenon to illustrate why she does not feel accepted sometimes. But at the same time she expresses her feeling of belonging and equality to French society based on the multiculturalism of Paris. This was one of the surprises of this research. Half of the respondents in Paris (18 out of 31) described Paris as a multicultural city, which was a positive sign of inclusion for those of Turkish origin and part of the cultural richness of the city for those of French origin. In spite of a denial of multiculturalism in an official level, Parisians do embrace it as a positive feature of the city. And what makes this more interesting is that second generation Turks believes that multiculturalism is what makes them feel a part of the society.

In Stockholm, a great majority answered to feel as an equal among other Swedish citizens. Nevertheless, the respondents were clear when mentioning that this was not a synonym of being Swedish. Moreover, their “foreigness” should not presuppose discrimination because it is personal effort what leads to success in society and overpass the barrier that a different ethnic origin might carry.

My name is foreign. But I have never experience such a thing. It is perhaps because I am a social person and I am proficient in Swedish language. But I have never experience that. I have heard much about it. But it does not feel close to me. Do not have a job because I have a foreign name.... It might happen later in the future. But it is more about personality I

4 Frente Nationale. Extreme right wing organization whose leader is Jean-Marie Le Pen. The National Front exacerbates French nationalistic identity by rejecting any kind of foreign influence.
believe. You go to an interview and show what you can do. Then it does not really matter if your name is Ahmet or Erik, I believe.  

(Pia, 20. Turkish origin, Stockholm)

Pia expresses faith in the system. As many other respondents she recognizes that discrimination exists for people of migrant origin. Nevertheless, she accentuated that it has never occur to her, and that she will be able to overpass it in the future by showing her capacities. Pia has reasons to be confident. She is studying to become an engineer. But what happens when someone without Pia’s degree of education talks about their feeling of equality as a citizen?

I am as any other Swedish citizen but... I would not like to go and hang out with Swedes down at the city centre. We do not have so much in common I believe.

Q: Why not?
It is the cultural part. They have another sense of humor another language. They have other [kind off] parents. They have another values. They have money.

Q: But at the same time you said you feel Swedish.
Yes, I am Swedish.

Q: Would you say that you are treated differently?
It is still quite OK. But it could be better. There is nothing that I would get a grip with and try to change... I live my own culture and I am still Swedish. I am not here to be Swedish. But I do still have Swedish citizenship. I follow their rules and their rights and duties.

(Smek, 20. Turkish origin, Stockholm)

Smek is a good example of young boys who identify as Swedes but do not feel belonging to the “Swedish group”. Smek lives in Rinkeby, a stereotypical immigrant area and he struggles studying in an adult education center to get more credits in order to opt for a vocational education. Nevertheless, the feeling of exclusion from the “Swedes” as a group- but not from Sweden- was a constant for young men of Turkish origin in Stockholm, independently of their socioeconomic status or educational level.

In Paris, people express their feeling of belonging to France conditioned to maintain their Turkish side hidden. For some respondents, the impossibility of being considered as Turk is what makes them feel accepted in the French society.

People at the street who could see me would never think that I am Turkish. They would not recognize me.... They would be surprised [to know] that I am Turkish, voilá. They do not know much what is Turkey. However, this is a bit negative because the only things they know about Turkey is about the “intégrisme” and things like that. So they have a bad image of Turkey and when they know more about me they say it is not possible that you are Turkish.

Q: And why do you feel that you are not regarded as a Turk?
Well, perhaps because they already have another idea of a Turkish person. They have another image in their minds about the Turks. And that [image] cannot be like I am.

(Aylin, 23. Turkish origin, Paris.)

Aylin considers herself to be accepted and feels that she belongs to the French society. But because people in the outside world do not know that she is a Turk. If they knew she believes she would not be accepted because of prejudices against Turkey. Parisians of native background declared that even though identification was not necessary, certain rules of the French society ought to be adopted for “people’s sake”. The rhetoric of assimilation thus came before multicultural rhetoric. French identity was presented for most of the individuals as important in order to be a part of society. But at the same time, not all second generation Turks in Paris declared to feel themselves to the same extent as they feel Turkish. People of both groups recognized of the importance of personal assimilation in French society.

The possibility of multiple belongings is open for both groups but with stronger arguments in the case of Stockholm. The concept and dynamics of integration in Sweden reflect the multicultural discourse. Respondents stated that everybody needed to integrate into Swedish society regardless of ethnic origin. Such affirmation was equally embraced by respondents with a native Swedish background. Given that
integration is a process that includes the society as a whole, individuals feel that they are able to retain their originality.

*When you adjust it does not mean that you take away your roots. It is not about that. To adapt is about finding the true importance, to weight. It is like a boat you need to balance, in order not to forget your origin and at the same time to develop yourself. Sweden is a free country and if a person decided to live in Sweden, it is still possible to be him/herself. Sweden does not demand you to become Swedish; it is like: “we are the helping hand; try to benefit from it and do something that can help society”.*

(Pia, 20. Södermalm, Stockholm)

Confronted with the importance of belonging and identification with the country in which they were born, people answered that belonging was essential for daily life. Nevertheless, identification with national categories did not prove to be related to the virtue of being a good citizen.

**5. Summary and last remarks**

Second generation Turks seem to maintain their parents’ citizenship whenever the national legislation allow them to do so. In the cases here studied a majority of the individuals surveyed were dual citizens in France and in Sweden. But the fact of being a dual citizen does not proved to affect membership and allegiances in the country of birth.

The comparison among ethnic groups and across countries indicates that the main differences regarding experiences about citizenship can be found between individuals in France and Sweden and not between people with native and Turkish origin. The differences in the narratives among second generation Turks and people having native-born parents were reduced. However, the dissimilarities among countries were striking when defining citizenship. There is a notorious influence of citizenship regimes over people’s conceptions about citizenship. It seems that people cannot escape to the official discourse and expresses as proper republican citizens in France and welfare citizens in Sweden.

The recognition of diversity by the respondents in Paris is a surprising outcome in this study. Moreover, such diversity is actually what allows them feeling included in the French society. A recognition of diversity and the use of it as a ground for belonging contradicts the aversion for multiculturalism that the French political discourse has historically embraced. This was one of the few contested principles by the respondents having Turkish background in France.

In the case of Sweden, multiculturalism- although contested and permanently reformulated- could be behind the association of citizenship with belonging. A multicultural environment makes possible for people to feel inserted, in spite of their different background, in a society that includes without denying people’s cultural heritage. However, this cannot explain why the respondents having native ancestry also tend to associate citizenship with belonging. A possible explanation is that the Swedish welfare state and its universalistic character what makes Swedish citizens think on citizenship as an status that makes them a part of a society. There are grounds supporting this assumption. Sweden has been considered one of the most generous- if not the most generous- welfare states in Europe. The universality of the welfare make people feel contained and protected which generates a sense of belonging that overpass ethnicity.

Remarkably, people do not mention arguments close to classical principles that attribute citizenship as a legal status *ius soli, ius sanguinis* or *ius domicile*. This is perhaps a manifestation of citizenship is not being regarded as a legal status, but a practice in the case of France and an element of inclusion in the case of Sweden. Only a few thought of citizenship as a legal status only, but it was always accompanied by elements characteristic of the citizenship model that characterizes the country in which they were born.
In Sweden, citizenship is described through the elements of the welfare system. A good citizen is conscious of the system and contributes with work and taxes. Meanwhile in France a good republican citizen respects the law and is interested in the history and culture as grounds of the French Republic. Continuous reference to liberty, equality and fraternity are proves of the embeddedness of these young adults to French symbolism. Citizenship is expressed in terms of the elements given by the Revolution and the French Republique. The lack of such symbols in Swedish public discourse but a multicultural laissez faire resulted in an expression of aspects related to belonging as constitutive of citizenship. Although people of Turkish origin do not feel entirely identified with the category of Swede, they do feel a strong belonging to the country in which they were born and live.

The respondents - being between 19 and 37 years old - show that they are very much embedded in the discursive reality of the country in which they were born when it comes to citizenship in spite of their condition as dual nationals. The striking dissimilarities among the countries included in this study show that citizenship models and integration paradigms are strong elements influencing people’s perceptions of their living conditions, future prospects and belonging to the national society. People expressed their rights and duties according to what they believe the society requires from them. The perceptions referred to civic and cultural elements in France and more structural – welfare state rights and duties – in Sweden. Again, the ethnic origin does not show to be an intervenient factor when narrating personal opinions about citizenship. At the beginning of this paper, it was announced that citizenship would be approached from “people’s own words”. Nevertheless, it is country-specific models who actually talked through their citizens. In this case citizens have different origins and socio-economic backgrounds but in spite of this express a similar discourse. The exception could be in those individuals who identify citizenship with something merely legal, who were equally frequent among countries and ethnic origins. Citizenship is still a synonym of naturalization and a passport for some people as it is for legal-oriented theorists. Nevertheless, even these individuals were able to describe rights and duties associated to such legal figure in the specific context in which they were born. The regimes are still present in these cases. In that sense, dual citizenship is not affecting the perceptions that people have of citizenship and the rights and duties attributed to it. Unexpectedly, there was a lack of references to Turkey among the indire asked specifically about it descendants and also Turkish citizens. Turkey was rarely mentioned as a source of citizenship or the place in which exercise rights and duties. People are less entangled with their Turkish citizenship. Rights and duties are expressed thinking in the country of birth and residence. This is a sign that a dual legal status does not represents an impediment to be embedded in the country of residence.

The results of this study could be very different if the same questions were asked in countries following an ethnic-based conception of citizenship. The opportunities for second generation Turks to access to national citizenship, to be included as an equal citizen and furthermore, to be recognize as a national are few in e.g. Germany or Austria individuals are very reduced. Therefore, their conceptions of citizenship could be very different than the ones presented in this study. Perhaps, if the study would have looked into second generation Maghrébians’ reality in France or Somalians in Sweden, the results would have also been very different due to the stereotipation of these groups and different positioning in the French and Swedish societies.

This paper has discussed dual citizenship and the case of second generation Turks from a conceptual perspective. In another work based on the same study the factual membership is examined with similar results. Second generation Turks are members of the country of residence by voting and participating of the sociopolitical life and Turkey plays a minor role in their lives in spite of being also Turkish citizens (Vera-Larrucea, 2011). They are no less members of Sweden and France as political communities because of having Turkish citizenship.
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