



POLITICAL DUALITY OF DUAL CITIZENSHIP –  
DIASPORA VERSUS MINORITIES: A RESEARCH  
FRAMEWORK

AGNESE LĀCE  
KOÇ UNIVERSITY

INTEGRIM ONLINE PAPERS

2/2014

“The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 316796”

*A citizen exists originally within the political confines of a state, and until a genuinely global state exists that has sovereign powers to impose its will, it is misleading to talk about the “global citizen”.*

(Isin and Turner 2007: 14)

### **1. *Diaspora, Minorities and Citizenship***

While it is clear that a global state will not be on the horizon in the nearest future, and that global citizenship is rather a concept for theoretical exercise, multiple citizenship has been on the academic and political agenda for a while. Several countries in Europe are planning to or have already (re-)introduced dual citizenship measures in their citizenship laws. Such amendments present several challenges to any state, as citizenship policy directly influences relations with its diaspora abroad, national minorities within the state and the kin-state of these minorities, and international organizations, similarly to Brubaker's (1995, 1996) 'triangular configuration'. In other words, citizenship policy is increasingly politicised (Bauböck et al 2009: 15), and changes in citizenship policy interact with state's diaspora policy, internal policy and foreign policy, and introduce dilemmas when trying to accommodate interests of all parties involved. Some point out that migration has already altered the perception of citizenship as a legal status that excludes, rather than includes persons or groups (Joppke 1999). While the latter may hold true for national minority populations in host countries with restrictive naturalization policies, if aimed at diaspora, citizenship policy is more likely to be inclusive in order to preserve state's citizenry.

The political importance of diasporas is rarely contested, especially in the context of economic development of the kin-state or representation of state interests abroad. States seek to create favourable circumstances for diaspora engagement (Vertovec 2005; Pogonyi 2011; Newland 2010; Rannveig et al 2012; Xavier 2011). Yet, not only the actual participation of diaspora can be used as a political tool, but also the existence of it as such, when explaining certain provisions regarding multiple citizenship that may be disadvantageous to other population groups concerned. Furthermore, even the activities of diaspora communities themselves may be directed towards such arrangement, becoming involved in a rather political process of nation-building. Diasporic communities are engaged in defining the meaning and formulating the regulations of citizenship (Barabantseva and Sutherland 2011; Xavier 2011).

Governments may have different reasons and strategies for addressing and/or categorizing their populations abroad, but a central characteristic is seeing the nation-state as “the optimal condition of political-existence” (Ragazzi 2009). This thread of reasoning is interwoven also in states' citizenship policies, and further exemplifies the dilemmas governments face when matching the different policy aspects identified above. It is the mere existence of a state that serves as a driving force for a debate within the state.

Reluctance for dual nationality, thus, has been a characteristic of citizenship policies of liberal democratic states, inter alia, to prevent too much political participation both by minority populations and diasporas; however, a liberalization of plural citizenship regulations can also be identified, dominated by ethnic conceptions and attempts to use citizenship policy to compensate for historical wrongdoings by

conferring or denying citizenship (Liebich 2009, Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer 2002, Vertovec 2005; Joppke 1999). Hence, in Europe one can trace a wide spectrum of state positions regarding plural citizenship with varying degrees of acceptance, as well as varying motivations. Iordachi (2006) claims that while in Western Europe dual citizenship has become more acceptable due to the need to incorporate immigrants as a result of economic globalization, in Eastern Europe it is still more linked with revival of nationalist and ethnic policies, remaining in the centuries-old European tradition. Besides, “a growing number of countries [...] do not allow plural citizenship for naturalised citizens but authorise it for members of their own ethnic group” residing abroad, hence, looking out for their own ethnic kin (Liebich 2009: 23; Ragazzi 2009). “Minority rights can sometimes be regarded as the price to be paid for the rights of ethnic kins in the diaspora (Pap 2006: 245), quite contrary to Kymlicka’s (1995) multicultural citizenship idea. However, to verify claims of “diasporic nationalism” (Ragazzi 2009), a more in-depth analysis is required, focusing not only on institutions and historical context, but also political discourse of different actors on national and international level. Furthermore, the effects of recent migration in and out of countries on citizenship policies still need to be assessed, especially in the EU context, as free movement of labour has increased the opportunities of, the rights to and the scope of mobility (Isin and Turner 2007). Also, EU integration processes may be linked with claims that citizenship policies become more liberal due to weakening or redefinition of state sovereignty (Pogonyi 2011: 685-686; Barabantseva and Sutherland 2011).

## **2. Research Questions and Design**

Following the outline of some debates concerning diaspora, minorities and citizenship, several questions arise. *How to keep a state’s citizenry despite extensive emigration and intensive immigration? How to react to the presence of more nationalities in one country without upsetting the diaspora? How to balance attitudes towards a national minority and one’s own diaspora in minority’s kin-state?* One may argue for ethno-politics as a rather simple explanatory framework, albeit other factors, influenced by the rationale of ‘political existence’, as international commitments, constructed borders, economic preferences, security considerations, among others, may in fact have a larger impact on formulating citizenship policies. Indeed, dual citizenship may not be as widely accepted as recently claimed (Stasiulis and Ross 2006; Howard 2010), or even may be used to strengthen state’s sovereignty, contrary to the usual perception (Pogonyi 2011).

As can be seen, citizenship and migration nexus is not a newcomer in policy research. There have been numerous publications comparing experiences of different states (Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer 2000, 2001, 2002), for example, assessing the impact of political landscape (Howard 2010) and the impact of citizenship policies on naturalization (e.g. Dronkers and Vink 2012). However, previous studies focus on national membership models and access of citizenship to immigrants, according to Vink and Bauböck (2013: 4), rather than the dilemmas a state faces when deciding on citizenship provisions for its diaspora and national minorities residing within the state. Moreover, there has been a particular focus on European and North American states (Joppke 1999, Bauböck et al 2006), also the new EU member states separately (Bauböck et al 2009), but not in a comparative perspective in the context of free movement of people within the EU and of European citizenship. Furthermore, previous studies mostly focus on analysing the

legal framework citizenship policies set. Therefore, this research aims at analysing the impact of European citizenship framework on dual citizenship debates in parliaments of three countries – an old EU member state (the Netherlands), a new EU member state (Latvia), and an EU candidate country (Turkey) – where both a diaspora and a minority population is present. Adding a candidate country serves as introducing a control variable regarding the impact of European citizenship.

The research proposed rather aims to analyse the *process* of how respective citizenship policies and diaspora policies come about – the dilemmas that exist and the discourses states use to solve them, following the logic of policy analysis or policy evaluation, defined by F.Fischer (1995: 2) as “an applied endeavour “which uses multiple methods of inquiry and argument to produce and transform policy relevant information”, [...] and is designed to supply information about complex social and economic problems and to assess the processes through which their resolution is pursued.”

The research will be structured in four stages. First, a comprehensive theoretical framework on the nexus of citizenship, diaspora and national minorities will be elaborated by drawing on classical notions of these concepts, identifying points of (possible) intersection or even clash. That will help identify the political dilemmas state governments may face when deciding on a particular policy.

Second stage focuses on identification and analysis of relevant documents and materials to sketch the legal framework of each particular case at the moment of the research. A useful tool for the completion of this stage will be the numerous databases on citizenship regulations, for example, by EUDO Observatory on Citizenship.

Third, an interpretation of the nature of politics or discourse analysis will be performed, providing a context – political, geographic, historic, economic and migratory – for the political debates regarding provisions of dual citizenship, as well as carefully ‘reading’ the arguments used by all parties involved – the state, the diaspora, the minority, international organizations as OSCE or EU, in order to achieve a thorough perspective on the challenges of citizenship policy making. The intended research method is described in detail below. Finally, the cases will be compared to identify trends (if any) or to explain differences in the policy making process.

A comparative analysis of three countries using discourse analysis will be performed to formulate policy guidelines for dealing with political dualities when developing citizenship policies. A significant contribution would be to identify mechanisms that allow protecting members of minority groups and diaspora alike.

### **3. *Research Method: Discourse Analysis***

Discourse analysis has been used extensively to analyse communication of different political actors both on the national, as well as international level, drawing on the contemporary understanding of deliberative politics. As Dryzek (2006) puts it, “a discourse is a shared set of concepts, categories, and ideas that provides its adherents with a framework for making sense of situations, embodying judgments, assumptions, capabilities, dispositions and intentions [...] and] it provides basic terms for analysis, debates, agreements, and disagreements” (p.1). Discourses are primary components of construction of a meaning

of a process, involving both practices and language, and hence can help explaining the process of politics (ibid, p.3). As parliaments by their definition are forums of talking (if not conversation) when discussing legislative proposals or assessing the work of other government institutions, thus representing a formalised and institutionalised form of political language (Bayley 2004: 7, Ilie 2010).

Vivien A. Schmidt (2010) classifies approaches that explain political change in institutional context in terms of ideas and discourses as discursive institutionalism. “Discursive institutionalism is an umbrella concept for the vast range of works in political science that take account of the substantive content of ideas and the interactive processes by which ideas are conveyed and exchanged through discourse” (Schmidt 2010: 3). Not only does discursive institutionalism look at the framing, narrative and other representation of ideas through discourse, but also at the interactive dimension of discursive processes, namely, how policy ideas are constructed, communicated, deliberated and legitimated through epistemic communities, advocacy coalitions, communicative action and deliberative democracy (ibid: 5). All of these dimensions of discursive practices are present in the debate on dual citizenship, and once again show the different levels of policies and actors involved in this process. Thus, while this research aims at analysing parliamentary debates and thus parliamentary discourse more directly, it will be necessary to look at the role of epistemic communities and advocacy coalitions in shaping the discourse on dual citizenship.

Moreover, institutions in this case are understood as structures of meaning (ibid: 4), and discourse analysis can provide grounds to an exploration on changes in the meaning of central concepts as diaspora, minority, and citizenship in parliamentary discourse that may indicate shifts in the character of parliamentary debates, as well as in the society.

Teun A. van Dijk has elaborated a comprehensive framework for critical discourse analysis, also, among other fields, focusing on parliamentary discourse on immigration and ethnicity in particular (van Dijk 2000a, 2000b). He argues for the necessity to develop categories of analysis based on theoretical framework of concepts, for example, in case of this research proposal, clear definitions of diaspora, minorities, citizenship. Also, the context of specific parliamentary debates, involving participants, settings, actors, and tentative aims needs to be defined prior to discourse analysis. Such pattern is observed in the previously outlined structure of the proposed research, and allows for systemic examination of various semantic and formal levels of discourse to determine the mechanisms that are used to shape the legal framework of citizenship regulation (van Dijk 2000b).

Discourse can be viewed from two perspectives. On the one hand, it shows the interaction of the parliament *with* other political actors, including diaspora, minorities and international organizations, hence embodying the interactional form of problematisation. On the other hand, discourse has cognitive properties that serve as shaping the meaning of the problematique or, in other words, discourse *about* sensitive categories (van Dijk 2000b: 88).

Parliamentary debates about ethnic affairs and immigration belong to this latter type of discourse. Analysis of such debates yields insights into the ways politicians not only (a) speak about minorities or immigrants, but indirectly also (b) about their social representations they share about the Others and (c) the possible effects of parliamentary debates on the representations of recipients, in this case (d) *within a socio-political*

*context of legislation and public opinion formation.* In this theoretical framework, then, we need to analyse those discourse structures or categories that are typically involved in these social and cognitive functions of expressing or influencing ethnic representations (van Dijk 2000b: 88; emphasis added).

Some of the focus points of discourse analysis of parliamentary debates are the topics covered, the implicit arguments made, disclaimers or justifications of arguments, level of detail, and other semantic structures used. Also, the types of lexicon used, for example, ‘illegal’ v. ‘irregular’, as well as pronouns employed (‘us’ v. ‘them’) along with rhetorical tools are central to discourse analysis (van Dijk 2000b). Van Dijk also suggests that discourse also “exhibits more specific schematic organizational patterns, that is, some kind of superstructure” (1985: 3). Okulsa and Cap (2010) offer insights in how language – political rhetoric, mediated communication, ideology, politics of language choice, etc. – can be used to reach political outcomes.

These different properties of discourse require a mixed method approach to the analysis of parliamentary debate. On the one hand, qualitative methods of close reading and interpreting the arguments provides the necessary in-depth analysis of particular arguments in particular contexts. For example, S.Cohen (1996) classifies state responses to assessments of non-governmental organizations or international institutions regarding human rights situation, thus indicating the commitment of the state to solve the respective issue. On the other hand, quantitative methods as coding and ‘quantifying’ the arguments, terms, labels and similar help to identify patterns and trends in parliamentary discourse. This will require creating such a coding system that is suitable for all three countries, taking into account specificities of language in order to allow a cross-country comparison. The quantitative dimension will allow to observe the dynamic of arguments and labels used, showing the shifts in meaning and salience of issues and terms, as deemed important by discursive institutionalism. There are several data analysis programs that facilitate both approaches to discourse analysis, for example, MAXQDA. Other authors have been successful analysing parliamentary debates, using computer assistance by programs as Hamlet and Alceste (Bara et al 2007).

The discourse analysis in the framework of proposed research will be performed on the transcripts of parliamentary debates that may facilitate the process of coding, but with the sacrifice of spoken intonations, reactions in the audience and similar live interactions. Nevertheless, the focus is on the shape and content of arguments made in favour or against dual citizenship regulations. Besides, transcripts are easily accessible to researchers on-line. However, as it is significant for the aim of this research to identify the impact of also non-parliamentary actors (e.g. epistemic communities, advocacy networks), research regarding proposals from other actors or groups regarding citizenship legislation will need to be performed. While a part of such proposals is confidential under the framework of quiet diplomacy, some signs may be traced in the arguments made in the parliament.

Of course, for a cross-country comparison a reiteration of importance of context is necessary, as the character of the parliamentary debates will depend significantly on the role of the parliament in comparison to the executive or in policy-making process in general, the type of state (unitary v. federative), election systems and political culture (Bayley 2004). Indeed, Steiner et al (2004) have explored

the impact of different institutional factors on the character and outcomes of deliberations. Furthermore, process-tracing will be used to contextualise the debates. The next section of this proposal addresses case selection, and gives a brief overview of the three countries selected.

#### **4. Case Selection**

The aim of this research is to analyse the impact of European citizenship framework on dual citizenship debates in parliaments of three countries where both a diaspora and a minority community is present. The core method used in the research will be that of discourse analysis and the main aim of the research proposed is to explore the political dilemmas connected with dual citizenship in three countries – an old EU member state (the Netherlands), a new EU member state (Latvia), and an EU candidate country (Turkey) from 1990-2013. Latvia's citizenship policies are influenced by excessive emigration to other EU member states in the recent years, as well as its historical legacy of forced incorporation in the USSR; debates in the Netherlands are mainly centred on status of immigrants and the special circumstances when one is allowed to keep multiple nationalities; Turkey's acceptance of multiple citizenship seeks to maintain ties with emigrants, but has been closely linked with the developments of citizenship policies in their host countries, e.g. Germany, as well as with immigration of Turkish descent and culture. The cases chosen for the comparative analysis represent different geographic, historic, political and migratory contexts, and include both an 'old' and a 'new' member state, and a candidate country, that will allow to control for the impact of EU membership on such debates in context with European citizenship, European identity and free movement of labour.

While comparative method is one of the principal methods of political science research, it often is criticised for having too many variables for analysis in too little cases, facing the problem of theoretical overload even when analysing a small number of cases (Denk 2010: 29). Several solutions are provided for this issue. First, the comparative approach chosen for this study is that of most different cases or *Most Different Systems Design* (Denk 2010; Anckar 2008), aiming at seeing the impact of one variable – that of European citizenship – on dual-citizenship debates in countries with different migratory backgrounds and current context. Following this design, one first compares variable interactions within different systems and then compares the outcomes of this analysis between the cases (ibid: 391). For the quantitative dimension of the research, multi-level techniques allow simultaneous analysis of both levels, provided that regression models are built following the logic of most different systems approach, namely, that the contexts vary as much as possible, as it allows excluding more system-level variables from the regression models. Moreover, the dependent variable should be placed at the sub-systemic level, while the independent variable – at the systemic level (ibid: 391-392). This condition corresponds to the aim of the proposed research, where impact of European citizenship (independent variable) on national dual citizenship debates (dependent variable) is to be assessed.

Taking European citizenship regime as a systemic variable allows not only increasing the number of comparative cases, but also the possibility of analysing more complex relationship between factors, embedded in the regression models. Second, the theoretical discussions regarding terms and labels can be

limited to the specific region. And finally, the most different systems approach increases sensitivity to intra-system factors and variations within countries that is relevant for the proposed research, as identified above in the discussion on discourse analysis and its context-dependency (Denk 2010: 30). Moreover, this research can address a limitation of intra-system design identified in the literature, as it aims to assess the effects of systemic level exerted on the sub-systemic level (ibid).

What follows is a brief overview of the main developments regarding citizenship issues in the three selected countries to provide an insight in the differences across the cases, justifying the selection of most different systems approach.

#### **4.1. Latvia**

The debates on citizenship in Latvia are influenced, on the one hand, by extensive emigration during both world wars, as well as within the framework of free movement on labour in the EU, and, on the other hand, by immigration to the current territory of Latvia during the Soviet period. The former migration dynamic has fostered a creation of a numerically significant Latvian diaspora, while the latter – the presence of a large Russian-speaking national minority amounting to over 25% of the population according to the most recent census. While Latvia is essentially an emigration country, the role of the largest minority group has shaped state's policy towards citizenship in a twofold manner.

After the restoration of independence in 1990 dual citizenship was primarily seen as a tool to reconnect with the émigrés, but the time-span allotted for application for dual citizenship was limited. 1994 Citizenship Law in combination with the principle of state continuation provided opportunities for dual citizenship, without unambiguously recognizing it. Citizenship policy as such was not implemented in a way to accommodate the suddenly marginalized group of Russian-speaking minority, despite efforts of international organizations as OSCE HCNM, EU and Council of Europe to convince the government to liberalise this policy, and culminated with the final introduction of the non-citizen status in 1995. Today, a high number of non-citizens remain due to unwillingness to naturalise as a result of internal struggles (language acquisition) and external benefits (visa-free travel to Russia) (Krūma 2013).

Recently, diaspora policies have gained prominence on the current policy agenda as a reaction to prospects of lack of workforce and extensive emigration as a result of the economic crisis, and the debate on dual citizenship resurfaced as a tool to strengthen links with the diaspora. Russia was excluded from the list of countries, citizens of which are eligible to hold dual citizenship with Latvia, again failing to use this policy instrument as an incentive to promote integration among the minority community. Changes in the Citizenship Law seemed necessary in order to accommodate it to changing flows of economic emigration, as well as historical emigration, making it easier to acquire citizenship for children of emigrated citizens, in addition to Latvian citizens who emigrated during World War II and their descendants, basically meaning a second round of applications for émigrés and their descendants. The amendments allowing dual citizenship entered into force on 1 October 2013.

#### **4.2. *The Netherlands***

The character of Dutch citizenship regulations stems from the immigration country status of the Netherlands. Initially used as a tool to facilitate integration and improve minorities' legal position along with the promotion of multiculturalism in 1980s it has become more assimilationist and instead of being seen as means for integration has become the end of the integration process. Along with more restrictive immigration policies, more restrictive measures for residence and naturalization were introduced in early 2000s (van Oers et al 2013).

A significant Dutch diaspora was formed in the years after WWII when the government of the Netherlands encouraged its citizens to resettle abroad in order to increase government's capacity dealing with social security pressures. At the same time, along with second generation immigrants, former Dutch citizens and subjects (residents of former colonies) were in a privileged position regarding naturalization – naturalization for applicants with a strong connection to the Netherlands was seen as their right, and the cultural affinity was seen as a favouring factor for successful integration (van Oers et al 2013).

The 1984 Dutch Nationality Act provided circumstances for possibility of dual citizenship; however, the government of the Netherlands explicitly opposed dual citizenship and introduced such measures as automatic loss of citizenship for Dutch nationals after spending ten or more years abroad or a requirement to renounce previous citizenship upon naturalization of possible. Both diaspora and immigrant communities were opposed to the respective regulations and in early 1990s also the government saw dual citizenship as a tool for promoting integration. A compromise was reached in the government loosening the renunciation requirement for immigrants. Dutch citizens residing abroad for more than 10 years or with another citizenship were excluded from the target group of this change. Both emigrant communities and political parties opposed this differential treatment, and in the end 1995 Citizenship Law allowed for dual citizenship both for immigrants and emigrants. When the Netherlands again faced integration troubles (acquiring citizenship for pragmatic reasons and not as a sign of loyalty), instead of amending dual citizenship regulations, the requirements for integration were made more restrictive and the opportunities for Dutch residing abroad to retain or re-acquire citizenship were enlarged (van Oers et al 2013).

Recently the debates on dual citizenship have resurfaced and are centred around the distribution of benefits among emigrants and immigrants. Political parties are divided on the issue, some willing to retain equal access to dual citizenship for both groups, while some suggest a preferential treatment of the emigrants. In such a case the regulations of dual citizenship will have gone a full circle from favouring immigrants initially to emigrant communities instead.

#### **4.3. *Turkey***

Turkish citizenship was constructed during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century along the establishment of the Republic. Initially the main underlying principle for defining the citizenry was religion – also non-Turkish groups residing in the territory of Turkey were recognised as part of the citizenry if they were Muslim, while non-Muslim Turkic were excluded. Such cultural conceptualization of citizenship was challenged by increasing

international migration and formation of large Turkish emigrant communities abroad and rise of powerful religious, ethnic movements of Kurds, Alevis and others. Implementation of dual citizenship has been controversial as a result of the former challenge. It was first implemented in April 1981, which led to a large number of emigrants acquiring citizenship in their countries of residence while retaining their Turkish citizenship. Thus, Turkey considers dual citizenship as a tool of integration of migrants in receiving societies. The uprising of identity-based groups, in turn, has increased the awareness of citizenship as a tool for solving identity-based conflicts and has resulted in a shift away from Islam as main determining factor for citizenship by recognizing multicultural diversity (İçduygu et al 2000; Kadirbeyoglu 2012).

Some legal difficulties faced by Turkish emigrants in Germany who used Turkish law to surpass German regulations regarding dual citizenship led to an introduction of a privileged non-citizen status in order to protect the rights of emigrants in Turkey, depriving them only of voting rights in local and national elections, in cases when their host-country doesn't accept multiple citizenship. This specific tool, however, was not intended to include minorities who have renounced their Turkish citizenship upon leaving the country, and instead was to benefit Turkish emigrants. Emigrant organizations have played an active role in designing such specific conditions, and their positions depend on developments in their host countries (Kadirbeyoglu 2012).

There are also mechanisms allowing easier access to naturalization to those immigrants of Turkish origins or with close links to Turkish culture. In fact, the category of an immigrant is reserved only for persons who fulfil these requirements. Interestingly, in the case of Bulgarian Turks, the Turkish government encouraged this group to acquire dual citizenship when such an option was made available by Bulgaria and to participate politically there. It is argued that such an interpretation of the category of immigrants that has prevented the politicization of this group in the citizenship debates. Nevertheless, there are signs of immigrant activism demanding 'equal treatment' on the same principles as those that have fuelled the dual citizenship institution (Kadirbeyoglu 2012).

While the influence of international organizations is not directly observable in the citizenship debate, it has been significant regarding immigration and asylum policies and questions of national minorities. Accession partnership agreements with the EU called for harmonization efforts regarding immigration and asylum, for example, in Turkey's visa and border regimes (İçduygu 2007). Issues of national minorities have been points of contestation among the government of Turkey and OSCE HCNM.

## **5. Conclusion**

The selected cases present a wide array of issues and levels influencing debates on dual citizenship, and show the importance of migration dynamics on the changes in citizenship legislation. The aim of this thesis, nevertheless, is to concentrate on the debate on dual citizenship in parliaments of these three countries and assess the impact of European citizenship on these debates. Mixed research methods will be employed in this study. The qualitative dimension, in line with the method of discourse analysis, complemented by process-tracing, will seek to identify the labels and terms used by parliamentarians to

express their position, implying certain favouritism for one group or the other, to categorise the responses of parliaments to criticisms of international actors or other states (recognition, counter-offensive, denial, etc.), and to identify the motivations and justifications for the respective positions. The quantitative dimension will follow the logic of most different systems approach.

## **Bibliography**

- Aleinikoff, T. Alexander, Douglas Klusmeyer (2002), *Citizenship Policies for and Age of Migration*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Aleinikoff, T. Alexander, Douglas Klusmeyer (eds.) (2001), *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Aleinikoff, T. Alexander, Douglas Klusmeyer (eds.) (2000), *From Migrants to Citizens: Membership in a Changing World*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Anckar, Carsten (2008), 'On the Applicability of the Most Similar Systems Design and the Most Different Systems Design in Comparative Research', *International Journal of Social Science Methodology* 11(5): 389-401.
- Bara, Judith, Albert Weale, Aude Biquelet (2007), 'Analysing Parliamentary Debate with Computer Assistance', *Swiss Political Science Review* 13(4): 577-605.
- Barabantseva, Elena, Claire Sutherland (2011), 'Diaspora and Citizenship: Introduction', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 17(1): 1-13.
- Bauböck, Rainer, Eva Ersbøll, Kees Groenendijk, Harald Waldrauch (eds.) (2006), *Acquisition and Loss of Nationality: Policies and Trends in 15 European Countries* (Volume 1 and 2). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bauböck, Rainer, Bernhard Perching, Wiebke Sievers (2009), *Citizenship Policies in the New Europe*. Amsterdam: IMISCOE/Amsterdam University Press.
- Bauböck, Rainer, Thomas Faist (2010), *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories, Methods*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bayley, Paul (2004), *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Brubaker, Rogers (1995), 'National Minorities, Nationalizing States, and External National Homelands in the New Europe', *Daedalus* 124(2): 107-132.
- Brubaker, Rogers (1996), *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers (2005), 'The 'Diaspora' Diaspora', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1): 1-19.
- Cohen, Robin (1997), *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. UK: UCL Press.
- Cohen, Stanley (1996), 'Government Responses to Human Rights Reports: Claims, Denials, and Counterclaims', *Human Rights Quarterly* 18(3): 517-543.
- Denk, Thomas (2010), 'Comparative Multilevel Analysis: Proposal for a Methodology', *International Journal of Social Science Methodology* 13(1): 29-39.
- Dronkers, Jaap, Maarten Peter Vink (2012), 'Explaining Access to Citizenship in Europe: How citizenship Policies Affect Naturalization Rates', *European Union Politics* 13(3): 390-412.
- Dryzek, John S. (2006), *Deliberative Global Politics*. UK: Polity Press.
- Fischer, Frank (1995), *Evaluating Public Policy*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Howard, Marc Morje (2010), 'The Impact of the Far Right on Citizenship Policy in Europe: Explaining Continuity and Change', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(5): 735-751.

- İçduygu, Ahmet (2007), 'EU-ization matters: Changes in Immigration and Asylum Practices in Turkey', in Faist, Thomas, Andreas Ete (eds.) *The Europeanization of National Policies and Politics of Immigration*. USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- İçduygu, Ahmet, Yılmaz Çolak, Nalan Soyarik (2000), 'What is the Matter with Citizenship? A Turkish Debate', in Kedourie, Sylvia (ed.) *Sevety-Five Years of the Turkish Republic*. UK: Frank Cass Publishers.
- Ilie, Cornelia (2010), *European Parliaments under Scrutiny. Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Iordachi, Constantin (2006), 'Dual Citizenship in Post-Communist Central and Eastern Europe: Regional Integration and Inter-Ethnic Tensions', in Osamu, Ieda, Uyama Tomohiko (eds.) *Reconstruction and Interaction of Slavic Eurasia and Its Neighboring Worlds*. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center.
- Isin, Engin F., Bryan S. Turner (2007), 'Investigating Citizenship: An Agenda for Citizenship Studies', *Citizenship Studies* 11(1): 5-17.
- Joppke, Christian (1999), 'How Immigration is Changing Citizenship: a Comparative View', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(4): 629-652.
- Kadirbeyoglu, Zeynep (2012), *Country Report: Turkey*. EUDO Citizenship Observatory.
- Krūma, Kristīne (2013), *Country Report: Latvia*. EUDO Citizenship Observatory.
- Kymlicka, Will (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liebich, Andre (2009), 'Introduction: Altneuländer or the vicissitudes of citizenship in the new EU states', in Bauböck, Rainer, Bernhard Perching, Wiebke Sievers (eds.) *Citizenship Policies in the New Europe*. Amsterdam: IMISCOE/Amsterdam University Press.
- Newland, Kathleen (2010), *Voice after Exit: Diaspora Advocacy*. USA: Migration Policy Institute.
- Newland, Kathleen, Erin Patrick (2004), *Beyond Remittances: The Role of Diaspora in Poverty Reduction in Their Countries of Origin*. USA: Migration Policy Institute.
- Newland, Kathleen, Hiroyuki Tanaka (2010), *Mobilizing Diaspora Entrepreneurship for Development*. USA: Migration Policy Institute.
- Newland, Kathleen, Carylanna Taylor (2010), *Heritage Tourism and Nostalgia Trade: A Diaspora Niche in the Development Landscape*. USA: Migration Policy Institute.
- Newland, Kathleen, Aaron Terrazas, Roberto Munster (2010), *Diaspora Philanthropy: Private Giving and Public Policy*. USA: Migration Policy Institute.
- Okulska, Urszula, Piotr Cap (2010), *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Pap, András L. (2006), 'Minority Rights and Diaspora Claims: Collision, Interdependence and Loss of Orientation', in Osamu Ieda (ed.) *Beyond Sovereignty: From Status Law to Transnational Citizenship?* Sapporo: Slavic Research Center.
- Pogonyi, Szabolcs (2011), 'Dual Citizenship and Sovereignty', *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 39(5): 685-704.
- Ragazzi, Francesco (2009), 'Governing Diasporas', *International Political Sociology* 3(4): 378-397.

- Rannveig Agunias, Dovelyn, Kathleen Newland (2012), *Developing a Road Map for Engaging Diasporas in Development. A Handbook for Policymakers and Practitioners in Home and Host Countries*. International Organization for Migration/Migration Policy Institute.
- Schmidt, Vivian A. (2010), 'Taking Ideas and Discourse Seriously: Explaining Change through Discursive Institutionalism as the Fourth 'New Institutionalism''. In: *European Political Science Review*, Vol.2, No.1, pp.1-25.
- Sheffer, Gabriel (2003), *Diaspora Politics: At Home Abroad*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stasiulis, Daiva, Daryll Ross (2006), 'Security, Flexible Sovereignty, and the Perils of Multiple Citizenship', *Citizenship Studies* 10(3): 329-348.
- Steiner, Jürg, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco R. Steenbergen (2004), *Deliberative Politics in Action: Analyzing Parliamentary Discourse*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, Teun A., Ed. (1985), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Volume 2. UK: Academic Press London.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2000a), 'Ideologies, racism, discourse: Debates on immigration and ethnic issues', in Jessika ter Wal, Markel Verkuyten (Eds.) *Comparative Perspectives on Racism*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2000b), 'On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration', in M.Reisigl, R.Wodak (Eds.) *The Semiotics of Racism. Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis*. Vienna: Passagen Verlag.
- Van Oers, Ricky, Betty de Hart, Kees Groenendijk (2013), *Country Report: The Netherlands*. EUDO Citizenship Observatory.
- Vertovec, Steven (2005), *The Political Importance of Diasporas*. University of Oxford Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, Working Paper No.13.
- Vertovec, Steven (1999), 'Three Meanings of 'Diaspora', Exemplified Among South Asian Religions', *Diaspora* 7(2) [in press].
- Vink, Maarten Peter, Rainer Bauböck (2013), *Citizenship Configurations: Analysing the Multiple Purposes of Citizenship Regimes in Europe*. [Manuscript under review]
- Xavier, Constantino (2011), 'Experimenting with Diasporic Incorporation: The Overseas Citizenship of India', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 17(1): 34-53.