

Litteraturgranskningar

Litteraturredaktör: Rickard Andersson

Vera-Larrucea, Constanza, 2013. *Citizenship by Citizens: First generation nationals with Turkish ancestry on lived citizenship in Paris and Stockholm*. Stockholm Studies in Politics 150. Stockholm: Department of Political Science, Stockholm University

Anmälan av Bo Petersson

The main point of departure of Constanza Vera Larrucea's (henceforth CVL) PhD thesis is that there is a lacuna in the otherwise profuse scholarly writing on citizenship. The concept has been subjected to a lot of attention during the past two decades due to the pressure brought to bear on the nation state by forces of migration, globalization and far-reaching power shifts in the post-Cold War world. Thus, in response to the traditional literature and its basic precepts about the one-to-one nexus between the citizen and the state, and the more or less well-defined obligations and rights for both parties to this figurative contract, i.e. the citizen and the state, an array of new concepts have been hatched, supposedly better matching and catching the complexities of the contemporary situation. Thus, suggestions have been made about the introduction of more nuanced concepts, such as transnational citizenship, cosmopolitan citizenship, post-national citizenship, and the like. CVL's point of departure, and also her fundamental point of critique, is that these new concepts may well capture important aspects of the fundamental processes of change going on in the world of today, but they also have one trait in common: they are all abstractions made from the vantage point of theorizing, and they all fail to incorporate the experience of one of the main parties to the old, figurative contract, namely the

citizens themselves. CVL's contribution to the scholarly literature on citizenship is thus to take this neglected aspect into account. She simply endeavors to let the voices of the citizens be heard.

Furthermore, CVL's focus is not on mainstream, average citizens, belonging to the ethnic majority inhabiting a state. Instead it is on a category of people that epitomizes the challenges brought to bear on the standard notions of citizenship. Substantial attention has been given to the predicaments of the first-generation migrants and their often hard-won integration into their new host countries. However, CVL focuses on their offspring, the next generation, those who often-times are given the politically less correct term of "second-generation migrants". Like CVL points out, this is a flawed denomination as these people are no longer migrants, having been born and brought up in their countries of residence. The fact that these once happened to be the new host countries of their migrating parents should actually be beside the point. Therefore it is more correct to call this category of people, like CVL does, first-generation citizens, or citizens with an ethnic ancestry different from the majority. Even though they have thus been born and bred in the countries that their parents once moved to, earlier research has indicated that they are in many cases still at a disadvantage with regard to housing, education and career opportunities. They are also supposedly in a special situation since they are argued to represent a minority culture, different from the national majority one. These premises are what CVL has chosen to subject to closer scrutiny.

More specifically, CVL has done this by focusing on the group of first-generation citizens with Turkish ancestry in Sweden and

France, or more specifically, in the capitals: Stockholm and Paris. Methodologically, this objective has been pursued with reliance on a mixed-method approach, making use of both survey material and qualitative data generated through individual face-to-face interviews. These methods are argued to be complementary. The initial selection of the respondents has been made within an international research project with the acronym of TIES – The Integration of the European Second Generation. The main thrust of the TIES project has been to undertake a comparative survey among young first-generation citizens with other ethnic ancestries than the one of the majority residing in a number of European countries and urban metropolises.

In her turn, CVL has used the TIES dataset to describe fundamental socio-economic patterns of integration and to locate key dimensions to analyze deeper and further. After doing this she has approached the respondents of the survey for follow-up, individual in-depth interviews on central dimensions of citizenship and the experiences that the respondents have of them. Control groups of corresponding size, consisting of respondents with parents who were both born in the countries concerned have been approached to provide for comparison and perspective. The interviews have been conducted in Swedish and in French.

The qualitative part is what CVL herself considers the key contribution of her study. In this qualitative analysis she adheres to a constructivist outlook, where reality is seen as formed and shaped by contextual influences, social encounters and individual experiences.

Throughout the thesis CVL uses an abductive research strategy, which allows her to move back and forth between the quantitative and the qualitative material that she has generated or had access to, and the theoretical precepts of the study. This strategy is a cross-over between a deductive research design, as often used in quantitatively oriented studies, on the one hand, where general hypotheses are for-

mulated on the basis of theoretical presumptions and applied to the material with the ambition of identifying causal relations, and an inductive research strategy, on the other hand, which uses interpretative approaches to the material and through close readings of it tries to discern patterns and formulate hypotheses aiming for theories of more general reach. CVL's choice of the abductive research strategy shows itself through the fact that some key dimensions of her theoretical framework have been added on the basis of having been suggested by findings emerging from the empirical material.

One key dimension of analysis to emerge in such a manner concerns the practice and implications of dual citizenship. As a matter of fact, it turned out already at an early stage of study that the overwhelming majority of the participants of the follow-up, qualitative study actually had dual citizenship, holding passports proving their citizenship in Sweden and Turkey, and in France and Turkey, respectively. CVL looks further into this fact and scrutinizes the arguments often made that dual citizenship is a precarious construct for the individual states concerned as it subtracts from the citizens' loyalty and commitment towards the individual state. Another central dimension of analysis suggested by the material concerns gender, which CVL in many respects finds to have more crucial implications for lived citizenship than factors of ethnic ancestry.

The two countries, Sweden and France, have been selected to illustrate different conditions for citizens with other ethnic ancestry than the one represented by the majority. Sweden is on the official level committed to the celebration of multiculturalism in the sense that different ethnic origins do not constitute an obstacle for integration. France with its republican ideal illustrates in many ways the opposite kind of reality, since all migrants are expected to relegate their different cultures to the private sphere and assimilate into a civic kind of nationhood.

In order to come to grips with the complex realities of lived citizenship and bring it closer to the perspective of her respondents CVL has operationalized the concept of citizenship through the sub-division into three dimensions of study. First, there is the *civic* dimension of citizenship which is the one that corresponds most closely to the classical notions of citizenship, above all its republican ideal where there are certain clear-cut obligations on the part of the citizen, like paying taxes, voting in general elections, and for males often conducting military service. The corresponding obligations on the part of the state are to protect its citizens and cater for their well-being. Secondly, there is the *subjective* dimension of citizenship which is concerned with the diffuse, intangible and fuzzy matters of identity, identification and belonging. Thirdly, there is the *substantial* side of citizenship which focuses on citizenship in practice and to what extent all citizens are provided with equal access to non-segregated housing, education, social services and career opportunities.

All of this lands CVL in the main aim of the study, which she specifies to be “to describe and explain the meanings of citizenship based on the experiences of people having immigrant parents”. Her concept of lived citizenship – which could and maybe even should have been reflected in the main title of the thesis – takes into consideration exactly how individuals perceive and experience citizenship. There are also secondary aims that CVL endeavors to fulfill: a) to find out whether the context has an influence on people’s perceptions of citizenship; b) to present a characterization of second generation Turks as citizens in comparison with individuals of native origin, and c) through an analysis based on the experiences of descendants of immigrants in Europe contribute to the theoretical debate on the new modes of citizenship and the integration of people with non-native backgrounds. In order to fulfill these aims CVL has formulated a number of concise research questions:

“How is citizenship described on the basis of the experience of people with Turkish ancestry?”, “Are they different citizens than people without migrant ancestry?”, “To what extent does their migrant ancestry affect their experiences as citizens?” Those are the main questions, but also subsidiary ones branch out from these and are specified in subsequent chapters of the thesis.

After having undertaken this general summing up of the basic precepts of the thesis I will now briefly go chapter by chapter, introducing the highlights of them. The thesis is subdivided into nine Chapters. The first one basically recounts the story that I have now summarized.

In Chapter Two there is a basic discussion of the main theoretical points of departure. Here a review is undertaken of the paradigmatic literature on citizenship, in many respects having T.H. Marshall’s (1950) seminal study on the evolution of the three kinds of basic rights emanating from citizenship at its base. The distinction between the *demos*, defined through residency of a state, and the *ethnos*, defined through ethnic origin, is elaborated on here. Likewise, there is a discussion about main directions of analysis with regard to the concept of integration, which in many ways is a kindred concept to citizenship. Citizenship spells out what is expected, by way of rights and obligations, from someone being a member of the *demos*, whereas national policies of integration suggest the standards of behavior that the state expects from someone who aspires to become a citizen. In the Chapter, the concepts of assimilation, acculturation and multiculturalism are presented as corresponding to different ideal types of integration. A further presentation is also made with regard to the often perceived hazards of dual citizenship referred to earlier. Finally, the three operational dimensions of citizenship that CVL uses and that were also mentioned earlier, i.e. civic, subjective and substantial citizenship, are elaborated on and presented.

Chapter Three is devoted to the presentation of the sources and methods of the study. Here the TIES project is thoroughly introduced. The project involved comparative research about descendants of immigrants from Turkey, Morocco, and former Yugoslavia in fifteen cities in eight countries (among these Sweden, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and Switzerland). In each site a control group consisting of citizens without parental migrant ancestry was also included. The project generated a unique dataset which provided several of the initial parameters for CVL's study. In the TIES project 9771 individuals (roughly matching the original goal of including 250 representatives of each group in each city surveyed), between 18 and 35 years of age, were presented with a questionnaire designed to measure structural and socio-cultural aspects of integration. In the sub-samples made by CVL for the follow-up interviews, only ethnic Turks were included, thus e.g. excluding Kurds, which is important to remember especially with regard to the Swedish setting. All in all, and excluding interviews that were later discarded for technical reasons, 31 interviews conducted by CVL in Paris were finally used for the thesis, out of which 17 interviews were made with people with Turkish ancestry and 14 with people of native origin. The corresponding figures for Stockholm were 32, 17 and 15, respectively.

Chapter Four elaborates on the national contexts of integration and policies of citizenship characterizing Sweden and France. Also, background data is provided with regard to the extent and characteristics of Turkish migration and the Turkish diaspora in Europe.

Chapters Five through Eight are empirical Chapters offering insights into the life-worlds of the respondents. The answers provided in the in-depth interviews reveal their experiences of the different dimensions of lived citizenship. Chapter Five provides an introductory birds-eye view where the respondents present their basic understandings of the meanings of the concept of citizenship, as

well as on integration. The role of the Chapter is to provide a background that will make it easier to understand the patterns offered in the three subsequent empirical Chapters.

Chapter Six takes up the civic dimension of lived citizenship. Firstly, results of a quantitative analysis are presented with regard to what impact ethnicity and dual citizenship may have on electoral participation and involvement in civil society associations. It is shown that on average, electoral participation is somewhat lower for the group with Turkish ancestry than for the control group. However, and on the basis of the qualitative data, the thesis about the dangers of dual citizenship is refuted, as it is indicated that dual citizenship does not diminish the individuals' sense of commitment and obligation to the country of birth. The Turkish citizenship oftentimes seems to take on the hue of an external citizenship, having mostly a symbolic value and often being maintained to facilitate the sorting out of certain practicalities such as making it easier to travel into the country and to take care of family heritage. Nevertheless, dual citizenship may, CVL contends, constitute a basis for the development of transnational practices which in the longer run may serve to challenge the traditional concept of citizenship.

Chapter Seven deals with the subjective dimension of citizenship which – as pointed out by CVL – does not lend itself very well to quantitative analysis since it necessitates looking into fuzzy dimensions such as identity, identification and belonging which, being social and contextually contingent constructions, are hard to capture in figures and trends. Even so, the dimension is firstly analyzed on the basis of TIES questions on the belonging to different “proximal hosts” such as ethnic group, nation and city. Multivariate analysis is used to test possible effects of other characteristics, such as age, gender and education on the sense of belonging to the national group. However, in this Chapter narratives collected from the qualitative

interviews provide the bulk and the essence, and apparently it is in this dimension of citizenship that Turkish ancestry has the clearest implications for lived citizenship. However, precious few of the respondents seem to be of the opinion that they belong less to their country of birth for being second generation Turks. However, there seems to be more of a belonging to the country than to the ethnic group of the majority, which was the proximal host actually enquired about in the survey. The findings could best be summarized, like it is done in the chapter sub-heading, by saying that these first generation citizens with Turkish ancestry, rather than being citizens of lesser or marginal standing, are citizens “with an extra spice”, enjoying the benefits of an additional culture to draw upon, and having access to an extra frame of reference.

Chapter Eight deals with substantial citizenship and looks into whether citizens with Turkish ancestry are provided with equal access to goods and services such as non-segregated housing, education, social benefits and career opportunities. The findings of the survey are that there seems to be a negative effect in these areas. However, a widespread perception among the respondents appears to be that equal access *is* provided and that there is no structural disadvantage, but that it is rather up to the individuals to make full use of the opportunity structures available. This is then a case where CVL – especially in the interviews in Stockholm – got indications that gender and parenthood had a more tangible impact than ethnicity. In other words, women, above all women who happened to be mothers, were at a disadvantage. This also prompted CVL to, true to her back and forth design, conduct a logistic regression analysis corroborating the relation between gender and employment.

In the ninth and final Chapter the results from the empirical Chapters are summarized and related to old and new configurations of citizenship. Based on the findings of Chapter Eight, CVL stresses the need for further loo-

king into the gendered dimensions of citizenship, and also for further development of the theorizing on a denationalized concept of citizenship. This would among other things accommodate the transnational practices and widespread possessions of dual citizenship encountered in her study. It would also open up for a reconstructed concept of ethnicity which would serve the need of loosening the nexus between citizenship and a nation-state defined on ethnic premises.

As is almost always the case, there are a number of critical observations that can be made when subjecting the thesis to closer scrutiny. The points raised below were the most important ones raised by me at the public viva in Stockholm on March 13, 2013.

THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION, CONCEPTUAL TERRAIN, AND CONSTRUCTIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

A fundamental question that needs to be asked is wherein CVL's theoretical contribution to the field lies. The thesis is first and foremost empirical in character, which is of course perfectly legitimate. Given the subject of the thesis, it would otherwise have been natural to render a theoretical contribution to the contested field of citizenship, and CVL's focus on lived citizenship would have seemed to provide a natural entry point. Unfortunately, the author never really engages critically with the alternative concepts of citizenship that, like she does, try to look beyond the traditional nation-state frame, even if they are mentioned in the text, like for example transnational, post-national, and cosmopolitan citizenship. Given the focus that CVL upholds on dual citizenship, Bauböck's (1994) concept of transnational citizenship would seem to have been particularly helpful here.

Whereas CVL might have benefitted from making the relation between her lived citizenship, among respondents with dual citizenship, and the concept of transnational citizenship clearer, she makes profuse refe-

rences to transnational practices in her analysis. However, it is doubtful to what extent these practices, such as vacation trips to the old homeland of Turkey, are actually transnational, or if they should rather be characterized as bi-national or bilateral exercises. In fact, in CVL's analysis "transnational" often seems to be equivalent to "trans-border". However, the concept of transnational should override the nation-state frame, whereas her use of it does not. If one were to be harsh here, one might say that despite the author's ambitions to the contrary, this is not a thesis about a post-national context; but a thesis still rather trapped in a nation-state mindset (Glick-Schiller and Wimmer 2002).

In a somewhat related fashion and with regard to theoretical perspectives, CVL takes a tough stance against theories about hybridity, arguing that they imply "in-betweenness" and "does not leave open the possibility for a mixture" (p. 49). One might think that she is unduly harsh here, most probably due to insufficient grounding in the literature, where several leading authors are actually absent from the references (e.g. Bhabha 1994). What is more, in her own analysis about mixing elements from different cultures, CVL seems to use arguments with a slant towards reification, presupposing that cultures do exist out there, consisting of distinct elements and component parts (p. 251, 256, 263).

At times, the clarity of CVL's argument is somewhat confounded by her tendency of conflating certain fundamental concepts, "state" and "nation" being the prime candidates, but sometimes also in relation to concepts such as "country" and "nation-state". Two examples from her texts will suffice to illustrate this: "Citizenship in its traditional sense is intimately linked to the nation", she writes (p. 165). Here citizenship should of course rightly be associated with the legal entity of the state and nothing else. Similarly, when stating that "a denationalized view would support the inclusion of individuals into a country's citizenry even when some individu-

als might belong to another nation" (p. 264), she uses "country" and "nation" interchangeably where the reference to "state" would have been the proper one to make.

In Chapter 7, on subjective citizenship, citizenship seems, paradoxically, kind of lost from view, and is drifted away from in the analysis. Are the issues being discussed with the respondents really about citizenship? Did the respondents have the impression that they were talking about citizenship or did they think that they were discussing something else, such as belonging and identity *as such*, rather than belonging and identity *as part of* citizenship? CVL mentions that her respondents seemed to be more enthusiastic when talking about subjective citizenship than they were when discussing other dimensions of citizenship. Maybe this should not be seen as a coincidence, since belonging and identity do matter to most people and are more emotionally laden than civic and substantial dimensions of citizenship. There might even be a lack of fit between the researcher's abstractions and the respondents' lived reality here, which should have been pointed out by the author.

METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN: STUDYING LIVED CITIZENSHIP IN PRACTICE

There are no doubt considerable benefits as well as certain problems associated with the fact that this thesis is a spin-off project from a bigger, multi-party research program (TIES). Like the author clarifies, she has used material generated by the project and approached certain respondents for a second, follow-up, round of interviews. This also means, however, that she has been stuck with respondents and material which at times have been selected and sampled due to other criteria and principles than would have been the case if she had been able to do the selection herself. Selection biases marking the old TIES project have automatically been taken over by her thesis project. One example is that second-generation immigrants in the age cohort older

than 35 have not been included in her study, even if their experiences would have been valuable to look into. The dilemma is however above all epitomized by the choice of Turks as the ethnic category to be analyzed, even if this group neither is the most stigmatized nor the most populous one in Sweden or France.

When analyzing the substantial dimension of citizenship, CVL asserts that “discrimination was rarely mentioned by the participants of this study” (p. 232). However, in posing her questions she has never seemed to ask outright about respondents’ experiences of discrimination. In the analysis there is also some lacking contextual information about when and under what circumstances interviews were made. Interview results are often analyzed and dealt with as if there was no wider, societal context to relate or respond to. Did the interviews e.g. coincide with election campaigns and accompanying debates on migration and integration?

Throughout her thesis CVL makes a major point of the fact that she has opted for an abductive research methodology, which permits her to move back and forth between her theoretical precepts and her empirical material. While this appears as a sound strategy, given the magnitude of the empirical material and the sensitivity of the issues involved, which demand a flexible construction of questionnaires, there are also certain risks associated with abduction and the author’s mixed-method strategy of moving between quantitative and qualitative research methods. This is discernible in the thesis, e.g. in the author’s occasional tendency to, in spite of her awareness of the problem, generalize on the basis of a rather small *n* in the qualitative part (p. 143).

However, in CVL’s methodological design the most bewildering trait is the treatment of the concept of “indicators” (e.g. p. 22, 150, 246). She uses the word not only to denote operationalizations of abstract phenomena which make it possible for her to interpret empirical phenomena in theoretical terms.

Her indicators are meant to serve this purpose, but they also serve as a theoretical framework guiding her analysis. On other occasions, “indicators” serve as components to be analyzed within a certain dimension of citizenship. This is confusing. Moreover, among “the indicators” that she has established there are abstract and contested concepts such as identity and belonging (p. 55). How can fuzzy concepts like these ever serve as indicators? And exactly what do they indicate? There is also an “indicator” carrying the label of “being a second generation Turk in a national context”. One cannot help wondering what kind of an indicator this is. It would rather seem to denote a result of the analysis, or even the whole problem to be investigated in the first place.

ROUTES NOT TAKEN

Towards the end of her analysis CVL makes important observations about the ways that gender seems to have impacted on the respondents’ lived experiences. In certain respects it seems to have had greater significance than ethnicity. Gender is therefore, true to the abductive strategy, actively brought into the analysis with regard to the substantial dimension of citizenship, but one wonders why this half-way house is chosen, and why gender was not brought in alongside ethnicity throughout. Incidentally, when towards the close of her argument CVL addresses possible reconfigurations of ethnicity as a desired outcome one wonders whether she does not really refer to the construction of civic national identity, which is a well-known subject in the literature on nationalism and national identity (e.g. Smith 1991), but not brought up by CVL in her literature review.

If there are paths only partly taken there are also roads that are not chosen at all and where one keeps wondering why this was so. One of them concerns race (p. 173, 264). CVL mentions in her conclusion that race should be considered more thoroughly in public discourse but she does not consider it herself as

an analytical prism. Also, and surprisingly, there is a glaring absence of religion (Islam) in the analysis. This dimension would seem to have been available in the material emanating from the TIES questionnaire but is not explored in CVL's analysis, despite its seemingly significant importance when discussing substantial citizenship and experiences of discrimination.

Finally, I find there to be a certain neglect of the city level in the analysis, despite the fact that CVL rightly points out that in the contemporary world the characteristics of residential cities are as important as those of the state when discussing citizenship (p. 20). In her thesis she does not quite live up to this, however, and the city context largely disappears from view in her analysis.

CONCLUSION

All in all, and despite the concerns raised above, one has to say that this doctoral thesis is empirically very thorough and dense and that it uses a solid conceptual frame, drawing on central, and contested, concepts within the spheres of studies on migration and integration. Above all it has as its conscientious and commendable ambition to analyze citizenship as it is perceived by citizens: this is the lived citizenship that the author refers to. It contributes an important and empirically grounded insight that the status of dual citizenship does not subtract from the commitment and belonging to one's country of birth. Through CVL the voices of the important category of first-generation citizens are heard and a better understanding is generated about the ways that belonging to and identification with the country of residence are constructed or not constructed among citizens with Turkish ancestry.

In sum, CVL's thesis renders an important contribution to contemporary discussions on citizenship, the importance of citizenships to the people concerned, and the implications of dual citizenship in different contexts. Drawing upon an impressive, rich and engaging

fieldwork material it adds to the understanding of citizenship and its premises in the contemporary transnational world and enriches debates on integration in France and Sweden, and is of considerable interest to Turkish communities in these two states.

I truly congratulate Constanza Vera-Larrucea to the completion of this solid and important work.

REFERENCES

- Bauböck, Rainer, 1994. *Transnational citizenship: Membership and rights in international migration*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Bhabha, Homi K., 1994. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, T. H., 1950. *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, Anthony D., 1991. *National Identity*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.
- Wimmer, Andreas & Glick-Schiller, Nina, 2002. "Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences", *Global Networks* 2(4), p. 301-334.

Bo Petersson är professor i statsvetenskap och IMER vid Malmö högskola.
E-post: bo.petersson@mah.se