

Affective Citizenship:

How do Turkish immigrants emotionally approach Austrian citizenship?

By

Elif Çağatay

Submitted to

Central European University

Nationalism Studies Program

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Rainer Bauböck

Vienna, Austria

2023

Abstract

The decision-making process on naturalisation can be affected by many factors. Immigrants and their emotional ties to their home country and host country are crucial to analyze instrumental and emotional motives behind naturalisation processes. Especially for the countries that do not allow for dual citizenship, there is a huge dilemma for immigrants regarding the decision of whether to apply for host country citizenship and renounce home country citizenship. This analysis uses the concept of ‘affective citizenship’ which criticizes political science research for being too rational and neglecting emotions. For this reason, in this research, qualitative interviews will be undertaken to analyze the emotions of respondents through in-depth content analysis. In this thesis project, the decisions of Turkish citizens on naturalisation in Austria and their emotions regarding the renunciation of Turkish citizenship will be analyzed by interviewing them.

Keywords: affective citizenship, belonging, emotions, immigration, naturalisation

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>4</i>
Naturalisation Requirements in Austria.....	5
Legislation on Renouncing Turkish Citizenship	6
<i>Literature Review.....</i>	<i>8</i>
Restriction of Dual Citizenship and Its Effect on Naturalisation	8
Motives for Naturalisation	10
Transnationalism and Naturalisation.....	11
Problems With Dual Citizenship and Sending State Strategies	14
Affective Citizenship at Three Levels.....	16
The Case of Turkish Citizens in Austria.....	19
<i>Research Gap and Research Questions</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Methods and Methodology</i>	<i>22</i>
Participant Selection Process	25
<i>Analysis of Interviews</i>	<i>30</i>
Group 1.....	30
Group 2.....	38
Group 3.....	44
Inter-Group Analysis and Results	50
<i>Concluding Remarks</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Appendices</i>	<i>55</i>
Appendix A	55
Appendix B	57
Appendix C	58
Appendix D	59
<i>Bibliography.....</i>	<i>61</i>

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between citizenship and belonging regarding the immigrants' willingness to acquire the citizenship of their country of residence under the condition that this would entail the loss of their home country citizenship. To understand this relationship, I am studying immigrants who came from Turkey to Austria and who have Turkish citizenship. Austria generally does not allow for dual citizenship through naturalisation, but after 6 to 10 years of residency, people can apply for Austrian citizenship. According to the Wiener Bevölkerung Daten und Fakten zu Migration und Integration 2022¹ (Viennese Population Facts and Figures on Migration and Integration 2022) published by Stadt Wien, citizens of Turkey are the fourth largest category of nationals in Vienna after citizens of Austria, Serbia, and Germany. For this reason, I want to research Turkish citizens in Vienna about whether they want to have Austrian citizenship or not. In addition, I believe that conducting interviews on emotions in the respondents' native language is essential to evaluate their emotional reactions. As a Turkish native speaker, I am well equipped for this task. In this research, I aim to show the relationship between Turkish immigrants' emotional attachment to Turkey and Austria, and their willingness to get an Austrian citizenship. I argue that even if Austria does not allow for dual citizenship and Turkish immigrants are emotionally bound to Turkey, the -economic, social, and political- shortcomings of the Turkish state may induce them to renounce Turkish citizenship in order to obtain Austrian citizenship. Moreover, I want to analyze the emotional and instrumental motives behind their interest in Austrian citizenship. The distinctive question here is to which degree they feel bound to the host society or whether they still belong to their home country. How they describe their identities, and how the host society

¹ <https://www.wien.gv.at/menschen/integration/daten-fakten/bevoelkerung-migration.html>

identifies them may have crucial impacts on this attachment. Finally, immigrants' perception of how the host society identifies them may also affect their sense of belonging. These are all characteristics that create an emotional background in the responses of immigrants. To analyze their emotional attachment, I plan to look at how they define their feelings when they think of getting Austrian citizenship. I believe that this study will contribute to the existing literature on the emotions of immigrants towards the host country and the home country politics and to affective citizenship studies which is a recently developed field of study.

Naturalisation Requirements in Austria

In order to be eligible for Austrian citizenship, foreigners living in Austria need to meet certain requirements. These requirements are proficiency in the German language at the B1 level², uninterrupted residence and settlement status in Austria (or recognition as a refugee)³, the absence of criminal convictions⁴, knowledge of the democratic system and its historical aspects⁵, renouncing the citizenship of first nationality, taking an Austrian citizenship oath,⁶ and having a regular income without any interruption in last 3 years, including not having received any social assistance benefits.⁷ Requirements may change for the uninterrupted residence criterion. For ordinary naturalisation, uninterrupted residence should be at least 10 years in Austria. Applicants

²Stiller, M. (2019). "Möglichkeiten Des Staatsbürgerschaftserwerbs Durch Fremde in Österreich = Pathways to Citizenship for Foreigners in Austria." *Wien: Nationaler Kontaktpunkt Österreich im Europäischen Migrationsnetzwerk*, Internationale Organisation für Migration, Landesbüro für Österreich, p.42.

³Stiller, M. (2019), p.40.

⁴Stern, J. & Gerd Valchars. (2013a). "Country Report: Austria." *EUDO Citizenship Observatory*, European University Institute, p.22.

⁵Stiller, M. (2019), p. 44.

⁶<https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10005579>, Article 21/2.

⁷Stern, J. & Gerd Valchars. (2013a), p.22.

who are EU citizens, who have been born in Austria, whose spouses are Austrian citizens, or who have made special integration efforts can be granted Austrian citizenship earlier – in most cases after 6 years – if they meet the other requirements. Their residence also should be lawful. This means that the person should stay with a visa-free allowance such as a permanent residence permit or fixed-term residence permit.⁸

Legislation on Renouncing Turkish Citizenship

In this chapter, I will give detailed information on the history of Turkish citizenship law and the renunciation requirement in the Austrian citizenship law. From 1964, the citizenship law of Turkey was based on the idea that everyone should have only one citizenship, but they must have an option to change their citizenship.⁹ However, this idea was affected by the migration of guest workers to Europe, especially to Germany, because Turkish migrants were making investments in Turkey with their savings in Europe. In 1981, there was a first change in the law, and dual citizenship was allowed under the condition of informing the government.¹⁰ In addition, the Turkish government encouraged Turkish emigrants in Europe to naturalise in their host countries - even if these countries did not allow for dual citizenship - based on the idea that they should have voting rights in their host countries.¹¹ This idea also resulted in the initiative for a ‘pink card’ in the legislation on the implementation of Turkish Citizenship Law. The pink card, currently the blue card, gives property, inheritance, work, and residence rights in Turkey to former Turkish citizens. However, they do not regain the right to vote, to be elected, and to be

⁸Stiller, M. (2019), p.38.

⁹Kadirbeyoğlu, Z. (2012). “Country Report: Turkey.” *EUDO Citizenship Observatory*, European University Institute, p. 3-4.

¹⁰Kadirbeyoğlu, Z. (2012), p. 4.

¹¹Country Report Turkey, p.6

diplomatically protected by Turkey. In the theoretical explanations part, I will provide more information on the blue card. However, Turkey does not allow for voluntary statelessness and only releases from its citizenship if the person has already acquired a new citizenship from the host country or shows a document to prove that s/he will acquire it. For this case, Austrian authorities provide a document (*Zusicherungsbescheid*) certifying the intended award of Austrian citizenship to allow applicants to renounce their citizenship of origin.¹²

¹²<https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/NormDokument.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10005579&Artikel=&Paragraf=20&Anlage=&Uebergangsrecht=>
Stern, J. & Gerd Valchars. (2013b). “Naturalisation Procedures for Immigrants Austria.” *EUDO Citizenship Observatory*, European University Institute, p. 5.

Literature Review

Restriction of Dual Citizenship and Its Effect on Naturalisation

In this part, I will provide a closer look at the literature on dual citizenship, especially restrictions on it, and its effects on the naturalisation of immigrants. While many countries allow for dual citizenship in naturalisation, others restrict it and allow citizenship acquisition only on the condition that the former citizenship is renounced. Austria is one of these countries that do not allow for dual citizenship. This is one of the challenges for naturalisation for immigrants since giving up the original citizenship is a must in ordinary naturalisations if renunciation is possible, and this requirement brings some emotional costs. These emotional costs occur because citizenship does not only mean being connected to the state through a set of rights but also means membership which may be constituted through belonging to the state (Weinmann, 2022, p. 238). This may affect the number of individuals who want to retain their original citizenship in the host country where dual citizenship is prohibited. The reason why they want to keep their original citizenship can be explained by perceiving “naturalisation as a form of individual boundary crossing” (Diehl & Blohm, 2010, p.321). Alba explains this boundary crossing as a change in an individual’s positionality from one group to another group “with all the social and psychic burdens a conversion process entails: growing distance from peers, feelings of disloyalty, and anxieties about acceptance.” (Alba, 2005, p.24). As Weinmann claims concerning this aspect of boundary crossing, besides the legal obstacles in the naturalisation process, there are obstacles that are determined by subjective states like acceptance and feelings of belonging (Weinmann, 2022, p.241). This may seem much more related to an immigrant’s feelings towards the host society. In my study, the focus is mostly on immigrants’ emotions towards their home country. For some immigrants, it is emotionally hard to renounce their original citizenship in order to

naturalise, so they prefer not to apply for citizenship in the host country. As Hammar puts it, for immigrants, giving up the old nationality and a change in the nationality may be “something like a denial of one’s national identity, or a break in loyalty to the emigration state, or a betrayal of the friends and relatives left behind there” (Hammar, 441, p.1985). For these reasons, the decision on naturalisation is one of the hardest to make for immigrants. They live abroad for years, and the only formal connection they have with their home countries is their citizenship. If they naturalise in a country where dual citizenship is not allowed, they have to give up this connection. At some point, their reluctance to lose this connection is emotional since they want to keep their national belonging and identification (Pogonyi, 2011, p.690). Belonging should be considered as an “emotionally constructed category to understand its implications for citizenship and nationhood” (Ho, 2009, p.791). There is also another emotional cost of naturalisation which is a key factor in my research: Reading the oath. In some countries, it is required to read an oath to signify the shift of identity and loyalty to another state. In other words, states try to create individuals who are what Badenhop calls a ‘Super Citizen’ (Badenhop, 2021). All those tests, ceremonies, and courses in the naturalisation process are for a particular subjectivity, Super Citizen, which states plan to impose on migrants’ behavior and self-understanding (Badenhop, 2021, p. 565). This is the point where legal aspects of naturalisation cannot be solely considered without emotional ties (Hammar, 1985, p.449). The oath materializes identity and a sense of belonging at the last step of citizenship acquisition by increasing the emotionalization of citizenship to ensure loyalty and civil awareness in the naturalized individuals (Damsholt, 2018, p. 5-14). Thus, duties of allegiance are signified by the oath which may cause a conflict with emotional ties to another country. In the next chapter, I will give the theoretical background of motives for naturalisation, to comprehend emotional motives in light of the comparison with instrumental motives.

Motives for Naturalisation

While existing literature mostly focuses on instrumental reasons behind the naturalisation decision, I want to indicate the emotional background of decision-making processes on naturalisation. There is no doubt that while deciding on naturalisation and renunciation, both instrumental and emotional motives play a crucial role. Reichel and Perchinig list two main aspects which influence a person's decision to naturalise in a country: legal constraints in the destination country and the value that migrants attribute to the naturalisation in terms of its benefits (Reichel and Perchinig, 2014, p. 34-35). While these are related to constructing a formal membership within a state, a 'citizenship-as-identity' perspective gives an individual sense of association which is different from formal membership because it comprises belonging and loyalty to the community in a country (Raue and Sutter, 2009, p.77). Yanasmayan makes a distinction between the 'thick' and 'thin' senses of citizenship and emphasizes the importance of a thick understanding of citizenship which implies the emotional attachment to the citizenship status (Yanasmayan, 2015, p.4; Knott, 2019, p.1001). On the other hand, the value of naturalisation might be an instrumental one, rather than a sentimental attachment, in the sense that the new citizenship brings better life opportunities, more rights, secure residence status in society, and freedom of mobility (Harpaz, 2019, p. 900). For instance, the economic situation of a sending country has a crucial impact on immigrants' intention to naturalise. If the sending state is a low-income country, immigrants coming from these countries are much more inclined to naturalise than immigrants coming from high-income countries (Harpaz and Mateos, 2019, p. 848). Here, we need to consider how people make their decisions between instrumental and non-instrumental values of naturalisation. This decision is not made solely based on the value of citizenship. Some criteria affect the decision-making process as Bauböck remarks: "If citizens enjoy considerably more rights than long-term residents, then immigrants will be more often

instrumentally motivated to apply for naturalisation. By contrast, if the only additional benefit that citizenship provides them with is the right to vote, then those who still decide to naturalise will more often do so because they feel at home in the country” (Bauböck, 2019, p. 8). To be clear, citizenship may bring certain values, but people may decide according to their status in the host country. Their status changes the value that they attribute to host country citizenship. For example, Witte has studied the effect of naturalised friends and family members on the naturalisation decision of a person. His hypothesis was that Turkish residents with more naturalised family members and friends are more inclined to naturalise (Witte, 2014, p. 12). However, after doing the research, he found out that naturalised family members and friends do not have any significant effect on the naturalisation decision (Witte, 2014, p.17). Thus, while citizenship has the values that it provides to the citizens, these values can be also considered as more or less important by the people who plan to naturalise.

Transnationalism and Naturalisation

In the naturalisation processes, emotional and instrumental motivations behind the wish for the host country citizenship and emotional bonds to the home country have a crucial impact. Especially in the states where dual citizenship is not allowed, these motivations may conflict with each other. Here, transnationalism is a useful concept for analysis of this conflict concerning the mobilization of immigrants from the host country to the home country or vice versa. This mobilization can be understood as a navigator of the emotions towards both sending and receiving countries. When we analyze the immigrant ties to the host country and home country, transnationalism has an important place because it helps to understand the construction of these ties by the mobilization factor. It is located in the relationship that immigrants establish with

societies in both their home and host countries. While the key factors in the concept of transnationalism like mobilization, borders, and constructed ties shape the decision-making processes on naturalization, emotions also have a crucial impact on this shape and in the whole process. First, we can look at how transnationalism affects the ties to the home country and the host country. For instance, many governments of sending countries take action to transmit their activities to the places where they send migrants in order to present them as ambassadors of the nation (Portes, 2001, p.190). This encourages immigrants to establish transnational ties back and forth. Whether states implement in their citizenship regulations what transnationalism legally suggests is important for immigrants because the legal restrictions shape decision-making for naturalisation. In countries where dual citizenship is not allowed, people face many obstacles legally and socially in the host countries, and it may also not be easy for them to give up their home country citizenship. In spite of these obstacles, transmigrants can maintain their ties to their home country in host countries since social life is not limited by national borders and these immigrants can transmit social links across borders through social movements, networks, and so forth (Levitt, 2004, p.1007). On the other hand, it is not necessary that they transmit social life from their home country to the host country in order to talk about them as ‘transnational’, but they are included in the transnational social field since they benefit from it by connections and information (Levitt, 2004, p.1009-1010). Following this, a criticism of methodological nationalism can be raised. Since methodological nationalism takes nation and nation-related phenomena for granted without analyzing them, it considers nationally bounded societies as ‘naturally given’ (Wimmer, 2002, p.304). However, one must consider that analysis of nations and their societies cannot be reduced to borders and limitations within that nation ‘as given.’ Instead, like the transnationalism approach, one should analyze nations both from top-down and

bottom-up perspectives to see the effect of border-crossing social networks on nations and nations' effect on each other.

When it comes to the issue of citizenship and naturalisation, it is important to look at whether transmigrants are satisfied with their rights abroad or if they need a full membership status there. According to Schiller and Çağlar, some people want to gain their rights by collective action or by contributing to state apparatus and society, so they are social citizens who prefer to claim their rights by social practice instead of claiming them through the law (Glick Schiller, 2008, p.205). In addition, in liberal democracies, their rights are also protected by international human rights, so they can also continue to practice their culture and societal habits abroad (Soysal, 1998, p.195). Even if this is the case, they do not have the same full rights as citizens and also do not have the same attitude as the native society; they often face discrimination by the host society. To try to make themselves accepted in the host society may be one of the motivations for some to pursue citizenship of the host country. For this reason, they may try to get along with the host society even if one does not feel comfortable within that society. On the contrary, this identification process may also cause some not to apply for citizenship from the host country since they cannot identify with the host society. In both cases, they may still have ties with the homeland and may identify more with the home country and the society there. "Migrants who become citizens of a new state, continue to influence their homeland, even if they abandoned their legal citizenship rights" of their homeland (Glick Schiller, 2008, p.207). It can be inferred that it is a huge dilemma for a migrant to choose between host country citizenship and home country citizenship to start a naturalisation process in which they cannot become dual citizens. They can stay, nevertheless, as dual 'social' citizens based on their affection towards societies in both the sending country and receiving country. This keeps them as transnational migrants. Even after having abandoned the citizenship of a home country and even if they are perceived as

‘integrated’ in the new country, “the integrating migrant cannot ever fully embrace the ideal ‘host’ society fully, thus s/he is in a perpetual state of integrating” (Çağlar, 2016, p.7). To be clear, having citizenship from another country and abandoning the previous one does not make the individual also abandon the previous society, culture, and politics, in order to adjust to the new one. Moreover, transnational networks of migrants are relevant to considering their movement between country of origin and immigration regarding their strong interest in the future of the sending country (Bauböck, 2002, p.23). These individuals keep protecting their ties to their home country while trying to integrate into the host society, so again, they are transnational migrants who have a social and economic impact on both receiving and sending states. As we see in the next chapter, Turkey’s blue card can be perceived as one of the transnational policy tools that allow immigrants to establish social and economic ties with both home and host country in spite of having had to renounce their citizenship of origin.

Problems With Dual Citizenship and Sending State Strategies

While transnationalism allows people to protect their ties to their home country and pursue their cultures in the host country, the prohibition on dual citizenship does not allow them to keep these ties in a political sphere. Some states do not allow dual citizenship for their citizens because of the concerns about their citizens being also a member of another state. This causes problems both from the citizens’ side and the states’ side. If they have dual citizenship, citizens may be subjected to dual military obligations, complicated legal status, dual taxation, and uncertain diplomatic protection because of having more than one nationality (Hammar, 1985, p.445). From the states’ side, they need to know who their citizens are and with this logic, they make citizenship laws (Vink and Bauböck, 2013, p.626). For instance, to avoid multiple citizenship,

some states adopt ‘singularity’ as one of the principles of their citizenship law, considering the idea that citizens must have a lifetime loyalty only to one state (Vink and Bauböck, 2013, p. 630). Individuals who have only instrumental motives to apply for host country citizenship may be more loyal to the country of origin rather than the country of settlement (Verkuyten et al., 2023, p. 4). Problems with loyalty, national security, and political trust cause states to avoid multiple citizenships (Faist et al., 2004, p. 915). “Multiple membership raises questions of competing loyalties and obligations – for whom does one fight in the event of a military conflict? – “(Bloemraad et al., 2008, p. 168).

Some states create solutions for the loss of original nationality because of naturalisation in another country. Turkey is one of these states which provides a blue card to its former citizens. The blue card (formerly pink card) gives the rights of “residence, work, mobility, investments, inheritance, and property rights like buying, selling and renting land” to the former Turkish citizens, which makes them “free from the restrictions the foreigners are subject to in Turkey” (Caglar, 2005, p.279). Caglar argues that the idea behind the blue card has failed as we can see in the naturalisation rates in Germany after its implementation since it reduces the citizenship to a mere instrumental relationship with the state. This is as misleading as to reduce it to a mere loyalty relationship (Caglar, 2005, p.284). She conducted interviews with Turkish citizens in Germany who did not apply for German citizenship. While some believe that the attitude of the host society will remain the same because of how they look, others believe that the blue card is not reliable and the Turkish state may give up providing it one day (Caglar, 2005, p.285-6). Even if many people rely on the blue card to naturalise in another country, it is still not seen as an ultimate solution to dual citizenship restrictions and an unwillingness to naturalise.

Affective Citizenship at Three Levels

Emotions in the naturalisation process and transnationalism's effect on this process can be analyzed under the concept of 'affective citizenship.' If we look at the affective side of citizenship, it has bottom-up and top-down approaches. We can consider the affect from the side of government and the side of individuals in society. There is no doubt that affects and emotions are important for political practices (Ayata, 2019b, p.332). Their importance should be further regarded in citizenship studies. In order to study affective citizenship, one must analyze it at three levels: the state, the community, and the individual (Ayata, 2019b, p.334). I am analyzing mostly from the individual level in my research since my focus is on emotions in the decision-making process on naturalisation from the individuals' side. To comprehend individuals' position on naturalisation, there is no doubt that the state level and the community level should be considered too. Before the analysis of these three levels, I want to raise a critique of methodological nationalism again. Concepts of nationalism must not be taken for granted, but they are criticized according to the emotional content and their affection. For the individual level, qualitative interviews should be undertaken. Rather than doing interviews as straightforward conversations, as is commonly done in political science research, we need to look at the emotional atmosphere during an interview (Ayata, 2019a, p.63-64). One of the important things to consider from the individual perspective is exclusion and inclusion. Through the affective relationship between the state and individuals, and between the community and individuals, feelings of exclusion and inclusion penetrate migrants. By this penetration, a migrant's belonging to the host/home country is shaped because affective practices by states and communities evoke certain feelings of migrants. Their decision on naturalisation is certainly also shaped by this affection.

Analyzing political discourses as an affective factor from the top-down approach of affective citizenship is one of the clearest ways to understand the emotional affection of immigrants by the

government. In the identification process of immigrants in a society, politicians have also a crucial role to play in their discourses. What they say partly shapes the perception of the host society and affects immigrants. When politicians perform their discourses, the discourse comes with the affection by the nation. This affection occurs unconsciously. As Fox and Miller-Idriss put it, “nation is not something ordinary people talk *about*; rather, it’s something they talk *with*” (Fox, 2008, p.540). To be clearer, nation is something that always informs the talks and creates an unconscious tendency by making the nation background of the talk. We can understand political discourses as one of the clearest examples of ‘talking with the nation.’ A politician has a positionality coming from his/her nation while performing a discourse. When a politician talks with his/her nation to the society, every group in that society would be affected differently according to their backgrounds. Affection from discourses does not happen independently from people’s backgrounds; a discourse has a role in the affection, but not in itself. “Encoding and recalling of information is dependent on moods and emotions experienced while being exposed to the information” (Ismer, 2011, p.550). This means that when people encounter a discourse, they evaluate it according to their own experiences. However, when a politician engages in anti-immigrant propaganda, s/he calls the immigrant group with features that are seen as bad by the host society. The host society, as an established group, tends to attribute what they perceive as the worst characteristics of immigrants, which are outsiders, to the whole group of immigrants (Elias, 2008, p.19). The distinction between ‘them’ and ‘us’ or ‘us’ and ‘the other’ is always clearly drawn in anti-immigrant propaganda.

When it comes to the relationship between the community and the individual level, it is important to look at factors in the integration process that may later influence the decision-making on naturalisation. Emotions of immigrants are evoked by identifying them in society. Defining immigrants may occur on three levels: their definition of themselves, their definition by the host

society, and their perception of this definition by the host society. Tajfel calls the first one ‘inferiority’ and claims that the group, first, must accept their group in itself in order to legitimize their efforts (Tajfel, 1992, p.342). If they see themselves as inferior, as the host society attributes inferiority to them, then they cannot make themselves other than ‘inferior’. First, they need to construct themselves as a group, in such a way that the label ‘inferior’ is not mentioned concerning their groups. The complicated part is how the host society defines or accepts these immigrants. Here, immigrant integration may be discussed as a distinctive factor. In the literature, immigrant integration remains a concept, and we always think about the integration of immigrants into the host society. Subsequently, one may ask the question of why immigrants are always considered to be obligated to integrate into the host society whereas the host society is not subjected to the same consideration (Schinkel, 2018, p.14). In addition, here, there is a problem in defining the host society in which immigrants live and can be considered included in the host society. If we only consider the integration of immigrants and do not include them in the host society, then the host population must be perceived as “the norm to which immigrants should aspire” (Saharso, 2019, p.1). This is also an inequality that immigrants experience because of their differences from the host society. Immigrants sense these inequalities by the attitudes of the host society. These attitudes are meaning-making acts that are oriented to immigrants to create a change in their position and behavior in society both emotionally and logically (Retiova, 2021, p.4). Consequently, identity conflicts occur between immigrants and the host society, and both sides are trying to define themselves in this mutual identification process.

The Case of Turkish Citizens in Austria

As a predominantly Muslim group, Turkish immigrants and their children born in Austria are commonly regarded as lagging behind other immigrant groups on socioeconomic and cultural-linguistic integration. They have also been the subject of xenophobic propaganda, particularly from the right-wing populist Freedom Party (Bauböck, 2021, p.218-19). Turkish immigrants who live in Austria and have the right to apply for Austrian citizenship must renounce their Turkish citizenship to obtain the Austrian one. However, we need to analyze also the emotional side of interest in Austrian citizenship since emotional bonds to the home country may alter their decision on renunciation. Haller and Haindorfer indicate that “immigrants from Turkey are politically and emotionally more connected to their country of origin” and they are affected by the Turkish government (Haller, 2021a, p.257). On the other hand, there are Austrian politics and discourses on migration which have been called “right-wing populist affective communication” (Thiele, 2021, p.466). Between these two discourses, Austrian politics and Turkish politics, Turkish immigrants’ emotions oscillate. On the one hand, there is a Turkish discourse, for instance from Erdoğan, indicating that there is no difference between Turkish people living abroad and those living in Turkey. He wants to give the former a sense that he is always with them and makes them feel included in Turkish society even if they live abroad. On the other hand, there is an Austrian anti-immigrant discourse that objects to people coming from Muslim countries and wants to protect Austrian people from immigrants. These top-down affective discourses at the state level are influencing immigrants’ decisions on naturalisation. For the individual level of Turkish citizens in Austria, we can consider their exclusion from and inclusion in the Austrian society. As one might perceive from the anti-immigrant party’s vote share in elections in Austria, there is discrimination towards immigrants in society including the Turkish ones. They are mostly seen coming from a Muslim country and are evaluated according to

prejudice towards this identity. There is a study about the identification of immigrants in Austria (Haller, 2021b). This study compares immigrants coming from former Yugoslavia and Turkey. In this study which a survey is conducted with 600 immigrants, Haller finds that “immigrants from the former Yugoslavia already feel that they are Austrians more frequently than those from Turkey” (Haller, 2021b, p. 41). For instance, while 40% of immigrants from former Yugoslavia say they feel more like an Austrian, the percentage is only 20 among Turkish immigrants, and 41% of Turkish immigrants identify more with their origin whereas this number is only 16% for Yugoslavians. Both the state level and the individual level of discrimination contribute to creating this difference in the identification of immigrants coming from different countries.

Research Gap and Research Questions

This thesis is intended to show the importance of emotions in the decision-making process of citizenship acquisition from a host country that does not allow dual citizenship in order to prevent maintenance of citizenship ties to the home country. The method in this thesis is conducting interviews and in-depth analysis of these, especially from the emotional aspect. This is the innovative side of this research since most of the literature has tended to ignore the role of immigrants' emotions triggered by dual citizenship prohibition. My thesis aims to contribute to the research on citizenship with its specific analysis of emotional motives behind keeping or renouncing home country citizenship when considering whether to acquire host country citizenship. I consider these three main questions:

- What are the motives behind giving up the home country (Turkish) citizenship and applying for host country (Austrian) citizenship?
- Are emotional ties to the home country or host country shaping decisions on citizenship?
- What is the mix of emotional and instrumental motives behind pursuing host country citizenship?
- Does the required loss of home country citizenship strengthen the role of attachment and emotional ties to the home country as obstacles for naturalisation?
- Does the perception of the weakness of the home country (in economic or political ways) and the value of its citizenship play a role in motivations to apply for host country citizenship?

Methods and Methodology

In this chapter, I will provide a detailed explanation of the methodology used in this research. In this project, to answer my questions, I conducted interviews and pursued a qualitative method for interview analysis. I conducted interviews in Turkish since it is my and the interviewees' native language. I qualitatively analyzed the contents of interviews carried out with 15 people. I looked at the emotional attachment to the home country and desire for host country citizenship regarding the reasons behind them and how these reasons affect renunciation/naturalisation. I selected my interviewees from Turkish citizens living in Vienna and who came to Austria from Turkey. To analyze my interviews, first, I transcribed the necessary parts of the interviews, and extracted content on emotions and belonging to home country or host country. In addition, I looked at the relationship between instrumental and emotional motives behind pursuing Austrian citizenship and keeping or renouncing Turkish citizenship.

In this research, my population is all Turkish immigrants in Austria who came from Turkey and who have Turkish citizenship. For choosing a sample from my population, I divided people into 3 groups and conducted interviews with 15 people in total - 5 people from each group. These groups are:

- 1- People who came to Austria from Turkey and who are Turkish citizens, and do not yet have the right to apply for Austrian citizenship (i.e. have been residing in Austria continuously for less than 6 years).
- 2- People who came to Austria from Turkey and who are Turkish citizens, and have the option to apply for Austrian citizenship, but have not applied yet (i.e. continuous residence in Austria for 6 years or more).

- 3- People who came to Austria from Turkey and who are Turkish citizens, and who are in the process of application.

The reason for dividing the population into these three groups is to see different instrumental and emotional motives behind naturalisation. I argue that these groups will have different interests in Austrian citizenship. This might be supported by Nils Witte's statement: "Motives for naturalisation intentions are an imprecise measure of motives for naturalisation, but they are the best that can be had. The differences result from the time-variance of opportunities, desires, and beliefs" (Witte, 2018, p.51). I want to indicate possible differences between Group 1 and Group 2. Group 1 consists of people who immigrated in recent years from Turkey to Austria and these people may have different instrumental and emotional motives mainly because of the current social and economic changes in Turkey; in addition to having less experience in Austria which is shaped by recent events such as the pandemic.

First, I prepared a consent form for respondents to ask for their approval to participate in my research anonymously and to record their voices (see Appendix A). However, since I focused on emotions, I planned to do one-to-one interviews in person or online. The reason why I did some interviews online is that some people were hesitant to meet outside and to have a close connection with someone when they were sharing information about their private lives. Although I prepared a questionnaire in both Turkish and English (see Appendix C), I used only the Turkish one for all interviews since interviews are done in Turkish. I pursued qualitative methods because I needed in-depth content analysis of their answers and comparisons among them. Before the questions, I want to explain the reason why I asked for demographic questions below. There has been a possibility for my research to be affected by these variables and my research can be

further analyzed according to them. Moreover, my research would be more fruitful with broader variation in my sample on demographic variables.

1. Demographic questions: Gender, age, occupation, last or current educational degree, years of uninterrupted residency in Austria (see Appendix B).

2. Can you tell me about how and when you came to Austria? What were you doing before and what are you doing now? How do you feel about leaving Turkey and living in Austria?

3. Questions on Austrian citizenship:

Group 1: You have not yet lived in Austria for long enough to apply for Austrian citizenship. Do you intend to apply for it later on? If yes, would you be willing to give up Turkish citizenship in order to get the Austrian one?

Group 2: You have lived in Austria for long enough to apply for Austrian citizenship. Do you intend to apply for it? If yes, would you be willing to give up Turkish citizenship in order to get the Austrian one, and when are you planning to apply and why? If not, why not?

Group 3: You have applied for Austrian citizenship. Why? What has been your experience with the procedure? How has it made you feel towards Austria and Turkey? How do you feel about losing your Turkish citizenship?

4. Question on attachment and belonging to home/host country:

I requested them to read this statement out loud in Turkish. This is the Austrian citizenship oath that every person who completes the application process has to take when getting citizenship.

Austrian citizenship oath: ‘I swear that I will be a loyal citizen of the Republic of Austria, that I will always conscientiously abide by the laws and that I will avoid

everything that might harm the interests and the reputation of the Republic and that I commit myself to the core values of a European democratic state and society.’

Then, I asked these questions about Turkey: How are you feeling when you imagine yourself reading this statement as an Austrian citizen who renounces Turkish citizenship? (According to their answer to specify emotions): Do you feel proud, ashamed, happy, or angry, or does it not bother you at all?

5. Turkey had elections on May 14, 2023, the outcome of which may have impacted naturalisation intentions in Austria. For this reason, I needed to add questions about the elections:

Are you going to vote/did you vote in the upcoming elections in Turkey?

Could the result of the upcoming election in Turkey affect your willingness to apply for Austrian citizenship?

When I planned the time to conduct interviews, the most important thing for me was to complete interviews before the election in Turkey since answers might be influenced by election results. For instance, some people may not want to renounce Turkish citizenship if the current ruling party changes / does not change. As planned, I completed all interviews before the presidential election in Turkey on May 14, 2023.

Participant Selection Process

To find participants for my research, first, I went to the translation office which was founded by Turkish people in Vienna where Turkish people in the Austrian citizenship application process might go to have their documents translated into German. I left my phone number there and one person contacted me. Moreover, I posted on the following Facebook and Discord groups;

Göçmen Kadınlar Viyana (Immigrant Women Vienna), Avusturyadakiler (Turkish People in Austria), Avusturyalı Türkler (Austrian Turkish People), and Viyana’da ve Avusturya’da Yaşayan Türkler (Turkish People Living in Vienna and Austria). I did not choose among the people who responded to avoid bias and I accepted those who wrote me first if they met the criteria. I was selective only concerning gender and age. For instance, if I had done interviews mostly with women, I was trying to find men. This applies also for the age criterion. Interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes in person or online. The information on participants is provided in the table below with pseudonyms to protect anonymity:

GROUP 1

	Gender	Age	Occupation	Educational Level	Uninterrupted Years of Residency in Austria
Mehmet	Male	30	Teacher (Turkey) Unemployed (Austria)	Bachelor's degree	15 months
Özgür	Male	44	Business manager (Turkey) Student (Austria)	Master's degree	18 months
Ayla	Female	31	Student	Master's degree	20 months
Sedef	Female	26	Student	Master's degree	3 years
Cansu	Female	43	Jewellery (Turkey) Unemployed (Austria)	Bachelor's degree	18 months

GROUP 2

	Gender	Age	Occupation	Educational Level	Uninterrupted Years of Residency in Austria
Leyla	Female	48	Project Manager	Bachelor's degree	11 years
Nihat	Male	45	Worker	Vocational High School	23 years
Yusuf	Male	46	Baker	Vocational High School	20 years
Ferda	Female	45	Mechanical Engineer	Bachelor's degree	23 years
Şirin	Female	41	Graphic Designer (Turkey) Grocery store clerk (Austria)	Vocational High School	14 years

GROUP 3

	Gender	Age	Occupation	Educational Level	Uninterrupted Years of Residency in Austria
Murat	Male	33	Safety Management	Master's degree	13 years
Zehra	Female	29	Student	Bachelor's degree	11 years
Taner	Male	37	Communication Engineering	Bachelor's degree	8 years
Emre	Male	29	Engineer	Master's degree	10 years
Emine	Female	42	Special Educational Organization	Master's degree	19 years

Analysis of Interviews

In this part of the thesis, I analyze interviews first as an intra-group analysis and then as an inter-group analysis. I believe that to compare the groups to each other, first, we need to comprehend the first expressions of each individual during interviews.

Group 1

This group consists of people who came from Turkey to Austria in recent years. I expected from this group that they may strongly prefer to get Austrian citizenship, if they were able to do it, because of the current social and economic struggles in Turkey. Among the 5 people in this group, 3 people - Cansu, Özgür, and Mehmet - would like to get Austrian citizenship and they would be ready to renounce their Turkish citizenship.

Cansu, who came to Austria with a spouse visa, owned a jewelry store in Turkey and she is unemployed in Austria. She was talking about the process of moving to Austria and stated:

“We didn't take out everything in Turkey when we came here. We left our workplace open. Our house with the furniture inside and car were still there for 6 months. I think that period was the hardest part of immigration, the adaptation process, language problems, etc.”

This shows that initially, she did not want to lose everything in Turkey because it was still a safe place for her. However, after 6 months, the adaptation process in Austria was getting better.

“After 6 months, we started to remove our remaining possessions there. I still live both here and there, but slowly I feel like I am starting to belong here.”

She was talking about her family and family ties were important to her. However, there were important reasons for her to move to Austria. As a woman, she was worrying about the rights of women and to be safe as a woman in Turkey.

“As a woman in Turkey, I do not feel so safe. Yes, I could get in my car and go anywhere, but I cannot wear whatever I want and walk around freely whenever I want, like here.”

For her, living in Austria and its advantages of Austria are much more related to safety concerns and she also talked about being secure in traffic, and the general calmness of people in Austria. However, when I asked about leaving Turkey, it was hard for her to explain.

“As for the advantages in Turkey, there is a different sincerity there, I don't know how to explain it, those who experience it will know. When you go there, I don't know if it's something you get from entering a familiar area, but I feel very comfortable, very safe and peaceful. Of course, there is an economic crisis in Turkey right now. It is difficult to realize the purchasing power we have here in Turkey. We live very comfortably here as two people. If we could solve the in-between situation and missing part about Turkey, everything would be more comfortable.”

Even if she said before that the adaptation process is getting better in Austria over time, she still feels Turkey is a ‘safe and peaceful’ place. I think that ‘to be safe’ here does not mean being safe in society, for she has stated before that living in Austria is safer, but it means being emotionally safe and peaceful thanks to being with family, relatives, and friends.

When it comes to the question of citizenship, Cansu was sure about her interest in Austrian citizenship and there was no hesitation to give up Turkish citizenship from her side.

“If I had the right to become a citizen, I would love to take advantage of it. I would also risk giving up my Turkish citizenship because it does not bring much benefit to me. If we return to Turkey in the future, we will return more comfortably because we will have

rights in Austria. There is always the possibility of returning, I'm not saying I definitely won't return."

It seems that she still can move back to Turkey. In that case, she would keep her Austrian citizenship and would need to use the advantages of the blue card.

"As long as my family is alive, I will always go to Turkey. If I had a more stable life and order here, I would go to Turkey more often. I'm glad we didn't go to the US or Canada. I think being close to Turkey and flying in 2 hours is a great freedom, a very relaxing thing."

One of the advantages of living in Vienna for her is also to be close to Turkey and the ability to get there in such a short time. When I asked her to read the Austrian citizenship oath, she did not express any emotions.

"This oath doesn't make me feel anything. Even when I was in Turkey, I used to question whether I belonged there. The movements and behaviors of people would seem foreign. Of course, I can't deny this, you miss your family, you miss the place where you were born and raised, simply you miss the tavern."

She did not express any emotional belongingness to Austria and only specified that she was adjusting to living there over time.

Özgür, who moved to Austria as a master's student, was a business manager in Turkey. His main reason for moving to Austria was not the economic, but social. He would like to have Austrian citizenship if he had the right to apply.

"If I have the right to apply for Austrian citizenship in the future, I would like to apply. Of course, every person loves their country. Especially when I was young, I was more idealistic and I used to think about it a lot, but now I don't feel this strength in myself. I don't feel very energetic about whether I can do or fix something in Turkey."

He talked especially about being a part of Austrian society. He thinks this society gives importance to human rights and this is not something people can find in Turkey. However, the language barrier in the Austrian society makes adapting to that society harder for him.

“Of course, I don't feel like a part of this society right now. There is a background that time brings, but I do not have this yet, I am new here. But it's nice to live in this society, even if I don't feel like I am a part of it. Losing Turkish citizenship may create an emotional struggle, but logically speaking, I don't think it will be negative.”

As we can understand from his answers, Özgür gives importance to human rights and since he thinks that the rights are underestimated in Turkey, he likes to live in Austria, and he wants to be a part of Austrian society. Despite his decisiveness on Austrian citizenship, he gave a surprising answer to the question on the oath.

"Here it says, 'I will avoid everything that might harm the interests and the reputation of the Republic.' There might be a problem with this. It is understood that when the interests of the Republic of Austria and the Republic of Turkey conflict, it is necessary to defend the Austrian Republic according to this oath. There is a problem here. I think I would feel emotionally distressed here. But of course, if citizenship requires this, it must be done. How do I feel when I compare it with the Republic of Turkey? This is the difficult part. There is a saying in Turkish: Homeland is the place where you were born or the place where you get enough. Do you feel closer to the culture you were born in, or do you feel closer to the place where you are fed, where you can express yourself, and where you can live the life you want? This is a difficult question, I cannot answer it. If we do not consider this emotional dilemma, I think I would feel proud when I attained Austrian citizenship. I think it makes me proud to be a part of this society.”

I call this answer ‘surprising’ because he is determined to change his citizenship, but this oath made him question and compare loyalty to Austria and Turkey. When he read this oath, it made him emotionally realize what happens when he will not be a part of Turkish society anymore. I want to note that Özgür was the first person who made me realize the importance of using this oath in my research.

The third interviewee in this group is an asylum seeker, Mehmet, who was a teacher in Turkey and who had been sentenced to prison because of being an opponent to Erdogan and a part of the Gülen movement. After getting out of prison, he could not find a job in Turkey and he came to Austria.

“There is respect for human rights here, you are treated like a human being, and your ideas are valued. In Turkey, you are judged for your opinions. It's not just economic reasons. I wish our country could be more livable. Of course, we miss her. I was a bit of a nationalist person, but the concepts of homeland, nation, unity, and solidarity faded away for me. Because the people in the geography I value and consider sacred subjected me to social exclusion. That's why I had to come here.”

These are the reasons why Mehmet would like to have Austrian citizenship, but he also stated that he can always turn back to Turkey thanks to the blue card.

“If I have the right in the future, I will consider applying for Austrian citizenship. These are all on paper. If I want to go to Turkey after becoming a citizen here, if I want to acquire assets there, or if I want to do something, all of these are possible. We give Turkish citizenship to people from different ethnic origins and nationalities in Turkey, but this does not change who they are. These procedures, changing the citizenship, are only on paper, so it is difficult to get them into the heart.”

I think the last sentence clarifies his emotional ties to Turkey. Since it is always possible to move back to Turkey when one has a blue card, he could apply for Austrian citizenship if he gets the chance. For Mehmet, this will not change his Turkish identity and his connection to Turkey. His emotional state is even clearer in his response to the question on the oath.

“For example, is this a situation that would damage my national pride? Yes, it is. It would disturb a nationalist person to read this. It's a humbling situation. But as I said, we do not give up our identity just because we read this oath. Reading doesn't bother me; it just subtly breaks me. On the other hand, it flatters my pride because it means that as a person from another nation, I have become a part of this society and I deserve it.”

Like Özgür, Mehmet would also feel proud to become a part of Austrian society, but differently, he felt about the oath as diminishing his dignity. From this, we can understand that dignity works in two ways: to become a part of a society in a more developed country makes him feel naturally proud, but to stay outside of the society of the country which he was born into and where he lived makes him abashed in an emotional sense.

The last two interviewees are persons who have never considered renouncing their Turkish citizenship. Ayla, who is a master's student in Austria, stated that for her the only advantage of living in Austria is economic opportunities.

“For me, living here has more disadvantages. To put it simply, there is a language barrier. I don't even understand the advertisements and announcements on the tram. I can never get used to people. I miss the warm weather in Turkey. Frankly, it doesn't feel very good to be here. The only disadvantage of living in Turkey for me is the low purchasing power.”

She said that when she completes her education, she wants to move back to Turkey if the circumstances allow. For this reason, she never thought to renounce her Turkish citizenship.

“I asked myself this many times, but I decided that I couldn't do it. Turkey is my home. A place where I feel I belong.”

Ayla has a strong emotional connection to Turkey, and when she saw the oath, she said that she would feel proud like others, but she also adds:

“Probably if I saw this seriously for the first time and had to read to become an Austrian citizen, I would wish I had read something like this for Turkey. I would only feel this way.”

What she means is that she would like to feel proud of Turkey instead of Austria. In addition, in this group, she was the only person who would be affected by the election results in Turkey in her consideration of Austrian citizenship. She said that if the current president is re-elected after the elections in May 2023, she would lose her hope for Turkey and might want to get Austrian citizenship later, but still she was not sure while saying those words.

The last person in this group, Sedef, came to Austria for master's studies 3 years ago. For me, Sedef illuminates an interesting aspect of living in Austria as a person coming from Turkey.

When she compares life in Austria and Turkey, she remarks that she does not feel different when she lives in Austria.

“I see Austria as advantageous only from an economic perspective. Of course, there are also psychological effects of living as a woman in Turkey. As I pass through an empty street here, I am a little scared because I come from a background in Turkey, but at the same time, I know that this place is safe. Maybe because I feel this fear both here and in Turkey, it doesn't seem so different to live here because I already have that feeling ingrained in me, I have the same way of thinking in Turkey. It's very hard for me to throw this away. I feel like it's an emotional habit. Logically, of course, I know the differences

between Turkey and here, but when I put it into practice, it does not seem very different in terms of lifestyle.”

This attitude was very surprising for me as I had not expected to hear it before. Of course, it may take some time for her to adjust to life in Austria, but after 3 years, she still feels a similarity with life in Turkey. For her, if she continues to live in Austria, it would be only if she were unable to move back to Turkey. She also explained this while reading the oath and when she read it, her voice was choked by tears.

“When I read this, I feel nothing for the Austrian Republic. I don't want to do anything for them, I don't care if they get hurt or not. I don't care about conscientiously obeying their laws. Of course, I follow the rules of where I live, but I do it for myself. To be able to stay here, I do it for my benefit. I never cared about the interests and reputation of their republic. Of course, I wouldn't do any harm, but not because I care about the Austrian Republic; It's because of my understanding of not harming the place I'm in anyway.”

I think this is a common understanding among the Turkish immigrants I talked to because when they read the oath, they mostly stated that they do not want to harm the society where they live, but not because it is Austria. When it comes to the question on citizenship, she does not want to have Austrian citizenship and to renounce her Turkish citizenship.

“When I imagine having renounced Turkish citizenship, I feel lost. So....it's like....(crying) I feel like I've lost everything I have, I feel like I've lost my home. Of course, there are rights given to you when you renounce citizenship, you get a blue card, but for example, voting is very important to me. Yes, even though I am hopeless, I would like to have the chance to do something for Turkey, because it is my home. Even if I continue to live here, I want to contribute there and maybe I always want to keep the

possibility of my return. So, if I stay here, it's not because of this place, it's because I can't go back there. That's why I feel like I destroyed my possibility of returning."

For Sedef, there is always a possibility to go back to Turkey, but this depends on living standards in Turkey. She does not feel connected to Austria and the reason she stays in Austria is that there is no possibility for her to live in Turkey right now.

Group 2

The second group consists of people who have the right to apply for Austrian citizenship but have not yet applied. The first person I will analyze in this group is Ferda who came to Austria in October 2000. Ferda has graduated from a school that provides education in German in Turkey, so she does not have a language problem while living in Austria. She said that it was not hard for her to adapt to life in Austria and she did not have a long-lasting adaptation process. However, even if life is easy for her in Austria, she thinks of going back to Turkey after some years:

"To those who asked me whether I would return or not, I said I would never return because I have a beautiful life here that makes me happy. This was 2 or 3 years ago. But in recent years, perhaps due to age, I have had an incredible desire to return. What keeps me here is mostly economic advantages. And of course, some social advantages. The current situation in Turkey is not something I would feel comfortable with, in terms of worldview and lifestyle."

What makes her stay in Austria is mostly economic and social advantages, but when I asked her to explain the desire to turn back to Turkey, it was something she could not explain clearly.

"My decision is towards Austria right now, even though emotionally it's the exact opposite. By emotionally, I mean that I want to spend my older age in Turkey and return

if the conditions allow. Having my family there is an important factor, but it is not entirely the reason why I want to return. Believe me, I don't know either why, maybe I'm getting more emotional as I get older, but it feels like it's my homeland and I'll be more emotionally satisfied there."

However, the reason she has not applied for Austrian citizenship is not this emotional situation. She explained that since Austrian bureaucracy makes it hard to do this kind of paperwork, she had never thought about applying and she is satisfied with a permanent residence permit. When she read the oath, she said she would feel happy since Austria makes her happy and provides many opportunities to her and she adds that the requirement of renouncing Turkish citizenship does not have any influence on her decision. Even if she thinks in that way, she answered the question on the election in Turkey in a different way.

"I voted in these elections, and I even said that I'm glad I didn't become an Austrian citizen. So, of course, I wouldn't feel good about losing voting rights in the future. These are also question marks for me right now. If you had asked me these questions one or two years ago, my answers might have been the exact opposite. I could say it wouldn't affect me at all, but it's becoming more and more important now. I can give up applying for Austrian citizenship at any time. Because as I followed the times my own country was going through, I realized that this was much more important than I expected. I mean, it would hurt and upset me if I couldn't vote right now."

With this answer, Ferda was the first person who made me realize the significance of asking the question on the election in Turkey because this question revealed her connection to 'her own country' as she stated, and also made her aware of the importance of voting in Turkish elections.

We can understand that to do something for one's own country is important and has an emotional

place in his/her ties to their home country. It is even becoming much more important for her when she sees Turkey's situation getting worse according to her understanding.

The second person, Leyla, came to Austria with a student visa and continued to stay through family reunification. She was the person who expressed intense emotions while reading the oath.

“(She reads in a tearful voice and starts crying when she finishes). It seems that it is not so easily forgotten, I must have nationalism in me. This is something that upsets people deeply. My husband received Austrian citizenship; I was also very emotional when he gave up his Turkish ID. It’s a simple thing, Turkey also supports it and gives a blue card. So, it is a very good solution against not allowing dual citizenship. But there is a bond of love that is difficult to break. (Tearful). When I think about it logically, everything is fine, but emotionally it is very sad, I realize now.”

When I asked why she did not apply for Austrian citizenship, she said that the reason was losing Turkish citizenship. Like Ferda, she also talked about her willingness to do something for her country and how she feels guilty about staying away from Turkey.

“There is a saying: ‘Every educated Turkish woman owes something to this republic.’ In that sense, I can say that I feel guilty. (Tearful). Why didn't I stay in my country and try to change this? But will I go back? No, I won't. I love my country, but I also have to stay away from it. I feel guilty about this and always will. I could have stayed in my own country and fought to avoid the hardship there, but my struggle would have been in vain.”

She is hopeless about doing something to make Turkey a better country, but still, she has the guilt of staying far from the country. Even if she does not consider moving back to Turkey and she said there is no possibility of this also in the future, she is emotionally bound to Turkey.

“My soul belongs to Turkey, maybe it will never belong here.”

The next person, Nihat, came to Austria by way of family reunification 23 years ago. Despite all those years, he could not adjust to life in Austria.

“Turkey is our homeland, we always feel its absence. There is always a bitterness of not being able to live there. I came here but it seems like I couldn't adapt. My mind and heart have always remained in Turkey. Even though I live under the conditions here, my love for Turkey is different. Maybe few people feel what I feel, but I always say that I will return.”

As far as I understood, Nihat has strong nationalist emotions towards Turkey. He also talked about being a Turkish person and described it as a unique situation in the world. In addition, he mentioned the advantages in Austria, especially regarding health care and the economic situation. He, nevertheless, never thought of applying for Austrian citizenship and as he said, he would never think about it. When he read the Austrian citizenship oath, he thought that reading this oath may influence him emotionally and this may be the reason for his decision.

“Maybe I do not naturalize because of this oath and renouncing Turkish citizenship may affect me emotionally. If the news about Turkey on TV today affects me, if I get emotional, which I do, you can't tear me away from Turkey. I am Turkey and Turkey is me. No matter how much it changes, whether it gets better or worse, we will accept it as it is, that country is our country.”

Nihat believes in the importance of uniting under one nation and with this mindset, he argues that everyone should have the same feelings for their country, even though that country is going through difficult times.

Yusuf, whose father was living in Austria before, came to Austria to live with his father and to work in a bakery. For this reason, he gives importance to employee rights in Austria compared to Turkey and this is the main reason why he chose to live in Austria.

“Here, for example, there is no need to work every day, workers' rights are good here.

The advantage of living in Turkey would be to be in my own homeland. If I had worked in Turkey right now, I would have been more crushed and worn out. I am a worker, workers' rights are important to me.”

Yusuf also described Turkey as ‘his own homeland’ and he does not want to give up Turkish citizenship, but if there could be a right to dual citizenship, he said that he could apply for Austrian citizenship.

“I don't know why I didn't want to give up my Turkish citizenship, I don't know if it was emotional or not. I act according to my feelings, I don't know how it happens either. It means that the place where I live and grew up seems warmer to me, I don't know... I say homeland is homeland. If my children and family were not here, I would definitely return to Turkey, I would not stay here. It's an emotional situation that I can't define, I don't know.”

Like many other interviewees, Yusuf also has an emotional state that he cannot explain, but he would not feel bothered while reading the oath because he thinks that Austria is the country where he and his children live, so he wants to protect this place and follow the rules there.

The last person in this group is Şirin who has an Alevi origin. She said that people in Austria and Turkey discriminated against her because of her origin, and even Turkish people in Austria did so. Her main reason for staying in Austria is her children.

“I stay because my children are here. I wouldn't stay if it wasn't for the kids. For example, I bought a house in Turkey. I always think that I will return there one day. Its smell and atmosphere are different. This place seems strange to me. I feel happy when I go to Turkey. I love Turkey very much, I am attached to the land of my birth. I want to be buried there when I die.”

She was talking about Tunceli, where she was born and grew up. Rather than Turkey, she seems mostly connected to the city of Tunceli and the people there. On the other hand, she thinks that Turkey is not a livable state for her right now.

“I don't feel I am lifeful here. But of course, the conditions in Turkey right now are very scary, very frightening. Living conditions are very difficult there, everything is very expensive, and people are discriminated against. There is no security in Turkey. For example, here I am not afraid when I hear the sound of a window in my home or I can sleep without locking my door, but in Turkey I am afraid, I am afraid when I walk on the street.”

Although she is aware of deficiencies in Turkey, she does not want to renounce her Turkish citizenship.

“I do not want Austrian citizenship. Because I feel like I will lose my true self when I apply. I'm someone who protects their roots a bit. Everything I have is in Turkey, that's where I was born. I don't know if it's called extreme nationalism or bonding, but I may feel like I betrayed that place. I have never thought of getting Austrian citizenship, and I never will.”

She also adds that she is even psychologically regretting learning German and does not want to talk in German since she cannot feel comfortable with it. For her, it may be the result of an unwillingness to be a part of Austria or Austrian society. When she read the oath, her voice sounded a bit distressed, and she explained:

“I felt like I betrayed my republic. I felt crushed under this oath. It seems like a very serious sacrifice to me. It's not something I can do, I don't want it at all. It seems very repulsive to me. I want to remain as a Turkish citizen. If I had the chance, I would go to Turkey right now.”

Group 3

Emre, who came to Austria after finishing high school in Turkey, is a master's student in mechanical engineering. When he first came to Austria, he was always thinking about returning to Turkey.

“To be honest, I decided to return to Turkey several times at first, I never wanted to stay here. But when you think about it logically, you can't go back. You continue by grumbling. The effect of this situation has diminished, but of course, it still continues.”

When he compares Austria and Turkey, there is no reason to live in Turkey for him because of the political and economic situation. However, to him, there is no reason to stay in Austria except for getting citizenship.

“I hope I can get Austrian citizenship and go somewhere else in the EU with peace of mind. The things that connect me to Turkey here are always emotional. For example, missing, feeling of not belonging, wanting to speak your language, etc. But of course, Turkey's biggest disadvantage is its political and economic situation. You have no freedom, you have no legal security, the system is not proper, and you have no freedom of thought. I don't have to be exposed to these here.”

He plans to stay in Austria and go to another country after receiving his citizenship. When he talks about renunciation of Turkish citizenship, he mentions he would prefer having dual citizenship if it was allowed.

“Frankly, I wish they would accept dual citizenship, but I wouldn't even think twice to renounce my Turkish citizenship. Wherever I sign, I sign it immediately. With the blue card, you already become like a Turkish citizen, you have entry and exit, inheritance, and

buying and selling rights. The benefits of European citizenship are great. Especially the fact that it is Austria doesn't mean anything to me, I don't care. The only thing I want is to be able to live anywhere in Europe whenever I want. ”

He does not feel anything for both Turkish citizenship and Austrian citizenship, and he just thinks about the advantages of his life. He thinks that he can keep his ties with Turkey with the blue card. He was not affected by the oath and would not be bothered by reading it.

“This oath doesn't affect me at all. I'm not a nationalist either. Belonging to Austria doesn't mean anything, and breaking away from Turkey doesn't mean anything either. For me, citizenship is just a piece of paper that will bring advantages, I'll read it and pass on it.”

The only difficulty for him to get Austrian citizenship is military service. He needs to perform this task in Austria when he gets citizenship, but he is thinking about doing alternative civilian service instead of military service. Other than this duty, he did not experience any emotional and bureaucratic hardship in the application process and he never thought of giving up.

Murat is another person who also always thought about returning to Turkey the first time he came to Austria. For him, the application process for Austrian citizenship was difficult, especially since it was crowded in Vienna.

“Due to the high number of citizenship applications done in Vienna, for example, I get my citizenship later than those living in other cities. The longer the process takes, the more risky your application for citizenship becomes. You need to keep your job stable during that process. So far, I have not seen any advantage of Turkish citizenship, so I have no hesitation about renouncing it.”

Even if the application process was difficult for him, he did not consider giving up. He remarked that having the blue card would allow him to have almost all rights in Turkey as a citizen.

However, he talked about military service, and he touched on an important point.

“For example, the fear of some people who have not become citizens is military service.

Some of my friends say they will go and do it, but if you ask me, I won't go. I did military service in Turkey. I don't think I can do military service for Austria, I don't know why but I don't have that desire.”

After his answer, I realized that asking male respondents about military service would be a good idea and may be crucial to reveal their desire to serve in Austria in order to understand their feelings towards Turkey and Austria. His answer is not very clear in concluding his feelings, but it seems to me that he does not feel to belong to Austria as strongly as he feels for Turkey.

Taner, who came to Austria in 2015 for studies, is an engineer and he began his application process in November 2022. When he talked about Turkey and how he belonged there, he mentioned that some outside factors made him leave Turkey, but he did not give any details of those factors.

“If I felt like I belonged to Turkey, I probably wouldn't have thought about leaving, or rather, I wouldn't have come here if I hadn't received signals of 'you don't belong here'.

The ideal thing for me would be to live a happy life in Turkey; would feel like I belonged and continue my life there.”

The main reason why he applied for Austrian citizenship is that he does not want to prepare documents and deal with renewing his residence permit. He wants to deal with these kinds of processes only for one time -even if “The documentation required is another significant obstacle for ordinary naturalisation in many states of Europe.” and it “was found to be most demanding in countries like Austria...” (Bauböck et al., 2013, pp. 17) - and wants to continue to his life with a

life-long secure residence. What was difficult for him in the application process was his emotional state.

“My difficult point when applying was emotional. There are some facts and we did not choose them. For example, we did not choose to be aware of Turkey or to be Turkish nationalists. Regarding Turkish citizenship, giving up one's old citizenship certainly makes one think. Conditions lead you to apply for Austrian citizenship. For example, I have been here for eight years, and I always deal with residence permit issues, I don't want to deal with it. Even if I decide to return to Turkey, there is no problem, I can return as an Austrian citizen. So I don't think I will have a big loss on paper.”

He also thinks that since the blue card will allow him to return to Turkey and do almost whatever he wants, Austrian citizenship will not make him lose anything. Moreover, after reading the oath, he commented on it emphasizing an important point.

“If the sentence were ‘I will work for the interests and reputation of the republic’, I would say, ‘I wonder if I can do this?’ But of course, I avoid anything that could cause harm. This means being respectful. There is a difference between the two. In one case, you dedicate yourself there, or we do that in Turkey, I don't know. But here the sentence has no such expectation, it just says respect me.”

He does not want to harm the country where he lives, but he is not sure about committing himself to benefit the Austrian Republic. Of course, the oath itself does not have a statement on this or does not require to do this, but it is enlightening that people are thinking about these kinds of distinctions while reading it. Taner expresses his connection to Turkey in these words:

“For example, I constantly watch Turkish news here, it's a strange situation. Even though I will get citizenship here, or those who already got it act in the same way, our hearts somehow beat for Turkey.”

Zehra, who is an Alevi and who is from Tunceli like Şirin, moved to Austria after she completed her high school education in Turkey.

“I am from Tunceli, I am Alevi. I was exposed to a lot of racist discourse in Turkey because of this identity. I came here, I am an immigrant here, I can understand the racism here, but it is very hurtful to be exposed to these racist discourses in your own country.”

In the first place, she did not want to come to Austria because she was afraid of being in a foreign place. She was always considering moving back to Turkey. She was staying with her aunt in Vienna, but after some time, she started to work, and she had her place.

“I wanted to stand on my own feet, and as I stood, I started to love this place. I decided to stay here because I think it would be better to stay here due to the economic and political situation and divisive politics in Turkey. I go to Turkey every summer holiday. As time passes, I miss this place now, just as I missed Turkey in the beginning. The sense of feeling at home has changed. This is my home because as a woman I feel safer.”

For her, Austria is the place that made her who she is now. For this reason, she feels connected to where she lives, and she has no hesitation in renouncing Turkish citizenship to get Austrian citizenship. This connection is much more related to the advantages that Austria gives her as she says after reading the oath:

“I do not hate Turkey, I love Turkey, but here I have to pay extra only because of my Turkish identity, or constantly extending visas and giving money, I want to get rid of these problems because I have been experiencing these problems for 9 years. I don't think I could fit in here culturally. I am quite satisfied with the Alevi culture. Obtaining citizenship will not change anything in my life in terms of feelings and culture. I just want to take advantage of the benefits it provides.”

Emine, the last person in this group, came to Austria after dropping out of university education due to the headscarf ban. She applied for Austrian citizenship because she wanted to have political rights in Austria. In the beginning, she came to Austria with a plan to return to Turkey after completing the university, but then she married and began to work. The possibility of returning to Turkey was her main reason for not applying for Austrian citizenship until now.

“The reason I didn't apply until now was always the possibility of returning. Right now, I don't have an intense fear of losing my Turkish citizenship, I don't have an emotional attachment to my passport. My loyalty to my country is not about a piece of paper. I will have lost my right to vote, but I live here and I am in favor of voting for the people who will determine our fate here.”

When she considers Turkey and Austria, and compares these two, she thinks that Austria has economic advantages because the economic crisis is easily overcome here. For Turkey, it is not like that. She remarks that Turkey's geographical location does not allow it to overcome economic hardships. Thus, she does not find Turkey deficient but finds it surrounded by deficiencies. After reading the oath, she expressed what she feels for Turkey more clearly.

“No matter what you do, you are a foreigner here, whether you are a citizen or not. In Austria, these walls do not collapse easily. You cannot change this in the eyes of society, hidden racism is at high levels, but Austria is my second homeland, my country. She opened her door to me. My bond with Turkey is much different, no one can tear it out of my soul, I belong there with everything I have. There is no such thing as I belong to Austria”

Inter-Group Analysis and Results

In this section, I will compare the 3 groups with each other. First, we need to summarize the group dynamics.

Consisting of Turkish citizens who came to Austria in recent years, Group 1 includes 3 people who would like to have Austrian citizenship, and 2 people who would not give up their Turkish citizenship. The former 3 people all have instrumental motives to get Austrian citizenship, especially motives about human rights. There is always the possibility to turn back to Turkey for Cansu and Mehmet, but not for Özgür, even if they become Austrian citizens. Here, we may question if they still want to have Austrian citizenship in the case that the Turkish state does not provide the blue card. One of the reasons why they comfortably give up Turkish citizenship might be that they will benefit from the blue card, and they can maintain their lives in Turkey as Austrian citizens. Even if the other person, Özgür, precisely stated that he wants to have Austrian citizenship in the future, the oath revealed his emotional state towards Turkey and Austria. The other 2 people, Ayla and Sedef, showed higher emotional motives not to give up Turkish citizenship or get Austrian citizenship if they had the right, and they expressed their feelings mostly while reading the oath. In addition, they find Turkey economically disadvantageous in comparison with Austria and this is not a sufficient reason for them to renounce Turkish citizenship. This shows that for this group, economic shortcomings are not as important as social shortcomings as motives for giving up their Turkish citizenship.

For the second group, first, I want to emphasize that all people in this group referred to Turkey with similar phrases: ‘my own homeland’, ‘my country’, ‘our country’, ‘my own country’, and ‘my homeland.’ As expected, this group showed higher emotional belonging to their home country, for they are the people who did not apply for Austrian citizenship even if they had the

right to apply. They have instrumental reasons to stay in Austria, like worker rights, and economic and social advantages, but mostly all want to move back to Turkey for emotional reasons. Ferda and Leyla have an urge to do something for their own country, especially when they see their country is going through hard times. Only Leyla was emotionally affected while reading the oath, but I can remark that this group has already those feelings that I intend to reveal by the oath. However, one person, Yusuf, stated that he could get Austrian citizenship if there was an allowance for dual citizenship. I think that this thought might be valid also for the other people in this group.

The third group, including Turkish citizens who are in the application process for Austrian citizenship, shows lots of differences among group members. They all want to have Austrian citizenship and never thought to give up the process. Taner, Murat, and Emre rely on the blue card in case they want to live in Turkey in the future, or if they want to use some rights in Turkey. The other 2 people, Zehra and Emine, did not mention living in Turkey in the future or having a blue card. Some people in this group - Zehra, Emine, Taner, Murat – want to stay in Austria for instrumental reasons, but one person, Emre, wants to leave Austria after getting citizenship. Most of the group was not affected by the oath while reading it; only Taner questioned his commitment to Austria and Turkey, and it seems he has more emotional ties to Turkey rather than to Austria. Except for Murat and Emre, all other interviewees showed their emotional connection to Turkey with their expressions, and they mostly did this after reading the oath. In this group, people think that reading the oath is just a procedure and changing their citizenship is only on paper. For this reason, they have no hesitation to renounce Turkish citizenship. Unlike Pogonyi's study on non-resident citizens of Hungary, which shows that non-resident Hungarians get Hungarian citizenship to be accepted by the Hungarians in Hungary and to prove that they belong to Hungary (Pogonyi, 2019, pp.988), Turkish citizens do not evaluate

their belonging according to the which passport they have. This might show different dynamics between societies in terms of how they measure their belonging to their home country.

When I compare all groups according to their motives, they mostly give instrumental value to Austrian citizenship, and they do not have any emotional motive for naturalisation in Austria.

Most of them have an emotional connection to Turkish citizenship and most of the interviewees who consider getting Austrian citizenship plan to protect their belonging to Turkey with the opportunities provided by the blue card. In a study (Politi et al., 2022) in which immigrants were asked about their naturalisation motives in Switzerland, more than half of the respondents said ‘I feel I belong to Switzerland’ but the information on their country of origin is not indicated in the study. In addition, more than half of them also say they want ‘to vote and get involved in my local community.’ (Politi et al., 2022, p.442). When I look at my study, this is exactly the reverse for Turkish citizens. Only one person, Emine, said that she wants Austrian citizenship to vote in Austria, but this is not to get involved in ‘her community’ because she said that she will always feel like a foreigner in Austria and that she belongs to Turkey.

Lastly, I want to make a comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In the first group, we have 3 people who want Austrian citizenship due to the deficiencies in the implementation of human rights and social rights in Turkey. However, the second group has 2 people who said that they want to do something for Turkey because of these deficiencies in Turkey even if they live in Austria. In this case, it is important to realize that those deficiencies in a state make some people pursue citizenship from another country based on an instrumental motive while making others retain their home country citizenship for emotional reasons.

Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, the findings in my thesis show that emotions cannot be neglected in the evaluation of motives behind naturalisation. My aim in this research was to show the importance of emotional motives in the decision-making process for naturalisation and which factors those motives are affected by. I believe that in-depth interviews clearly showed the immigrants' emotional positionality towards their home countries while they think about getting citizenship from the host country where dual citizenship is not allowed. Unfortunately, emotions are mostly disregarded in citizenship studies, and it was quite hard for me to find directly relevant literature for my thesis topic.

Furthermore, I want to acknowledge the limitations and possible criticisms of my research. First, the oath requirement was the key factor in my research to reveal the emotions of interviewees. They all read it in Turkish. Now I think that reading the oath in Turkish might make respondents more emotional than reading it in German. However, during the interviews, I asked people who knew German that there were both German and Turkish versions to read it, but they all chose to read the oath in Turkish. I think this was better for my research to follow the same pattern for every participant. Secondly, in all groups, the majority of respondents do not show any belongingness to Austria. I could have dug deeper with some questions like if they want any European citizenship or specifically Austrian citizenship. Even so, the answers mostly reveal that Austrian citizenship is desired for instrumental motives rather than emotional ones. In addition, questions may also include devaluing Turkish citizenship and how this affects the decision on naturalisation in Austria. However, this devaluation in instrumental and emotional senses is oscillating in Turkey, especially in recent years, regarding the commodification of Turkish citizenship. For instance, foreigners can have the right to get Turkish citizenship if they purchase

real estate which is amount to minimum 400.000 dollars in Turkey.¹³ Since my interviews are done before the elections, the election environment may affect the accuracy of answers to the question on devalued Turkish citizenship.

In addition, this research can be considered as a contribution to the literature on dual citizenship. In some sense, it shows a couple of reasons why dual citizenship is not allowed in some countries. For instance, loyalty is one of the factors that we can find in the answers to interviews. If a war occurs, a state expects its citizens to stand on its side but for some immigrants, it might not be possible to show loyalty to the host country if a war occurs with their home country. The findings from the interviews can be also used to evaluate why dual citizenship must be allowed, concerning the emotions of immigrants in the case of renunciation of their home country citizenship. If the home country does not offer something like the blue card in Turkey, how can these people maintain their ties to the home country?

Here, I want to conclude by remarking that this thesis might create a further agenda for both me and citizenship scholarship on the place of emotions in the decision-making process through citizenship acquisition. This topic can be further researched regarding other nationalities and can be turned into cross-national studies.

¹³ <https://www.invest.gov.tr/en/investmentguide/pages/acquiring-property-and-citizenship.aspx>

Appendices

Appendix A

Katılımcı Onay Formu (in Turkish, English below)

Central European Üniversitesi, Milliyetçilik Çalışmaları bölümünde Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi olan Elif Çağatay'ın yüksek lisans araştırma projesi için mülakata katılmayı, kendi isteğimle, hiçbir baskı ve zorlama olmaksızın, kimlik bilgilerimin paylaşılması şartı ile kabul ediyorum. Çalışma ile ilgili ayrıntılı açıklamalar sözlü olarak araştırmacı tarafından yapıldı. Görüşmenin ses kayıt cihazı ile kaydedilmesine ve araştırma bulgularının Central European Üniversitesi ile paylaşılmasına onay veriyorum.

Bu araştırma projesi, Profesör Rainer Bauböck danışmanlığında yürütülmektedir.

Araştırmacı iletişim bilgileri: cagatay_elif@student.ceu.edu

_____	_____	_____
Katılımcının İsmi	Tarih	İmza
_____	_____	_____
Araştırmacının İsmi	Tarih	İmza

Consent Form

I hereby accept to participate in the interview for the graduate research project of Elif Çağatay, a graduate student in the Department of Nationalism Studies at Central European University, on the condition that my identity information will not be shared. Detailed explanations about the study were made orally by the researcher. I consent to the recording of the interview with a voice recorder and sharing the research findings with Central European University.

This research project is under the supervision of Professor Rainer Bauböck.

Contact information of the researcher: cagatay_elif@student.ceu.edu

_____	_____	_____
Name of participant	Date	Signature
_____	_____	_____
Name of researcher	Date	Signature

Appendix B

Katılımcı Bilgi Formu (in Turkish, English below)

Cinsiyet: ☐ Kadın ☐ Erkek ☐ Belirtmek istemiyorum

Yaş:

Meslek:

Eğitim seviyesi:

Avusturya’da geçirilen kesintisiz süre:

Participant Information Form

Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male ☐ Do not want to indicate

Age:

Occupation:

Educational degree:

Uninterrupted years of residency in Austria:

Appendix C

Interview Questions In Turkish

- 1) Kendinizden bahseder misiniz? Avusturya'ya gelmeden önce ne yapıyordunuz?
Türkiye'de neler yapıyordunuz? Avusturya'ya nasıl geldiniz?
- 2) Türkiye'den ayrılmak ve burada yaşamak size nasıl hissettiriyor? Avantajlar ve dezavantajlar neler?
- 3) Grup 1: İleriki zamanlarda Avusturya vatandaşlığına başvurmayı düşünür müsünüz?
Neden? Eğer düşünüyorsanız Türkiye vatandaşlığından çıkmak ister misiniz?
Grup 2: Avusturya vatandaşlığına başvurmayı düşünüyor musunuz? Neden? Eğer düşünüyorsanız Türkiye vatandaşlığından çıkmak ister misiniz?
Grup 3: Avusturya vatandaşlığı başvuru sürecindesiniz. Süreç nasıl ilerliyor?
Zorlandığınız noktalar oldu mu? Kararsızlık yaşadığınız anlar oldu mu? Türkiye vatandaşlığınızı kaybetme konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?
- 4) Avusturya vatandaşlık yemini:

"Avusturya Cumhuriyeti'nin sadık bir vatandaşı olacağıma, kanunlara her zaman vicdanen uyacağıma ve Cumhuriyetin çıkarlarına ve itibarına zarar verebilecek her şeyden kaçınacağıma ve Avrupa demokratik devleti ve toplumunun değerlerini özümseyeceğime ant içerim."

Kendinizi Türk vatandaşlığından çıkmış bir Avusturya vatandaşı olarak bu açıklamayı okurken hayal ettiğinizde ne hissediyorsunuz?

Kendinizi gururlu, utanmış, mutlu, kızgın hissediyor musunuz, yoksa bu sizi hiç rahatsız etmiyor mu?

- 5) Türkiye 14 Mayıs 2023 tarihinde seçime gidiyor.
Seçimde oy kullanacak mısınız / kullandınız mı?
Bu seçimin sonucu Avusturya vatandaşlığı alma ve Türkiye vatandaşlığından çıkma ile ilgili düşüncelerinizi etkiler mi / etkiledi mi?

Appendix D

Austrian citizenship oath in Turkish (for English and German, see below):

"Avusturya Cumhuriyeti'nin sadık bir vatandaşı olacağıma, kanunlara her zaman vicdanen uyacağıma ve Cumhuriyetin çıkarlarına ve itibarına zarar verebilecek her şeyden kaçınacağıma ve Avrupa demokratik devleti ve toplumunun değerlerini özümseyeceğime ant içerim."

Austrian citizenship oath in English:

"I swear that I will be a loyal citizen of the Republic of Austria, that I will always conscientiously abide by the laws and that I will avoid everything that might harm the interests and the reputation of the Republic and I commit myself to the basic values of a democratic European country and its society "14

Austrian citizenship oath in German:

“Ich gelobe, dass ich der Republik Österreich als getreuer Staatsbürger angehören, ihre Gesetze stets gewissenhaft beachten und alles unterlassen werde, was den Interessen und dem Ansehen der Republik abträglich sein könnte und bekenne mich zu den Grundwerten eines europäischen demokratischen Staates und seiner Gesellschaft.“15

¹⁴ <https://www.refworld.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/rwmain/opendocpdf.pdf?reldoc=y&docid=5c863d4c4>

¹⁵ <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10005579>

Bibliography

- Alba, R. (2005). "Bright vs. Blurred Boundaries: Second-Generation Assimilation and Exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1), p. 20–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000280003>.
- Ayata, B., Cilia Harders, Derya Özkaya & Dina Wahba. (2019a). "Interviews as situated affective encounters: A relational and processual approach for empirical research on affect, emotion and politics." *Analyzing Affective Societies: Methods and Methodologies*, p.63-77.
- Ayata, B. (2019b). "Affective Citizenship." *Affective Societies: Key Concepts*, p. 330-338.
- Badenhoop, E. (2021). "Responding to the call for the Super Citizen: migrants' ambivalent experiences of naturalization in Germany and the United Kingdom." *Citizenship Studies*, 25:4, p. 564-582.
- Bauböck, R. (2002). "How migration transforms citizenship: international, multinational and transnational perspectives." *IWE Working Paper Series*, 24.
- Bauböck, R., Iseult Honohan, Thomas Huddleston, Derek Hutcheson, Jo Shaw & Maarten Peter Vink. (2013). *Access to Citizenship and Its Impact on Immigrant Integration*, European Summary and Standards, European University Institute.
- Bauböck, R. (2018). "Genuine Links and Useful Passports: Evaluating Strategic Uses of Citizenship." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45 (6), p. 1015-1026.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1440495>.
- Bauböck, R., & Gerd Valchars. (2021). "Non-Toleration of Dual Citizenship in Austria." *Dual Citizenship and naturalisation: global, comparative and Austrian perspectives*, 910, p. 207-227.

- Bloemraad, I., Anna Korteweg, & Gökçe Yurdakul. (2008). "Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State." *The Annual Review of Sociology*, p. 153-179.
- Caglar, A. (2016). "Still 'migrants' after all those years: foundational mobilities, temporal frames and emplacement of migrants." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126085.
- Caglar, A. (2004). "Citizenship Light": Transnational Ties, Multiple Rules of Membership, and the "Pink Card." In *Worlds On The Move: Globalization, Migration and Cultural Security*, p. 273-291.
- Damsholt, T. (2017). "'I Didn't Think I Would Be Emotional until I Started Saying the Oath' – Emotionalising and Ritualising Citizenship." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (16), p. 2701-2716. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1389038>.
- Diehl, C., & Michael Blohm. (2010). "Naturalization as Boundary Crossing: Evidence from Labor Migrants in Germany." *Identity and Participation in Culturally Diverse Societies*, 1st ed., p. 315-337. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444328158.ch16>.
- Elias, N., & John L. Scotson. (2008). *The established and the outsiders*. Dublin, Ireland: University College Dublin Press.
- Faist, T., Jürgen Gerdes, & Beate Rieple. (2004). "Dual Citizenship as a Path-Dependent Process." *International Migration Review*, 38 (3), p. 913-944. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00224.x>.
- Fox, Jon E., & Cynthia Miller-Idriss. (2008). "Everyday Nationhood." *Ethnicities*, 8 (4), p. 536-563.
- Glick Schiller, N., & Ayse Caglar. (2008). "'And Ye Shall Possess It, and Dwell Therein': Social

- Citizenship, Global Christianity, and Non-Ethnic Immigrant Incorporation.” *Immigration and Citizenship in Europe and the United States: Anthropological Perspectives*, p. 201-225.
- Haller, M., & Raimund Haindorfer. (2021a). “Does Citizenship Promote Integration? An Austrian Case Study of Immigrants from Former Yugoslavia and Turkey.” *Dual Citizenship and naturalisation: global, comparative and Austrian perspectives*, 910, p. 253-273.
- Haller, M. (2021b). “(Dual) Citizenship and National Identity in a Globalised World: Sociological Perspectives.” *Dual Citizenship and naturalisation: global, comparative and Austrian perspectives*, 910, p. 33-58.
- Hammar, T. (1985). “Dual Citizenship and Political Integration.” *The International Migration Review*, Vol. 19, p. 438-450.
- Harpaz, Y. (2019). “Compensatory Citizenship: Dual Nationality as a Strategy of Global Upward Mobility.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45 (6), p. 897–916.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1440486>.
- Harpaz, Y., & Pablo Mateos. (2019). “Strategic Citizenship: Negotiating Membership in the Age of Dual Nationality.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45 (6), p. 843–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1440482>.
- Ho, E. (2009). “Constituting Citizenship Through the Emotions: Singaporean Transmigrants in London.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 99 (4), pp.788–804.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00045600903102857>.
- Ismer, S. (2011). “Embodying the Nation: Football, Emotions and the Construction of Collective Identity.” *Nationalities Papers*, 39 (4), p.547-565.
- Kadirbeyoğlu, Z. (2012). “Country Report: Turkey.” *EUDO Citizenship Observatory*, European

- University Institute.
- Knott, E. (2019). "Strategy, identity or legitimacy? Analysing engagement with dual citizenship from the bottom-up." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45:6, p. 994-1014, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1440494.
- Levitt, P., & Nina Glick Schiller. (2004). "Transnational Perspectives on Migration: Conceptualizing Simultaneity." *International Migration Review*, p. 1002-1039.
- Mason, A.C.. (2009). "Citizenship Scarcity and State Weakness: Learning from the Colombian Experience." In Facets and Practices of State-Building. *Legal Aspects of International Organization*, Vol. 49, p. 75-103. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Pogonyi, S. (2011). "Dual Citizenship and Sovereignty." *Nationalities Papers*, Vol.39, p. 685-704.
- Pogonyi, S. (2019). "The passport as means of identity management: making and unmaking ethnic boundaries through citizenship." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45:6, p. 975-993, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1440493
- Politi, Emanuele, Salomon Bennour, Adrian Lüders, Anita Manatschal, & Eva G. T. Green. (2022). "Where and Why Immigrants Intend to Naturalize: The Interplay Between Acculturation Strategies and Integration Policies." *Political Psychology* 43, p.437–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12771>.
- Portes, A. (2001). "Introduction: The Debates and Significance of Immigrant Transnationalism." *Global Networks*, p. 181-194.
- Reichel, D., & Bernhard Perchinig. (2015). "Reflections on the Value of Citizenship – Explaining Naturalisation Practices." *Austrian Journal of Political Science*, December, pp. 32-45 <https://doi.org/10.15203/OZP.282.VOL44ISS1>.
- Rétiová, A., Ivana Rapoš Božič, Radka Klvaňová, & Bernadette Nadya Jaworsky. (2021).

- “Shifting Categories, Changing Attitudes: A Boundary Work Approach in the Study of Attitudes toward Migrants”. *Sociology Compass*, 15 (3).
- Saharso, S. (2019). “Who Needs Integration? Debating a Central, yet Increasingly Contested Concept in Migration Studies.” *Comparative Migration Studies*, 7 (1).
- Schinkel, W. (2018). “Against ‘Immigrant Integration’: For an End to Neocolonial Knowledge Production.” *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6 (1).
- Soysal, Y. (1998). “Toward a Post-national Model of Membership.” *The Citizenship Debates*, p. 189- 220.
- Stern, J. & Gerd Valchars. (2013a). “Country Report: Austria.” EUDO Citizenship Observatory, European University Institute.
- Stern, J. & Gerd Valchars. (2013b). “Naturalisation Procedures for Immigrants Austria.” *EUDO Citizenship Observatory*, European University Institute.
- Stiller, M. (2019). “Möglichkeiten Des Staatsbürgerschaftserwerbs Durch Fremde in Österreich = Pathways to Citizenship for Foreigners in Austria.” *Wien: Nationaler Kontaktpunkt Österreich im Europäischen Migrationsnetzwerk*, Internationale Organisation für Migration, Landesbüro für Österreich.
- Tajfel, H. (1992). “The Social Psychology of Minorities.” *Minority Rights Group Report*, 38. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Thiele, D., Birgit Sauer, & Otto Penz. (2021). “Right-wing populist affective governing: a frame analysis of Austrian parliamentary debates on migration.” *Patterns of Prejudice*, 55:5, p. 457-477, DOI: 10.1080/0031322X.2021.2014089
- Verkuyten, M., Jessica Gale, Kumar Yogeeswaran, & Levi Adelman. (2022). “The Impact of

Emotional versus Instrumental Reasons for Dual Citizenship on the Perceived Loyalty and Political Tolerance of Immigrant-Origin Minorities.” *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 10 (3), p. 354–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/XPS.2022.17>.

Vink, M. P., & Rainer Bauböck. (2013). “Citizenship Configurations: Analysing the Multiple Purposes of Citizenship Regimes in Europe.” *Comparative European Politics*, 11, p. 621–648.

Weinmann, M. (2022). “Barriers to Naturalization: How Dual Citizenship Restrictions Impede Full Membership.” *International Migration* 60 (5), p. 237–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12950>.

Wimmer, A., & Nina Glick Schiller. (2002). “Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences.” *Global Networks*, p. 301–334.

Witte, N. (2014). “Legal and Symbolic Membership – Symbolic Boundaries and Naturalization Intentions of Turkish Residents in Germany.” *EUI Working Papers*,

Witte, N. (2018). *Negotiating The Boundaries of Belonging: The Intricacies of Naturalisation in Germany*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-19787-2>.

Yanasmayan, Z. (2015). “Citizenship on Paper or at Heart? A Closer Look into the Dual Citizenship Debate in Europe.” *Citizenship Studies*,