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INTRODUCTION

The project ‘Access to Citizenship and its Impact on Immigrant Integration (ACIT)’ funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-country Nationals provides a new evidence base for comparing different elements of citizenship in Europe.

The five consortium partners (the European University Institute, the Migration Policy Group, University College Dublin, University of Edinburgh and Maastricht University) have developed four sets of citizenship indicators on citizenship laws, their implementation, shares of citizenship acquisition and its impact on integration for all 27 EU Member States, accession candidates (Croatia, Iceland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey) and European Economic Area countries (Norway, Switzerland).

The outcomes of this research were presented to politicians, civil servants, members of civil society and academics in ten EU Member States (Austria, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom) in order to use this information to improve their policies and practices. Citizenship stakeholders were asked to share their insights about which factors influence naturalisation rates, on the impact of citizenship on integration, on past and future policy changes and on the political environment for citizenship reform. These ‘national roundtables’ were a key element of this research as the national stakeholders had the opportunity to interpret the results and give meaning to the numbers.

The Migration Policy Group produced this handbook based on the results from the citizenship indicators and the responses of national stakeholders at the national roundtable. It provides a snapshot of how the vast amount of data of this project can be used for national policy debates. All citizenship stakeholders, be they policymakers, academics, non-governmental organisations or others, can go online and create their own graphs, dig into the data and use this information for presentations, debates or publications. All the results are accessible through an interactive online tool and comparative reports at http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators.¹

¹ For more information on the background and methodology see appendix and visit http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators. For a more comprehensive overview of citizenship laws and procedures see EUDO country profiles accessible at http://eudo-citizenship.eu/country-profiles/?country=United%20Kingdom.
1. CITIZENSHIP ACQUISITION INDICATORS: WHO BECOMES A CITIZEN?

How likely are foreign born immigrants to become citizens in Europe and how long does it take them? Citizenship Acquisition Indicators measure the share of foreign-born immigrants (aged 16-74) that have acquired citizenship as well as the number of years between arrival in the country of residence and the acquisition of citizenship.2

Overall, 35% of foreign born immigrants have become citizens in the UK. This figure close to the average of 34% for the EU-15 countries, many of which are much newer countries of immigration than the UK. The acquisition of citizenship varies considerably across the EU. Between 60% and 70% of foreign-born immigrants are citizens in Sweden and the Netherlands compared to below 15% in Switzerland, Ireland and Luxembourg.

Share of naturalised persons among first generation in EU-15, Switzerland and Norway in 2008

![Graph showing share of naturalised persons among first generation in EU-15, Switzerland and Norway in 2008.](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators)

It takes foreign-born immigrants on average eight and a half years to become citizens in the UK, which is only around the average number of years in EU-15 countries.3 In EU-15 countries, Norway and Switzerland, it takes on average 10 years. Foreign born immigrants in Belgium, France, Switzerland, and Luxembourg take around 14 years to acquire citizenship compared to less than six years in Greece and Ireland.

---

2 See methodological appendix for more information.

3 This includes all foreign born immigrants regardless of their country of origin.
What explains why immigrants become citizens in Europe and how much time it takes? The analysis concludes that residence, immigrants’ country of origin, gender, background (education, employment and family status among others), and policies are determining factors to apply for citizenship.

**Residence matters:** One reason for the rather average share of citizenship acquisition in the UK is the relatively large share of newcomers among the foreign-born. While the UK has long-established immigrant communities, it still remains a major country of destination, where a larger part of the foreign-born population are newcomers compared to most other EU-15 countries. Our multivariate analysis\(^4\) shows that the longer immigrants have settled in a country, the more likely they are to become citizens. In the UK, the share of naturalised immigrants increases enormously comparing newcomers (five years or less in the UK) and long-settled immigrants (20+ years).

---

Immigrants’ background plays a major role. Another reason for the average share of citizenship acquisition in the UK is the relatively large number of immigrants from highly-developed countries, including other EU countries. Across Europe, people born in less economically developed countries tend to naturalise more often than people born in higher developed countries. People born in medium and under-developed countries are on average 2.5 times more likely to become citizens than those born from highly developed countries. Immigrants from less developed countries also take longer to acquire citizenship than immigrants from higher developed countries. Across EU countries, the role of immigrants’ backgrounds can be reflected in the different results for EU and non-EU immigrants: Immigrants from outside the EU (on average from lower developed countries) are commonly much more likely to be citizens. In the UK, the difference between EU and non-EU immigrants that have become citizens is relatively large (33 %). In comparison, this difference is below 5% in Ireland.

Gender matters: Foreign born women in the EU are usually more likely to be citizens than men. Interestingly, this common gender difference is not observed in the UK.
Education, employment, family status and the use of language are additional factors that influence the acquisition of citizenship. Across most EU-15 countries, immigrants from less developed countries who have at least secondary education are about 42% more likely to naturalise than those with only primary education. Immigrants from both developing and developed countries are more likely to be citizens if they speak the country of residence’s language at home, if they are married, and if they are employed.

Policies matter: While these individual factors do play a role, citizenship laws significantly influence how many immigrants become citizens because they determine the conditions under which immigrants can choose to naturalise.

One example is the acceptance of multiple nationality: Immigrants from less developed countries that reside in EU countries that accept dual citizenship are 40% more likely to be citizens of the country of residence.\(^5\)

More importantly, inclusive citizenship laws in the country of residence have a major effect on whether or not immigrants naturalise.\(^6\)

---

\(^5\) Multiple nationality must be tolerated by both the country of origin and the country of residence.

\(^6\) Policies are measured by an adjusted score of the Migrant Integration Policy Index, see www.mipex.eu/
Probability of citizenship acquisition in EU-15 countries

This graph above shows how policies affect immigrants’ uptake of citizenship on average in EU-15 countries, Norway and Switzerland. Citizenship policies matter more for immigrants from less developed countries, especially for newcomers (as the three lines in on the left are steeper than the lines for immigrants from higher developed countries on the right). As for immigrants coming from highly developed countries, they are not only less likely to acquire citizenship, but whether or not they do so also seems to depend on fewer factors that go beyond the time of residence in the country. The UK’s naturalisation laws are thus the major factor determining whether immigrants become British citizens.

Source: Vink, M./ Prokic-Breuer, T./ Dronkers, J. (2013), also see http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators

The horizontal axis in the graph represents the ‘openness’ of citizenship laws across EU countries. The vertical axis represents the probability that foreign born immigrants are citizens. This analysis used pooled data from the European Social Survey (2002-2010) available for 16 Western European countries (EU-15, minus Italy, plus Norway and Switzerland). The graph shows that citizenship laws have a different effect for immigrants from different countries and with different length of duration in the country.
2. CITIZENSHIP LAW INDICATORS: WHAT ARE IMMIGRANTS’ LEGAL OPPORTUNITIES TO BECOME A CITIZEN?

Since citizenship policies influence why more immigrants become citizens in one country and not the other, what are the legal opportunities and obstacles that they face in Europe? Citizenship Law Indicators describe and compare legal rules for birth-right acquisition, naturalisation and loss of citizenship across countries and over time. Indicators measure degrees of inclusion and individual choice on a 0 to 1 scale.8 The provisions of citizenship laws have different target groups, such as immigrants, native born, emigrants, family members of citizens or stateless persons. A score of close to 1 indicates that the legal rules are relatively inclusive for the respective target group or allow more choice of citizenship status to its members, whereas a score close to 0 indicates more exclusion or lack of individual choice.

Overall, the UK’s citizenship regime is only slightly more inclusive than in most EU countries with the exception of its limited special naturalisation procedures.9

Citizenship by descent is unrestricted for children of UK citizens born in the UK. Citizenship for children born abroad to citizens is automatic only for children whose parents obtained citizenship otherwise than by descent, or who are in the public service. For children whose parents acquired citizenship by descent, but have lived at any time in the UK for three years citizenship can be acquired by registration while the child is a minor; they can also acquire citizenship if the child and parent live in the UK for five years, both with some additional conditions (ius sanguinis).

Children born in the UK (ius soli) automatically acquire citizenship if they are born to a person with no restrictions on the period of their residence in the UK or a UK citizen. Children born in the UK who have lived continuously in the UK to the age of 10 are also entitled to register as citizens (with condition of good character). Foundlings acquire citizenship automatically; children born without entitlement to another citizenship may also acquire citizenship through registration if present in the country for five years.

Only naturalised citizens can lose their citizenship due to treason, fraudulent acquisition, or if citizenship of presumed stateless person is established (involuntary loss). Renunciation of UK citizenship is unrestricted on the condition that an individual has another citizenship (renunciation).

---

8 See methodological appendix for more information.
9 For a more comprehensive overview of citizenship laws in the UK see EUDO country profile at http://eudo-citizenship.eu/country-profiles/?country=United Kingdom.
Compared to other EU countries, the UK provides little preferential access to citizenship to certain groups based on their special ties or contributions to the country.

Opportunities for family members of citizens to acquire UK citizenship are more restricted than in other EU countries (combined indicator \textit{ANATFAM}). Spouses or civil partners of citizens of the UK can apply for discretionary naturalisation if he or she has resided in the UK for three years and meets other requirements, such as ‘good character’, sufficient knowledge of one of the languages of the UK, sufficient knowledge about life in the UK, intention to have principal home in the UK and to continue residence in or service for the UK, and an oath of allegiance at citizenship ceremony (\textit{spousal transfer}). Citizenship can be transferred to a child only if the child was born in the UK and his/her parent acquires citizenship of the UK or becomes settled in the UK (\textit{child transfer}). Foreign-born children are not automatically granted citizenship if their parents naturalise. Children adopted by citizens automatically receive UK citizenship (\textit{adoption}).

The UK does not offer socialisation-based citizenship based on residence as a child (see instead France and Sweden). The absence of access based on residence as a child, the absence of automatic acquisition for children of individuals who naturalise, and the restricted nature of child transfer means that first generation children (born outside the UK) may only access citizenship through ordinary, residence-based naturalisation at age 18, even if they spend many years in the UK as children.

There are currently no legal provisions for refugees, unlike the majority of other EU countries (see for example Ireland and France). Stateless persons can acquire UK citizenship by declaration if the person was born outside the UK, has been stateless since birth, and was born to citizen of the UK, a citizen of UK with restricted citizen rights, or a former subject of the UK, and has been resident in UK for 3 years.

In exceptional cases, the UK offers discretionary naturalisation to persons that serve the UK, an international organisation of which the UK is a member, or a company or association based in the UK for 5 years, provided that the person has ‘good character’ (\textit{public service}).
The UK has fewer legal obstacles to ordinary residence–based naturalisation than most EU countries. This is mainly due to the straightforward residence requirements, the acceptance of dual nationality, and the flexible language requirements through the Life in UK Test or ESOL course-route.

The UK requires five years of permanent residence at the time of application. This five year requirement can be interrupted by 15 non-consecutive months spread across five years. In general, not more than 450 days can be spent outside the UK during the five-year period; and not more than 90 days outside the UK in the last 12 months of the five-year period (residence). The UK does not require immigrants to renounce any previous citizenship(s) (renunciation).

Applicants aged between 18 and 64 must show that they have sufficient knowledge of the English language and of life in the UK. They can meet this requirement by either passing the ‘Life in the UK’ test (B1 level) or making progress from one ESOL level to another through an approved English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) qualification using specified citizenship materials (language). The government’s new proposal to remove the ESOL-course and require an additional language test of all applicants will seriously undermine the path to citizenship in the UK.

While the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act was passed in 2009, the sections relating to naturalisation were not implemented and were abandoned by the current Coalition government. Implementation would have resulted in a longer (and more complex) residence requirement, more stringent language tests and obedience to law requirement, economic self-sufficiency, and demonstration of active citizenship (for example, by volunteering). Similar to a slight majority of EU countries, the UK does not make naturalisation conditional upon a certain income or job (economic resources) or the renunciation of a foreign citizenship (renunciation).

---

10 Ordinary naturalisation refers to ‘any mode of acquisition after birth of a nationality not previously held by the target person that requires an application by this person or his or her legal agent as well as an act of granting nationality by a public authority’ (EUDO citizenship glossary).
Currently, the UK is more restrictive than most EU countries regarding civic knowledge and criminal record requirements for ordinary naturalisation. The **citizenship test** is more demanding than citizenship tests in most EU countries. There are few exceptions of the test requirement for vulnerable groups. The **criminal record** requirement is discretionary and cannot be waived in any case. Guidance to decision-makers sets out the sorts of matters to be considered in relation to good character. In practice, any criminal conviction, apart from a single minor offence (e.g. minor speeding), could potentially be an obstacle to naturalisation. Immigration ‘fraud’ and other indications of bad character, even if not resulting in conviction, may also be grounds for refusal of citizenship.

**Provisions for ordinary naturalisation**

Results from the National Roundtable

Recent reforms have made it harder to naturalise, according to several national roundtable participants. Participants identified more legal obstacles to settlement and residence than to naturalisation. Restricting entry and settlement will eventually have an effect on naturalisation. In addition, cuts in funding for language courses (ESOL) are a major obstacle to acquire citizenship for lower educated immigrants. Increasing tuition fees must be seen in the context of already high application fees. High costs and income requirements may be a major obstacle for low-income families to become citizens. The study topics of the ‘life in the UK test’ have recently been extended to include more questions on culture and history of the UK. Since the roundtable, the government has proposed additional obstacles to the language requirement. Participants voiced concern that restricting settlement will have an impact on who is eligible for citizenship in the long run.

---

11 The UK national roundtable, organised by the ‘Runnymede Trust’, hosted two citizenship lawyers, three academic experts, one civil servant and eight representatives of non-governmental organisations.
Money has become a significant problem for entry and settlement. The Coalition government added restrictions for family migration and relatives, such as the major financial requirement to be granted the leave to remain in the UK. A new filter is established at the entry level with financial requirements.

(Participant of the ACIT National Roundtable in London, 28 November 2013, NGO)
3. CITIZENSHIP IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS: WHAT ARE THE PROCEDURAL OBSTACLES TO ORDINARY NATURALISATION?

Opportunities created by the law may be undermined by problems in the procedure. Creating indicators is one way to measure the major opportunities and obstacles in the procedure. Citizenship Implementation Indicators measure on a 0 to 1 scale the formal aspects of the ordinary naturalisation procedure: promotion activities, documentation requirements, administrative discretion, bureaucratic procedures, and review and appeal options. 38 indicators compare all implementation stages, from efforts by public authorities to inform applicants to the options to appeal a negative decision. A score of 1 means that the country facilitates naturalisation and involves few practical obstacles. A score of 0 reflects a procedure with little facilitation and many practical obstacles.12

In the majority of countries there is a link between the policies and the way that they are implemented. In general, countries that have more legal obstacles also tend to create greater practical obstacles in the procedure and vice-versa.

In contrast to relatively inclusive citizenship laws in the UK, the procedure creates slightly more practical obstacles to naturalisation than in most EU countries. The UK promotes naturalisation less than most EU countries and the procedure is more discretionary. Providing the required documentation for naturalisation is less complicated in the UK than in most other EU countries. High naturalisation fees are a major barrier for many compared to most countries.13

Overall results of Citizenship Implementation Indicators

![Graph showing the overall results of Citizenship Implementation Indicators](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators)

Source: [http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators)

12 For more information see appendix and visit [http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators).
13 For more information on citizenship procedures in the UK visit [http://eudo-citizenship.eu/country-profiles/?country=United Kingdom](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/country-profiles/?country=United Kingdom).
Promotion

The UK promotes naturalisation through citizenship ceremonies, a National Contact Centre and Nationality Checking Service. However, there are few promotional materials, information on websites is not written in easily accessible language and the benefits of naturalisation are not made clear. Lacking support for language courses and high application costs are major practical obstacles.

Promotion in EU-15

Documentation

The UK requires little complicated documentation, which allows eligible applicants to prove that they meet the legal requirements. Only Finland among EU countries facilitates the process more than the UK. The UK offers flexible solutions for proving identity and residence. The UK authorities check the criminal record requirement through their own administration rather than placing the burden on the applicant. The naturalisation candidate has some flexibility for providing documentation on language and integration requirements. Up until recently, the applicant could either take the ‘Life in UK Test’ or the ESOL Citizenship course. Proposed changes will make it much more difficult for immigrants to prove their knowledge of English and life in the UK.

Source: http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators
Documentation in EU-15

Discretion

Naturalisation is generally a discretionary procedure in the UK. Applicants who meet legal conditions are not entitled to British citizenship. British Nationality Act 1981 says that the Secretary of State ‘may, if he sees fit’ grant naturalisation if conditions are met. However, refusals are, in theory, founded on failure to meet the requirements. While discretion is limited in language and civic knowledge requirements, the UK can use discretion on the ‘good character’ requirement. In practice, any criminal conviction, apart from a single minor offence (e.g. minor speeding) can be considered a reason for refusal of naturalisation. Immigration ‘fraud’ and other indications of bad character, even if not resulting in conviction, may also be grounds for refusal.

Discretion EU-15

Source: http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators
Results from the National Roundtable

High fees for application are a major practical obstacle to naturalisation in the UK. Vulnerable groups such as low-income families are not exempt from the fees.

*Without the affordability issue, most people would be keen to apply. It is not a voluntary choice not to apply.*

(Participant of the ACIT National Roundtable in London, 28 November 2013, NGO)

Promotional materials may vary greatly across different regions in the UK. This can affect the implementation of naturalisation policies and funding priorities.

*The Wales case study is also different. BME (black and minority ethnic population) communities are not as concentrated as in the biggest cities such as London. BME and migrants are less numerous and more disperse. The migration context is different. Wales has developed a specific framework for migration/citizenship acquisition. ESOL provision received more funding than in England. Wales has developed its own ESOL policy and its own citizenship material.*

(Participant of the ACIT National Roundtable in London, 28 November 2013, NGO)
4. CITIZENSHIP INTEGRATION INDICATORS: DOES CITIZENSHIP MATTER FOR INTEGRATION?

Are naturalised immigrants better off than immigrants that have not acquired citizenship? Citizenship Integration Indicators compare labour market participation and socio-economic status of native citizens, naturalised citizens and non-citizens based on the 2008 Labour Force Survey and EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions. Ten core indicators measure levels of integration in the EU-27 countries, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland with regards to the citizenship status of migrants. Indicators are organised into three categories: labour force participation, social exclusion, and living conditions.\(^{14}\)

In most countries, immigrants who have naturalised are often better off than immigrants who have not naturalised. This is true even after taking into account the differences in age at arrival in the country, residence, education, the region of origin, the region of the destination country and the reason for migration.

**Employment of foreign born immigrants after statistical controls**

![Graph showing employment rates with and without citizenship across EU countries]

Source: ACIT conference presentation

On average across Europe, the difference between naturalised and non-naturalised is particularly high for immigrants from non-EU countries. Naturalised migrants are more often employed, less often overqualified for their jobs, have better housing conditions and have less difficulty paying household expenses.\(^{15}\)

---

14 The handbook features a selection of Citizenship Integration indicators. For more information see appendix and [http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators).

The UK is a special case in this regard because a large share of the immigrant population is from the EU or other high developed countries. The benefit of citizenship might not be as straightforward in the UK as immigrants from the EU or other developed regions are less likely to naturalise. For example, naturalised immigrants are more likely than non-naturalised immigrants in the UK to have problems making ends meet. This could be due to the fact that the UK has many high skilled work migrants from the EU that have less incentives to become citizens. However, naturalised foreign born immigrants in the UK are on average less likely to be overqualified for their jobs.

Share having difficulty making ends meet, UK, 2008 (%)

![Graph showing the share of difficulty making ends meet in the UK, EU-15, and EU-27 for natives, naturalised immigrants, and non-citizen immigrants.](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators)

Overqualification Rates, United Kingdom, 2008 (%)

![Graph showing overqualification rates in the UK for natives, foreign-born, EU immigrants, and non-EU immigrants.](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators)
In most of Europe, better outcomes for naturalised immigrants seem to be a sign that ‘better integrated’ immigrants are more likely to acquire citizenship irrespective of how inclusive or restrictive a country’s citizenship policy is. While immigrants from less developed countries are more likely to apply, among them, the ‘better integrated’ do. Thus, citizenship does not appear to be an adverse selection process across countries; instead the most integrated immigrants become citizens no matter how demanding the naturalisation policy is.

But does the acquisition of citizenship itself actually improve integration outcomes? Does the policy select the best ‘integrated’ immigrants or do only the best ‘integrated’ immigrants apply regardless of the policy? Do naturalised immigrants usually have better living conditions because they have acquired citizenship or is it more common for people with better living conditions to apply for citizenship?

More national and international research is needed to clarify the effects of citizenship and better address why naturalised immigrants often have better integration outcomes. Researchers need panel data to answer this question about causality. Several studies that have used panel data analysis have found a positive effect of citizenship on labour market participation in Germany, France and the United States.\textsuperscript{16} Also, this project found that citizenship is associated with more so-called ‘conventional participation’ in society, such as joining a trade union or a political party, participating in a boycott or demonstrations.

\textsuperscript{16} For more detail, see the OECD publication ‘A passport for the better integration of immigrants?’ (2011).
KEY RESULTS

1. Overall, the UK’s citizenship regime is slightly more inclusive than in most EU countries with the exception of limited special naturalisation procedures.

2. The UK’s ordinary naturalisation procedure promotes naturalisation through a relatively straightforward residence requirements, the acceptance of dual nationality, and flexible language requirements.

3. However, recent reforms have made it harder to naturalise, according to several national roundtable participants. Changes in the language requirement and cuts in funding for language courses (ESOL) are major obstacles to acquire citizenship for lower educated immigrants.

4. In contrast to relatively inclusive citizenship laws in the UK, the procedure is a greater obstacle to naturalisation than in most EU countries. The UK promotes naturalisation less than most EU countries and the procedure is more discretionary. High naturalisation fees are a major barrier for many compared to most other EU countries.
METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX

CITIZENSHIP ACQUISITION INDICATORS

Citizenship Acquisition Indicators have been developed by Maarten Vink (Maastricht University / European University Institute) and Tijana Prokic-Breuer (Maastricht University). Acquisition indicators have been calculated for 25 European states. The data source for the indicators is the Labour Force Survey Ad Hoc Module 2008 on the labour market situation of migrants and their descendants (Eurostat). The target population includes all persons aged between 15 and 74 (or 16 to 74 in countries where the target group for the core Labour Force Survey is from 16 years old). All numbers presented are based on at least 100 respondents.

Data is presented for the following European countries: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. In Germany, information on country of birth is missing for all respondents. To determine the region of origin (EU or non-EU), the study uses the country of birth of the father and/or mother of the respondent. There was no data provided by Eurostat for Finland. Data was excluded for Bulgaria, Malta and Romania due to small sample sizes.

Acquisition indicators analyse several factors, including:

- **sex** (the percentage of foreign-born females and males who have acquired citizenship of the respective country of residence),
- **origin** (the percentage of foreign-born persons from EU and non-EU countries who have acquired citizenship of the respective country of residence)
- **the age at migration** (the percentage of foreign-born persons who have acquired citizenship of their country of residence, differentiated by the age at which the respondent took up residence; age groups: 0-17 years; 18-39 years; 40+ years)
- **years of residence by cohort** (the percentage of foreign-born persons who have acquired citizenship of their country of residence, differentiated by the number of years of residence: 1-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-19 years; 20 + years)
- **years of residence by minimum number of years** (the percentage of foreign-born persons who have acquired citizenship of their country of residence, differentiated by the number of years the respondent has minimally resided there: at least 5 years; at least 10 years; at least 15 years; at least 20 years)
- **the time until naturalisation** (the numbers of years it takes on average for foreign-born persons to acquire the citizenship of the respective country of residence)

For more information visit:
http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators/citacqindicators
CITIZENSHIP LAW INDICATORS

Citizenship Law Indicators have been developed by Rainer Bauböck (European University Institute), Iseult Honohan and Kristen Jeffers (University College Dublin) in consultation with Maarten Vink (University of Maastricht) and Thomas Huddleston (Migration Policy Group).

Basic indicator scores have been calculated on the basis of a list of substantive and procedural requirements for each mode of acquisition or loss of citizenship using both additive and weighting formulas. The scoring is based on EUDO CITIZENSHIP's qualitative databases on modes of acquisition and loss of citizenship, on the detailed country reports and additional information from standardised questionnaire answers by legal experts in the respective countries.

Citizenship indicators are aggregated at different levels in order to analyse more general features of citizenship laws. The six highest level indicators that are calculated using all 45 basic indicators are: ius sanguinis, ius soli, residence-based ordinary naturalisation, naturalisation on specific grounds, voluntary renunciation and withdrawal/lapse.

These indicators have been calculated for 36 European states. The following labels are used for average indicators: EUROPE for all 36 states, EU 27 for all 2012 member states of the EU, EU 15 for the pre-2004 EU member states and EU 12 for the post-2004 accession states. Citizenship Law Indicators are based on citizenship laws at the end of 2011. In the future, it is foreseen to offer a new edition for past years that allow analysing trends over time.

For more information visit: http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators/eudo-citizenship-law-indicators where you will also find a comprehensive methodology report.

CITIZENSHIP IMPLEMENTATION INDICATORS

Citizenship Implementation Indicators have been developed by Thomas Huddleston (Migration Policy Group).

Citizenship Implementation Indicators have been calculated for 35 European states, as well as for three German federal provinces. The following list presents the five dimensions and the number of corresponding indicators and sub-indicators:

- Promotion: how much do authorities encourage eligible applicants to apply?
- Documentation: how easy is it for applicants to prove that they meet the legal conditions?
- Discretion: how much room do authorities have to interpret the legal conditions?
- Bureaucracy: how easy is it for authorities to come to a decision?
- Review: how strong is judicial oversight of the procedure?
A country’s overall score is calculated as the simple average of these five dimensions. Based on a 0 to 1 scale, countries with scores closer to 1 create fewer obstacles in the implementation of naturalisation law. For each of the five dimensions, procedures that score closer to 1 involve greater promotion, easier documentation, less discretion, less bureaucracy, and/or stronger review. Countries with scores closer to 0 create more obstacles in the implementation of the naturalisation law. For each of the five dimensions, procedures that score closer to 0 involve little promotion, difficult documentation, wide discretion, greater bureaucracy, and/or weak review. The scores are the result of country reports written for the purpose of this project and a standardised questionnaire filled in by legal experts.

For more information visit:
http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators/citimpindicators

CITIZENSHIP INTEGRATION INDICATORS

Citizenship Integration Indicators have been developed by Derek Hutcheson and Kristen Jeffers (University College Dublin).

The indicators are derived from the 2008 EU Labour Force Survey Ad Hoc Module on ‘The Labour Market Situation of Migrants and Their Descendants’ (Eurostat). Socio-Economic Status indicators are derived from the 2008 cross-sectional EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC).

Some data may be omitted due to small sample sizes. All numbers presented are based on at least 100 respondents or 20 for the Socio-Economic Status indicators.

Citizenship indicators include:

LABOUR FORCE INDICATORS

**Unemployment**: the number of people aged 15 to 74 unemployed, as defined by the International Labour Organisation, as a percentage of the labour force (the total number of people employed plus unemployed) of the same age group.

**Economic Activity Rate**: the total number of people aged 15 to 74 employed plus the total number of people unemployed (the labour force) as a percentage of the total population of the same age group.

**Level of Education**: the mean highest education attainment level among respondents aged 25 to 74. Values correspond to mean education levels specified by the International Standard Classification on Education: (1) primary education; (2) lower secondary education; (3) higher secondary education; (4) post-secondary non-tertiary education; (5) university degree; (6) postgraduate studies.

**Overqualification rate**: calculated as a share of the population aged 25 to 74 with a high educational level (ISCED 5 or 6), and having low or medium skilled jobs (ISCO
occupation levels 4 to 9) among employed persons having attained a high educational level of the same age group.

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS INDICATORS**

**Social Benefit dependence**: measures receipt of family/children related allowance, housing allowances, and social benefits not elsewhere classified as the mean share of respondents’ gross annual income.

**Poor dwelling (quality)**: aims to objectively measure the quality of the respondents’ accommodation. Values correspond to the percentage of respondents who indicate that the dwelling in which they live has a problem with a leaking roof and/or damp ceilings, dampness in the walls, floors or foundation and/or rot in window frames and doors.

**Poor dwelling (environment)**: aims to objectively measure the quality of the area in which the respondent resides. Values correspond to the percentage of respondents who indicate that pollution, grime, or other environmental problems in the area caused by traffic or industry is a problem for the household.

**Poor dwelling (crime)**: aims to objectively measure the quality of the area in which the respondent resides. Values correspond to the percentage of respondents who indicate that crime, violence, or vandalism in the area is a problem for the household.

**Difficulty making ends meet**: measures the level of difficulty the respondents’ household has in paying its usual expenses. Values correspond to the percentage of respondents that indicate they have some difficulty, difficulty, or great difficulty paying usual household expenses.

**Housing cost burden**: measures the average percentage of monthly disposable household income spent on monthly housing costs.

**Unmet health need**: measures the percentage of respondents who indicated that there had been at least one occasion during the last twelve months when the respondent needed medical or dental examination or treatment and did not receive treatment.

For more information visit: [http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators/integration-indicators](http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators/integration-indicators)

**NATIONAL ROUNDTABLES**

National Roundtables were organised by national partners and the Migration Policy Group in Austria, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom. The purpose of the roundtables was to present the project’s country results to national stakeholders in order to gather their feedback and interpret the findings in a national policy context. Participants were asked about the factors that influence naturalisation, the impact of citizenship on various forms of
introduction, the impact of national policies and the political environment for reform. 
The ten events took place between November 2012 and February 2013.

10-20 national stakeholders were invited to each event. Stakeholders included civil 
 servants working in national, regional or local administration, regional or national-
level politicians, members of non-governmental organisations including immigrant 
 organisation, advocacy groups and service providers, citizenship and immigration 
 lawyers, and academic researchers working for research institutes and universities. 
The full list of participants in each country is not made public because participants 
 were insured anonymity to facilitate open debate.

The ten national roundtables were organised in two structured focus group sessions 
 of each 60-90 minutes. The discussion was recorded and transcribed by national 
 partners and analysed by the Migration Policy Group. All transcripts were used for 
 content analysis using Nvivo software package for coding.

For more information, see the comparative EU level report: 
http://eudo-citizenship.eu/indicators
About the MIGRATION POLICY GROUP

The Migration Policy Group is an independent non-profit European organisation dedicated to strategic thinking and acting on mobility, equality, and diversity. MPG’s mission is to contribute to lasting and positive change resulting in open and inclusive societies by stimulating well-informed European debate and action on migration, equality and diversity, and enhancing European cooperation between and amongst governmental agencies, civil society organisations and the private sector.

We articulate this mission through four primary activities focused on harnessing the advantages of migration, equality and diversity and responding effectively to their challenges:

1. Gathering, analysing and sharing information
2. Creating opportunities for dialogue and mutual learning
3. Mobilising and engaging stakeholders in policy debates
4. Establishing, inspiring and managing expert networks

For more information on our past and current research, visit our website at www.migpolgroup.com

About EUDO-CITIZENSHIP

Democracy is government accountable to citizens. But how do states determine who their citizens are? EUDO CITIZENSHIP allows you to answer this and many other questions on citizenship in the EU member states and neighbouring countries.

EUDO CITIZENSHIP is an observatory within the European Union Observatory on Democracy (EUDO) web platform hosted at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies of the European University Institute in Florence.

The observatory conducts research and provides exhaustive and updated information on loss and acquisition of citizenship, national and international legal norms, citizenship statistics, bibliographical resources, comparative analyses and debates about research strategies and policy reforms.

For more information on our past and current research, visit our website at www.eudo-citizenship.eu