UCL **Migration Research Unit**

This paper may be downloaded for personal research purposes. However any additional reproduction for other purposes, in hard copy or electronically, requires the consent of the author(s). If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), the title, the working paper series, the year and the UCL Migration Research Unit as publisher.

This paper was originally submitted as a dissertation in completion of the requirements for the degree Masters in Global Migration. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of UCL's Migration Research Unit.

© 2020 David Beadle

UCL Migration Research Unit
UCL Department of Geography
University College London
26 Bedford Way
London WC1H 0AP

www.geog.ucl.ac.uk/mru

LONDON'S GLOBAL UNIVERSITY

UCL **Migration Research Unit**

Working Papers

No. 2020/3

Performing Strategic and Emotional Citizenship

Transnational Political Participation by UK-US Dual Citizens

David Beadle

UCL
Migration Research Unit

Image © UCL Digital Media

Performing Strategic and Emotional Citizenship

Transnational Political Participation by UK-US Dual Citizens

David Beadle

This research dissertation is submitted for the MSc in Global Migration at University College London

HLCY5

Supervisor: Dr Johanna Waters

2020

Abstract

Many states now tolerate dual citizenship for populations residing within and without the national territory. States' recognitions of claims to multiple belongings co-exist with instrumental goals to integrate increasingly diverse immigrant populations, facilitate transnational economic activities and contribute towards building a national community overseas. Transnational political participation is an emerging area of interest among scholars of dual citizenship as individuals can vote and affect change in two or more political communities. Existing research has not identified factors explaining why some dual citizens vote transnationally as opposed to voting singularly or abstaining from both countries' politics. This paper seeks to explore this topic through 22 qualitative interviews with UK-US dual nationals; applying a bottom-up perspective toward understanding motivations for and attitudes towards singular, multiple and abstinent political participation. An exploration of legal, historic and political factors influencing engagement and participation provide important context for this case study. This paper argues that dual citizenship has a performative quality in individuals' engagement with transnational political activities. I identify two dimensions of performing dual national citizenship: strategic performance and emotional performance. The former relates to concepts of instrumental and neo-liberal citizenship as internalized and reproduced by individuals. The latter connects to ideas of simultaneity and emotional affinities taking hold of political identities and attitudes. UK and US emigrant populations are often overlooked in migration studies due to common reputations as countries of immigration and the privileged statuses of their members. However, the super-diversity observed in each country's immigrant populations is now being reflected among their emigrants.

Effects of two votes in 2016 (the EU referendum and the presidential election) raise questions about political communities of belonging for UK-US dual citizens and experiences of dual political disengagement.

Word Count: 11,761

Acknowledgements

I give my thanks to the 22 individuals who agreed to participate in this research and offer their valuable to time to discuss their attitudes and experiences. The insights and recollections they shared with me were often profound and sometimes spoke to deep their emotional responses in acquiring and maintaining multiple citizenships.

I also wish to express gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Johanna Waters, who several critical contributions to the development of this study. Most significantly, she helped me devise an entirely new research plan after COVID-19 caused met to cancel my original plan. Additionally, she helped me get in touch with a couple of people that were instrumental in recruiting several UK-based respondents.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Tomoko, for her patience and support over the several months it took to complete this study.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction……6

Chapter 2: Literature Review of Theoretical Concepts……..….11

Chapter 3: Situating the Case Study……..……...19

Dual Citizenship in British and American Contexts……..……...…19

The 2016 Votes: Brexit and the Presidency…….....25

Chapter 4: Methodology……28

Table 1: Respondent Information……31

Chapter 5: The Political Performances of Dual Citizenship……34

Strategic Performances……35

Emotional Performances……..44

Chapter 6: Conclusion……..……...53

References……...……..55

Appendices

Initial Proposal (Implemented Plan)……64

Initial Proposal (Original Plan – Cancelled due to COVID-19)……...66

Research Diary……..70

Survey Questions……..73

Interview Structure……79

Consent Form……85

Excerpt from Recorded Interview……86

Chapter 1: Introduction

Dual citizenship, or the possession of citizenship in two or more political communities[1], exhibits a growing significance within citizenship studies as national government attitudes have shifted from scepticism to indifference and even active support. Traditionally conceived as formal membership within a singular community, citizenship is packaged with certain rights and duties afforded by virtue of one's legal status as a citizen. In advanced democratic states, this includes an efficacy to exercise a democratic 'right to heard' (Eylon and Harel 2006) and have some influential power over political decision-making. Alongside multi-layered or 'nested' citizenship in the European Union (Faist 2002), dual citizenship presents a potential challenge to traditional notions of state sovereignty as exercised within bounded territorial units. That is, extending membership outside of state borders can create a partial separation between state authority and national populations (Faist 2015:196). This has significant implications for reconfiguring ideas of national citizenship and determining which groups can and should have rights to be active political participants.

State concerns regarding questions of dual loyalty (for immigrant states) and disruptive long-distance nationalism (for emigrant states) (Anderson 1992) have subsided along with scepticism of dual citizenship as concept. Faist (2007) attributes this to a pragmatic acceptance of dual citizenship's inevitable transferability across multi-national families and a normative shift towards embracing individuals' claims to multiple belonging. This has prompted discussions in policy-making and scholarship regarding

[1] This paper will hereafter reference 'dual citizenship' as a single term encompassing dual and multiple citizenship.

citizens' rights and obligations as members of two or more national communities. Extra-territorial voting rights for non-resident citizens has been a contested and sometimes controversial topic (Collyer 2014).

The franchise, as an active and direct exercise of one's democratic political rights, is normally reserved for national citizens within state borders. However, the increasingly widespread provisions of voting rights to resident non-citizens and non-resident citizens has contributed to concurrent trends citizenship's erosion, expansion and extension (Faist 2015). This follows an apparent 'lightening' (Joppke 2010) or decline in the subjective value of citizenship as political rights become decoupled from both citizenship status and territorial residency.

This emergent separation of rights and citizenship provides a basis for Soysal's (1994) model of postnational citizenship, where citizenship exists outside of nation-states. However, this has been criticized as both premature in an era of increasing securitization (Turner 2017) and found to be limited in practice to socioeconomically privileged populations, mostly within Europe (Collyer 2014). An alternative conception of transnational citizenship developed from migrant transnationalism, which views migrant relations transcending borders but nation-states retaining importance, albeit in deterritorialized forms (Basch et al. 1994). Scholars have contested ideas of territorial irrelevancy in migrant-state relations (Bauböck 1994), and transnational citizenship can remain useful for imagining migrant capacities to possess membership and associated rights in multiple state jurisdictions.

There is a growing literature on state-centred approaches towards reacting to and engaging with populations residing outside a county's borders. Within the realm of

politics, these include the expansion of voting rights for non-resident citizens (Bauböck 2005, Collyer 2014) and alternative extra-parliamentary channels for affording political representation (Peltoniemi 2016). Recognizing that expansions and transformations of formal political rights for external citizens follow concerted efforts of *both* migrants and states (Barry 2006), few studies have critically assessed individuals' external political participation and motivations for engagement in origin country politics. Scholars have highlighted migrants' capacities and limitations as transnational actors in the institutionalization of 'emigrant politics' (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003, Tintori 2011), but case studies have primarily focused on emigrants from countries in the Global South (with Latin-American cases featuring prominently, see: Smith, M.P. 2003, Tintori 2011, Lafleur 2013). A notable exception, Ciornei & Østergaard-Nielsen's (2020) systematic approach towards explaining emigrant voter turnout includes populations originating from advanced democracies, including life-style migrants.

This research seeks to contribute towards better understandings of how dual citizens - possessing non-exclusive membership in multiple advanced democratic states- experience engagement in politics of 'here' and 'there'. Applying the concept of political transnationalism to a bottom-up perspective of citizenship, I will investigate how dual citizens engage with multiple political communities and why they choose to participate (or not participate) in one or both countries' politics. The research will analyse both activities and expectations of dual citizens vis-à-vis the political rights and duties of membership in two advanced democratic states with stable economies: The United Kingdom and the United States of America.

Focusing on two recent and divisive votes in each country, the EU (or 'Brexit') referendum in the UK and the 2016 presidential election in the USA, I will argue that political transnationalism -as exhibited by dual citizens in these two advanced democracies- can involve dynamic and context-dependent performances of citizenship encompassing both strategic and emotional dimensions. Contrasting with research aims of Schlenker et al. (2015) regarding practices of transnational citizenship, this study seeks to contribute to explaining how dual citizens feel they can and should be able to engage in transnational politics, rather than assessing a normative case for states to further embrace dual citizenship and extensions of political rights to external populations.

The research questions guiding this study are:

- To what extent do dual citizens feel engaged in each country's politics?
- How does transnationalism factor into political participation in each country?
- How do dual citizens choose to participate in each country's politics?
- Do dual citizens feel they have an entitlement to political rights and representation as non-resident citizens?

In the proceeding sections, I will first engage with the literature regarding theoretical concepts of dual citizenship and political transnationalism. This will lead into a focused discussion to provide contextual background for the case study. The next chapter will outline the methodological approach and considerations in collecting and analysing the data. This will be followed by a discussion of the empirical findings of the research through the idea of performing political transnationalism as dual citizens. Finally, the

concluding chapter will relate the empirical findings back to the existing literature and suggest implications for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review of Theoretical Concepts

This chapter will provide an overview of literature discussing theoretical concepts around dual citizenship and political transnationalism. First, it will explore the history and evolution of citizenship and how growing acceptances of dual citizenship have contributed towards simultaneous and seemingly contradictory trends of erosion, expansion and extension (Faist 2015). Thereafter, political transnationalism will be explored as a theoretical concept alongside implications for dual citizens' modes of engagement and participation.

Citizenship, in contemporary discourses, is imagined as political membership in a community and is accompanied by certain rights and duties. The formation of modern citizenship revolved around constructing territorial units around imagined communities. Soysal (1996) attributes this emergent national citizenship to a unification of nationality and citizenship, achieved via mechanisms of inclusive and exclusive membership. Respectively, the equal provisions of rights and duties across all levels of society and the attribution of shared commonalities (history, blood, culture, purpose) to all individuals defined as citizens (ibid:17). Although 'citizenship' and 'nationality' are used interchangeably in common language, by scholars and by some states[2], they are conceptually distinguishable as legal and political concepts respectively (Faist 2007). However, the merits of applying this distinction is beyond the scope of this paper and 'citizenship' will refer to both legal and political dimensions of membership.

[2] e.g. the US, a 'classical' immigration country with civic ideas surrounding citizenship (Faist 2007:8).

The traditional mechanism for states to afford national citizenship occurs through attributing membership via principles of *jus soli* ('birthright citizenship' or territorial attribution) and *jus sanguinis* (right of citizenship through parentage). Several countries, including the UK and US, have nationality laws accommodating both principles. The attribution of citizenship by birth through either principle provides an automatic means to perpetuate political communities while preserving boundaries of inclusivity and exclusivity (Spiro 2013:31). This can have significant implications for individuals' life chances. Shachar & Hirschl (2007) argue that the ascription of privileged citizenship statuses by accident of birth perpetuates inequalities through hereditary preservations of wealth. Inequality issues also arise when considering the acquisition of citizenship via naturalization for individuals born outside the national community and territory. That is, the state can apply a 'gate-keeping' function of citizenship access, including determinations of privileged categories for naturalization (ibid:260, Brubaker 1989). However, the contemporary significance of any exclusionary functions needs to be considered in the context of changing migration patterns. Significantly, impacts on the relative value of permanent residency versus citizenship and affected changes to the integrity of national citizenships (Joppke 2010, Spiro 2016).

Large-scale migration occurring post-World War II prompted scholars and policy makers in both 'receiving' and 'sending' countries to reassess citizenship policies and substantive elements of membership. Liberal democracies of receiving countries in the West began turning away from assimilationist ideas and embraced multiculturalism to address the challenges and opportunities of increased population diversity (Kymlicka 1995). Multiculturalism's commitment to integrate immigrant populations carries an

embedded moral requirement to provide a path to citizenship (Kymlicka 2002:359). However, ideological shifts away from assimilation also precluded assumptions that immigrants necessarily become separated from countries of origin (Barry 2006). Hammar (1989) relates this to a normatively unacceptable situation from immigrant states' perspectives: where foreign-born and long-term resident individuals ('denizens') have their lives centred in the receiving country but hold citizenship elsewhere. In this context, naturalizing immigrants is viewed as morally necessary and a pragmatic solution to bring denizens into the political community.

These shifting attitudes occurred in concert with a global human rights movement to recognize citizenship (for stateless persons) and gender equality as human rights. This included recognizing maternal transmissions of citizenship (Faist 2019). Gradual incorporations of international norms into domestic law laid a foundation for increasing numbers of immigrants (and their descendants) to possess claims to dual nationality; occurring through both multiple sources of attribution and through successful legal challenges. This litigation contradicted state arguments that naturalization in one country necessitated formal expatriation in another. Hammar (1989) contests historic state objections to dual citizenship, finding perceived risks to order, state loyalty, democratic integrity, and national cohesion and identity to be grounded in outdated ideals of assimilation and misrepresentative of modern societies' non-homogeneous populations.

Contemporary state attitudes towards dual citizenship have reflected divergent perspectives on both an ethnic dimension of national citizenship and a substantive aspect of citizenship's rights provisions. Joppke (2010) argues that the dynamic

interplay of de- and re-ethnicizing forces acting on citizenship has been supplanted by a 're-nationalization' of citizenship. This is actualized in receiving countries through nationality tests and a neo-liberal ideology of withdrawing state assistance and making individuals responsible for their own successful integration into the community (ibid:14-15). On the other side, many sending states have adopted a pragmatic acceptance of dual citizenship for their emigrant population. This is often expressed through a process of valorising a formerly distrusted external population as 'heroic citizens' (Barry 2006). However, while the preservation and development of a national community overseas can carry some significance, sending states are primarily concerned with the encouragement and facilitation of transnational economic activity via remittances and direct investment (ibid, Hammar 1989). Many sending states have proactively extended legal and political rights (e.g. voting) to external populations by facilitating dual citizenship. Other cases have exhibited bottom-up transnational processes where external citizens asserted and then successfully lobbied for these same right and privileges (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003).

These developments in receiving and sending states highlight three seemingly contradictory but simultaneous trends of citizenship's erosion, expansion and extension (Faist 2015). On the one hand, a neo-liberal reformulation of citizenship delinking provisions of social and welfare right from citizenship points to an erosion of citizenship. The severance of citizen-state connections has been furthered by suspensions of mandatory military service in many liberal democratic states and reduced tax obligations (Turner 2017). On the other hand, progressive trends towards making national citizenship more accessible for residents suggest an expansion of citizenship.

In addition to liberalized naturalization policies described earlier in this chapter, this would include *jus sanguinis* states adopting restricted *jus soli* nationality laws to (partially) de-ethnicize citizenship (as in the case of Germany) (Faist 2015). A final trend, extension, imagines citizenship as operating beyond the boundaries of nation-states. This can be imagined as occurring at a global or cosmopolitan level (as in Soysal's (1994) postnational citizenship model) or, alternatively, through the exercise of transnational citizenship (as realized by dual citizenship or nested citizenship in the EU).

Postnational citizenship is derived from the global human rights movement, where Soysal (1994) and other scholars (see: Sassen 1998) perceived a shift in certain fundamental rights from the domain of the citizen to personhood. Citizenship in the European Union offers the closest realization of postnational citizenship, viewed through its principle of freedom of movement for workers and disconnections of rights from national citizenships. However, postnational citizenship has its critics. Significantly, viewing the spectrum of migrant statuses from full access to rights for socioeconomically privileged non-citizens to near or total exclusion from basic rights and services for marginalized groups (especially irregular migrants) (Kofman in Collyer 2014:58).

Transnational citizenship, or membership in two or more communities, raises similar issues around the relative value of citizenship. Specifically, how citizenship's attribution by states and acquisition by individuals has assumed characteristics of instrumentalism (Joppke 2010). Receiving states, for example, provide legal and political rights to individuals and expect to receive economic benefits in return (remittances, investment and -in some limited cases- taxes). The extension of the franchise to external citizens

remains the most controversial element of transnational citizenship, and scholars have sought to rationalize the external exercise of a political right that still retains a core territorial referent (Collyer 2017). Bauböck (2005, 2007) posits that an individual's right to possess full political rights in one or more political communities should be based on a principle of 'stakeholder' citizenship. This means voting in a political community should be tied to possession of a genuine connection, rather than related to citizenship-based rights. This principle invites expanded political rights for resident non-citizens while denying that external citizens should *necessarily* be afforded the franchise. By invoking stakeholder citizenship principles, states may feel less susceptible to disruptive forces of long-distance nationalism (Anderson 1992) and purported capacities of organized emigrant populations to be peace-wreckers (as well as peace-makers) at home (Smith, H. 2007). However, criteria for determining a genuine connection cannot avoid being subjective and some individuals may be unjustifiably excluded. States' instrumental approaches to transnational political citizenship are contestable and -as demonstrated in M.P. Smith's (2003) research about the Mexican diaspora in the US- migrants possess efficacy to pursue political strategies at home and abroad independent of state and political party interests.

Collyer (2014, 2017) and others (Caramani & Grotz, 2015, Lafleur 2015) have begun interrogating variations in states' extension of the franchise to external citizens. Meanwhile Peltoniemi (2016) identified democratic and representational deficits for external citizens in existing systems and argues that extra-parliamentary participation offers potential solutions. Although over 120 countries have employed some form of enfranchisement for external citizens (Finn 2020), there is significant territorial variation

across different systems. While some states require external citizens to physically return to their home district in order to vote, most permit citizens to cast votes extra-territorially. Voting from overseas take forms of either casting a vote in one's last district of residence (most common; exhibited by the UK and US) or voting for a direct representative (as in France and Italy) (Collyer 2014). This second form, also known as special representation, involves creating one or more extra-territorial electoral districts to represent a geographically dispersed electorate. For example, Italy has 4 overseas constituencies with proportional representation according to relative numbers of Italian citizens. Although Collyer identifies special representation as a progression of extra-territorial voting rights, there are limited exercises of the right in practice (Lafleur 2015). One possible explanation is the presence of administrative hurdles. Some national governments worry that external citizens can decisively impact election outcomes (ibid). Alternatively, the franchise is sometimes viewed as being *symbolically* important to external citizens; representing a tangible link with the origin country and fostering feelings of belonging within national political community (ibid). Meanwhile, Peltoniemi (2016) finds that extra-territorial voting -regardless of the system employed- is not an ideal method to resolve democratic and representational deficits. Instead of having an explicit territorial referent to the state via elected representatives, citizens can pursue alternative active modes of representation through extra-parliamentary channels, such as NGOs and citizen groups (ibid). A final interesting development is Finn's (2020) research into political activities of dual citizens. Although the study focuses on voting, it raises an interesting question about motivational factors for dual citizens' political

participation: why do certain individuals choose to participate in one country (either host or origin), in both countries or in neither country? (ibid:743).

This study will seek to contribute towards answering Finn's question. Adopting a view from the bottom that transnational political activities can reveal articulations of citizenship as participation or performance (see: Burchell 2002), the study will investigate how citizenship can be exercised strategically and emotionally. Viewed as performative, citizenship can be re-imagined and re-understood through perspectives of individuals, looking beyond those characteristics and attributes ascribed by states and political institutions (Cisneros 2011). However, to adopt an individualized perspective is not to ignore interconnected factors of history, location and legal rights in shaping the actualization of performative citizenship. The proceeding chapter will thus identify and describe contextual factors as applicable to the empirical discussion and analysis presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 3: Situating the Case Study

Dual Citizenship in British and American Contexts

Reflecting divergent experiences as countries of immigration *and* emigration, attitudes towards dual nationality have evolved differently in British and American contexts. Consequently, there are some variations in legal and emotional dimensions of dual citizenship. Historical debates surrounding dual citizenship in both countries have largely centred around state approaches towards foreign-born populations: a historical shift in the UK from admitting Commonwealth citizens as immigrants to admitting diverse groups of immigrants as potential citizens (Brubaker 1989:123), and changing attitudes in the US from scepticism to tolerance vis-à-vis immigrants' homeland ties (Hammar 1989).

Considering the UK first, the state has largely held an indifferent attitude to dual citizenship since the British Nationality Act of 1948 softened historic restrictions. Passage of this legislation followed a recognized urgency to reconcile British citizenship with emerging national identities of Commonwealth countries and their creations of distinct citizenship statuses (as in Canada) (Home Office 2017). Positive attitudes towards the military service of Commonwealth citizens during the Second World War had also tempered historical concerns regarding dual loyalty, national order and national security (Hammar 1989). Ensuing post-war immigration from Commonwealth countries prompted several revisions to British nationality law and mechanisms of inclusive and exclusive citizenship. Per the British Nationality Act of 1981 (enacted in

1983), conditions for transferring citizenship were both restricted (as in the case of *jus soli* laws) and expanded (as in the case of enabling mothers to transmit citizenship). Significantly, no restrictions were placed on dual citizenship. Following increasing immigration from non-Commonwealth countries, Hansen (2002:185) argues that the UK position progressed from indifference to instrumentalization; perceiving naturalization of immigrants as dual citizens as a positive process to integrate diverse populations into British society.

Indeed, the 'super-diversity' of recent British immigrants -describing the complex and dynamic interplay of several variables (socio-economic, legal, cultural) (Vertovec 2007)- is increasingly observable in British emigrants, many of whom hold dual citizenship status (Hampshire 2013). Presented with a large, diverse and geographically dispersed population of external citizens[3], the UK's adoption of hands-off approaches towards engagement stands in contrast to other countries with sizable emigrant populations. Beyond committed provisions of diplomatic services overseas, there has been minimal formal and informal state activity to mobilize external citizens for economic, cultural or political purposes. Although the UK extended the right to vote to external citizens in 1985 (Parliament. House of Commons 2019), the state does not play an active role in encouraging emigrant citizens to register as overseas electors. Furthermore, despite recent Conservative Party manifesto promises to extend external voting rights further[4], party politics have stymied efforts to promote external citizens' rights to participate in

[3] Comprehensive and reliable figures are difficult to determine. There are an estimated 5.5 million UK citizens with permanent residency overseas (or 9.2% of the population of the UK) per 2006 data (Sriskandarajah & Drew 2006).
[4] Per stated goals for voter reform, the '15-year rule'(describing the number of years previously resident British citizens can retain the right vote) would be eliminated and replaced with unlimited voting rights (Benson 2019).

British political life (Collard 2019). In other areas, the constituent countries of the UK have diverged from national patterns of non-engagement. Notably, the Scottish devolved government has taken an active role in community-building overseas via business and social networking programs such as Global Scot and Global Friends of Scotland (Finch et al. 2010).

Some scholars, imagining the UK's vast overseas population as a valuable and relatively untapped resource for economic and social remittances, support greater levels of government activism. Active engagement with external citizens' affairs and well-being may aid in building an 'imagined' community of British nationals residing overseas and consequently promote increased returns via economic remittances and investment (ibid)[5]. However, Hampshire (2013), considering bottom-up perspectives, argues that British emigrants and the UK government have exhibited a mutual disinterest in active transnational engagement. This is attributed to several factors. Among them, a plurality of diverse identities and affiliations inhibiting a cohesive national identity, no perceived benefits of bringing the state into existing transnational economic activities (e.g. remittances) and a general lack of awareness and overall disinterest in participating in homeland political affairs (ibid). This latter point is evidenced in the low levels of turnout among overseas electors, with registered voters numbering no more than 35,000 for any election prior to 2015 (Parliament. House of Commons 2017). However, a surge of voter registrations for the 2016 Brexit referendum led to 263,902 overseas votes being

[5] Sometimes imagined as the 'British diaspora', following a post-war shift in emigration; moving away from settler migration patterns of populating the British Empire (Constantine 2003). The relative merits of applying the term 'diaspora' to UK (and US) emigrant populations is beyond the scope of this paper.

cast (ibid). This is suggestive that external British citizens have a potential for greater political engagement if there is a perceived stake in the outcome.

Next, considering the US case, there has been a marked attitudinal shift from scepticism of dual citizenship towards pragmatic indifference. Historical objections were ground in concerns about divided loyalties and threats to national cohesion during wartime; controversially providing for revocations of US citizenship (as in the case of Japanese-Americans during the Second World War). However, a series of post-war Supreme Court decisions affirmed citizenship as a basic right. Notably, the landmark decision in Afroyim v. Rusk[6] effectively protected an individual's right to dual citizenship via the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the US Constitution (Spiro 2016). This provided for both naturalization without renouncing foreign citizenship and retention of US nationality if naturalizing in a foreign country. Although the state abandoned its opposition to dual citizenship in the 1990s (ibid), some modern US scholars have continued to criticize dual citizenship, arguing that it inhibits the successful integration of immigrants and their adoption of the American 'creed' of tolerance and democracy (Renshon 2001, Huntington 2004). Notwithstanding the symbolic significance of the Oath of Allegiance's pledge to renounce allegiance to any foreign state, US attitudes towards dual citizenship as a legal right have converged with those of the UK over time.

In contrast to the UK case, US citizenship laws and its history with emigration present different opportunities and challenges for engagement with its external citizens. The two

[6] 387 U.S. 253 (1967).

paramount legal issues are the unrestricted right to citizenship via *jus soli* and an obligation to file income taxes regardless of residency (i.e. citizenship-based taxation). These two issues can intersect in the case of 'Accidental Americans', or those individuals that US citizenship but hold only a tenuous connection to the US (e.g. via place of birth) (Christians 2017). This is especially pronounced following the 2010 adoption of the Federal Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA), which has served to enforce the citizenship-based tax system (ibid). Regardless of possessing any meaningful familial or emotional ties to the US, external citizens necessarily have a relationship with the state through their tax obligation.

Argued through the language of rights and obligations, as through the slogan "no taxation without representation!", US citizens achieved an unrestricted right to vote from overseas following passage of the 1975 Overseas Voting Rights Act (Bauböck 2005:684). However, while US external citizens presumably possess some level of interest in the outcome of elections, voter registration and participation rates are far below those of the domestic citizens.[7] Assessing contributing factors towards levels of transnational political engagement is complicated by a scarcity of studies about US emigrant experiences; reflecting common perceptions of the US as a country of immigration. Early research into this area by Finifter (1976) suggested emerging lifestyle migration for young and highly educated US citizens; viewing an economically recovered Europe as a viable destination and escape from political disaffection during the Vietnam War era. More recently, and developing from a 1992 publication, the

[7] In the 2016 US General Election, the estimated voting rate for all eligible overseas voters was 6.9% versus 72% for domestic voters (Federal Voting Assistance Program 2018:1).

comprehensive work of Dashefsky and Woodrow-Lafield (2020) has attempted to document and explain the diverse conditions and motivations of emigrant US citizens. Characterized as a relatively affluent and highly educated population, while also exhibiting characteristics of super-diversity similar to their British counterparts, the US emigrant experience is individualized and encompasses numerous (and often inter-locking) factors. Encompassing both expressive and instrumental motivations (ibid), these include migration for economic, educational, political, lifestyle (adventure-seeking) and family-related reasons.

Thus, UK and US external citizens share common threads in their widespread geographic dispersal and extreme diversities in characteristics and motivations for residing overseas. Significantly, the UK and US are also each home to relatively large proportions of each other's external citizens[8]. This would include large number of dual citizens of both countries. Viewed from a state perspective, there are also key commonalities in legal rights to possessing dual citizenship and basic rights to participate in elections from overseas (including voting and political donations (see: The Electoral Commission 2019 for UK and Federal Electoral Commission 2017 for US)). A divergence in state-citizen political relations emerges in the citizenship-based tax obligation for the US and the 15-year limitation on overseas voting rights for the UK. Consequently, in attempting to understand the political engagement of UK-US dual citizens, the territorial distinction in rights and obligations justifies a comparative distinction based on current residency.

[8] The UK and US are each ranked 3rd as destination countries for their emigrant populations (Sriskandarajah & Drew 2006, Federal Voting Assistance Program 2020a).

The 2016 Votes: Brexit and the Presidency

Proceeding with this comparative analysis, it is expedient to pinpoint two major political events in each country that presented dual citizens with opportunities for double engagement and -potentially- double participation via formal or informal activities. This section will briefly describe the conditions for two 2016 votes and their significance for dual citizens of the UK and US.

Beginning with the Brexit referendum on 23 June 2016, overseas electors were granted a right to vote per the Parliamentary franchise provisions of the *Representation of the People Act 1985* and the 15-year residency rule set by the *Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000* (Parliament. House of Commons 2019). Two British citizens living overseas unsuccessfully challenged the 15-year rule's legality in the High Court of Justice, arguing that it restricted their right to freedom of movement and penalized the exercise of that right (ibid, Collard 2019:5). The conditions of the franchise raised interesting questions regarding who could participate and who would be subject to the referendum's outcome. Notably, British citizens residing in EU countries (subject to the effects of a decision to leave the EU) had the same access and limitations as those living elsewhere (e.g. North America). Furthermore, with certain exceptions[9], EU citizens residing in the UK without UK citizenship were restricted from voting.

Considering the US General Election held on 8 November 2016, external US citizens' voting rights were both uncontroversial and unchanged from previous elections. The

[9] Those with citizenship in the Republic of Ireland and/or Commonwealth countries (Malta, Cyprus).

Electoral College system, which elects the president, presented a key difference in how votes were counted versus the Brexit referendum's simple majority. Instead of directly electing the president, external US citizens cast their votes in their state of voting residence. This is typically the place of last domicile before emigration or -in the case of US citizens born abroad- the place where their parents have eligibility to vote (Federal Voting Assistance Program 2020b). Similar to British General Elections, this establishes a nominal link between overseas citizens and sub-national political territorial districts. In practice, the impact of overseas voting is diffused and -as a direct consequence of the Electoral College system (Banzhaf 1968)- the weight of an individual's vote varies depending their state's population. David Strömberg (2008) also considers strategic inequalities between states, where the electoral system incentivizes presidential candidates to target a few and unequally distributed states believed to determine election outcomes. The consequence for overseas voters in 2016 (and any other election) is that -absent any state-led efforts to encourage participation- party candidates have little incentive to actively engage with them.

Finally, prominent messaging present in the campaigns for both votes raise some interesting issues vis-à-vis the attitudes dual citizens took towards political engagement and participation. Although deep explorations of the salient issues are beyond the scope of this research, the contrasting messaging and attitudes deserve a brief mention. Individuals' status as winners or losers in an era of globalization featured prominently in both cases, with slight nuances. In the Brexit case, scholars identified the winners as educated, upwardly mobile individuals who perceived open borders and immigration as beneficial to society (Hobolt 2016:1265). The losers, by contrast, were

less well-educated, from working class backgrounds and had a scepticism towards immigration (ibid:265). Adopting the language of mobility and place, the journalist David Goodhart labelled the opposing poles of this division as the 'Anywheres' and the 'Somewheres' (Goodhart 2017). Imagining the US election as a similar referendum on globalization, some nuanced differences deserve consideration. First, attitudes and experiences vis-à-vis immigration and globalization were framed in terms of race and ethnicity in conjunction with class and social status (Schaffner et al. 2018). Second, as the US election involved an elected office, campaign messaging and voter attitudes were shaped around both candidates and ideas they represented. Finally, there was no direct linkage between the election outcome and opportunities for freedom of movement to live and work overseas.

Chapter 4: Methodology

This research applied two methods of data collection to a single pool of respondents. First, a short online questionnaire, administered via Google Forms, was sent to respondents in late June 2020. This preceded semi-structured interviews that I conducted between July 2020 and August 2020 via Zoom and Skype video-chat applications. The questionnaire served as a screening tool and collected basic demographic information. Data from the interviews was transcribed, coded and analysed to uncover themes and inform the structure of the empirical discussion. This section will briefly describe the research methods and associated considerations around ethics, positionality and analytical limitations.

I found that qualitative interviews had the greatest efficacy for eliciting detailed individual accounts of dual citizenship and political participation. The specificity of the target group supported purposeful sampling (Sandelowski 1995); seeking both demographic variation amongst dual citizens (current age, gender, country of first citizenship) and phenomenal variation (method of acquiring second citizenship, life stage when migrating). Emerging themes during data collection suggested further avenues for purposeful sampling (ethnic identification, possession of third country citizenship) for future research in this area.

I recruited participants through two primary channels: emails to personal/professional connections and posts in social media groups created for British and American citizens living overseas. An important entry-point for recruiting US-based respondents was a family friend, who later became a participant in the research. I was able to contact

several prospective respondents through his connections with the International Executive Resources Group and the British-American Business Council. A professional acquaintance of my supervisor, Dr. Johanna Waters, was able to tap into her personal and professional network to assist with recruitment on the UK side.

I was able to recruit all other respondents via Facebook groups and a notice sent out via Twitter. As a UK-US dual national who had lived in both countries, I was able to join two active Facebook groups for American and British expatriates[10] and post a recruitment notice in each. Facebook and other social media platforms offer a great efficacy to target hard-to-reach and geographically dispersed populations and control against a skewed sample from exclusively using professional networks. Consistent with the findings of Sikkens et al. (2017), targeting respondents by "liked" groups before recruiting via private messages proved to be an effective strategy to mitigate trust issues between respondent and researcher.

Although Facebook and other forms of digital communication outreach have been linked to greater success in recruiting millennials (Dalessandro 2018), a limitation of using expatriate Facebook groups was that the age profiles of the two targeted groups proved to be dissimilar. While prospective respondents in the US expatriate group reflected a diversity of age cohorts, the UK expatriate group trended towards the middle and higher age cohorts. A second limitation related to social media recruitment was possible selection bias in favour of individuals that both had access to social media accounts and held strong or very strong interests in politics. The recruitment notice referred to politics

[10] "Brits in the USA" for UK nationals living in the United States and "Americans in London" for USA nationals living in London and elsewhere in the United Kingdom.

and participation in its description of the research aims and likely contributed towards attracting individuals that were actively engaged in at least one country's politics.

Overall sampling for interviews was successful in recruiting a diverse set of 22 individuals as viewed across several demographic and social variables (see Table 1). 12 respondents were UK-born, 9 were US-born and 1 was born in a third country. 5 of the respondents were dual nationals from birth with the remainder being naturalized in at least one country. 10 of 22 respondents were female and only 2 out of the entire sample were single, never married. Only 4 respondents were aged 39 or younger.

The questionnaire functioned as intended to screen respondents and ensure that they all held dual citizenship on or before the registration deadline for the first of the two 2016 votes, the Brexit referendum.[11] Furthermore, the questionnaire had a complementary function with the interviews; separating the collection of demographic data from the semi-structured interview format, which was intended to foster "conversation with a purpose" (Eyles, cited in Valentine 2005:111) (see: Appendix D for the list of survey questions). Recognizing the potential for the emergence of new themes during data collection, semi-structured interviews offered flexibility and an expanded capacity for respondents to offer unprompted insights. An interview structure was applied to provide a general outline for conversations (see: Appendix E), but talk was guided in different directions according to issues that each respondent wished to discuss. Consequently, interview lengths varied considerably from 50 minutes to over 2 hours.

[11] Respondents needed to possess dual citizenship on or before 9 June 2016, per the UK government's extension of the registration deadline to 23:59 on 9 June (Cabinet Office 2016).

Name	Gender	Age Group	Marital Status	Highest Level of Education	Country of Birth	Country of Residency	Second Citizenship
Alexander W	Male	56 - 74	Married	PhD	UK (England)	USA (Massachusetts)	Naturalized
Beth W	Female	56 - 74	Married	Bachelor's	UK (England)	USA (Indiana)	Naturalized
Alistair S	Male	75+	Married	Teachers Training Diploma	UK (England)	USA (Connecticut)	Naturalized
Shawn S	Male	56 - 74	Married	Bachelor's	UK (England)	USA (Ohio)	Naturalized
Dale C	Male	56 - 74	Married	Masters	UK (England)	USA (California)	Naturalized
Richard J	Male	56 - 74	Married	None	UK (Wales)	USA (California)	Naturalized
Claudia B	Female	40 - 55	Married	Qualified Paraprofessional Educator	UK (Scotland)	USA (Florida)	Naturalized
Allan B	Male	56 - 74	Widowed or Divorced	Bachelor's	UK (England)	USA (North Carolina)	Naturalized
Rodney G	Male	56 - 74	Married	Bachelor's	UK (England)	USA (California)	Naturalized
Oliver B	Male	75+	Married	Not Stated	UK (Scotland)	USA (Arizona)	Naturalized
James S	Male	24 - 39	Single (never married)	Bachelor's	UK (England)	UK (England)	From mother
Carol W	Female	56 - 74	Married	Masters	UK (England)	UK (England)	Naturalized
Rose M	Female	56 - 74	Widowed or Divorced	High school	Italy	UK (England)	Naturalized
Patrick M	Male	24 - 39	Widowed or Divorced	PhD	USA (New York)	UK (England)	From mother
Eren P	Female	24 - 39	Married	Postgraduate diploma	USA (Minnesota)	UK (England)	From both parents
Lakshmi C	Female	24 - 39	Single (never married)	Bachelor's	USA (California)	UK (England)	From both parents
Kelly M	Female	40 - 55	Married	Bachelor's	USA (Pennsylvania)	UK (England)	Naturalized
Laurie C	Female	40 - 55	Married	Bachelor's	USA (Illinois)	UK (England)	Naturalized
Tania E	Female	40 - 55	Married	Masters	USA (New York)	UK (England)	Naturalized
Katherine H	Female	56 - 74	Prefer not to say	Bachelor's	USA (New York)	UK (England)	Naturalized
George A	Male	56 - 74	Married	Masters	USA (California)	UK (England)	From father
Aaron M	Male	56 - 74	Married	Bachelor's	USA (Pennsylvania)	UK (England)	Naturalized

Table 1: Participant Information

Positionality and the insider/outsider dynamic were key considerations throughout the interview process. My conversational tone had to be adjusted to appropriately engage and build rapport with individuals coming from a broad spectrum of educational, professional and social backgrounds. Opportunities and challenges for eliciting information emerged as respondents became aware of my own status as a UK-US dual citizen. However, given the uniqueness of each interviewee's background and experiences, I experienced shifting dynamics -as described by Mohammed (2001)- where insider and outsider positions were occupied by both sides alternatively, and sometimes simultaneously.

As conversations covered potentially sensitive topics such as political affiliations and voting decisions, I had to maintain ethical integrity by anonymizing each respondent's name during data collection and then omitting any references that could make them identifiable. I explained these ethical and privacy considerations to each respondent when confirming their informed consent to participate and have their responses recorded (see: Appendix F).

Interview recordings initially went through an automated transcription process using the Trint software package. Following import, each transcript was reviewed for accuracy and any identifying information was changed or removed. I reconstructed o e complete transcript within the transcription software to match the recording verbatim (see: Appendix G for an excerpt). I analysing the remaining transcripts as manually corrected versions of the automated transcriptions. Compared to manual transcriptions of data, automated transcription processes can present a reduced capacity for the researcher to develop deeper and more nuanced understandings of respondents' views (Lester et al. 2020). Considering this drawback and observed inaccuracies in the automation process, I listened to each interview recording several

times before and during transcription to establish familiarity with the content. I subsequently read through each transcript to identify 40 codes and organized them around 5 key themes. This analysis was carried out by cross-referencing notations made in Trint with a codebook assembled in Microsoft Excel. This was fleshed out for thematic exploration in Microsoft Word. The themes produced by this analysis inform the structure of the proceeding analytical chapters of this dissertation.

Chapter 5: The Political Performances of Dual Citizenship

The empirical data presented in this chapter for discussion and analysis was drawn from 22 interviews with UK-US dual citizens. Although exhibiting diversities in background characteristics and social attributes, the experiences and testimonies of participants cannot be extrapolated to make any generalized statements about dual citizenship and political participation. Furthermore, while this research intends to draw attention to a relatively small subset of the global population (one defined by the legal status of having citizenship in *both* the UK and US), the number of observations is too small to generalize about members of this group or any identifiable subgroups. Rather, this research will cover empirically observable trends and tendencies around individual performances of dual citizenship as viewed in the context of political participation. As such, the research offers an initial exploration into Finn's (2020) question concerning reasons behind dual citizens' decisions to participate or not participate in the politics of one or more countries. There are important contextual considerations regarding the timing of the research. First, many participants were in isolation at home (either by themselves or with their families) due to UK and US government policies implemented in response to the outbreak of COVID-19. Additionally, both the Brexit and 2016 Presidential votes featured as prominent news stories during the data collection period as new information was revealed regarding alleged interference by foreign state actors.

This chapter will be divided into two sections, reflecting the two core dimensions observed in individuals' performance of citizenship as transnational political actors. The first, a strategic dimension, sees citizenship practiced and expressed through an internalization of neoliberal ideas of individual responsibility. The second, an

emotional dimension, comprises of substantive identity-based ideas of citizenship that relate to performances as concerned and affected members of one or more political communities. These dimensions are neither exclusive nor necessarily contradictory and can be performed simultaneously in practices of citizenship.

Strategic Performances

Acquisition, Maintenance and Renunciation: Utilizing Dual Citizenship

Joppke (2010) described the instrumentalization of citizenship as nation-states became tolerant of multiple belongings and certain welfare and social rights became detached from membership. States' extensions of legal and political rights to non-resident populations through dual citizenship has been perceived as strategic provisions of rights and benefits in order to facilitate transnational activities (for sending states) and to smooth integration processes for increasing diverse immigrant populations (for receiving states). Although typically imagined in economic terms (e.g. remittances, investment, tax), states may also seek benefits from developing a national community overseas (Barry 2006) and facilitating social remittances, or transfers of knowledge, ideas and beliefs (Levitt 1998). Looking beyond state perspectives -and drawing inspiration from work by Leitner & Ehrkamp (2006) and an approach 'from below'- this first discussion of the empirical research will focus on how individuals express their own experiences of dual citizenship and transnational identities of multiple belonging. Through actions of acquiring citizenship, maintaining citizenship and making calculations about renouncing citizenship, this section will discuss individuals' practices of strategic citizenship.

As US-UK dual citizens, the research participants occupied relatively privileged positions in the landscape of human migration, reflecting inherent inequalities in ascribed national citizenship (Shachar & Hirschl 2007). However, some individuals were passive decision-makers in migration in accompanying parents or spouses overseas. Thus, although providing for access to greater autonomy, migration has gendered and aged dimensions, even among 'elite' and supposedly voluntarily mobile populations. Regarding participants' active involvement in migration decisions, dominant causative factors included lifestyle, education and career opportunities. In some instances, migration prompted an individual to 'activate' their claim to dual citizenship. George (interviewed 3rd August 2020) was born in the US to a British father and an American mother, possessing legal rights to citizenship in both countries from birth. Childhood visits to the UK had been with his US passport and it was only an early career decision to pursue "a sense of adventure, wanting to do something else" overseas that made him activate his second citizenship by applying for a UK passport.

For the majority of respondents that had singular citizenship at birth, migration and settlement overseas prompted a calculus of the relative merits of permanent residency (or 'denizenship' (Hammar 1989)) versus naturalized citizenship. The 'lightening' process of detaching rights from citizenship (Joppke 2010) has contributed towards permanent residency becoming increasing attractive as an end goal or 'the real prize' for immigrants versus naturalization (Spiro 2008:159). This attitude was often reflected in respondent testimonies. Among two UK-born individuals, one described his naturalization as a mere "technical adjustment" to make his US residency status air-tight (Dale, interviewed 14th July 2020), while another remembered his naturalization ceremony being "all a bit ridiculous" as his

primary motivation for naturalizing was to help his spouse get a permanent resident ('green') card (Rodney, interviewed 3rd July 2020). Several others expressed a lack of urgency in any decisions to naturalize. Tania (US-born, interviewed 9th July 2020) described feeling a sense of guilt at her UK citizenship ceremony because it held no emotional importance. Feeling that naturalization had been a low-cost, lost-reward proposition for her, she felt at odds with other "less-privileged" attendees that appeared to attach an emotional significance. Others echoed Dale's residency-based rationale for naturalization and -in an era of securitization- expressed concerns that US permanent residents could be arbitrarily stripped of their rights (including their residency). This is reflective of a 'slippery' or insecure quality observable in citizenship and denizenship (Walton-Roberts 2015).

Once acquired or activated, respondents often related their daily practices of citizenship through the language of rights and obligations and through neo-liberal ideas of individual responsibility. When asked about their responsibilities as domestic citizens, respondents described their obligations to pay taxes, obey laws and to be 'good' citizens, positively contributing towards society. Some included their duty to vote in elections, as Allan (naturalized US citizen, interviewed 7th July 2020) expressed, "they've given me the nationality. I think it's my right and job to vote really. I *should* vote if I'm a national." Concepts of rights and obligations also factored heavily in individuals' practices of maintaining citizenship in their country of origin. Significantly, the US citizenship-based taxation system drew a line between UK-resident and US-resident respondents. FATCA's impact in enforcing obligations on UK-resident US citizens (Christians 2017) connected to expressions of active engagement in US society and politics through having a 'stake' in events and outcomes. Patrick (interviewed 12th July 2020) left the US as a child and his

continued imaginations and exercises of US citizenship while resident in the UK are defined by FATCA's role in his life: "I think my feelings about dual nationality would be very different if they got rid of FATCA, because as I said, I would vote for anyone or anything to get rid of FATCA". Laurie (US-born, interviewed 12th July 2020) lamented that "I have a lot of obligations, but not a lot of rights at the moment" and others stated that they would continue to be active in US politics from abroad (through voting and campaign donations) if tax obligations were packaged with their citizenship status. By contrast, US-based respondents would employ the language of rights and obligations to describe their disengagement from active citizenship in the UK. Richard (UK-born, interviewed 22nd July 2020) felt that his British citizenship carried zero costs or obligations and therefore "I only need to be a citizen of one country [(the US)]".

The neo-liberal ideology that Joppke (2010) described in citizenship's re-nationalization, was reflected in respondents' notions of individual responsibility when practicing their citizenship. Residency and naturalization processes in both countries have demonstrated a retreat of the state in providing for the welfare and integration of new immigrants. In both countries, privileged visa statuses and permanent residency are tied to an individual's demonstrated capacity to support themselves without becoming burdens of the state.[12] Furthermore, naturalization involves civics and language tests that place responsibility on individuals to integrate into host country's culture and society (as defined from a top-down perspective). These factors did not prove to be significant hurdles for participants in the research.

[12] For example, the US requires green card sponsors to file an affidavit of support (Form I-864) with proof of income or other financial resources (125% of Federal Poverty Guidelines) (USCIS 2019). Similarly, family visas in the UK require sponsors to meet a minimum income threshold (at least £18,600 per annum) or a calculated equivalent based on savings (Home Office 2020).

The two respondents that did encounter issues employed personal and professional resources (including paid legal assistance) to achieve speedy resolutions. Although some respondents were cognizant of their positionality as privileged migrants, most took an individualized perspective towards performing their acquired 2nd citizenship. For Alexander (UK-born, interviewed 25th July 2020), who had experienced life in multiple countries, the practice of dual citizenship was viewed as an enablement of one's right to be internationally mobile. Allan (7 July), on the other hand, related it to principled considerations against active engagement in the politics of 'there': "You made the decision to live somewhere else. You shouldn't have influence over the people who actually live in that country". Embodying notions of individualized citizenship, very few respondents felt that the origin country's government had any reciprocal obligations to them; even as they enjoyed exercising certain afforded rights (e.g. voting). Although supportive of a democratic right to be heard (Eylon and Harel 2006) through citizenship, most felt that the state was obliged to serve and respond to its domestic population first and foremost. Aside from exceptional diplomatic circumstances, the state was believed to have a minimal responsibility to those who had (presumably) chosen to reside outside the country's borders by their own volition.

A final consideration in this section is the strategic practice of protesting one's citizenship. While some US-based respondents, such as Richard, were happy to let their British citizenship remain dormant (e.g. not renewing UK passports, disengaging from political and social life at home), nearly all UK-based respondents had engaged with ideas of renouncing their US citizenship. Observations of rising renunciation rates among US citizens permanently resident abroad have been linked to FATCA's enactment in 2010 (Balta & Altan-Olcay 2016). FATCA's stated intent

was to clamp down on a limited number of cases where wealthy individuals used foreign accounts to hide themselves from the IRS (Christians 2017). The US government aggressively lobbied and threatened sanctions on foreign financial institutions that did not comply with requirements to report on US account holders (ibid). However, rather than impacting a minority of very wealthy US external citizens, the effects have been felt broadly. This is especially true for 'Accidental Americans', who have only a tenuous connection to the US but find that their citizenship status now limits access to financial services and pension schemes in their country of residence (ibid). Eren (interviewed 2nd July 2020), who emigrated when she was a young child, and James (interviewed 18th July 2020), who has never resided in the US, had often weighed the costs and benefits of renunciation. As non-voters in the US with no future intent to reside there, both perceived US citizenship as a burden with no accompanying benefits. However, the renunciation fee of $2,350 (U.S. Embassy & Consulates in the United Kingdom 2020), coupled with additional paperwork costs, has made this an unattractive option. This burden of US citizenship has possible broader implications for its continued perception as a wealth-enabling status (Balta & Altan-Olcay 2016).

Engagement versus Participation: Transnational Political Participation as a Responsible Citizen

As discussed in Chapter 4, selection biases in recruitment processes contributed to a sample that likely had higher levels of political engagement and participation than would be considered normal. To illustrate, the Federal Voting Assistance Program (2018) reported an estimated participation rate of 9.5% in the 2016 presidential election among voting-eligible UK-residents. Meanwhile 10 out of the 11 UK-based respondents in this research recalled voting in that election. Furthermore, a

selection bias contributed to a majority of US-based respondents being ineligible to vote in the Brexit referendum due to their length of overseas residency. Nonetheless, the interviews revealed interesting insights regarding how individuals choose to participate (e.g. voting at local vs. national levels), when they choose to participate and why they feel they should or should not participate in politics.

Local versus national considerations among research participants revealed divergent attitudes towards modes of participation within countries of residency compared to their extra-territorial forms of participation. Regardless of one's expressed level of attachment to home overseas, there was a universal reservation towards sub-national practices of voting, donating and lobbying. While the UK does not permit its external citizens to vote in local or devolved assembly elections, some US states have granted local voting rights. George (3 August), possessing a right to vote locally in California, expressed his intentional non-participation as follows, "I don't have the knowledge and therefore I probably am not a qualified voter. And, you know, let's face it, I'm not a constituent there [...] nor a taxpayer [locally]." Patrick (12 July), also eligible to vote in California, likened local voting from overseas to being "an intruder" and that "it's not my place [to do so]". This reflects an internalization of Bauböck's (2007) stakeholder citizenship concept regarding local-level voting. That is, individuals have a capacity to vote locally but consciously abstain following recognition that they do not have a genuine connection to the political community. This position was even held by individuals that were actively interested in current affairs at home. Aaron (US-born, interviewed 15th July 2020) and Katherine (US-born, interviewed 31st July 2020) both maintained strong translocal links through family, friends and social organizations, and both had personal connections with local political figures (as candidates or elected officials). However, neither felt that

their ‘affected interests’ (Bauböck 2005) amounted to a justification for participating in local politics.

Broaching the topic of limits on national-level participation, respondents deferred to the language of rights and obligations to describe their views. Although some made an exception for the 2016 Brexit vote as a national referendum, the idea that the UK government could place an arbitrary 15-year rule on the right to vote was considered acceptable in the absence of external obligations. Most respondents believed there should be some minimum number of years to accommodate external citizens that intend to return, but they did not feel *entitled* to any inherent right to vote. Perceived as voluntary departees from the national territory, emigrant British citizens were not believed to have sufficient claims to access the franchise and formally participate in the political community. These attitudes did not preclude a right for informal participation through one’s personal and professional networks. Beth (UK-born, interviewed 20th July) considered her right to actively express her political opinions on UK issues to be inalienable and unconstrained by territorial residence.

Asked to reflect on Accidental Americans, the prevailing attitude among respondents was that the tax obligation provided a sufficient stake in the community to justify voting rights for federal offices. For the two Accidental Americans in the research (Eren and James), the right to vote was viewed as a trump card that could be played if the US’s influence on global affairs ever made them feel the outcome could have direct impacts on their lives. Others, including George (3 August) and Kelly (US-born, interviewed 11th July 2020) took exception to the idea that the US state could require obligations from all citizens and then “pick and choose” which citizens could access the right to vote. Reciprocity emerged as a key theme in expressions of

strategic practices generally; individuals expected as much from states as they were obliged to provide as political members.

This selection will conclude with a brief consideration of elements in three of Finn's (2020) hypotheses about dual transnational voting: 1) knowledge of suffrage rights, 2) political interest levels and 3) intention to stay in the country of immigration. While Finn was primarily concerned with dual citizens knowledge of immigrant voting rights, several respondents in this research were unaware or ill-informed about their *emigrant* voting rights. This was especially true for UK-born respondents, many of whom had never heard of the 15-year rule and -despite holding strong views on UK politics- were unaware that they currently or previously had a right to vote from overseas. Dale (14 July) who had expressed regret about abstaining from the 2016 Brexit referendum expressed relief when informed that he had been ineligible to vote. Several individuals that actively engaged in UK politics and held undetermined views about eventual return expressed a minimal interest in determining if they had a right to vote. Furthermore, they did not expect the state to proactively notify them regarding their right to vote. Finally, for UK-based respondents, procedural hurdles occasionally contributed towards gaps between political interest and participation. Lakshmi's (US-born, interviewed 19th July 2020) succinct description of the voter registration process as "a pain in the ass" (and contributing towards her selective participation in US elections) echoes a concern expressed by Lafleur (2015): that administrative barriers remain limiting factors in external citizens' interests and efficacies to sustain active participation in their home country's political community.

Emotional Performances

The strategic practices of dual citizenship described in the preceding section represented one dimension of performance, and this was exercised both alternatively and simultaneously with emotional practices. Temporal and locational factors weighed heavily on which type of citizenship was performed. Some had become explicitly aware of shifting identities through past experiences of circular migration and imagined practicing citizenship as members of a global community. For many others, one or both the two 2016 votes was attributed to making the emotional dimension of their citizenships visible for the first time. This section will discuss individuals' construction and practices of emotional dual citizenship through transnational political activity. It will conclude with an analysis of how strategic and emotional dimensions became coincident for some individuals through their responses to the events and outcomes of 2016.

Background and Home Making: Affirmations of Belonging Somewhere or Anywhere

The transnational identities of migrant groups have been configured through the concept of 'simultaneity', referring to the efficacy of individuals to be engaged with and actively participate in two or more countries at the same time (Tsuda 2012). Although the practices of dual transnational voting (Finn 2020) and other strategic exercises of dual citizenship are encompassed within ideas of simultaneity, a growing area of scholarly interest has emerged around the simultaneous *identities* of dual citizens (Schlenker et al. 2015). This embraces ideas that attribution or acquisition dual citizenship can impact one's sense of belonging in one or more

countries, or even create consciousness of identities that are cross-border or entirely separated from nation-states.

The observed trend of super-diversity among both immigrant and emigrant populations of the UK and US suggests that political identities derived from citizenship may coexist with other meaningful sources of identity. For example, Lakshmi (19 July) was born to parents from India that grew up in the UK, naturalized there and then migrated a second time to live in the US. Although the nativist sentiments expressed in the 2016 US presidential election had shifted her perceptions, she described experiencing a civic political identity in the US where she could describe her identity as "just American. I don't really feel the need to say Indian American". This contrasted with her experience in the UK where she felt she had to define and exercise her identity as both a UK-US dual national and as someone with Indian "heritage".

The exercise of self-described identities around 'heritage' and 'culture' played out contextually for some individuals depending on their place of residence. Claudia (UK-born, interviewed 17th July 2020) exercised her Scottish and British identities differently in the US compared to the UK. Claudia, identifying as Scottish while resident in the UK, felt an increasing sense of 'Britishness' living overseas and actively sought out social 'communities of belonging' (Antonsich 2010) with other British-Americans, disregarding notions of national identities as English, Scottish or Welsh. This was reflected in her political participation as her voting behaviour in the 2016 Brexit referendum was shaped entirely around what she thought was best for the UK as a whole.

Other individuals viewed dual citizenship as an affirmation of their commitment to build a new life in their country of residence. For some, the act of acquiring citizenship carried both emotional and strategic considerations. Kelly (11 July) had initially applied for UK citizenship to fulfil a job requirement but described feeling "incredibly moved" by the naturalization process. She felt she was entering a community that embraced her claims to multiple national identities and contrasted with her parent's scepticism towards dual nationality. Others, such as Rodney, developed a sense of belonging that emerged after naturalization. They experienced rootedness through their families, social networks and employment in the country of immigration. Such experiences mirror Andreotti et al.'s (2012) descriptions of socioeconomically privileged groups in Europe, where the core value of mobility coexists with developing local community ties. These ties often involved committing oneself as a social and political citizen in the country of immigration. This relates to a degree of scalability in political attitudes, where individuals engaged locally in the country of residence and nationally or globally in relation to their country of origin. Oliver (13 July) reflected a cosmopolitan outlook around an idea that dual citizenship (or "dualies" as he called them) was an identity itself and that he felt "reassured" when encountering other dual citizens, regardless of their countries of origin or residence. He linked to ideas of dual citizenship as a mindset; that a development of an emotional belonging to two or more places opened one up to simultaneous identities as translocal, transnational and global citizens.

Finally, dual emotional identities sometimes coexisted with complete disengagement from the politics of the home country. Richard (22 July) who had identified and voted as a Welsh nationalist before emigrating, had completely disconnected from any formal or informal political participation in the UK after naturalizing. This revealed an

interesting separation of nationality and citizenship. Richard felt that he would always be Welsh and consider it an important part of his background, but this did not necessitate a need to actively maintain his status as a dual citizen in the present. Turning his back on his life in the UK, he enjoyed a "can do" attitude experienced in the US and felt that he only required active citizenship in one country. Rather than expressing a rights and obligations opposition to external voting, he held a position of indifference. This connects back to the blurred distinction between denizenship and citizenship in the context of strategic citizenship (i.e. as two statuses with rights and obligations that increasingly overlap (Joppke 2010)). Considering individuals such as Richard, the process of transitioning from permanent residency to naturalized citizen in the US enabled him to passively deactivate his UK citizenship without compromising emotional attachments to his Welsh national identity.

"No one cares about our issues": The Search for Meaning in Transnational Political Activity

Laurie (12 July), reflecting on ideas of political representation, felt that issues immediately relevant to her and other US citizens abroad were being ignored by the US government. Connecting back to Eylon & Harel's (2006) concept of a democratic right to be heard, many US citizens -explicitly concerned about FATCA and the frustrations of the tax filing requirement- felt that their political participation was inconsequential or meaningless if there was no guarantee of receptiveness or representation. Katherine (31 July) felt a sense of disenfranchisement as voting amounted to nothing more than "shouting into a big void". The extension of voting rights to external citizens through incorporation into existing domestic electoral

systems has contributed towards what Peltoniemi (2016) has identified as a democratic and representational deficit.

Considering the case of US overseas citizens first, individuals' participation in the 2016 presidential election was often related to national-level issues of foreign policy, national image and reputation, and several aforementioned emigrant issues, such as FATCA. However, the Electoral College system used to elect US presidents required external citizens to cast their votes in their state of voting residence. Voting for other federal offices on the ballot (senator, representative) is also tied to specific states. Thus, individuals felt that they had no voice if the collective external citizen vote was being diffused. They also felt there was no representation if candidates for federal office had no clear incentives to be responsive to their needs. They also felt their issues had no visibility at home and Patrick (12 July) expressed his frustrations with the knowledge gap in transnational exchanges of ideas.

> …when I go back to America and talk about politics with my family and they go, "what are the issues?" They're always talking about like abortion and guns and stuff. I don't care about any of those things. I'm totally wound up about FATCA and they don't know what FATCA is.

Both UK-resident and US-resident individuals were asked to suggest effective ways to make their voices heard (besides voting) and offer opinions about special representation as an alternative voting arrangement. Although Peltoniemi (2016) found potential for extra-parliamentary forms of representation, such as collective action groups and activism on the part of external citizens, the individuals in this study related participation and representation to existing formal institutions and structures of states. Thus, while several respondents brought up special

representation without needing to be prompted, only a handful entertained ideas of making their voices heard through individual or collective action. A few UK-based respondents identified a potential for engagement through political party groups. For example, participation through Democrats Abroad, an official organization of the Democratic Party that allows external citizens to elect delegates to its national convention. Regarding FATCA, individuals felt that more needed to be done to raise awareness of the issue and Democrats Abroad (and Republicans Abroad) could take an activist role to give them some voice in homeland politics. For others, property and personal connections offered an in-road into meaningful political participation. Oliver (13 July), had relatives and close friends working in the British government that he felt he could make directly appeal to for matters of importance. Notably, he felt aggrieved that his British army service and work to help facilitate overseas investment for Scotland and the UK still left him in a position where he was both disenfranchised and underrepresented. Claudia (17 July) and Dale (14 July), who both owned property in their country of origin, saw opportunities in the social connections they had made with local politicians. Although they had principled concerns about voting at local levels, they felt differently about making direct appeals if local issues affected their personal investments.

Special representation had very little appeal in either country in comparison to existing systems, mirroring the findings of Lafleur (2013) and Peltoniemi (2016) that external voting has yet to become an attractive form of participation for external citizens. Conceptually, Bauböck (2007) expresses reservations that it creates a distinction between citizens inside and outside of the territory, while Collyer (2014) and Peltoniemi (2016) find some positives in increasing potential for representations of salient emigrant issues. One cynical view, expressed by Patrick (12 July), was

that dual citizens' only effective means to make themselves heard in either country would be to speak with their wallets.

On reflection, a contradiction appears between dual citizens' informal engagement as interested political citizens in two countries and their beliefs around participation. Although individuals in this study did not perceive voting as an effective means to make their views heard, there was also only a minimal interest in any bottom-up strategies to lobby around collective interests or identities. This may reflect the super-diversity and geographical dispersal of both country's emigrant populations (Hampshire 2013) with consequent difficulties achieving any widespread or organized political activity directed at homeland politics.

Double Disillusionment: Psychological Stress and Dual Disengagement

This final discussion around emotional performance of citizenship is inspired by Laurie's (12 July) expressions of negative emotions following the 2016 votes. To her, "double disillusionment" was the feeling that the Brexit vote had negatively impacted her growing affinity with British culture and society and that the 2016 presidential election had similarly affected her by denying a reverse affinity towards feeling more American. The immediacy of the two votes and their continuing impacts on the polarization of individuals' attitudes has contributed to a relative absence of literature to the psychological effects of dual democratic disillusionment. Writing before the votes, Manning & Holmes (2014) considered dual political disengagement in electoral politics through ideas that emotions, and especially affinities, have become important in informing individuals' political engagement or disengagement. Previous sources of organizing one's political identity (around

class, for example) are replaced with emotional attachments and emotional expressions of political discourse (ibid). Although many respondents criticized voters on the opposite sides of the 2016 votes for voting with feelings instead of facts, those same individuals reporting feeling intense emotional responses to the vote outcomes. These included embarrassment and depression on one side and feelings of being "very happy" (Oliver 13 July) on the other. Carol (interviewed 17th July 2020), who had immigrated to the US from the UK, naturalized and then returned to the UK, took on a pessimistic view of the US afterwards: "It is a part of my life, which since '16 I would probably choose not to be part of my life." It is perhaps possible to relate one's psychological feelings of dual political disengagement to a sense of transnational political marginalization. That is, dual citizens on the "losing" side of emotional votes in both countries may feel that their voices have been silenced. Carol (UK-born, interviewed 17th July 2020) described this as lacking a "political home" in either country.

The emotional act of engaging in and reacting to the two 2016 votes as either interested citizens or as participants, led many to reconsider their dual citizenship status. In some cases, individuals combined strategic and emotional considerations of citizenship practice to search for additional citizenships in 3rd countries. In the aftermath of the Brexit vote, Alexander (25 July) looked into acquiring Irish citizenship and found that he had an automatic right to apply through his father. Although his initial consideration was maintaining access to freedom of movement in the EU, he described emergent feelings of identity with his Irish nationality. This culminated in a trip to visit the Republic of Ireland after he had naturalized there. Rodney sought to acquire Canadian citizenship through his partner so that his family had an option to emigrate from the US without necessarily having to return to the

UK. This relates back to the idea of mobility as a value (Andreotti et al. 2012) but also reveals some disparities in dual citizens' capabilities. While some can seek out new citizenships to practice strategically and emotionally, others feel more confined by their double disillusionment. James (18 July) described possessing feelings of pride as a European citizen. However, reflecting on the two 2016 votes, he had a pessimistic outlook towards his continued identity as a UK citizen and towards a US citizenship that had never held any emotional significance: "I wish I could be as proud of my citizenships as I could … but I can't". Dale (14 July) related to a feeling of political entrapment; not eligible to apply for a 3rd country's citizenship but feeling politically alienated in both countries: "I don't belong to a […] post Brexit Britain and I certainly don't belong to Trump's America". Double disillusionment thus appeared to have both enabling and disabling effects on individuals' practices of their citizenships. However, it remains to be determined if the emotional dimensions of individuals' existing citizenships outweigh strategic efficacies to engage in ongoing migration and find new political communities of belonging. The acquisition of 3rd country citizenship as a response to dual political disengagement is perhaps an area worth exploring in future research.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This study has identified the performance of citizenship as a concept for understanding the political transnational activities of UK-US dual citizens. The implications are that dual citizens' political practices comprise of at least two dimensions: the strategic and the emotional. In order to understand how and why dual citizens choose to engage and participate in the politics of 'here' and 'there', it is necessary to investigate how these dimensions are practiced simultaneously and antagonistically.

The first empirical chapter investigated strategic performances of citizenship. Linking to Joppke's (2010) and Spiro's (2008) descriptions of citizenship's instrumentalization from state perspectives, we saw that individuals incorporated similar language and ideas into their own attitudes and activities. The theme of "rights and obligations" was prominent in individuals' justification of active and passive political behaviours. A right to vote externally was frequently contrasted with the obligations one had to an overseas political community. Neo-liberal ideas of personal responsibility, which are at the heart of citizenship's turn toward re-nationalization (Joppke), also informed many individuals' attitudes towards how they should practice citizenship. Respondents felt they and other UK-US dual citizens had made a voluntary decision to leave one country and settle in another. Thus, they had a responsibility to provide for their own integration into the country of resident and be active citizens through voting and social engagement. However, this also presented fewer claims to 'stakeholdership' (Bauböck 2007) overseas and active participation was often viewed as unjustifiable below the national level.

The second empirical chapter assessed emotional practices of political citizenship. The strategic considerations that inhibited or enabled external political participation played out alongside a 'simultaneity' in transnational identities and emotional affinities (Tsuda 2012, Schlenker et al. 2015). Some dual citizens created a distinction where nationality remained rooted in the origin country and political citizenship was exercised only in the country of residence. Others experiencing shifting identities and practices of citizenship became highly contextualized by time and place. A final group envisioned a broader political identity and sought to participate as global citizens or mobilize identities around dual citizenship through imagined communities of belonging (Antonsich 2010). The 2016 votes had profound emotional effects on dual citizens in this study and prompted new performances around psychological distress and "double disillusionment". Some combined strategic and emotional practices to pursue 3rd country citizenships by seeking continued access to mobility and new political communities of belonging. Others felt entrapped by feelings of disengagement and the loss of political "homes" in both countries.

These last insights offer potential for future research to investigate political disengagement in advanced democracies and strategies of mitigating emotional and psychological distress. Specifically, what are the conceptual limitations of simultaneity when 3rd country citizenship and residence is both viable and preferable? Also, how can we relate ideas of political entrapment to dual citizens' continued access to social and economic mobilities? Finally, the UK and US emigrant populations investigated in this research are underrepresented in the field of migration studies and more attention should be paid to the experiences of 'privileged' and Anglophone migrant groups.

References

Anderson, B. (1992) 'The New World Disorder', *New Left Review*, 193, 3-13.

Balta, E. & Altan-Olcay, Ö. (2016) 'Strategic citizens of America: transnational inequalities and transformation of citizenship', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39, 6, 939-957.

Banzhaf, J.F. (1968) 'One Man, 3,312 Votes: A Mathematical Analysis of the Electoral College', *Villanova Law Review*, 13, 2, 304-332.

Barry, K. (2006) 'Home and Away: The Construction of Citizenship in an Emigration Context', *New York University Law Review*, 81, 11–59.

Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N. & Szanton Blanc, C. (1994) *Nations Unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states*, Langhorne PA: Gordon and Breach.

Bauböck, R. (1994) *Transnational Citizenship Membership and Rights in International Migration*, Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Bauböck, R. (2005) 'Expansive Citizenship: Voting Beyond Territory and Membership', *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 38, 4, 683-687.

Bauböck, R. (2007) 'Stakeholder Citizenship and Transnational Political Participation: A Normative Evaluation of External Voting', *Fordham Law Review*, 75, 5, 2393-2448.

Benson, M. (2019) *The election and the overseas vote in the EU* [online], Available at: https://ukandeu.ac.uk/the-election-and-the-overseas-vote-in-the-eu/ (Accessed 5 June 2020).

Brubaker, R. (1989) 'Citizenship and Naturalization: Policies and Politics' in Brubaker, R. (ed.) *Immigration and the politics of citizenship in Europe and North America*, Lanham: University Press of America, 99-127.

Burchell, D. (2002) 'What to Do with the Civic Body?', *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 16, 1, 67-79.

Cabinet Office (2016) *Extending the deadline to register to vote for the EU referendum: statement* [Press release], 8 June, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/extending-the-deadline-to-register-to-vote-for-the-eu-referendum-statement (Accessed: 1 September 2020).

Caramani, D. & Grotz, F. (2015) 'Beyond citizenship and residence? Exploring the extension of voting rights in the age of globalization', *Democratization*, 22, 5, 799-819.

Christians, A. (2017) 'A Global Perspective on Citizenship-Based Taxation', Michigan Journal of International Law, 38, 2, 193-244.

Ciornei, I. & Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2020) 'Transnational turnout. Determinants of emigrant voting in home country elections', *Political Geography*, 78, 1-10.

Cisneros, J.D. (2011) '(Re)Bordering the Civic Imaginary: Rhetoric, Hybridity, and Citizenship in La Gran Marcha', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 97, 1, 26-49.

Collard, S. (2019) 'The UK Politics of Overseas Voting', *The Political Quarterly*, 90, 4, 672-680.

Collyer, M. (2014) 'A geography of extra-territorial citizenship: Explanations of external voting', *Migration Studies*, 2, 1, 55-72.

Collyer, M. (2017) ‘Diasporas and Transnational Citizenship’ in Shachar, A. et al. (eds.) The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 576-598.

Constantine, S. (2003) ‘British emigration to the empire-commonwealth since 1880: From overseas settlement to Diaspora?’, *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 31, 2, 16-35.

Dalessandro, C. (2018) ‘Recruitment Tools for Reaching Millennials: The Digital Difference’, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17, 1-7.

Eylon, Y. and Harel, A. (2006) ‘The Right to Judicial Review’, *Virginia Law Review,* 92, 5, 991-1022.

Faist, T. (2002) ‘Social Citizenship in the European Union: Nested Membership’, *Journal of common market studies*, 39, 1, 37-58.

Faist, T. (2007) *Dual Citizenship in Europe: From Nationhood to Societal Integration*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Faist, T. (2015) ‘Shapeshifting Citizenship in Germany: Expansion, Erosion, and Extension’ in: Howard-Hassmann, R.E. and Walton-Roberts, M. (eds.) *The Human Right to Citizenship: A Slipper Concept*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 193-208.

Faist, T. (2019) ‘Local and Transnational Citizenship’, *Europa ethnica*, 76, 1-2, 12-15.

Federal Electoral Commission (2017) Foreign nationals [online], Available at: https://www.fec.gov/updates/foreign-nationals/ (Accessed 7 September 2020).

Federal Voting Assistance Program (2018) *2016 Overseas Citizen Population Analysis Report* [online], Available at: https://www.fvap.gov/uploads/FVAP/Reports/FVAP-2016-OCPA-FINAL-Report.pdf (Accessed: 6 September 2020).

Federal Voting Assistance Program (2020a) *2018 Overseas Citizen Population Analysis Report* [online], Available at: https://www.fvap.gov/uploads/FVAP/Reports/2018-Overseas-Citizen-Population-Analysis-Report.pdf (Accessed: 6 September 2020).

Federal Voting Assistance Program (2020b) *How to Determine Your Voting Residency* [online], Available at: https://www.fvap.gov/info/laws/voting-residence (Accessed: 7 September 2020).

Finn, V. (2020) 'Migrant voting: here, there, in both countries, or nowhere', *Citizenship Studies*, 24, 6, 730-750.

Goodhart, D. (2017) *The Road to Somewhere: The New Tribes Shaping British Politics*, London: Penguin.

Hammar, T. (1989) 'State, National, and Dual Citizenship' in Brubaker, R. (ed.) *Immigration and the politics of citizenship in Europe and North America*, Lanham: University Press of America, 81-96.

Hampshire, J. (2013) 'An Emigrant Nation without an Emigrant Policy: The Curious Case of Britain', in Collyer, M. (ed.) *Emigration Nations*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 302-326.

Hansen, R. (2002) 'The Dog that didn't Bark' in Hansen, R. and Weil, P. (eds.) *Dual Nationality, Social Rights and Federal Citizenship in the U.S. and Europe: The Reinvention of Citizenship*, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 179-191.

Hobolt, S.B. (2016) 'The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent', Journal of European Public Policy, 23,9, 1259-1277.

Home Office (2020) *Immigration Directorate Instruction Family Migration: Appendix FM Section 1.7 Appendix Armed Forces Financial requirement* [online], Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/910644/appendix-fm-1-7-financial-requirement-v2.0-ext.pdf (Accessed 12 September 2020).

Huntington, S.P. (2004) *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Joppke, C. (2010) 'The Inevitable Lightening of Citizenship', *European Journal of Sociology, 51*, 1, 9-32.

Kymlicka, W. (1995) M*ulticultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2002) *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lafleur, J-M. (2013) *Transnational Politics and the State: The External Voting Rights of Diasporas*, New York: Routledge.

Lafleur, J-M (2015) 'The enfranchisement of citizens abroad: variations and explanations', *Democratization*, 22, 5, 840-860.

Leitner, H. & Ehrkamp, P. (2006) ‘Transnationalism and migrants' imaginings of citizenship’, *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 1615-1632.

Lester, J.N., Cho, Y. & Lochmiller, C.R. (2020) ‘Learning to Do Qualitative Data Analysis: A Starting Point’, *Human Resource Development Review*, 19, 1, 94-106.

Levitt, P. (1998) ‘Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion’, *The International Migration Review*, 32, 4, 926-948.

Manning, N. & Holmes, M. (2014) ‘Political Emotions: A Role for Feelings of Affinity in Citizens’ (Dis)Engagements with Electoral Politics?’, *Sociology*, 48, 4, 698-714.

Mohammed, R. (2001) ‘’Insiders’ and/or ‘outsiders’: positionality, theory and praxis’ in Limb, M. and Dwyer, C. (eds.) *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debate*, London: Arnold, 101-117.

Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2003) ‘The Politics of Migrants’ Transnational Political Practices’, *The International migration review*, 37, 3, 760-786.

Parliament. House of Commons (2019) *Overseas Voters* [online], (5923), London: The Stationery Office, Available at: https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN05923/SN05923.pdf (Accessed: 5 June 2020).

Peltoniemi, J. (2016) ‘Overseas Voters and Representational Deficit: Regional Representation Challenged by Emigration’, *Representation*, 52, 4, 295-309.

Renshon, S.A. (2001) *Dual Citizenship and American National Identity* [online], Available at:

http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.729.6594&rep=rep1&type=pdf (Accessed 6 September 2020).

Sandelowski, M. (1995) 'Sample Size in Qualitative Research', *Research in Nursing & Health*, 18, 2, 179-183.

Schaffner, B.F., MacWilliams, M. & Nteta, T. (2018) 'Understanding White Polarization in the 2016 Vote for President: The Sobering Role of Racism and Sexism', Political Science Quarterly, 131, 1, 9-34.

Shachar, A. & Hirschl, R. (2007) 'Citizenship as Inherited Property', *Political Theory*, 35, 3, 253-287.

Schlenker, A., Blatter, J. & Birka, I. (2015) 'Practising transnational citizenship: dual nationality and simultaneous political involvement among emigrants', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43, 3, 418-440.

Sikkens, E. et al. (2017) 'Participant Recruitment through Social Media: Lessons Learned from a Qualitative Radicalization Study Using Facebook', *Field Methods*, 29, 2, 130-139.

Smith, M.P. (2003) 'Transnationalism, the State, and the Extraterritorial Citizen', Politics & Society, 31, 4, 467-502.

Smith, H. (2007) 'Diasporas in international conflict', in Smith, H. and Stares, P. (eds.) *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-Makers or Peace-Wreckers*, Tokyo; New York: United Nations University Press, 3-16.

Soysal, Y. (1994*) Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Soysal, Y. (1996) 'Changing Citizenship in Europe: Remarks on Postnational Membership and the National State', in Cesarani, D. & Fulbrook, M. (eds.) *Citizenship, nationality, and migration in Europe*, London: Routledge, 17-29.

Spiro, P.J. (2008) *Beyond Citizenship*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Spiro, P.J. (2013) 'Interrogating Birthright Citizenship', Politics, and Society, 60, 29-53.

Spiro, P.J. (2016) *At Home in Two Countries: The Past and Future of Dual Citizenship*, New York: New York University Press.

Sriskandarajah, D. & Drew, C. (2006) *Brits Abroad: Mapping the Scale and Nature of British Emigration* [online], Available at: https://www.ippr.org/files/images/media/files/publication/2011/05/BA_exec_summ_1548.pdf (Accessed 4 September 2020).

Strömberg, D. (2008) 'How the Electoral College Influences Campaigns and Policy: The Probability of Being Florida', *The American Economic Review,* 98, 3, 769-807.

The Electoral Commission (2019) *Donations and loans* [online], Available at: https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/who-we-are-and-what-we-do/financial-reporting/donations-and-loans (Accessed 7 September 2020).

Tintori, G. (2011) 'The Transnational Political Practices of ''Latin American Italians''', *International Migration*, 49, 3, 168-188.

Tsuda, T. (2012) 'Whatever Happened to Simultaneity? Transnational Migration Theory and Dual Engagement in Sending and Receiving Countries', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38, 4, 631-649.

Turner, B.S. (2017) 'Contemporary Citizenship: Four Types', *Journal of Citizenship and Globalisation Studies*, 1, 1, 10-23.

U.S. Embassy & Consulates in the United Kingdom (2020) *Loss of U.S. Citizenship (i.e. Expatriation)* [online], Available at: https://uk.usembassy.gov/u-s-citizen-services/citizenship/loss-of-u-s-citizenship-i-e-expatriation/ (Accessed 12 September 2020).

USCIS (United States Citizenship and Immigration Services) (2019) *Instructions for Affidavit of Support* [online], Available at: https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/document/forms/i-864instr-pc.pdf (Accessed 12 September 2020).

Valentine, G. (2005) 'Tell me about . . . using interviews as a research methodology', in Flowerdew, R. and Martin, D. (eds.) *Methods in Human Geography: A Guide for Students Doing a Research Project*, Edinburgh Gate: Addison Wesley Longman, 110-127.

Vertovec, S. (2007) 'Super-Diversity and its Implications', *Ethnic and Racial* Studies, 29, 6, 1024-1054.

Appendix A – Initial Proposal (Implemented Plan)

Submitted informally on 5 April 2020. See Appendix B for original (cancelled) proposal.

New Proposal/Topic: Forms of Political Participation Among Dual Nationals of the UK and USA.

Ideal Scope: 1.5-generation individuals residing in both countries (split sample 50/50).

Realistic Scope: Individuals that migrated at least once to one of the two countries and are old enough to have memories of living in both countries (tentative lower cutoff age: 8 years old).

Aims

To examine how dual-nationals participate in multiple political contexts (incl. if they choose to participate at all*) with a focus on British-Americans and American-Britons in the context of the 2016 Presidential Election and the 2016 'Brexit' referendum.

*The '15-year rule' in the UK case means that some dual nationals (such as myself) would have been unable to vote but could still have participated in other ways.

These two events were selected because each had strongly nativist elements (Trump campaign's appeals to nativism; Immigration-based arguments for remain) that dual nationals, with varying levels of transnational identities, would have considered in their decisions of how to participate politically (voting, social media, volunteering, etc.).

Research Questions

To what extent do dual nationals feel engaged in each country's politics?

How does transnationalism factor into political identities in either or both country's politics?

How do dual nationals respond to nativist arguments and appeals?

What forms of political participation do dual nationals engage with in each country?

Do dual nationals feel that they have an entitlement to vote regardless of how long they reside outside of a given country?

Objectives

To understand transnational identities in a British/American context.

To assess the impact of nativism on dual nationals' political identities.

To examine different forms of political participation in different spatial contexts: in the country of residence and the country of non-residence.

To understand the importance of overseas voting for dual nationals.

Methods

Two sample groups: American nationals living in the UK with dual citizenship; British nationals living in the USA with dual citizenship:

1) Email a questionnaire to collect demographic details and background information (e.g. age of migration to UK/USA),
2) Conduct interviews via VoIP (specific app will be based on respondents' preference).

Code interview content and analyze alongside questionnaire results.

Anonymize all respondent data due to the potentially sensitive nature of citizenship.

Recruitment will be via snowballing, starting with personal connections (friends and relatives).

Ideal will be to recruit individuals who migrated to one or the other country before adulthood. This provides for a potentially interesting hypothesis that 1.5-generation migrants are mostly or fully disposed towards transnationalism, are active participants in both countries politics and have a strong negative reaction to nativism.

Concerns:

How many interviews would be appropriate: 10 per group? Or 12-15 is better?

Should there be a cutoff at the high end if going with the more realistic scope (i.e. is it better to exclude those who migrated after reaching retirement age?).

Appendix B – Initial Proposal (Cancelled Plan)

This plan was effectively terminated on 24 March 2020 following UCL policy guidelines to suspend all fieldwork.

Working Title: Government-Supported Rural In-Migration: Experiences of Relocating from Urban Areas to Settle in Rural Saitama Prefecture

Research Aims & Objectives

The overall objective of my research is to critically assess government-supported rural in-migration by understanding the processes and outcomes of internal migration to a semi-rural region of Saitama Prefecture, Japan. A prefectural government initiative, started in April 2019, exists in the form of a payment to individuals or families that move from specified urban locations in the greater Tokyo area to rural and semi-rural communities in Saitama[13]. A majority of the eligible target areas are in the far west of Saitama Prefecture and centered around the small city of Chichibu, which is where I will conduct my research. Chichibu possesses several amenities that can attract in-migrants from more urban regions: natural beauty, affordable housing, a growing recreational economy and good transport links to larger urban centres. The region's economy has historically been centred around agriculture, forestry and -to a lesser extent- mining and manufacturing. Although local-oriented economic activities by in-migrants may run into initial challenges from skill mismatches, Chichibu's diversity and connectiveness is suggestive that it could be a beneficiary of commercial counterurbanisation (Bosworth 2010).

My hypothesis is that urban to rural migration in Japan has made positive impacts to the economy at a regional level but has had limited benefits to local communities. The selective nature of the support fund allocations will likely continue to reinforce these trends and favor greater recognition for diversity in rural in-migration processes and outcomes.

Objectives:

- Describe an initiative in Saitama Prefecture whereby municipal governments in 9 designated target areas allocate funds to support rural in-migrants from urban Tokyo.
- Interview members of municipal governments in the target areas who work directly with in-migration (housing assistance, social services, business development) and the support fund system to understand motivations and objectives.
- Document factors that prompt or encourage movement from large cities to rural and semi-rural areas by interviewing in-migrants.

[13] Saitama Prefectural Office, 'Guidance for the Immigration Support Fund System', http://www.pref.saitama.lg.jp/a0106/sumunarasaitama/documents/ijushienkin_chirashi4.pdf

- Assess the consequences and challenges of this in-migration (community integration, contributions to local/regional economies, housing costs, social service provision, and how these change over time).
- Add to policy discussions about rural in-migration and theoretical debates about counterurbanisation.

Research Questions:

- Why are the support funds limited to in-migrants from urban Tokyo?
- How do municipal government motivations/objectives contribute towards creating ideal types of in-migrants?
- To what extent do the business skills of urban to rural in-migrants "match" with local and regional economies?
- Why do people decide to stay after moving in?
- How can internal migration policy and counterurbanisation narratives be reconceptualised to accommodate the diversity of rural places and in-migrants?

Brief Literature Review

A starting point for approaching contemporary rural in-migration research is Halfacree's (2008) reflection on the prototypical narrative term, counterurbanisation; that the movements, motivations and characteristics of rural in-migrants are accepted as conforming to a singular norm. The stereotype becomes that of wealthier families moving out from the crowded cities to enjoy the rural idyll and the countryside's natural beauty. While this continues to be the dominant form of rural in-migration, recent literature has uncovered numerous previously unexplored diversities and supports Halfacree's claim there is still space for dialogue when researching this topic (Stockdale 2016:602).

Through a discussion of intra-rural migration, Stockdale rejects assumptions that counterurbanisation is inseparable from rural in-migration studies and that it is necessarily *always* the most dominant form of mobility (Ibid:602). Intra-rural mobilities can conform to a cascading model of counterurbanisation (Champion 2005), where net migration flows from large to small settlements, but also suggest greater complexities regarding the 'who' and 'why' of rural migration flows. Quantitative research in North-Netherlands villages challenged the centrality of attractiveness in causal explanations of rural and peri-urban in-migration (Elshof et al 2017). Expanding rural amenities to include practical benefits such as cheaper housing and relative availability of social services, stores and transport links can help explain in-movements (and retention) of younger people and retirees.

Scholars researching the economic dimensions of in-rural migration have noted the multiple challenges encountered when starting a new business. Relative proximity to urban centres, skill matching (or desire to retrain) and the level of orientation to the local community all impact the viability and long-term efficacy of business enterprises. Research by Herslund (2012) finds that regionalisation is critical for the survival of both local- and-urban oriented businesses. Consequently, the new economic activity is less embedded in individual localities and have marginal, if any, positive contributions to communities.

Methodology

There will be approximately 20-25 mostly semi-structured interviews, which will be divided as follows: 8-10 interviews with residents that moved to Chichibu from a large city but did not meet the criteria for the bonus money (whether due to date of arrival, location of origin or other factors), 8-10

interviews with residents that moved to Chichibu and met the criteria for the bonus money, 6-8 interviews with relevant officials in the Chichibu municipal government.

The total duration of my stay in the Chichibu area will be between 30 and 40 days from mid/late May to late June. Interview subjects will be contacted using a combination of official channels (e.g. email addresses of municipal government offices and community groups) and personal connections facilitated by family and friend networks. The snowballing method will also be applied as necessary to recruit additional interview subjects from the in-migrant populations. Although I will attempt to recruit support fund-eligible respondents by contacting gatekeepers in the Chichibu municipal government and Saitama Prefectural Office, I am confident that I will be recruit via personal networks and snowballing if access is not granted.

Semi-structured interviews are preferred for the in-migrants to complement subject's background information with more personal, narrative accounts of their experiences. The interviews with municipal officials will be structured for the following reasons:

- I anticipate that there will be little or no allowance to extend interviews if they are running over-time.
- A logical order and flow will contribute towards maintaining the appropriate level of professionalism and control of each interview's direction.
- The primary purpose of these interviews is to better understand governments' policies and objectives. This can be pursued appropriately by asking pre-prepared questions and relevant follow ups.

Although I will be leading the interviews in Japanese, an interpreter will be available to assist with the language as needed. The presence of an interpreter raises interesting questions surrounding potential effects on positionality and affecting insider/outsider dynamics. The interpreter is Japanese and grew up in Chichibu while I, the researcher, am male and non-Japanese. My writing will discuss the interpreter's presence as opposed to a tendency in positivist social science research to make the interpreter controllable and therefore invisible (Berman and Tyyskä 2011:179).

The interview recordings will be transcribed and coded to the furthest extent possible under the constraints of time. Any material that I translate for inclusion in the writing will be reviewed by a bilingual Japanese-English speaker to confirm accuracy.

<u>Timetable</u>

- March – May
  - Literature review; prepare for interviews.
- May – June
  - Fieldwork: conduct interviews to collect data.
- June – July
  - Transcription and coding of qualitative data to the furthest extent possible; Analysis.
- August – September
  - Writing; Final editing.

Potential outcomes, rationale and value

The outcomes of this research will be to expand understandings of contemporary rural in-migration by assessing the impact of government support and examining the topic within the socioeconomic contexts of Japan. Notably, Japan's population decline and ageing, coupled with attitudes and policies restrictive to international immigration, produce demands for rural in-migration rarely explored in English-language literature, which overwhelmingly focuses on Western European, North American and Australian cases. Economic development (and redevelopment) is combined with population management.

Comparing and contrasting the aims and objectives of municipal government with the lived experiences of in-migrants provides space for discussions of governance and identity. It is not unreasonable to believe that expectations and imaginations (e.g. "community") will diverge between and within each of the groups being interviewed. Including additional considerations for the gendered nature of rural migration, the invisibility of certain groups (e.g. immigrants from China and the Philippines), presence of a creative class, and infrastructural amenities (transportation links, access to high-speed internet), this research will support the idea of rural migration being a complex, messy process. Furthermore, it will hope to inspire further research to critique counterurbanisation by calling for greater recognition of diversities existing across multiple dimensions.

Preferred supervisor:

Jennifer Robinson.

References:

Berman, R.C. and Tyyskä, V. (2011), 'A Critical Reflection on the Use of Translators/Interpreters in a Qualitative Cross-Language Research Project', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 10(2), 178–190.

Bosworth, G. (2010), 'Commercial counterurbanisation: an emerging force in rural economic development', *Environment and Planning A*, 42(4), 966–981.

Champion, T. (2005), 'The counterurbanisation cascade in England and Wales since 1991: the evidence of a new migration dataset', *Belgeo*, 1(1-2), 85-102.

Elshof, H. et al. (2017), 'The influence of village attractiveness on flows of movers in a declining rural region', *Journal of Rural Studies*, 56, 39–52.

Halfacree, K. (2008), 'To revitalise counterurbanisation research? Recognising an international and fuller picture', *Population, Space and Place*, 14(6), 479-495.

Herslund, L. (2012), 'The Rural Creative Class: Counterurbanisation and Entrepreneurship in the Danish Countryside', *Sociologica Ruralis*, 52(2), 235-255.

Stockdale, A. (2016), 'Contemporary and 'Messy' Rural In-migration Processes: Comparing Counterurban and Lateral Rural Migration', *Population, Space and Place*, 22(6), 599-616.

Appendix C – Research Diary

Original Plan: Government-Supported Rural In-Migration

8 Feb – 23 Feb: Read literature around urban to rural migration and economic activities related to this movement. Reviewed policy documents in Japan to identify the requirements of individuals and families to receive government support for rural in-migration. Continued studying the Japanese language in preparation of my assessments and exams.

24 Feb: Submitted proposal for review.

5 Mar: Received feedback for initial proposal.

6 Mar – 24 Mar: Continued literature review and began reviewing possible avenues to contact respondents in Japan. Monitored the COVID-19 situation in Japan as it became increasingly likely that it would be difficult to travel there.

24 Mar: Received a notification on UCL that fieldwork would be suspended. Began considering alternative methodologies to in-person interviews.

25 Mar: Notified supervisor that I would like to meet discuss possible changes to my research proposal.

2 Apr: Had a virtual meeting with my supervisor to discuss alternative methodologies and a completely new research plan designed around political transnational activities of dual citizens.

New Research Plan Starts

5-6 Apr: Submitted new research proposal to my supervisor. Met with my supervisor via MS Teams and received a list of recommended reading for the literature review.

7 Apr: Contacted Dr Jason Dittmer for literature recommendations related to geopolitics.

8 Apr – 9 Jun: Read literature around external voting and political participation across borders. Assembled Powerpoint slides for my dissertation presentation. Met with supervisor on Jun 3 ahead of my presentation. Began formal recruitment via personal networks in the US; submitted a social media post on Twitter asking for interested individuals to contact me. Received one response. Continued working on coursework and submitted all written assessments. Studied Japanese ahead of oral and written exams.

10 Jun: Presented my dissertation topic via MS Teams. Received feedback.

15 Jun: Met with my supervisor via MS Teams to review recruitment strategies and methodology.

16 Jun – 24 Jun: Continued literature review with a focus on political transnationalism. Began reading about emigration experiences and policies of both the US and UK. Continued formal recruitment. respondents through personal/professional networks. Joined Facebook groups for US

and UK emigrants and submitted a recruitment post. Created a sample version of my questionnaire form.

25 Jun: Reviewed questionnaire with my supervisor via MS Teams to confirm that the questions were all appropriate.

26 Jun – 30 Jun: Continued recruitment via email and social media. Informed interested individuals about the interview schedule. Released the questionnaire on 30 June. Began receiving responses immediately. (Note: all respondents were able to complete the questionnaire BEFORE their scheduled interview).

1 July: Conducted practice interviews with a pair of UK-US dual citizens (my parents). Removed a few unnecessary questions and restructured the interview plan. Identified an issue that the questions about Brexit and the US election could seem repetitive.

2 July: First interview with Eren. Although our email communication suggested her US citizenship carried little meaning as she left the country as a young child, her high level of engagement in the US election and belief that the citizenship could one day take on greater meaning in her life was interesting.

3 Jul – 7 Jul: Two interviews with naturalized US citizens that left the UK as young adults. Very different perspectives on citizenship. One saw naturalization as a validation of his decision to settle and saw his UK citizenship as source of potential opportunity for his children. The other felt little emotion as an American despite being heavily engaged in his local community. Considered leaving the US depending on the 2020 election outcome and settling in another country with his family.

9 Jul – 12 Jul: Several interviews with UK-based respondents. Very different attitudes towards political engagement in their origin country. Frequently invoked the language of rights and obligations. FATCA was prominent and I need to look into it further. Laurie mentioned the idea of 'double disillusionment' as she felt politically disengaged from both countries in the current political climate.

13 Jul – 17 Jul: Several interviews with US-based respondents. Emerging ideas that individuals are practicing their citizenship in different ways as emotional or pragmatic citizens. Changes according to the context of residency and the immediacy of certain events such as the 2016 votes.

18 Jul – 19 Jul: Interviewed two young (20's) respondents, both based in UK. One had never lived in the US and was an Accidental American, having acquired citizenship through his mother. Felt frustrated that his US citizenship didn't mean anything and felt alienated after the 2016 votes (double disillusionment again). Lakshmi's complicated national identity between two citizenships and a third identity constructed around her parent's country of origin. Speaks to some of the super-diversity of UK/US emigrants.

20 Jul – 28 Jul: Continued interviews. Mostly US-based. Had become apparent by now that differential practices of citizenship were a recurrent theme in political transnational activity. 2016 election very relevant in the idea of double disillusionment and psychological experiences of dual citizenship. Otherwise, practiced citizenship can be related more generally with the election as an indirect reference point perhaps…

31 Jul: Last scheduled interview. Had begun transcribing interviews but was having trouble with time management. Wife is pregnant, planning to move house in a few weeks' time, still working in

paid employment. Not sure manual transcription will be feasible to complete this research in time. Will look into alternatives (AI or outsourcing).

1 Aug – 2 Aug: Reviewed AI transcription services and reviewed comments by other scholars. Trint is the most financially viable option and has been used a lot by other researchers. Will save a lot of time but will still require corrections and close reviewing of the content to establish familiarity ahead of analysis.

3 Aug: Surprise extra interview from someone I hadn't heard from in weeks. Had some interesting thoughts about rights and obligations. Also from the same hometown as me and I found it was easier to develop intimacy and get into some deeper conversation.

4 Aug – 27 Aug: Completed transcription (and corrections of AI mistakes) and began analysis. Started compiling codes through cross-references in MS Office (Word, Excel). 5 themes emerged around the strategic and emotional practices of citizenship.

28 Aug – 30 Aug: Moved from London to Manchester. Didn't get any work done.

1 Sep – 4 Sep: Finalized analysis and constructed a basic outline for the written work.

5 Sep – 13 Sep: Wrote the paper and assembled supporting pieces (appendices, tables, etc.).

14 Sep: Final editing/review and consolidation of all parts into a single document.

Appendix D – Survey Questions

Screening

All questions in this section are required.

Are you currently a dual citizen of the United Kingdom and the United States of America? *

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If you were naturalized as a citizen of either country, did you acquire your second citizenship on or before 9 June, 2016? *

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Not Applicable (e.g. if dual national from birth)

Were you at least 18 years old on 9 June, 2016? *

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Background Information

Answers will be used to help structure the interviews and to provide possible avenues for further data analysis.

All questions in this section are optional. If you do not wish to answer a particular question, leave blank or select the "Prefer not to say" option.

Are you ...?

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female
- ◯ Other
- ◯ Prefer not to say

What is your age?

- ◯ 23 or under
- ◯ 24 - 39
- ◯ 40 - 55
- ◯ 56 - 74
- ◯ 75 or over
- ◯ Prefer not to say

What is your current marital status?

- ◯ Single (never married)
- ◯ Married
- ◯ Separated
- ◯ Widowed or Divorced
- ◯ Prefer not to say

What is your highest educational qualification (e.g. "Bachelor's degree")?

Your answer

Where were you born?

- ◯ United Kingdom
- ◯ United States of America
- ◯ Prefer not to say
- ◯ Other:

Where were you living on the date of the Brexit referendum (23 June 2016)?

- ◯ United Kingdom
- ◯ United States of America
- ◯ Other - EU country
- ◯ Other - non-EU country
- ◯ Prefer not to say

Where were you living on the date of the 2016 United States presidential election (8 November 2016)?

- ◯ United Kingdom
- ◯ United States of America
- ◯ Other - EU country
- ◯ Other - non-EU country
- ◯ Prefer not to say

If you were resident in the United Kingdom in 2016, what country did you live in (select all that apply)?

- [ ] England
- [ ] Scotland
- [ ] Wales
- [ ] Northern Ireland
- [ ] N/A - Did not reside in the United Kingdom in 2016

If you were resident in the United States in 2016, what state did you live in?

Your answer

Political Participation

Please answer a few questions regarding the 2016 Brexit referendum and the 2016 United States presidential election.

All questions in this section are optional. If you do not wish to answer a particular question, leave blank or select the "Prefer not to say" option.

Were you eligible to register for a vote in the 2016 Brexit referendum?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Don't know

Did you vote in the 2016 Brexit referendum?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Can't recall

Were you eligible to register for a vote in the 2016 United States presidential election?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Don't know

Did you vote in the 2016 United States presidential election?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Can't recall

Contact Information and Follow Up

The questions in section will used to link questionnaire responses to the interviews.

The first two questions are optional but it would be helpful if you could answer at least one of them.
The final question, confirming your willingness to participate in a recorded video interview, is required.

For identification purposes, please provide your first name and last initial (e.g. "David B").

Your answer

What is the best email address to contact you for a follow up?

Your answer

Would you be willing to participate in a recorded video interview to discuss dual citizenship and your participation in the two 2016 votes? *

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Appendix E - Interview Structure

Section 1 – Basic information

Where are you from?

Is this the same country/place where you were born?

Where do you currently live?

How long have you lived in ~ ?

Have you lived anywhere else in [current country] besides your current home?

Who do you live with in ~ ? / Do you live with anyone in ~?

Do you have any other family members living in [current country] (besides those who live with you)?

What do you currently do (for work or school)?

Section 2 – Transnational Connections

Why did you move to ~?

(Why did you parents move to ~)

Besides ~ , have you lived in any other countries?

Where?

Where did you use to live in ~?

How long did you live there?

Why were you living there?

Do you still have any friends or family in ~?

How do you keep in touch with ~?

How often do you contact them?

Have you ever been to visit ~?

How often do you visit ~?

How long do you usually stay in ~?

Do you think there is such a thing as a British-American/American-British community?

Do you feel a part of such a community?

Why/Why not?

Do you plan to live in ~ permanently?

(If no) would you consider moving back to ~?

(If yes) would you want to retire there?

Section 3 – Citizenship

Were you a dual or multi-national from birth?

(If yes), what countries were you a national of?

Are your nationalities the same as your parents?

How many passports do you currently have?

(If 2+): what countries' passports do you have other than US & UK?

Are you eligible to apply for a passport in a country other than the US or UK?

(if yes): do you have any plans to apply for that passport. Why/Why not?

If asked "what is your nationality?", how would you respond?

Do you feel that you have a stronger identity with country A or country B?

How did you acquire [2nd nationality] – ask if not dual national of US & UK from birth?

Why did you decide to acquire [2nd nationality]?

Would have applied for [2nd nationality] if it had required you to give up [1st nationality]?

Why or Why not?

Were there any challenges to acquiring [2nd nationality]?

Did you attend a naturalization ceremony (US) / citizenship ceremony (UK)?

How did you feel after the ceremony had finished?

Does your partner have more than one nationality?

(If yes): what are they?

(If no): what nationality does he/she have?

Do you have any children?

What nationalities do they have?

Are there any advantages or disadvantages to having dual citizenship?

Are there any advantages or disadvantages to having EU citizenship?

Were you ever directly affected by any of these?

Do you think you have any obligations or responsibilities as a citizen of [origin country]?

Do you have any different responsibilities as a citizen of [current country]?

Have you ever considered renouncing any of your nationalities?

If yes, what made you consider that?

What is the most important reason for keeping your [origin country] citizenship?

<u>Section 4 – Politics (General)</u>

Do you use any social media services?

(If yes), which ones?

Do you get any of your political news from [social media]?

Are you interested in politics in the UK?

(How important is it to you to stay in touch with current events in the UK?)

How do you stay informed about current events in the UK?

Are you interested in politics in the USA?

(How important is it to you to stay in touch with current events in the US?)

How do you stay informed about current events in the USA?

Do you keep informed with local news in [origin country] / e.g. local newspaper?

How important is voting for you?

Do you usually vote in elections in [current country]?

Do you feel that your dual nationality impacts how you make decisions about voting in [current country]?

Have you ever voted from overseas in [origin country]?

Do you feel that you should have a right to vote in [origin country] even if you reside overseas?

Looking at the United Kingdom, do you think there should be any changes to the restriction on overseas voting after 15 or more years spent living abroad?

Looking at the United States, how do you feel about citizens voting in US elections even if they have never lived in the United States?

Do you have any concerns about the impact of overseas voting on election outcomes?

Do you have any concerns about the process of overseas voting?

Do you feel that you have any representation in [origin country]?

Do you feel that the government of [origin country] should be paying more attention to citizens living overseas?

What do you think is the best way to make your voice heard in the politics of [origin country]?

Would you support the creation of a special electoral bloc to represent overseas citizens in Parliament/Congress?

<u>Section 5 – Brexit</u>

Did you vote in the 2016 Brexit referendum?

Why not?

If you had been eligible to vote, would you have voted?

Why not?

Did you vote in-person, by mail or by proxy?

Was this your first time to vote in the UK?

If no, what was the most recent election or referendum you voted in prior to Brexit?

(Do you recall if you were eligible to vote in the 1975 referendum regarding a question of whether to remain in the European Communities?)

Did you vote? How did you vote?

What was your primary source for news about Brexit?

What were the most important issues for you in this referendum?

Did you talk about these issues with friends and family?

Did you engage with these issues on social media?

Did you donate to any groups or organizations affiliated with either the Leave or Remain campaigns?

What do you remember about the Leave campaign?

What do you remember about the Remain campaign?

Do you feel that the messages from either or both campaigns impacted your desire to vote?

Aside from voting, did you take any other political actions during the campaign period?

How did you vote / How would you have voted (if eligible)?

To what extent did the outcome of this referendum affect you personally? (How did you feel about the outcome?)

If a second referendum was held today (and you were eligible to vote) with the same options (Leave/Remain), how would you vote?

If different, why would you change your vote?

If same, would the reasons for your voting decision be any different?

Has your interest in British politics changed as an outcome of the Brexit referendum?

Did you vote in either the 2017 or 2019 general election / do you think you would have voted in either if eligible?

<u>Section 6 – US Presidential Election</u>

Did you vote in the 2016 US presidential election?

Why not?

If you had been eligible to vote, would you have voted?

Why not?

Did you vote in-person, by mail or by online vote?

Was this your first time to vote in a US election?

Have you voted in any US elections (including primaries and local/state level offices) since 2016?

What was the most recent election you voted in prior to 2016?

Do you recall voting for any other offices (federal, state, local) or ballot measures during the 2016 election?

What was your primary source for news about the 2016 US election?

What were the most important issues for you in this election?

Did you talk about any of these issues with friends and family?

Did you engage with any of these issues on social media?

Did you donate to either presidential campaign?

Did you donate to any other organizations, groups or individuals involved in this election?

What do you remember about the Trump campaign?

What do you remember about the Clinton campaign?

Do you feel that the messages from either or both campaigns impacted your desire to vote?

How did you vote / How would you have voted (if eligible)?

To what extent did the outcome of this election affect you personally?

Has your interest in US politics changed because of this election?

Are you planning to vote in the 2020 election?

Appendix F – Consent Form (From the Survey Introduction Page)

Introduction and Informed Consent

Project Title: Political transnationalism: UK-USA dual citizens' participation in the 2016 Brexit referendum and US presidential election.

Name: David Beadle

Contact details: david.beadle.19@ucl.ac.uk / +44 7948 050276

Project Details: This project aims to examine how political transnationalism and multiple citizenship is experienced by dual nationals of the United Kingdom and the United States. The research will specifically focus on two recent votes (1 in each country): the 2016 Brexit referendum and the 2016 United States presidential election.

Results from this research will be used to produce a master's dissertation for the Global Migration MSc in the Geography Department at University College London (UCL).

Consent:

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time.

Ticking the box below will indicate that you:

•have decided to volunteer as a research participant in this study
•have read and understood the information provided above
•give me your permission to use your questionnaire responses for my research

The researcher acknowledges that:

•all interview participants will be anonymized and their responses kept confidential
•all data will be collected and stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018, also known as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)

* Required

Informed Consent *

☐ Please tick this box to confirm that you have consented to participate in this study.

Appendix G – Interview Excerpts

Eren

US nationality from place of birth (Minnesota); UK nationality from both parents

Current resident of UK

Interviewer [00:03:58] Have you ever been to visit the United States since moving back to the United Kingdom?

Eren [00:04:02] Yeah. Yeah. So I, I first went back when I was 10 and my parents took me to Minneapolis to see it. And I've been to California where my uncle and aunt live ... a lot. We went back last year and then two years before that. And then it had been a long time before that. I think my teenage years, I went about four or five times.

Interviewer [00:04:29] So I know you wouldn't probably wouldn't have remembered anything from Minnesota [before moving to the UK], but how did it feel to go there and visit?

Eren [00:04:36] Yeah. Good. It was unfortunately, it was '93, and I don't know if you know or remember, but there was major floods in that region at that time. So actually, what was quite sad is we who we kind of had to end up not being abl- we weren't able to do some of the things that we would have done because the ... well everywhere was flooded. And there was also I think there was a big ... I think it was a big football game in town and my parents hadn't booked in a motel or hotel. So we had to stay quite a way out. But it was cool going back to some of the lakes. Going fishing on the lakes. And I would really love to take my kids and my husband there one day because it kind of it does feel like this slightly strange thing that that was my experience for two years. It was my formative years. And no one of my family knows about it. No one.

Interviewer [00:05:34] Yeah.

Eren [00:05:34] And I yeah. I can't. They don't know anything about Minneapolis. In fact, in one sense... Yeah, the whole everything that's happened around George Floyd and it being in Minneapolis is ... I don't know, there was something about it that made it somehow feel more connected and that's that's nuts. I have no experience of racism, and so I am I'm not trying to put myself in in that connection. But I was like, gosh, something about it grieved me that it was actually the city I was born. And, if that make sense.

Interviewer [00:06:12] No, it's kind of like a personal connection with the place, I suppose. Does that make sense?

Eren [00:06:17] Yeah.

Interviewer [00:06:18] Yeah. Okay, and do you plan to stay in the UK permanently or would you ever consider moving to the United States?

Eren [00:06:27] I think ... we have no plans. I really ... we thought we would, when we first got married. We lived in Montreal for a year because my husband was studying and we went over to visit my family in California and just thought, "Oh, I'd love to live here. This is where ... this feels a bit like home. Great, amazing". But then we we moved. We moved back to Britain. We came... we came to Birmingham because my husband was finishing his degree and we felt like actually it was right to stay. And now we've been here 16, 17 years. And yeah, I can't ... I can't really imagine now living there. My p-, my, my kids don't have citizenship. I don't think they can because I didn't live there long enough. So I think you have to live there five years. And I was only there for two so everything about it would be quite difficult. And so I don't ... it would have to take something really mega for us to leave. Though, my eldest wants to go to Stanford University. That's partly because her cousins have, you see. But yeah.

Interviewer [00:07:53] So your, your children ... they only have British nationality. Is that correct?

Eren [00:07:56] Yeah.

Interviewer [00:07:57] And how about your husband?

Eren [00:07:59] Yeah, he's just British. Yeah just...

…

Eren [00:09:30] It is actually a law, so I have to use it. I did actually look at ... what's the word when you get rid of your passport, you...

Interviewer [00:09:41] Renounce.

Eren [00:09:41] Yeah, renounce it. And I found out partly because it's just really complicated to get it. They have all sorts of things around photos. And I ended up spending hundreds of pounds trying to get the right photo and sending it off and then it not being right and not being able to get the money back. And I was so cross. I just said, "How much is it- Can I renounce my citizenship?" Which they didn't answer and I looked at it ... The American embassy didn't answer but I looked into it and it was going to cost like five thousand dollars or something to do.

Interviewer [00:10:19] Quite a lot.

Eren [00:10:19] I'll just I... But yeah. So I do I do travel on it when I'm going to the states, obviously... But yeah.

Interviewer [00:10:29] If you don't mind me asking, what made you consider renouncing your citizenship?

Eren [00:10:36] I think because in one sense ... If I'm... There is part of me that's a little bit ... "afraid" is the wrong word, but I don't love the system in America. And I feel like I'm gonna get something wrong. And yeah, and I because I don't live there and don't know the system enough, I feel like I could, I could quite easily do something wrong, and then get myself into quite hot water with them. And I don't want to and I think because we don't have any plans to move there. And I don't have any... It would be so difficult to move there anyway because of my whole family not being American. It kind of doesn't feel like a privilege or an opportunity to have. It kind of feels more like a bit of a- a kind of noose around a neck, if that makes any sense.

Interviewer [00:11:39] Sure. And I guess just to clarify, is this related to the requirement to file taxes in the US, by any chance?

Eren [00:11:45] Yes.

…

Interviewer [00:20:59] Okay. And as far as you know, are you eligible to vote there?

Eren [00:21:02] Do you know, I ... I don't know. I guess so. I have a national insuran- not a national insurance, Social Security number and the like, so probably. But yeah...

Interviewer [00:21:15] As of right now, you've never. Seriously consid-.

Eren [00:21:18] I- Yeah, no, I haven't. No.

Interviewer [00:21:21] But do you feel that as a citizen of the United States, even though you live overseas, that you have a right to vote there?

Eren [00:21:30] I know, probably likely that I do have a right to vote. Like literal right. I don't really feel that I do have a right, in a way, because I don't consider myself ... from Am- I don't consider myself American. And therefore feel a little bit like I'm meddling. And particul- yeah, I do have quite strong views. But I equally don't actually know what it's like to live there. And in one sense, you know, global politics does impacts us wherever we live. So, of course, who's in power in the United States does, you know, have a knock-on effect to us. But I don't feel it ... it has a direct knock on impact to me. So therefore I kind of feel it's not really ... fair, which I know you could argue, and I could argue with myself about that, but just don't really feel that it directly impacts me, therefore, it's, it's not really my place. And yeah, I think ... So a friend who lives in the States but is British. He voted to leave in the Brexit ... decision. And that really frustrated me because ... I know it didn't actually come down to his vote, but equally it felt like, hang on a minute. This is not actually impacting you, that's not fair. You don't really know what's going on here, which may- that might have been unfair, but I just felt like, you know. And I think it would be the same. I don't really know what it's what it's like to be there and what's going on.

Interviewer [00:23:26] Sure. Do you feel it be any different if you were to perhaps consider different levels of voting? So, for example, if you were to only vote for the president versus looking for a state or local offices?

Eren [00:23:37] Yeah, maybe. I mean, I've never even thought to vote locally. I did wonder about voting last time. Was it 2016? I did sort of think, "well, maybe, maybe I should". But again, that kind of thought process went through my mind. So it has crossed my mind, it hasn't crossed my mind to ever think locally.

…

Interviewer [00:47:01] So now kind of considering the two side by side and the fact that, you know, Brexit and the U.S. presidential election occured within a few months of each other. Did you draw any parallels between the issues or the messaging of the campaigns involved?

Eren [00:47:15] Yeah, I think well, I think my very, very limited understanding is that... with Brexit... and it happening and actually from what seemed to not be going to happen, it then being we're going to leave. It did feel like suddenly that sort of... the floodgates were opened to actually the impossible could happen. And so I think I felt ... was it the other way around? It wasn't, was it? It was.. I've got completely confused but it was Brexit first, wasn't it?

Interviewer [00:47:50] That's correct.

Eren [00:47:50] Yeah, yeah, yeah. And... I remember when Trump won that feeling coming back. I remember watching it on the TV in tears in the morning. And, and just all those same I can't believe this has happened again. And I think it's that just feeling of like a very well run but very... deceptive campaign has won. And that just doesn't feel like okay and right.

Interviewer [00:48:26] So, again, looking at the 2016 US presidential election, if you had been eligible to vote and you decided to vote, how would you have voted?

Eren [00:48:36] I'd have voted for Clinton.

Interviewer [00:48:40] Sure. And then looking at this election, did it affect you personally in any way?

Eren [00:48:46] Not really. I'd say, other than, again, the sort of feeling of "ugh" about it. But no, it didn't affect me personally.

Interviewer [00:48:58] Sure. And did you feel that your interest in American politics changed at all as a result of the election?

Eren [00:49:07] ... Possibly. Yeah, maybe ... Yeah, it's difficul- I probably, I mean, you know, Donald Trump is on Twitter a lot... the kind of- It's in your... it's in my knowledge much more than it probably ever was before. Yeah, so, probably on balance, yes. Yeah.

Interviewer [00:49:38] And then one final question. Do you have any interest in voting in the 2020 election?

Eren [00:49:46] I think for what I said before. No. And if I'm honest, I don't... I feel... I kind of look on and just, I think, oh, I'm not- I wouldn't vote for Trump, but I'm not sure I would vote for Biden. So... Yeah, and I don't- I'm not- again, I'm not on the ground, I don't really... I don't know... enough. I don't feel like I know enough to, to do so.