UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

IRiS
Institute for Research into Superdiversity

European denizens

The political participation of UK based EU citizens at the EU referendum

Monika Bozhinoska

IRiS Working Paper Series, No. 20/2017

www.birmingham.ac.uk/iris

IRiS Working Paper Series

The Institute for Research into Superdiversity (IRiS) Working Paper Series is intended to aid the rapid distribution of work in progress, research findings and special lectures by researchers and associates of the Institute. Papers aim to stimulate discussion among scholars, policymakers and practitioners and will address a range of topics including issues surrounding population dynamics, security, cohesion and integration, identity, global networks, rights and citizenship, diasporic and transnational activities, service delivery, wellbeing, social exclusion and the opportunities which superdiverse societies offer to support economic recovery.

The IRiS WP Series is edited by Dr Nando Sigona and Dr Aleksandra Kazlowska at the Institute for Research into Superdiversity, University of Birmingham. We welcome proposals for Working Papers from researchers, policymakers and practitioners; for queries and proposals, please contact: n.sigona@bham.ac.uk. All papers are peer-reviewed before publication.

Papers are distributed free of charge in PDF format via the IRiS website. Hard copies will be occasionally available at IRiS public events.

Institute for Research into Superdiversity
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
B15 2TT
Birmingham UK
www.birmingham.ac.uk/iris

Contents

European denizens: The political participation of UK based EU citizens at the EU referendum

Monika Bozhinoska

Abstract

In June 2016 the UK held a referendum on whether to stay or leave the EU. EU citizens living in the UK, irrespective of how long had they spent in the UK, were not eligible to vote. This study uses the referendum as a case to analyse the ethnic nationalism model of state membership in relation to EU citizenship. It focuses on how EU residents experienced the referendum campaign and the exclusion from referendum voting. Specifically, it investigates the EU citizens' perception of their political integration in the state, their national identities and feeling of membership, as well as their political engagement in the EU referendum. The study draws on semi-structured in-depth interviews with EU citizens who lived in the UK for at least 5 years and do not have British citizenship.

Keywords

Membership models, EU citizenship, EU mobility, Brexit, political participation

Citation

Bozhinoska, M. (2017) 'European denizens: The political participation of UK based EU citizens at the EU referendum', *IRiS Working Paper Series*, No. 20/2015, Birmingham: Institute for Research into Superdiversity

About the author

Monika Bozhinoska is an independent researcher. Email address for correspondence: monikabozinoska@gmail.com

Introduction

One of the basic principles of democracy confers the right that all members of the community should be able to participate in the political decision-making processes that define the future of the community and its governance (Entzinger, 1999). Traditionally membership in a political community is ensured with citizenship (Bauböck, 2006, p.15; Bauböck, 2015; Schall, 2012; Qwen, 2013;). Global migration and especially the free movement within the EU challenged the traditional concepts of membership. The EU citizenship extended the national borders and enabled EU citizens to enjoy equal rights in every Member State. Though EU citizenship guarantees residency, it does not involve membership. Therefore, the EU citizenship developed a population of citizens who are unable to participate in the decisions on the future of the state where they live and decide on the governance under which authority they are. Hence, within the free movement a population of citizens is created who do not enjoy full political rights. This raises question over how these citizens construct their political identities, and how settled EU movers seek involvement in the political affairs of the state where they reside.

The EU referendum in the United Kingdom is one case of national political decision making where the EU residents in the UK are directly affected by its outcome and at the same time not eligible to vote. This impacts the long-term residents who based on their EU citizenship settled in the UK and are planning to reside in the country. As Owen (2013) noticed this is a normative issue that raises concerns whether the political autonomy of these citizens is secured.

This study aims to explore how long-term EU residents in the UK perceive their position as political members of the UK. It explores how they explain their national identities, feelings of membership and belonging and how they perceive their political integration in the UK. Based on these research objectives, this study analyses how the citizenship dimensions corresponds with EU citizenship. It will also assess the ethnic nationalism model of membership influences the political integration of EU citizens in a Member State where they are not naturalised.

Literature review

This chapter provides an overview of the existing body of scholarship including previous studies on membership in political communities, with a particular focus on the European Union (hereinafter EU), the concept of citizenship and its implications on political integration of EU 'movers'.

Citizenship and national membership

Since the times of the Athenian nation-state and the Roman Republic, citizenship is the status that defines the membership in a self-governing political community (Bauböck, 2006, p.15). As such, citizenship defines the demos, or who is entitled to full political rights (Schall, 2012; Qwen, 2013; Bauböck, 2015). Citizenship is not a fixed institution but something that should be adaptable to changes in the population (Benhabiib, 2004, p.139). However, in the age of global migration and freedom of movement for EU citizens, how well different models of membership can reflect the changing population is a question that needs addressing.

Granting citizenship is commonly based either on (i) the territory where a person is born (ius soli) or (ii) on kinship (ius sanguinis) (Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, 2001, p.17), or some combination of both.

Isin (2012) argues that birth as a ground for granting membership status conflicts with two assumptions of who belongs to the political community, the consent and choice to be part of it. Highlighting the argument raised in the question ``how could it be that political membership, something which is so crucial for our identity, for our rights, for our political voice and for our life opportunities, is distributed on the basis of accidents of birth?'', Shachar introduces the concept of "jus nexi citizenship" grounded in the individual's relation to a polity (Shachar, 2009 cited in Isin, 2012). In a similar manner, Weber argues that consent and fraternity rather than blood and kinship should be founding elements of political community and citizenship (Weber, 1909 cited in Isin, 2012).

Scholars of citizenship studies have tried to unpack and explain the concept of citizenship. Thomas H. Marshall (1964) developed a concept that explains citizenship through civic, political and social rights (cited in Delanty, 1997). Olson (2006) extended Marshall's concept of citizenship and developed a new concept of "reflexive democracy" where citizens decide the meaning of citizenship (cited in Schall, 2012). Bauböck conceptualised citizenship by distinguishing three dimensions, "first, citizenship as a political and legal status, second, as legal rights and duties attached to this status, and, third, individual practices, dispositions and identities attributed to, or expected from those who hold the status" (Bauböck, 2006, p.16). Weber argues that "unity of residency, administrative subjection, democratic participation and cultural membership" constitutes an ideal model of citizenship in the modern world (cited Benhabiib, 2004, p.144).

Identity, rights, duties and participation are key dimensions of citizenship through which can be defined the relation between the political community and the citizens (Delanty, 1997; Siklodi, 2015). On the basis of these dimensions different models of citizenship each emphasising a different dimension have been developed (Delanty, 1997). Citizenship shapes the citizens position in the society and with it the political system where the citizens exercise their rights. Distinguishing between exclusive R democracy and inclusive L democracy, Miler (2009) argues that national identity as dimension of the citizenship other than exclusion increases the chances for oppression of the minority group from the majority group. The active rights and the active capacities to influence politics, that one citizenship contains, are the ground for the existence of democracy (Janoski and Gran, 2002, p.13). Therefore, citizenship that interferes with the active rights to influence the politics challenges the concept of democracy.

The understanding of political membership is a complex issue that is shaped by the social and political context (Beckman, 2006). Existing models on membership argue on different criteria as a ground that should define the demos.

The ethnic nationalism membership model defines the demos based on ethnic relations, shared common cultural and social affinity and not on the relation with the

state or territory (Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010). This model restricts the inclusion of the residents' non-nationals. Delanty (1997) argues that this model should not be criticized for creating exclusion unless it creates negative identification of the "other". The liberal nationalist model favoured by David Miler allows naturalization as a path for immigrants to include themselves in the political community (Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010).

The second model of membership is based on the "all affected principle". In a broad interpretation it argues that all those affected by a political decision should be included in the process of making it (Beckman, 2006; Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010; Owen, 2011). Based on the ways someone can be

affected, this model has a number of interpretations. The causal interpretation argues that "laws and policies have causal effect on people's life" and therefore people should have the right to make decisions on them (Beckman, 2006). The contributivist view argues that everyone who pays taxes and contributes to the public finances should have the right to be included in political decisions (Beckman, 2006). The legal view argues that anyone who is subject to the authority of the state and is under its legal system should have the right to participate in the decisions of making it (Beckman, 2006). Using the legal view argumentation has developed the "all subjected principle" (Owen, 2011). In general, this model has been criticized for over inclusiveness and practical challenges in defining the group affected (Nykaza and McGhee, 2015; Miller, 2009; Bauböck, 2015).

Bauböck advocates stakeholder citizenship as a model of membership. This model argues that politics influences citizens' wellbeing and with political participation, citizens can shape the future politics (Owen, 2011). Based on this, it advocates that all non-national residents who fulfil the following criteria should be a given a citizenship; "The individual must rely on the community for the protection of their basic rights and the individual, and the individual must be, have been, or will be subject to that community's political authorities for a significant period over the course of their lives" (Bauböck, 2007 cited in Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010).

The social membership model developed by Rubino Marin (2000) and Carens (1989, 2005) bases the membership on two arguments, firstly, it's a social fact that living in a society makes one its member where the person develops attachment and connections with the society and secondly, living in a society means being under the political authority of that society (cited in Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010; Owen, 2011). Advocating for open borders, Carens (1987) argues that membership should be granted to all those who want to be members, have rights and responsibilities towards the state and choose to cooperate.

That being said, citizenship defines the members of the political community while acting as a mechanism that provides full political rights, allowing citizens to actively participate in the political life of the state. As one of the basic human rights, the right to political participation is guaranteed under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), the European Convention on Human Rights (1950). Therefore, the models of membership should guarantee the citizens protection of this essential right and prevent exclusion of any potential group that is treated with political deprivation and underrepresentation.

EU citizenship and membership

The European citizenship may be considered as a "world's first example of fully institutionalised trans, or post-national political rights beyond the nation state" (Favell, 2016). It was introduced in the Treaty of Maastricht (1992) and extended in the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997), the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe (2004) and Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union - Treaty of Lisbon (2007).

As noted in the Maastricht Treaty (1992) "every national of a Member State shall be a citizen of the European Union. Citizenship of the Union shall be additional to national citizenship, it shall not replace it". EU citizenship is "destined to be fundamental status of nationals of the Member States" and enables the citizens "who find themselves in the same situation to enjoy the same treatment in law

irrespective of the nationality" in any Member State (European Court of Justice, 2001 cited in Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010). Following the above, EU citizenship guarantees treatment equal to the native citizens in every Member State. Bearing in mind the political rights that come with one's citizenship and the dimensions it contains, EU citizenship challenges the traditional concepts of membership.

According to the Maastricht Treaty, the national laws are not influenced by the EU (Geddes, 2008, p.48). Therefore, EU citizenship is based on the national models of membership, constitutionally defined in the Member States (Delanty, 1997). Consequently, EU citizenship cannot be analysed in general, but it should be analysed vis-a-vis specific state models of membership. Lansbergen and Shaw (2010) argue that contextualised discourse on EU citizenship through national constitutions provides "multifaceted understanding of the nuanced operation of European citizenship across the multilevel Euro polity and highlights the implications for nation constitutional models that struggle to accommodate the required changes ".

Bearing in mind the EU is not the same political construct as a state, the traditional concepts of citizenship are not compatible with the concept of EU citizenship (Schall, 2012). Therefore, though EU citizenship is strongly rooted in the national context of the states, it is completely separate from it (Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010). Given the nature of EU citizenship, other concepts such as post-national citizenship and nested citizenship have been proposed (Schall, 2012).

Following Marshall's concept of citizenship, Schall (2012) explains that the EU citizenship weaknesses are undeveloped social rights and partially developed political rights while its biggest assets are the developed civic rights (right to work, education, healthcare, etc.). In the EU the social rights, which promote participation in the community and are related to active citizenship, are still national account (Schall, 2012). The Maastricht Treaty recognises the voting rights as political rights (Schall, 2012). The EU citizenship "gives every EU citizen the right to vote for and stand as a candidate in municipal and European Parliament elections in whichever EU country the citizen resides, under the same conditions as nationals" (European Commission, 2016), wherefrom it does not guarantee full political rights in the country of residence.

Recognizing the participation and multi identification as substantive challenges to the EU citizenship, Delanty (1997) argues that the EU citizenship is in danger of incorporating the disadvantages of global citizenship and nationalism (low participation and weak inclusion). The participation as a citizenship dimension particularly affects the EU movers, who although are more interested in politics, are less politically participative and have lower turnout in local and national elections in their country of origin (Pioneur project, 2003). Following the critiques mentioned above, Delanty (1997) suggests that EU citizenship based on residency will be substantive and will enforce bigger participation and inclusion, not only for the EU movers but also for other international citizens that live in the EU. The study "Participatory Citizenship in the European Union" based on findings of the theory, policy, practices and levels of engagement in 27 EU countries recognises barriers to participation and suggests a number of recommendations towards overcoming barriers to Participatory Citizenship in Europe (Hoskins and Kerr, 2012).

Following the presented dimensions of citizenship, models of membership and challenges within the EU citizenship, in the following subsections the analysis will be focused on the question of identity as a component of EU citizenship and its role in defining the EU citizens' membership. Analysis, will also

further address the issue of participation in the EU citizenship and in particular how free movement challenges the EU movers' membership and political participation.

The identity as a dimension in the EU citizenship

Identity as one of the core dimensions of citizenship directly influences political rights. Assumed identification with the community entitles the citizens to the right to participate in its governance. However, the EU citizenship and free movement challenged the relation between identity, citizenship and political rights.

The nation-state membership positioned the nationality and identity as citizenship (Isin and Wood, 1999, p.156). However, the equation between nationality and citizenship is no longer applicable to the modern state and can work against the democratic principles (Balibar 2001, p.37 cited in Isin, 2012). Citizenship and identity are two different concepts, where "citizenship is more of a concept of status than identity" (Isin and Wood, 1999, p.19). Individual who are entitled to political rights are assumed to have fixed identity on which those rights have been entitled (Benhabiib, 2004, p. 168). However, the political identities are not static "political identities are endogenous and not exogenous to processes of democratic iteration and the formation of rights" (Benhabiib, 2004, p.169). The national identity is not fixed (Boswell, 2003, p.76-77) and the modern nation state imposes master identity that includes more parts of the self that require political representation (Janoski and Gran, 2002, p. 38-42). Therefore, the identity cannot be reduced to nationality and should be recognised as alternative identities to allow membership to the political community (Delanty, 1997).

The state shapes the identity and defines the belonging and borders are an integral part of these processes (Madsen and Naerssen, 2003). The feeling of home for a country that is not a place of origin changes the migrants' national identity (Madsen and Naerssen, 2003). The experience of residency in another country has been recognized as relevant to the construction of national identities and there is emerging literature on modes of belonging that tries to explain how migrants construct their identities in relation to different places, groups and countries (Christiansen and Hedetoft 2004, Rummens 2003, Sicakkan and Lithman 2004 cited in Bauböck, 2006, p.19). Citizens build their political identity and constitute their political membership based on their experience with the government agencies and social policies (Schall, 2012). Therefore, the experience of residency in a different country plays a significant role in the process of identity development. Following the above, free movement represents firm ground for emerging new alternative identities among the movers population.

The trends of immigration in the recent history forced many European countries to "re-evaluate and revise traditional notions of citizenship and identity" and set new broader conceptions of membership and national identity (Boswell, 2003, p.76). The expansion of national borders and identities is one of the essential aspects of the long-term viability of the EU (Madsen and Naerssen, 2003). Therefore, some see the development of European identity as one of the core aspects of European integration (Fligstein, Polyakova and Sandholtz, 2012). MacCormick (1997) and Chryssochoou (1996) suggest that EU citizenship does not necessarily need common identity if European law can ensure truly democratic community (cited in Schall, 2012).

Research findings showed that the more positive the perception of Europe is, the stronger European identity is, and increased degree of cognitive mobilization and higher level of education increases the identification with Europe (Medrano and Gutiérrez, 2010). Bruter (2004) distinguishes two aspects of

citizens' political identity, a cultural component that speaks about the citizens' sense of belonging to the European continent and a civic component that is established through citizens' identification with the EU's political structures (cited in Siklodi, 2015).

EU Institutions promote the EU identity as alternative national identification aiming to develop sense of belonging and cohesion among the people of Europe (Moreira, 2000; Favell, 2016). In 2014, 65% of Europeans said they felt like citizens of the EU, 51% of them described themselves primarily by their nationality and only 2% saw themselves just as Europeans (Eurobarometer, 2014). Half of the EU movers have "so-called 'tripartite' territorial identities" that includes the nationalities of origin, residency and feeling of belonging to the EU. The other 50% of EU movers are divided into three groups: "first, those who identify with both the country of origin and the country of residency but have not developed a feeling of belonging to the EU, second, those who have experienced identity conflict between the country of origin and country of residency with identity and feel attached to either one of those in addition to the EU, and third, those who hold only one identity, or no territorial identity at all (Pioneur project, 2003). Based on this, it can be inferred that for now the European identity is an added layer to the national identity which is based on the territory of the state, its long history and culture (Favell, 2016; Medrano and Gutiérrez, 2010).

Mobile Europeans have a greater tendency to identify as Europeans (Schall, 2015; Favell, 2016). For EU movers, the EU identity enables them to find "midway between their otherwise incompatible national and regional identities" and feel comfortable with (Rother and Nebe, 2009 cited in Favell, 2016). It also allows "de–nationalized" identity that enables more individualistic life (Favell, 2016). EU identity among movers varies according to the country context, education and social-economic factors (Siklodi, 2015).

Following the above, for now it seems hard to argue that European identity is the identification that comes with EU citizenship. At the same time the process of migration within the Union encouraged by free movement changes and shapes the national identities. EU movers can develop variations of identities that are not necessarily based exclusively on the country of origin or country of residency. Based on this, the function of the identity as a component in the EU citizenship can be questioned.

Free movement and EU integration

Free movement of people, services, goods and capital within the EU is an essential part of EU citizenship (Geddes, 2000, 2008). According to Article 21 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (2007), "every citizen of the Union shall have the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States". Free movement extended national borders and entitled EU citizens to rights they can exercise in every Member State. However, the rights that come with EU citizenship can be activated only if citizens move to another EU state (Siklodi, 2015). Therefore, EU citizenship and rights attached to it, generally affect mobile EU citizens.

Free movement as an essential part of the EU brings benefits to the Union as a

whole (European Commission 2010, cited in Siklodi, 2015). In January 2015 it was estimated that 15.3 million EU citizens live in Member States with citizenship from another Member State (Eurostat, 2016). Knowing the increasing number of young mobile Europeans (Erasmus +, 2015) and the fact that this population is more likely to be mobile later in their life and work in other EU states

(European Commission 2010, cited in Siklodi, 2015), suggests an expected increase in movement in the Union.

The process of migration is more than a physical relocation, it is also a change of jurisdiction and membership (Zolberg, 1989, cited in Geddes, 2008, p.24). Borders differentiate international from internal migration. Free movement within the EU challenged the borders within the Union, as well as the concepts of membership, identity and sovereignty which traditionally have been defined towards the state borders (Geddes, 2008, p.17-31). However, integrated Europe should embrace the challenges coming with the concepts of membership, identity and sovereignty (Geddes, 2000, p.13).

Geddes distinguishes territorial, organizational (access to social and political institutions) and conceptual borders (notions of identity, belonging and entitlement) to explain European migration and the way in which European states make sense of migration (Geddes, 2008, p. 24-41). This free movement changed the territorial and organizational borders and at the same time raised the question of conceptual borders or "who we are" (Geddes, 2008, p.48). Furthermore, the legal residency without nationality raised the question "who are the people" of the state (Geddes, 2000, p.1).

The social movement within Europe drives European integration (Favell, 2016). In a broad way, integration can be defined as a process of immigrants' incorporation in the economy, society and political life of the receiving country (Boswell, 2003, p.75; Geddes, 2008, p.19), therefore European integration is associated with legal, political, institutional and social power (Geddes, 2008, p.17).

Social theories use different interpretations on the meaning of inclusion, which is reflected in the Members States national policy frameworks that demonstrate the deferring nature of the problem of inclusion and exclusion (Geddes, 2000, p. 166). Low incorporation in the receiving countries not only influences the migrants' wellbeing, but it impacts the receiving country's social, economic and cultural life (Boswell, 2003, p.74). Moreover, Geddes is arguing that "inclusion may be of more relevance to the stability of the system than to the interest of the included" (Geddes, 2000 p.136). The patterns of inclusion and exclusion differ in every country and are based on the country's adopted ideologues on migration that concern the concepts of citizenship, belonging, rights and responsibilities of members and obligation to non-members (Boswell, 2003, p.6). At the EU level, the exclusion and inclusion are based on EU migration policies, EU devotion on social inclusion and activism of the stakeholders in migration policies at an EU level (Geddes, 2000, p.30).

Between multiculturalism, which allows equal coexistence of diverse minority groups, and assimilation that expects immigrants to adopt the receiving country's values, characteristics and norms, European governments have adopted an integration approach that stands between these two concepts (Boswell, 2003, p.75-76). The integration approach is linked to the way the state constitutes their national identity and meaning of membership (Boswell, 2003, p.76). However, the citizens' integration is related to more factors than just the model of membership. The social exclusion of migrants can derive from the ideologies that use phenotypical or cultural differences that address the migrants' economic, social and political positions (Bovenkerk et. al., 1991 cited in Geddes, 2000, p.30). Other factors that influence the exclusion are differing national historical traditions (Geddes, 2000, p.30), public discourse on migration, highlighting the migrants' impact on the host society (Boswell, 2003, p.96-98). Generally, profiling the migrants as problematic hinders their identification and loyalty to the society and harms their integration (Boswell, 2003, p.93).

Political integration of EU movers

The free movement within the Union raised concerns about socio-economic and political integration of long-term residents into receiving countries (Boswell, 2003, p.74). The combination of "restrictive immigration policies and social and political exclusion of the settled migrants and their descendants" is a barrier to Fortress Europe (Geddes, 2000, p.15). Guiraudon (2000) points out that many EU movers acquire their legal and social rights before the political rights (cited in Geddes, 2008, p.57). Immigrants' political integration, which refers to the voting rights and the right to stand for elections, in most of the countries is seen as the final stage of integration (Boswell, 2003, p.75).

EU citizenship breaks the link between the legal, political and social rights that come with one citizenship (Geddes, 2008, p.57). According to the Maastricht Treaty EU citizenship is granted on nationality rather than residency (Bommes and Geddes, 2000 cited in Geddes, 2008, p.58). The jus sanguinis citizenship, which is adopted in most of the EU states, initiates political exclusion for the citizens who do not have the citizenship of the state of residency (Kozlowski, 1994).

The inconsistency of residency and nationality within EU citizenship created limitations to the political rights that EU movers can claim in the country of residency. Moreover, it developed group of "voteless" Europeans. According to the legislation of several Member States (Ireland, Hungary, Denmark, Malta, Austria and United Kingdom), their nationals are disenfranchised if they live in another Member State for a certain period of time. Therefore, the citizens who lost their right to vote in their country of origin and did not acquire citizenship from the Member State where they reside do not have a right to participate in any national elections (EU Commission, 2010 cited in Owen, 2013)

Research on international migration in the EU show that voting rights strongly influence electoral engagement in both the country of destination and country of origin (Chaudhary, 2016). Voting rights might influence political behaviour as they

contribute to a feeling of belonging in the community (Somers, 2008 cited in Schall, 2012; Nykaza and McGhee, 2015) and individuals tend to identify with those units that provide them with a greater sense of control (Lawler, 1992 cited in Medrano and Gutiérrez, 2010).

Political participation includes diverse actions that the Houses of Parliament (2015) divides it into formal and informal. The formal political participation includes official forums and processes, such as elections, political parties, etc. while the informal participation happens outside official settings and includes a range of 'bottom-up' activities such as; online activism, signing a petition, purchasing or boycotting products for political reasons, discussing politics with friends and family, etc. (Houses of Parliament, 2015). After arriving in their new countries, migrants experience political resocialisation (Waldinger, 2008 cited in Chaudhary, 2016). Based on the migrants' manifested political behaviour a typology of citizens–selves is developed that divides the citizens as (1)active - citizens participants, (2)passive - citizens subjects and (3)inactive - aliens and neglected citizens (Janoski and Gran, 2002, p.39).

The transnational political engagement in the country of origin and country of destination are two distinctive processes that are determined by different factors (Chaudhary, 2016). The political participation in the host country is affected by the context of both the host country and the country

of origin (Zapata-Barrero, et al., 2013; Chaudhary, 2016). There is a recognised positive relation between the institutional context and opportunities in the host country and the manifested political activity trends in the country of destination (Geddes, 2000, p.31; Zapata-Barrero, et al., 2013; Katsiaficas, 2014). However, increased opportunity for democratic participation does not necessarily increase participation (Schall, 2012).

According to Verba (1972) education is an essential component of the patterns of migrants' political participation (cited in Lamprianou, 2013). Studies found that the level of language knowledge, socioeconomic factors and length of residency are positively related to migrants' political engagement (Stoll and Wong, 2007; Zapata-

Barrero, et al., 2013; Chaudhary, 2016). Furthermore, political participation can be influenced by self-identification and feeling of belonging in the host country (Zapata-Barrero, et al., 2013) as well as family relations, specifically marriage (Chaudhary, 2016).

In conclusion, EU citizenship guarantees residency without membership. Therefore, a subject of further analysis will be the impact of access to political rights on political integration and participation of settled EU migrants in Member States different to their home state.

The EU referendum in the UK

The United Kingdom is one of the oldest Member States of the EU. It has been part of the single market, which is based on the principles of freedom of movement of goods, capital, services and people within the Union. After 43 years, the UK decided to re-asses its membership in the Union calling for a referendum. On June, 23rd 2016 the referendum was held, in which the majority of the UK citizens (51.9%) voted in favour of leaving the Union (The Electoral Commission, 2016).

In the referendum debate, a major argument of the Leave campaign was the free movement of people (Wadsworth et. all, 2016). Arguing that the country cannot control its own border, the Leave campaign was claiming that the UK has a high number of EU citizens who influence the UK citizens' quality of life by taking jobs and reducing wages (Wadsworth et. all, 2016). The anti-immigration discourse in the referendum debate highlighted the negative impact of the free movement and UK based EU residents on the UK. Despite this, the Leave campaigners were quite supportive of economic free trade with the EU (Centre for Economic Performance, 2016). This phenomenon is recognised as the "liberal paradox", which is characterized by openness towards movement of goods, capital and services and opposition toward movement of people (Geddes, 2008, p.26-27). Ruhs and Chang (2004) explain that one reason for this phenomenon is the rights that come with the people who reside and implications that the new residents have toward the societies

(cited in Geddes, 2008, p.26-27).

According to the voting criteria, all British and Commonwealth citizens residing in the UK were eligible to vote on the referendum, a rule applicable for general elections in the UK (The Electoral Commission, 2016). This ethnic nationalism model of state membership excluded all EU citizens who lived for many years in the country based on their EU citizenship.

As outlined in the text above, though the EU citizenship guarantees equal positions for all Europeans in every Member State, it does not involve membership in the state of residency. (Delanty, 1997). Therefore, the EU residents in the UK based on their EU citizenship ensure their residency in the UK

but not their membership in the country. Using an ethnic nationalism model of membership, the UK does not consider EU residents as its members and it does not include them in its demos. The challenges of identity and participation as dimensions in EU citizenship (Delanty, 1997; Schall 2012) raises question how these dimensions affect the citizens who regulate their status in the UK based on the EU citizenship. The active right to participate in the politics of society are basic grounds for democracy (Janoski and Gran, 2002, p.13-14; Koslowski, 1994). Therefore, it is crucial to understand how the noted challenges in the EU citizenship affect the engagement in the political affairs of the EU citizens who base their status on the EU citizenship.

Following the above, this study explores how long-term EU residents in the UK develop their feeling of membership and how their perspectives correspond with the models of membership (Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010; Beckman, 2006; Owen, 2011). The analysis will use the EU referendum as a case to analyse the dimensions of identity and participation in EU citizenship, as well as to explore how the ethnic nationalism model of membership interferes with the EU citizens' political participation. Specifically, the research focuses on how EU long-term residents in the UK construct their political identities, how they perceive their position as political actors in the UK, and how they engage in political affairs.

Methodology

Research strategy and research design

The research explores how the existing concepts of political participation and integration apply to long-term EU residents in the UK and specifically focuses on the case of the EU long-term UK residents' engagement on the EU referendum. Based on this, the research has a deductive research strategy (Bryman, 2012, p.24; Vaus, 2001, p.6-8; Blaikie, 2010, p.85-87).

This study focuses on the phenomenology of the context and explores the subjective understandings of the social actions, wherefrom it bases on interpretivist epistemology and constructionism ontology (Bryman, 2012, p.28–34). The research is based on cross- sectional research design (Vaus, 2001, p.170-193). It is a one-time measurement, the data provides only a snapshot of the researched questions in the specifically defined population. The research was conducted in the period from 3rd to 22nd of June 2016, in Birmingham, London, and Liverpool. Therefore, the data was collected in the same social and political context and it was not influenced by the results of the referendum.

The overarching question of the research is:

- How the EU long-term residents in the UK construct their identities as political members of the UK?

The research will focus on the following sub-questions:

1. How do the long-term EU residents in the UK explain their national identities and state membership?

2. How the long-term EU citizens based in the UK explain their political integration in the UK?

3. How the long-term EU citizens based in the UK engaged on the EU referendum?

Based on the nature of the research questions which require in–depth insights on the topic, qualitative interviews were used as a data collection method. This research does not aim to generalise the findings, but to explore the research topic in the specific population of interest. The interview as a method provided more meaningful and detailed data on the participants' experiences, behaviours, feelings and thoughts on the researched issue (Arksey and Knight, 1999, p.32-42). The conducted interviews were semi-structured (Dencombe, 1998, p.113; Arksey and Knight, 1999, p.2-9). The relevant topics and themes were defined before the interviews were conducted and structured in the interview guide. The interview guide contains 4 main topics and 41 open-ended questions. However, depending on the dynamic of the conversation the questions were differently ordered and depending on the content provided in the answers different sub questions were used.

Population and sample

The population of this research is EU citizens who have been living in the UK for five or more years and do not have British citizenship. The criteria of five years residency in the UK is based on the criteria required for British naturalization, which assumes that in this period the residents can integrate and naturalize in the UK (British Nationality Act, Chapter 18 Section 6, 1981). The interviews were conducted on voter population which means that all participants were older than 18. According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Labour Force Survey for 2015 there are 3.3 million EU citizens living in the UK (Migration Watch UK, 2016). However, there is no statistic on the number of the EU residents who have lived in the UK for five or more years.

The sample was developed with two non–probabilistic sampling strategies, snowball and purposive sampling methods (Blaikie, 2010, p.176-180). Researching a population that is difficult to identify, the snowball sampling was a very useful strategy. Based on this strategy, the participants recommended other EU citizens

who they know that have been living in the UK for a longer period. The purposive sampling strategy is used when the research requires some specific profiles or cases (Blaikie, 2010, p.176-180). Therefore, this strategy was used to recruit EU members of the campaigns and organizations that lobbied for the UK to remain in the EU and for representatives from EU communities and organizations in Birmingham. This sample is not representative for the whole population of EU long-term residents in the UK, but it provides rich qualitative data that contributes to better understanding of the population.

The sample contains thirteen interviewees, including four representatives of organizations that work with EU communities in the UK. In order to capture more variations in the population, the sample includes diverse profiles in terms of age, length of residency, gender, education, employment status, marital status, country of origin, children and migration history. It should be noted that the sample includes more educated participants and they all are employed or full time students, which makes their status in the UK more stable. In addition, one of the participants has been living for 4 years in the UK, but was included in the sample because of his experience in the referendum campaigns.

Methods for data analysis

The analysis aims to unpack the participants' perspectives, their understanding, experience, behaviour and feelings on the researched concepts. Focusing on the content of the narrative,

thematic analysis as the method for data analysis was used. Thematic analysis focuses on "what is said", rather than "how," "to whom," or "for what purposes" (Riessman, 2008). Within this method, the narrative can be analysed as biographical account in whole (Riessman, 2008), or it can be fragmented in themes that emerge from the data (Bryman, 2012, p.578 -581). For this analysis the Framework approach for thematic analysis was used. This approach was developed by the National Centre for Social Research in the UK as a general strategy for thematic analysis in qualitative data (Bryman, 2012, p.579). This method constructs

an index of central themes and subthemes. The themes and sub-themes can emerge "through reading and re-reading of the transcripts and field notes" (Bryman, 2012, p.579). In this research the themes and sub-themes were strongly influenced by the topics defined in the interview guide. The data analysis was divided in three key themes, each including different numbers of subthemes.

The first theme explores the participants' constructions of their national identities and membership. It includes questions on national and migrant identities, understanding of membership and feeling of belonging and perspectives on citizenship.

The second theme analyses the participants' perceptions of their political integration in the UK as well as their perceived political influence in the state. It involves their experiences with political participation and interest in politics (UK and place of origin) and explores their understanding of voting rights and argumentation towards it.

The third theme focuses on the participants' engagement on the EU referendum. Particularly, it explores their emotional reactions, actions they make, their perceptions on their influence and the influence of the EU community in the UK on the referendum outcome, actions they consider to take in case of Brexit and assumed consequences to them in case of Brexit.

Ethics and research limitation

Before conducting the research, all relevant ethical principles for social research were considered (Bryman, 2012, p.135). Before the interview, all participants signed informed consent. With signed consent, all interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed afterwards. For the participants who wanted to stay anonymous names were changed in the transcripts and analysis. The records were protected and saved in locked folders. The interviews were conducted in a setting that was comfortable for the participants and guaranteed privacy and anonymity. The research did not have any potential to harm the participants in any way.

One of the research's limitations is the sample size. It is small and it limits the analysis for discussing any potential relations and variances between the researched and relevant variables. Moreover, all participants speak English fluently, are employed and educated. Therefore, these relevant factors cannot be taken into account to the analysis of the participants' political participation. As a result of the sample size and the sampling strategies utilised, the findings cannot be generalised to the researched population. Finally, based on the qualitative nature of the research, the researcher has potential influence on the objectivity of the analysis.

Results

Following the previously defined research questions, the findings will be discussed in three topics: identification, belonging and citizenship; political integration of EU nationals who are long-term residents in the UK and engagement of EU residents in the UK in the EU referendum.

Identification, belonging and citizenship

This part of the study analyses how EU nationals, who have been long-term residents in the UK explain their membership, belonging and national identity. Specifically, it explores the relation between national identification and the feeling of belonging, as well as the feeling of membership in relation to their citizenship status.

It discusses two findings. Firstly, interviewees in this study feel like members of the UK without identifying themselves as British. For them national identity is predominantly based on the place of birth, with the feeling of belonging and membership on the place of residence. Following the above, it can be inferred that national identity is more resistant to changes than the feeling of belonging and membership. Based on the interviewees' experience, it can be said that the principle of nationality-based membership is not always applicable to settled EU migrants in the UK. Secondly, as a result of the nature of EU citizenship, interviewees had developed their membership and feeling of belonging in the UK without necessarily considering making it official. That being said, the feeling of membership and belonging in the country is not always related to one's official status of membership or to having citizenship. Membership and belonging are measured with the questions of (a) what do you consider a member of a society, (b) do you see yourself as a member of the UK and (c) where do you consider your home, while national identity with open ended question (a) how would you describe your national identity.

National identity and membership

In the explanations of national identities, variations can be noticed ranging from strong identification with the place of origin to a mixed identity with the country of origin and the UK or Europe and a strong European identity. In contrast, the answers on belonging and membership vary from strong attachment to the UK to mixed attachment to the UK and the country of origin.

Although none of the participants identify strongly as British, the feeling of belonging in the UK dominates in the answers on membership. The feeling of the UK as a home occurs even when there is a strong identification with the country of origin. Strong national identity of another country does not interfere with the feeling of belonging in the UK. Emma, who identifies herself strongly as German and has been living in the UK for 17 years, says: "home is the UK, sometimes I talk of Germany as home but that is just a language, home is definitely here". With a similar position Martyn says:

> "I still feel Polish I don't feel English but I feel England is my home…. I am living here and I feel like a part of this country, and anything affecting the country affects me as well…I feel like part of the UK no matter if I am a British citizen or not" (Martyn, living in the UK for 10 years).

European identification in this research occurs in two forms: as a broader layer to the national identity and as dominant national identification. In some cases, where the European identity is the

dominant identity, the national identity related to a specific country does appear. The feeling of a European identity influences the feeling and understanding of belonging and membership. Vladimir, who describes himself as Bulgarian and European and has been living in the UK for 4 years, says: "home is anywhere in Europe for me". Similarly, Marco from Italy, who has been living in the UK for 19 years and describe himself just as European, says: "this is Europe, this is my country, my country is Europe. Italy is a region, the UK is a region, so as long as I am in the UK I am at home".

Although national identification is predominantly related to the place of birth, the experience of long-term residency in the UK can affect this feeling. Sofia, who was born in Germany, has been living in the UK for 19 years and has a British partner, says that she feels British–German. Also, Petar who has been living in Birmingham for 12 years developed local identity with the city and describe himself as "Slovakian and Brummie". However, the strength of identification with the country of origin is not necessarily influenced by the length of stay in the UK or by the experience of having family in the UK. For example, Marta, who has been living in the UK for 12 years, is married to a British citizen and has two UK-born children, feels very strongly about her Czech nationality. Therefore, the changes in national identity are more complex and are related to more factors than simply the length of residency and established family relations.

Established family relations in the UK can increase the feeling of belonging. Emma, who describes herself as German and has two UK-born children, explains what it means for her to be a member of society:

> "Working, paying taxes, having children who go to school, that made a difference to me. Certainly I feel more of a member or more having the right to be a member of a society because I have children who go to school here, that made a big difference".

Other factors that contribute to the feeling of membership and belonging for the interviewees are: contributing to society, working, paying taxes, occupying the space, using public services, having friends and good relations with the community, enjoying rights and responsibilities to the society.

For some, it takes more than the above mentioned factors to develop their feeling of membership. The process of developing belonging is an individual process that is not necessarily related to one specific place. Lukas, who has been living in London for 5 years, when asked about his home, says:

> "I consider Lithuania as my home but I am not really decided about that, about all these borders, how much we need that and how real it is, whether it is necessary. You are just born in some spot of the world at one time, does this mean that some other spot belongs to other people just because they are born there?...Lithuania is still my home, but it's becoming a grey area for me, it is difficult".

National identity is not always a significant identity with which people relate themselves. Thirty-year-old Eleni who has been living in the UK for 5 years says: "I was born in Greece but that is all really, I don't feel Greek, I can just say I was born in Greece".

Membership and citizenship

Although most of the participants feel like members of the UK and fulfil the criteria for citizenship, they had never applied for British citizenship. They have different reasons why they made this decision, but the dominant reason is the nature of EU citizenship. As a result of the rights that EU

citizens enjoy in the UK, they have not felt the need to acquire British citizenship. Therefore, the feeling of membership is not always related to the official status of membership.

> "I always thought I am an EU citizen and I am absolutely fine with it. What if I move one day to a different EU country? I don't need to collect citizenships. I am actually fine with being German and European, that is all I need" (Anna, University Lecturer, living in the UK for 9 years).
>
> "Why should I take up British citizenship, I am European, I don't need it" (Marco, from Italy, company owner, living in the UK for 19 years).

Some EU countries do not allow dual citizenship. This is a significant barrier for naturalization in another country. For example, Petar never applied for British citizenship because if he did he would lose his Slovak citizenship, which he considers a very difficult decision. Strong identification with the country of origin can also influence the decision. For example, Marta explains her decision not to apply for British citizenship by saying:

> "Partly because I feel very Czech, I don't identify with being British. I live here but I am not British, these are two different things. Unless I am pushed into the corner that it will be more beneficial to me to have the British citizenship, I am not going to apply for it…. I feel happy being a Czech".

Another barrier mentioned by a few participants is the high expense and the demanding procedure of naturalization. Sofia, who identifies herself as British–German and feels a strong belonging to the UK, did not apply for British citizenship in the beginning, because she did not have the right to dual citizenship and now because of the procedure.

> "When I looked at the procedure, I was really disheartening. I needed to spend over 2,000 pounds and to pass all those tests. I have been living in this country for such a long time, working for the university and local authority and I am in civil partnership with a British person, and despite this, I have to go through all those citizenship tests" (Sofia).

Political integration of EU nationals who are long-term residents in the UK

Political integration is one of the crucial dimensions of integration in a society. In this research, political integration was analysed against questions on perceptions of political integration in the UK, interest in politics and political engagement both in the country of origin and in the UK.

In this section, two findings are discussed. Firstly, the political integration of the interviewed long-term EU residents in the UK is predominantly influenced by their voting rights. Additional factors to political engagement, noticed by the interviewees are their perception of how politics affects them, self-identification as migrants, general interest in politics and free time. Secondly, most of the interviewees justify the voting rights based on the "affected principle" and "contributivist and legal view", underlying their long-term contribution to the country, while some strongly oppose political rights grounded just on nationality. Therefore, most of the participants believe they should have the right to vote in the UK general elections.

Political integration and political participation in the UK

Although all interviewees feel very integrated in the UK, many do not feel politically integrated. The dominant barrier to their political integration that they identify is the lack of voting rights in general elections. For some, this is also the main reason why they do not engage in UK politics in any way.

> "I don't feel politically integrated, because I can't vote. I can't vote in the national election and I can't vote in the referendum so I am not integrated and that is a disgrace for me. I feel very invested, I follow the news and I am informed but ultimately I don't have a saying, so I don't feel fully integrated. I feel like what I have to say doesn't matter, for example, on Facebook debates, the fact that I can't vote holds me back" (Marija, Team Manager in the City Council of Birmingham, aged 48, has been living in the UK for 28 years).

Voting rights influence Marija's engagement overall. When explaining why she is not engaged in UK politics she says:

> "There is a part of me that feels hollow because I can't vote so I can never do that basic thing of putting the ballot in the box. I am less politically invested in general and I think a lot of it has to do with not having the right to vote. It just doesn't seem ultimately like the whole thing [other forms of political participation] goes to conclusion; ultimately it doesn't matter, because what I say doesn't matter. This is how I feel, my opinion doesn't count" (Marija).

With a similar position, Emma from Germany explains:

> "I don't feel politically integrated mostly because I can't vote in elections, apart from the local and European ones. I vote in local elections but I find them fairly insignificant. Because I can't vote in the national election I don't feel politically integrated at all".

She describes herself as an "outlooker" and "men of no land in terms of politics" because she believes that she can just observe UK politics and cannot influence it and at the same time, she is not interested or engaged in German politics because it does not affect her.

For some, voting rights influence the political power they feel they have. When asked about his engagement in UK politics, 29 year-old Jakub, who has been living in the UK since he was 21, says:

> "Because of my passport I can be more involved in shaping or think that I can shape the government of Poland because I can vote in all of the elections…But here I have a blockade because of where I come from, because of being a migrant. I would love to be more engaged here because I have been living all my adult life here, but I can't".

For the big communities, such as the Eastern European community which is the largest EU community in the UK (The Migration Observatory, 2016), the voting rights can affect the feeling of representation of the community's interests in UK institutions. Petar, representative of an NGO for Eastern European citizens in the West Midlands points out that the lack of a vote on general elections not only affects his political integration in the UK but also it affects the representation of the Eastern European community's voice in UK institutions.

The differences and the inconsistency of the national voting regulations in the EU states can create "voteless" citizens among the EU mobile citizens. Sofia and Emma have been living in the UK for 19

and 17 years respectively and are not registered residents in Germany. According to the German laws, only German citizens who are registered residents in the country can vote. At the same time, because they do not have British citizenship they cannot vote in general elections in the UK. Therefore, Emma and Sofia cannot decide either on the future of German or UK politics. Based on this experience, it can be inferred that with the free movement, the current concept of EU citizenship and autonomy of the state members to decide the national voting systems can create cases of citizens who cannot enjoy full political rights in any country.

The identity of a migrant also seems to play a role in the lower political engagement for some participants. Fernando, who has been living in the UK for 14 years and has a British wife and two UK-born children and who is very interested in politics, says that his position as a migrant influences his political behaviour: "I don't want to raise any political debates here in the UK because the things I say, being a migrant, may be perceived in a different way". Also Marija, explains that she feels as she is differently perceived by others because she is not a native: "I feel very reduced by being a foreigner".

According to some participants, the public discourse on migration, political movements and social changes affect their self-identification as 'migrants', irrespective of the length of residency and family relations in the UK. Fernando, when asked whether he feels like a migrant, says:

> "That is a very good question because I do, and recently more than before…and particularly with the political movements, for example political parties such as UKIP and now because of the referendum. The word migrant is constantly on the news so I cannot stop thinking that I am a migrant".

Participants who feel very politically integrated are at the same time actively involved in the political life of the UK. These participants work in the field of politics, based on what can be inferred, their political engagement is a combination of their private and professional interest. However, even Anna, University Lecturer in German and EU politics, who feels completely integrated in the UK's political life and is actively involved in diverse political activities, explains that she finds the voting rights issue as a barrier to her full political integration and because of it she will apply for British citizenship, so she can express her concerns about the political movements in the country.

That said, the political integration of the long-term EU residents in this sample is strongly influenced by the voting rights and for some their identification as migrants. Moreover, these factors influenced participants general political participation and engagement. Citizens who feel politically integrated are at the same time very active in UK politics. However, bearing in mind that the "active" participants are professionally involved in politics, this question should be analysed from the perspective of politically active citizens who do not work within politics.

Justification for voting rights

Interviewees predominantly believe that they should have the right to decide on the future of the UK. The justification that dominates their answers is based on the fact that they are affected by the political decisions and that they are long-term contributors to the country, highlighting the economic contribution. Also, the participants' arguments underline the importance of their loyalty to the country in terms of long-term residence, settlement and future plans to reside. The long-term residency is generally seen as a precondition to voting rights. However, there is a big variation in the

understanding of how long is enough for someone to be entitled to equal voting rights, and it varies from 2 to 10 years.

On the question of who should have the right to decide on the future of the state, Anna, a university lecture on German and EU politics says:

> "I have been asking myself this question these days. Now I cannot vote in the referendum and it is an issue that affects me much more than who will be the next German Chancellor, that is the elections in which I can vote and it does not affect me. I mean ideally the EU citizenship should come with the right to vote in general elections in the country where one resides. I can very well see that you should make a decision, it is not ok to vote in the European election in the UK and in Germany, that is illegal and that is why you should decide to you have one document and one active citizenship. I think it would be a more meaningful citizenship if it came with the right to vote in national elections and not just European and local ones".

Marija, who strongly believes that she should have the right to vote in the general election in the UK, when asked why she should be given this right, explains:

> "Because I was not born in this country, I haven't cost this country a single penny: they didn't have to educate me, they didn't have to immunize me, they didn't have to give me anything. And since I have been living here I have been in the hospital once, when I had a child and I have never had a major illness. I have never taken any benefits from this country and, since 1988, this country is receiving my taxes. So I think if anything I should have more of a say than all those who have cost this country a lot of money, it is just a birth accident, but I contributed to this country taxes and I have taken very little, so I should have the right to vote and it is a disgrace that I don't have it".

On the same question Marco says:

> "I am a long-term resident and a tax payer and I should be given the opportunity to make the choice because I am part of the choice, brutally if they take my tax they should give me the right to vote".

The "affected" argument dominates the answers on voting rights and bases itself on the place of residency, rather on nationality. Therefore, some argue it should not be applied only to voting rights in the country of residence, but also to voting rights in the country of origin.

> "I live here and I don't have the mental right to decide what will happen in Poland. I'm not saying it is not my country but I don't want to decide about the people there. That is why I think voting rights for emigrants are wrong, we should not have the right to vote if we live for a longer period out of Poland. I should vote here" (Martyn).

When arguing against nationality-based voting rights, a couple of participants brought up the voting rights of citizens from the Commonwealth countries in the UK.

> "If commonwealth citizens, who, without necessarily living here, can decide on the future of the people who live here, then, I think I should be given the right to vote, since I live and I am planning to live here"(Jakub).

The participants' arguments on their voting rights in the UK clearly underline that they are affected by any decision for the future of the state. Raising a family and having children who are British citizens makes some feel even more affected by the future policies of the UK. Petar who has not applied for British citizenship because Slovakia does not allow dual citizenship says:

> "I am planning to apply for British citizenship because my children are growing up here and if I stay here I want to do something positive for my children. I want to decide and vote and make positive changes for them".

Participants who believe they should not have the right to vote in the UK, argue for naturalization as a precondition to voting rights and believe that as residents without British citizenship, they should not be given this right. Lukas does not think he should vote in the UK and decide on the future of the state because as he says: "I can leave to Lithuania right away while the British people have to stay here". Fernando points out that applying for citizenship is a way to access voting rights, so if he wants he can access equal political rights.

When asked about the voting right in the EU referendum specifically, most who argue for their voting rights in the UK with the same justification they argue their eligibility to vote for the referendum. However, some who argued for their voting rights in the UK have doubts if they should be given this right for the referendum, because it might influence the result towards remaining.

Engagement of EU residents in the UK in the EU referendum

Analysing the political integration and participation of EU long-term residents in the UK through the EU referendum allows us to see more than just a reflection of the previous experiences. It enables us to explore their current feelings, behaviours and thoughts, on a political question that directly affects them and at the same time excludes them from the formal process of decision-making. This part of the research discusses the engagement of EU long-term UK residents in the EU referendum.

The participants' engagement in the referendum varies from not engaged at all, to very active participation. However, based on the participants' experiences and perceptions, the EU residents in the UK predominantly were not engaged in the referendum. This subchapter firstly discusses the main reason reasons for exclusion of the referendum debate, secondly analyses the forms of engagement on the referendum and finally presents the assumed consequences and future plans in case of Brexit.

<u>Reasons for exclusion from the referendum debate</u>

In the activities organized for the referendum and in the campaigns for 'Remain', it was predominantly British citizens who were involved. Two main reasons were pointed out for exclusion in the referendum debate: the emphasis on EU migration and their lack of voting rights. The emphasis on EU migration in the referendum debate increased the feeling of being a foreigner or identification as a migrant for some and contributed to lower participation.

The intensive discourse of migration had an effect of "othering" even to the EU citizens who were very active on the referendum. Marco, who was an active campaigner for Remain, when asked how the referendum makes him feel, says:

> "For the first time ever since I came here, they make me feel like a foreigner, and I absolutely don't like this, because I am not a foreigner. This is Europe, this is my home, so I feel extremely uncomfortable".

Anna, in addition noticed that the referendum debate "brought more of the migrant in her", recognised the fact that she is not a UK citizen influenced the way she got involved.

> "It can be understood as patronizing, so I am bit careful. When I organized that debate in Birmingham I was the chair, I didn't want to be a panellist even though I have very strong views on it. I thought I can't vote and I am not British, so let the British discuss this, because I have a feeling this is very much about national identity. People feel under threat so maybe it is not right if I tell people what I think, what is right and what is wrong. That part of my thinks I can facilitate the debate, but maybe it is not good if I intervene directly" (Anna).

For others, the migration debate excluded them from any kind of engagement. Marta, when explaining why she did not get involved in any activities of the referendum, says: "I think because at the moment debates have been reduced to talking about immigrants, I would be worried that, being one or being considered as one, might go both ways. It can kind of send the wrong message to people".

Similarly, Fernando who has very strong views on the arguments in the referendum debate says that although for many times he wanted to share his opinion on social media he never did this because he is afraid that it will be perceived that he wants to defend Europe because he is Spanish. He recognises that his position as a migrant in the UK is a barrier to the way he will present himself to the public. At the same time, the referendum makes him upset:

> "It makes me anxious that people can't defend the argument on migration and sometimes I think that, if I had a microphone, I could defend it much better… that is why polls are moving closer and closer to Brexit because there is no one who can actually defend us…" (Fernando).

Beside the 'migrant issue', the feeling of a challenged status in the country influenced the engagement of some. Marija, when explaining why she is not engaged, says:

> "I know this sounds stupid but it feels like I am saying to people 'please let me stay' and I feel that this is embarrassing….I think anything I will say will be perceived from my bias, so this why I've stayed away".

For some, voting rights define who should be involved in the political debate and others had experience that inferred that the lack of voting rights excludes them from the debate.

> "I can't vote, so why should I try to influence other people. If they don't give me the vote, then I need to leave it to the people who can vote to make up their minds" (Emma).

> "Once I was stopped in the square from one TV reporter to give my opinion on the referendum and I really wanted to say what I thought. When I told her I was from Barcelona the reporter asked me whether I could vote and when I told her that I couldn't she then said that she didn't want my opinion" (Marija).

The community based organizations in this study were not very involved in the referendum. As has been established, many community clubs do not want to get involved politically and they do not work around this type of issue (Marta, the director of the Czech club in Birmingham and Martyn, the administrator of the Polish Expats Association in Birmingham). Furthermore, Martyn points out the low interest from Polish citizens:

> "If I put a note I want to meet and talk with 20 people about the referendum the answer will be - fuck off. The Polish community in the UK is divided in two groups, one is educated and integrated, with English friends and the other, which is around 80 percent, lives only with the Polish community, has problem with the language and don't care about what is happening".

Forms of engagement and political participation

What can be noticed in this study is that those who said that are very active in UK politics were also active on the referendum. Only four participants were active each by doing diverse activities such as campaigning as a part of 'Britain stronger in the EU', campaigning as a part of 'Labour In', delivering leaflets, emailing, participating in public conferences, donating, organizing debates, writing articles and giving interviews, attending meetings with NGOs that discussed the referendum.

The most employed ways of engagement were the use of social media and discussion with people from everyday life. Even those who said that they were not at all engaged in the referendum posted or commented something on it via social media or discussed the referendum with their friends, colleagues and family.

For some participants the interactions in their everyday life were used for lobbying and informing others who could vote.

> "I have discussions and try to influence the people who are not voting to go and vote" (Sofia).

> "When I talk with people, I try to put a seed or two about it [referendum]" (Marco).

People tend to have a social environment that suits their interest and tend to socialize with people with similar views as theirs (Verbrugge, 1977), so a frequent experience that the participants had in referendum discussions was a common agreement that the UK should stay in the EU.

> "Quite a lot of my friends are in the same situation, they can't vote, and most of my friends have the same political views as I do, so they don't need influencing" (Marta).

> "I haven't tried to lobby because I know only people that want to stay in and I would not try to change their opinion" (Eleni).

The lack of interaction between people with different views can significantly affect the quality of the political debate, the level of political information and the understanding of different political perspectives. Moreover, if this was the dominant way EU citizens engaged, it raises the question of whether their perspective and arguments reached the Brexit supporters.

Future actions

The referendum challenged the status of the EU residents in the UK. Basing the legal residency on EU citizenship, raised the question on future actions that can be taken in case the UK leaves the EU and consequently stops recognising EU citizenship as a right to residency in the UK. When asked about

the future plans in case of a Brexit vote, the participants predominantly underlined the need to know the exact consequences they would face in order to decide their actions. As a result of the unknown consequences, their future plans were uncertain too. However, the primary reaction they consider taking is to secure their life in the UK and the decision for leaving the UK is viewed as a final option. Therefore, the decision to take British citizenship generally comes as a response to their unstable status in the country. However, not everyone feels very comfortable with the decision of getting British citizenship.

When asked whether he considers getting British citizenship in case of a Brexit, Jakub says:

> "From this moment, I have so much appreciation for the EU. It allowed me to run from oppression and become who I am, to feel like I belong somewhere more than I used to. I would feel like I am betraying the cause that I stood to".

The appreciation of the EU also plays an important role in Sofia's decision: "if they stay I would really like to get the British citizenship, but not if they go…I wouldn't take up British nationality just because they are going out. Then I would condone being nationalistic, which I don't".

In case of Brexit, the citizens who identify as Europeans may feel differently about their position in the UK. When asked about how his life will change after Brexit Marco says: "leaving the EU will mean that I will officially be a foreigner and I don't like that". Emotional distance with the place of origin is an assumed outcome for Emma, who believes that, if the UK leaves the EU, she will feel more distant from Germany. Therefore, for some, Brexit might have emotional impact and might change the perception of their position in the UK.

In summary, this subchapter analyses the participants' engagement on the EU referendum. From the participants' narratives it can be inferred that the emphasized discourse on migration in the EU referendum debate and lack of vote initiated exclusion and lack of engagement. The most frequently used types of engagements were discussions with people in everyday life and social media activism. For the participants', common experience is general agreement for the preferred outcome of the referendum, which raises concerns for the interactions between diverse political views. Finally, participants were not able to make specific plans for their future because they were not familiar with the consequences to them in case of Brexit. However, some pointed out the emotional impact that Brexit might have to them.

Conclusions

The findings of this study raise concerns about the political integration of long-term EU residents in the UK. Participants see themselves as integrated into the UK but do not think of themselves as political actors who can equally participate and contribute to UK politics. The findings showed that even with strong integration, weak political integration can appear and supported the claims that political integration is the final phase of the integration process in a new society (Boswell, 2003, p.74; Geddes, 2008, p.57). Participants' narratives indicate that the main factors towards the construction of political identities are their political rights. Therefore, this study confirms the importance of the membership model towards political integration (Owen, 2011, 2013; Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010; Delanty, 1997; Beckman, 2006). The findings indicate that, as expected, the ethnic nationalism model of membership hinders the political integration of non-national residents (Lansbergen and Shaw,

2010), but showed that it may not interfere with the overall integration and the feeling of belonging in a particular society.

In the analysis of the construction of the identities and feelings of membership and belonging, it was observed that EU long-term residents in the UK develop feelings of membership and belonging towards the UK without developing identification with British nationality. Though previously theorised that the experience of migration and residency in other country changes the identities (Boswell, 2003; Bauböck, 2006; Benhabiib, 2004; Madsen and Naerssen, 2003) from the participants' narratives it can be inferred that national identification is more resistant to changes and is predominantly based on the place of origin, which differs from the feeling of membership and belonging, which is strongly influenced by the place of residence. Findings confirmed that citizenship is predominately perceived as a status (Isin and Wood, 1999, p.19) and demonstrated that citizenship as a status to membership and the subjective feeling of membership for EU movers may differ. Participants' narratives indicated that even strong national identity in one Member State does not necessarily interfere with the feeling of membership and belonging in another Member State. Therefore, the findings indicate that citizenship as a formal status, the subjective feeling of membership and the national identification may be three different constructs for EU movers.

This research challenged the idea of national identity as a key citizenship dimension of EU citizenship and as grounds to membership in a political community in three cases. Firstly, when the EU movers do not have a developed national identity but do have developed feelings of membership and belonging in the Member State where they reside and are not naturalised, the citizens are deprived of political rights in the country they feel part of and see themselves in the future. Secondly, when developed European identity, it does not influence the status of membership the citizens hold. Citizens are recognized as political members only in the community where they have national citizenship, which for the EU movers may not be the country of residence, the country they feel attached to or feel they belong in. Finally, EU movers may not identify with any nationality, but may develop feelings of membership and attachment of a Member State where they do not hold citizenship. Nowadays dynamic and multiple description of an identity is used (Janoski and Gran, 2002, p.41) and the political actions are based on diverse identities of the self (gender, sexual orientation, etc.) (Isin and Wood, 1999, p.158-159). Hence, national identity as a dimension in the EU citizenship can be seen as a barrier towards the political rights.

Analysing the political integration, findings supported the critiques towards the ethnic nationalism model of membership (Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010) and suggest that membership model or the voting rights are significant factors towards political integration. Participants do not feel politically integrated largely as a result that they cannot vote in national elections, a right that comes only by acquiring citizenship. They use the Beckman (2006) arguments for justification of their voting rights underlying the legal and contributivist views. Having family and especially raising British children appear to be factors that increase the feeling of being affected and the right to participate in the political decisions of the state. However, these arguments don't stand alone, but are combined with the principle of jus domicile, underpinned by long term residency and future plans to reside in the country. The participants' perspectives do not follow the Bauböck position to stakeholder membership, that membership status should be voluntarily initiated by the citizens by acquiring naturalization (Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010) and that voting rights should be an integral part of citizenship rights (Bauböck, 2005, 2009). The nature of

EU citizenship influenced participants not to initiate naturalization but to argue for voting rights based on residency and not exclusively on citizenship. Therefore, the results support the (Delanty, 1997; Owen, 2013) suggestion for EU citizenship based on residency as a more substantive citizenship that will enforce bigger participation and inclusion. The participants' narratives supported the Rubio Marin model on social membership that argues for membership as result of permanent residency and being for a long time part of and dependent on the collectivity (Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010). It advocates for automatic membership status after defined period of residency (Lansbergen and Shaw, 2010). However, participants underline that the voting right should not come without duties toward the state. Therefore, the findings confirm the duties as a one of the key citizenship dimensions (Delanty, 1997). These findings are very similar to the research on Polish citizens' justification for their right to vote on the Scottish independence referendum (Nykaza and McGhee, 2015).

Though the findings suggest change of the membership models that create exclusion, shaping the models of membership within the EU citizenship means changing the national constitutions that define the members, which can be understood as an intrusion of the state sovereignty (Koslowski, 1994). However, if the dominant model of membership in the EU Member States is the ethnic nationalism model it may hinder the political integration of the EU non-national residents and can initiate an increased number of dual citizenships from two Member States.

Analysing the participants' engagement on the EU referendum, it can be inferred that electoral rights can affect the citizens' engagement. For most of the participants, the exclusion from the electorate was the reason why they did not get involved in the other forms of political participation for the referendum. Therefore, the membership model can influence the overall participation. Other than the issue of voting rights, the participants' engagement was influenced by the strong negative discourse on EU migration in the referendum campaign. The negative migration discourse for some influenced their self-identification as migrants and their perception of their position in the UK. The negative migration discourse is a recognised factor towards exclusion (Boswell, 2003, p.93-98), as well as the process of "othering" or negative subjection to specific groups in the society (Delanty, 1997). British Citizens were more prominently involved in the Referendum campaigns than EU citizens residing in the UK. The participants' feeling that it is not up to them to engage confirms the problem of participation as an EU citizen. (Schall, 2012; Delanty, 1997). The prevalent form of engagement in the process amongst EU citizens was online activism and everyday discussion of the issue with other people. Bearing in mind the tendencies for homogenous social environments (Verbrugge, 1977), these forms of political engagement can influence the quality of the political debates and the level of information about different political positions.

In conclusion, this study indicates low political integration of EU long-term residents in the UK and highlights the influence of the ethnic nationalism membership model and nature of the EU citizenship towards political integration. The political exclusion of the EU movers not only influences their wellbeing, it influences the politics of the state (Geddes, 2000, p.139; Boswell, 2003, p.74) and raises concerns about the democratization of Europe (Keslowski, 1994).

Bibliography

Aleinikoff, T. A. and Klusmeyer, D. (2001) Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Arksey, H. and Knight, P. (1999) Interviewing for Social Scientists. London: SAGE Publications.

Bauböck, R. (2005) 'Expansive Citizenship: Voting beyond Territory and Membership', Political Science and Politics 38 (4), pp. 683–687.

Bauböck, R. (2006) Migration and Citizenship Legal Status, Rights and Political Participation. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bauböck, R. (2009) 'The Rights and Duties of External Citizenship', Citizenship Studies 13 (5), pp. 475–499.

Bauböck, R. (2015) 'Morphing the Demos into the right shape. Normative principles for enfranchising resident aliens and expatriate citizens', Democratization, 22(5), pp. 820–839.

Beckman, L. (2006) 'Citizenship and Voting Rights: Should Resident Aliens Vote?', Citizenship Studies, 10(2), pp. 153–165.

Benhabiib, S. (2004) The Rights of Others Aliens Residents and Citizens. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Blaike, N. (2010) Designing Social Research. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boswell, C. (2003) European Migration Policies in Flux. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

British Nationality Act (1981) Part I, Chapter 18: Naturalisation at discretion, Section 6

Bryman, A. (2012) Social Research Methods. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carens, J. 0. (1987) 'Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders', The Review of Politics, 49(2), pp. 251-273.

Centre for Economic Performance (2016) BREXIT 2016 Policy analysis from the Centre for Economic Performance. London: London School of Economics.

Chaudhary, A. R. (2016) 'Transnational politics and political integration among migrants in Europe', International Migration Institute (IMI), Oxford Department of International.

Council of Europe, European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, as amended by Protocols Nos. 11 and 14, 4 November 1950, ETS 5

Delanty, G. (1997) 'Models of citizenship: Defining European identity and citizenship', Citizenship studies , 1(3), pp. 285-303.

Denscombe, M. (1998) The Good Research Guide. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Entzinger, H. (1999) Political and Social Participation of Immigrants Through Consultative Bodies, Strasbourg: Council of Europe .

Erasmus + (2015) Erasmus Facts Figures and Trends, Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/statistics/erasmus-plus-facts-figures_en.pdf (Accessed: 25 July 2016).

Eurobarometer (2014) European Citizenship, European Commission.

European Commission (2016) Electoral Rights, Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/voting-rights/index_en.htm (Accessed: 02 August 2016).

European Union, Treaty on European Union (Consolidated Version), Treaty of Maastricht, 7 February 1992, Official Journal C 340

European Union, Treaty of Amsterdam Amending the Treaty on European Union, The treaties Establishing the European Communities, 2 October 1997, Official Journal C340

European Union, Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe, 16 December 2004, Official Journal C310

European Union, Treaty of Lisbon Amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, 13 December 2007

Eurostat (2016) EU citizenship - statistics on cross-border activities, Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/EU_citizenship_-_statistics_on_cross-border_activities (Accessed: 05 July 2016).

Favell, A. (2016) 'European identity and European citizenship in three “Eurocities”: A Sociological approach to the European Union', Cairn. Available at: http://www.cairn.info/article_p.php?ID_ARTICLE=POEU_030_0187

(Accessed: 14 May 2016).

Fligstein, N., Polyakova, A. and Sandholtz, W. (2012) 'European Integration, Nationalism and European Identity', Jurnal of Comon Market Studies, 20(1), pp. 106–122.

Geddes, A. (2000) Immigration and European integration Towards fortress Europe. first ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Geddes, A. (2008) Immigration and European integration Beyond fortress Europe. second ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Houses of Parliament (2015) Trends in Political Participation, London: Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology .

Hoskins, B. and Kerr, D. (2012) Participatory Citizenship in the European Union, European Commission, Europe for Citizens Programme.

Isin, E. F. and Wood, P. K. (1999) Citizenship and Identity. London: SAGE Publications.

Isin, E. F. (2012) 'Citizens without nations', Environment and Planning: Society and Space, 30 (1), pp. 450 467.

Janoski, T. and Gran, B. (2002) 'Political Citizenship: Foundations of Rights', in Isin. E. F. and Tuner B. S. (ed.) Handbook of Citizenship Studies. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 13-52.

Katsiaficas, C. (2014) Political Participation of Immigrants in the EU: Challenges and Tools, Bridging Europe.

Koslowski, R. (1994) 'Intra - EU Migration, Citizenship and Political Union', Journal of Common Market Studies , 32 (3), pp. 369-402.

Lamprianou, I. (2013) 'Contemporary Political Participation Research: A Critical Assessment', in Demetriou K. N. (ed.) Democracy in Transition Political Participation in the European Union. New York: Springer, pp. 21-42.

Lansbergen, A. and Shaw, J. (2010) 'National membership models in a multilevel Europe', Oxford University Press and New York University School of Law, 8 (1), pp. 50 – 71.

Madsen, K. D. and Naerssen, T. (2003) 'Migration, identity, and belonging', Journal of Borderlands Studies, 1 (18), pp. 61-75.

Medrano, J. D. and Gutiérrez, P. (2010) 'Nested identities: national and European identity in Spain', Ethnic and Racial Studies, 24 (5), pp. 753–778.

Migration Watch UK (2016) The British in Europe – and Vice Versa, Available at: http://www.migrationwatchuk.org/briefing-paper/354 (Accessed: 30 July 2016).

Miller, D. (2009) 'Democracy's Domain', Philosophy and Public Affairs, 37 (3), pp. 201–228.

Moreira, J. M. D. (2000) 'Cohesion and Citizenship in EU Cultural Policy', Journal of Common Market Studies , 38 (3), pp. 449-470.

Nykaza, E. P. and McGhee, D. (2015) 'Stakeholder citizenship: the complexities of Polish migrants' citizenship attachments in the context of the Scottish independence referendum'. Citizenship Studies, DOI: 10.1080/13621025.2015.1054789

Owen, D. (2011) 'Transnational citizenship and the democratic state: modes of membership and voting rights', Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosoph, 14 (5), pp. 641-663.

Owen, D. (2013) 'Demos Problems and the European Union: An Exercise in Contextual democratic theory', Izvorni znanstveni članak, 10 (1), pp. 7-23

Pioneur Project (2003) Pioneers of European Integration 'From below': mobility and the emergence of European identity among national and foreign citizens in the EU, Available at: http://www.obets.ua.es/pioneur/difusion/PioneurExecutiveSummary.pdf [Accessed: 28 July 2016].

Riessman, C.K. (2008) Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences, London: Sage Publications

Schall, C. E. (2012) 'Is the Problem of European Citizenship a Problem of Social Citizenship? Social Policy, Federalism and Democracy in the EU and United States', Sociological Inquiry, 82 (1), pp. 123-144.

Siklodi, N. (2015) 'Active citizenship through mobility? Students' perceptions of identity, rights and participation in the EU', Citizenship Studies, 19, pp. 820–835, DOI: 10.1080/13621025.2015.1053792

Stoll, M. A. and Wong, J. (2007) 'Immigration and Civic Participation in a Multiracial and Multi-ethnic Context', Centre for Migration Studies of New York, 41(4), pp. 880–908

The Electoral Commission (2016) Who is eligible to vote at a UK general election?, Available at: http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/faq/voting-and-registration/who-is-eligible-to-vote-at-a-uk-general-election (Accessed 22 June 2016).

The Electoral Commission (2016) EU referendum results, Available at: http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/find-information-by-subject/elections-and-

referendums/past-elections-and-referendums/eu-referendum/electorate-and-count-information (Accessed: 02 August 2016].

The Migration Observatory (2016) The stock of the migrant population almost doubled from 1993 to 2014, Available at: http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/briefings/migrants-uk-overview (Accessed: 11 August 2016).

United Nations (2016) International migration report 2013, Available at: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/migreport.shtml (Accessed: 13 August 2016].

UN General Assembly, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 10 December 1948, 217 A (III)

UN General Assembly, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966, United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, p. 171.

Vaus, D. (2001) Research Design in Social Research. London: SAGE Publications.

Verbrugge, L. M. (1977) 'The Structure of Adult Friendship Choices', Oxford University Press, pp. 576-597.

Wadsworth, J., Dhingra, S., Ottaviano, G. & Reenen, J. V. (2016) Brexit and the Impact of Immigration on the UK, London: Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics.

Zapata-Barrero, R., Gabrielli, L., Sánchez-Montijano, E. and Jaulin, T. (2013) The political participation of immigrants in host countries: An interpretative framework from the perspective of origin countries and societies, INTERACT Research Report, Available at: http://interact-project.eu/docs/publications/Research%20Report/INTERACT-RR-2013-07.pdf (Accessed: 19 June 2016).