



International Journal of Social Research (ISSN:2576-5531)



Dynamics of Norway's Dual Citizenship Discourse: Challenges and Prospects for African Immigrants' Integration and Political Engagement

Patrick Agyare

University of South-Eastern Norway

ABSTRACT

The unique principle of citizenship that enhances the possession of single citizenship, has long been the ideal of nationality laws. Yet, interest in dual citizenship has increased, triggered by the success of globalization and a gap in the ideal and reality of the principle of single citizenship. This article, therefore, offers an overview of Norway's dual citizenship policy and the associated opportunities and risks for African immigrants inclusion. It incorporates facts and arguments for sociopolitical deliberation in an area where emotional reactions abound. Data were drawn from semi-structured interviews and analysis of policy documents. The findings demonstrate that allowing dual citizenship activates the prospects for better integration of immigrants in mainstream society. However, dual citizens can be denaturalized if their actions significantly harm the interests or image of the state. In this way, the policy constitutes a robust impetus toward standardization and normalization of practices that challenge social integration relations. These heuristics are particularly pernicious to immigrants, the casualties of this discourse, because the authorities are aware of a minimal backlash, considering their limited power to fight back politically. Moreover, a major obstacle in the naturalization of immigrants has been removed. This in turn have positive implications for greater identification of migrants with the country of residence, as well as better economic and sociopolitical participation.

Keywords: Discourse, dual citizenship, integration, power, political engagement

*Correspondence to Author:

Patrick Agyare

University of South-Eastern Norway

How to cite this article:

Patrick Agyare. Dynamics of Norway's Dual Citizenship Discourse: Challenges and Prospects for African Immigrants' Integration and Political Engagement. International Journal of Social Research, 2020; 4:51.



eSciPub LLC, Houston, TX USA.

Website: <https://escipub.com/>

Introduction

This article investigates how the patterns of Norway's dual citizenship policy entail possibilities and challenges for African immigrants' integration and political engagement. For this, it employs policy document analysis and semi-structured interviews with respondents from seven African countries. Furthermore, it draws on Fairclough's (1992: 52) contribution on discourse and power that illustrate the normality of everyday practices as a basis for continuity and reproduction of unequal relations of power, domination, and subordination.

Faced with the low naturalization rate among immigrants (Pettersen, 2015:1.7) and the rapidly changing importance of single citizenship, the Norwegian parliament, on December 6, 2018, adopted amendments to the Nationality Act, which permits dual citizenship (Berglund, 2018). The amendments implied that the renunciation of former citizenship by immigrants would no longer be a condition for claiming Norwegian citizenship (Storting, 2018.12.6: 1172). Further, Norwegian citizens would not automatically lose their status on acquiring another citizenship by application or explicit consent (Storting, 2018.12.6: 1173). A new provision was provided for reclaiming the Norwegian citizenship to those who previously lost it due to the principle of single citizenship. The bill was debated in the Norwegian parliament on December 6, 2018 in the first reading. With 62 votes for and 39 against it, the bill was approved (Ibid). No revision was made during the second reading of the draft. Subsequently, the draft enactment approving dual citizenship was passed on December 10, 2018 (Storting, 2018.12.10: 1173). The changes came into effect on January 1, 2020, a year after Norway notified the Council of Europe about its will to terminate Chapter One of the Council of Europe Convention of 1963 on the limitation of cases of multiple citizenship of which it is a signatory (Council of Europe, 1963).

Essentially, this article contributes to previous work that explored migrant integration and citizenship discourse in Norway (Brochmann and

Hagelund, 2012; Hagelund, 2002; Thorud, 2017/2018). It intends to add to the international body of literature by highlighting the dual citizenship prospects and challenges that often symbolize the crystallization of the triumph of immigrants who want to retain their origins against the backdrop of often-concealed political clauses. In this sense, it is useful to critically analyze the political ideologies of Norway's dual citizenship policy and the inherent unequal relations of power.

As Ericson (2011: 3) suggested, public policies may be framed to serve the interests of a particular group, as governments often frame policies without the participation of groups that are most directly affected by them. Additionally, the exercise of state and institutional power faces pressures from below because people have become more conscious of their rights within state-citizen relationships (van Dijk, 2013: 262). These actions are contingent articulations that reproduce and challenge public discourses (Fairclough, 2010: 48; 2015: 27). In turn, this article contributes to research that highlights the essence of textual analysis of policy documents and the significance of tracing discourse and power through layers of context. Finally, it shows the need for further research focusing on the correlation between dual citizenship and subversive sociopolitical practices.

This article continues by firstly exploring the literature on dual citizenship. Secondly, it elaborates the theoretical framework inspired by Fairclough's conception of discourse and power. Next, it presents the data and method, which is based on as earlier mentioned, semi-structured interviews and policy document analysis. Ultimately, it analyzes and discusses the findings from the data before concluding.

Exploring Dual Citizenship

The concept of citizenship is often confused with the term politics amid the rise of the Greek polis (Bauböck, 2006: 22; Castles and Davidson, 2000: 30). There, "citizen" indicated someone who was born in the city, and who, being freed from economic needs, participated in the

political order. In modern times, the conformation of citizenship is often associated with the bourgeois revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries (Castles et al., 2000: 33). Furthermore, citizenship involves qualification attesting to membership of the state or legal connection between the state and individual. Three principles determine citizenship. Firstly, "jus sanguinis" that implies inheriting the citizenship of parents. Secondly, "jus soli" that grants citizenship based on the place of birth, and lastly, by naturalization. Naturalization typically involves fulfilling residential requirement, familiarity with the country's language, economic self-reliance, and good character, which entails the commitment to uphold and obey the laws of the state (Dumbrava, 2014: 33; Joppke, 2010: 19). Naturalization, however, is a condition that often prevents dual citizenship as the individual applicant is obliged to give up the other citizenship. Yet, this system does not completely eliminate dual citizenship as exemptions remain for persons from countries that cannot withdraw from former citizenship (Dumbrava, 2014: 36).

Moreover, being a citizen also implies access to guarantees against politically motivated injustice, that is, civil rights (Marshall, 1964). The ability to influence the shaping of the political order, that is, political rights, and ultimately, community protection through social rights (Ibid). Several scholars identified that citizenship also encompasses the inclusion and exclusion of immigrants (Bauböck, 2006; Dumbrava, 2014; Ericson 2011). Nation-state sets the criteria for controlling the flow of immigrants, determining who is a citizen and who is legally habitable (Thorud, 2017/2018). Similarly, the welfare state incorporates the redistribution and recognition mechanism (Fraser, 1995: 70). These are based on acknowledging that through injustice, minority groups are rendered invisible or systematically suppressed (Ibid). Even so, immigrants must be socioculturally integrated and maintain a sense of belonging, stability, and order (Brochmann et al., 2012: 17; Joppke, 2017). The unintegrated encounter multiple challenges regarding

employment, housing, education, health care, and other social services (Nussbaum, 2013: 118; Thorud, 2017/2018: 53). Thus, integration presupposes initiatives and policies that aim at human development, security, and predictability of sound economic future (Joppke, 2017; Moodood, 2007; Parekh, 2006: 9; Turner, 1993).

Alarian and Goodman (2017: 140) contested that the principle of single citizenship, as a par excellence of legally belonging to a state, is marked by practical limitations due to transnationality. Immigrants experience political re-socialization and incorporate new values and practices when circumstances dictate (Basok, Ilcan and Noonan, 2006; Brannon, Carter, Murdock-Perriera, and Higginbotham, 2018: 59; Crawford, 2012: 204; Hagelund, 2002; Waldinger, 2013: 762). However, the univocity of single citizenship was challenged with the advent of dual citizenship (Faist, 2007: 2; Joppke, 2010: 4). Dual citizenship, in the formal sense, explicate the concurrent possession of more than one citizenship by which a person can claim exclusive rights, protection, and membership from two states (Faist, 2007: 3; Joppke, 2010: 5). It differs from formal citizenship because dual citizens are not tightly bound to a single political community (Sinatti and Horst, 2015). It seems like an appropriate way of managing diversity, and it plays a strategic role in integration (Bauböck, Honohan, Huddleston, Hutcheson, Shaw and Vink, 2013; Vink, Prokic-Breuer and Dronkers, 2013).

However, conceptions of dual citizenship convey challenges pertaining to loyalty (Di Bartolomeo and Kalantaryan, 2017). Dual citizens may be confronted with competing allegiance, the possibility of having to vote in two states, potentially dual military service obligations, conflicting diplomatic protection, and dual taxation (Dumbrava, 2014: 39). Yet, it is questionable whether a dual affiliation leads to an inner rift that undermines political engagement (Castles and Miller, 2009: 45; Waldinger, 2013: 760). Political engagement is a central marker of active participation in mainstream politics and a common denominator of decision-making (Di Bartolomeo et al., 2017;

Harinen, Pitkänen, Sagne and Ronkainen, 2007: 124; Nussbaum, 2013). Dual citizenship also involves notions of “insiders” and “outsiders.” Insiders are citizens with all rights attached, and outsiders are non-citizens with rights that are not absolute (Wodak and Weiss, 2005: 131). Thus, membership can be redefined, and policymakers decide who can have access by initiating policies, ideologies, and the structural phenomena of exclusion (Ericson, 2011). However, Vollmer (2016: 4) underlined that, heightened securitization does not alleviate exclusion and the fear of “others.”

In the past, dual citizenship was considered unfortunate for practical and principled reasons. A convention adopted by the Council of Europe in 1963 was based on this basic view. Along similar lines, Norway has a long-standing tradition of disallowing dual citizenship, a tradition it maintained until it recognized dual citizenship in January 2020 (Storting, 2018.12.6). Nonetheless, Norwegian Nationality legislation contained several exemption provisions that allowed those who applied for citizenship but could not renounce their former citizenship to retain them (Norwegian Nationality Act, 2005). Statistics from the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI, 2019) from 2010 to 2017 showed that more than half of those who applied for Norwegian citizenship within this period were exempted from the renunciation requirement. Thus, the Norwegian authorities long accepted dual citizenship in practice.

Discourse and Power

Fairclough (2010: 3) described discourse as a practice that establishes, sustains, and changes the power relations of people, institutions, communities, and groups involved in social relations. Hence, discourse interpolates issues about policy, text, political strategy or words that play a part in producing the social world and the construction of unequal power relations. From this perspective, discourse is both a means of action used by individuals in social relations and a mode of representation (Fairclough, 1992: 63). This further illustrates that discourse involves a

network of doings and sayings, that is, a network of practices and representations from which not only messages about beings and things are emitted, but wherein their existence and meaning are instituted. Most specifically, it explores the relationships of causality between discursive practices and the broader sociopolitical structures and processes, as well as how they are shaped by power relations and struggles. Through discourse, one can observe the struggle for power among actors due to collusion in the political practice away from public eye. Sociopolitical processes and practices sustain a variety of coexistence, contrast, and often competing discursive practices generally exploited by those who wield power.

Power is a defining feature in public policies and a central condition in sociopolitical life. It is implicit within social practices and considerably distributed across various domains of social life (Fairclough, 1992: 50; 2015: 26). Likewise, power is understood in terms of a set of institutions and apparatus enabling the subjection of people through policy formulations. It is a mode of subjection that takes the form of norms, and viewed as a system of domination (Fairclough, 1992: 50). This conception relates well to Foucault's (1972: 67) contribution regarding the relation between discourse and power, the discursive construction of vulnerable social groups, and the working of discourse for social transformation. According to Foucault, the rules and processes of appropriation of discourse and the ability to draw upon the corpus of established formulations are unequally distributed within institutional practices and power relations (Ibid: 68). As Fairclough (2015: 26) rightly points out, power is distinguishable in social practice, socially reproductive, constitutive, and central to understanding the dynamics and specifics of control in societies, though it remains invisible in social relations. Hence, power lends itself to a complex strategic situation in a given society, and unequal power relations emerge from these complex relations. It is both a productive and constraining force because it challenges

established orders and inculcates the inclusion and exclusion of other social actors.

Data and Method

This article drew data from a larger study, the author's master thesis, on the possibilities and challenges of Norway's dual citizenship policy for African immigrants integration and political participation. Semi-structured interviews and policy document analysis was employed for an "in-depth understanding" (Bryman, 2016: 28) about the rationality and logic of Norway's formal acceptance of dual citizenship. The interview sample consisted of $N=20$ African immigrants living in Norway. As Onwuegbuzie and Collins (2007: 289) suggested, the sample scope must not be so small as to make it difficult to achieve data saturation or informational redundancy. Strategic and snowball methods was utilized in selecting respondents. The respondents are immigrants from DR Congo, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe. In all, 11 men and nine women were selected to gain a broader knowledge of what dual citizenship signifies to these individuals. They were aged between 20 and 50 years and had diverse religious and educational backgrounds as well as family circumstances. Of them, six were naturalized Norwegian citizens, 13 held Norwegian permanent residency permits, and one was a dual citizen of Gambia and Spain.

The processing of personal data in this article comply with the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD, 1971) protection legislation. The interviews were conducted individually in three phases: seven interviews were conducted between September and October 2019, five in November 2019, and eight between December 2019 and January 2020. Each interview lasted up to 90 minutes, where discussions focused on the respondent's perception about the merits and drawbacks of Norway's dual citizenship policy for their integration and political engagement. Interviews were recorded, anonymized, and stored separately in encrypted external hard drives. Data were deleted post research, as per NSD regulations. The respondents provided an

informed consent regarding participation, and they are addressed using pseudonyms in this article.

Moreover, the secondary source of data comprises seven key policy documents¹: three from Norwegian government archives and four from Norwegian parliamentary records. These were selected on the basis of them being recent, relevant, and capturing the significant stages leading to Norway's formal approval of dual citizenship. Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional discourse-analytical framework aided the selection of the policy documents. The choice of this method is justified by exploring and making visible unequal power relations regarding the dual citizenship discourse. Fairclough revealed that, the semiotics or social process of texts is embedded in its intertextual predispositions.

Thus, texts are powerful basis for analysis, as it constitutes an important form of social action, and unearth the ideological effects of discourse that are often overlooked. Texts, as Fairclough postulates are sensitive barometers of sociopolitical practices that provide a vital indicator of social change. Through texts, social control and domination is exercised, negotiated, and resisted (Ibid: 76). Moreover, the analytical framework is part of a five-step guideline for discourse analysis. It begins with data based on the research question or social practice in the research area. The next step involves transcription and coding a whole corpus or large parts of the data, or coding in terms of themes or topics. The third entails analyzing the texts, spoken or written. The fourth involves analyzing the discursive practice focusing on the intertextuality and interdiscursivity categories that the texts are based on. The final stage involves analyzing the social practice that the discourse was part of (Ibid: 231).

Findings and Discussions

Fairclough's discourse-analytical guide, which provides a general framework for discourse-oriented sociopolitical analysis (Baker, Gabrielatos, KorsraviNik, Krzyzaowski, McEney and Wodak, 2013: 8), was employed to critically

visualize the complex plays of meanings emerging from the semi-structured interviews and the policy documents. Consequently, the data were read to identify key discursive categories that shed light on the dual citizenship discourse. These revolve around the idea of strengthening immigrant social integration by abolishing single citizenship, enhancing political identification and engagement, and finally, withdrawal of citizenship while addressing the challenges of statelessness.

Strengthening Immigrant Social Integration

Past research showed that dual citizenship facilitates social and economic integration of immigrants (Joppke, 2010: 79; Thorud, 2017/2018: 53). As Hagelund (2002: 402) pointed out, integration is one of the desirable strategies and final endpoint of Norwegian multicultural policies and citizenship participation. Integration, thus, represents some sort of optimal middle path, responding to the means of figuring out how to visualize recognition and social parity through dual citizenship in forms that sustain rather than weaken it (Modood, 2007: 36; Parekh, 2006: 9). Most of the respondents shared the perception that Norway's dual citizenship policy has positive implications for their integration. This position relates well to Castles et al. (2000: 87) observation that citizenship enhances social integration. Integration thus offers insights into how excluded groups define themselves in different contexts, including how they see themselves in relation to others as well as what this implies for their membership in the larger community. The respondents further shared their aspiration that the values of dual citizenship may articulate a vision of what a more inclusive society might imply for better integration.

Integration is about not forcing immigrants to assimilate, but by promoting the diversity of cultures, as well as open and hospitable policies that do not see immigrants as problem bearers. Becoming a dual Norwegian citizen can be a crucial element for my inclusion into the mainstream society. It is a form of empowerment, to be part of the

system and contribute to the country I live in.

The experiential values of the respondents' aspiration indicated that the insertion of immigrants in the receiving society demands reflections. Integration as a social process takes place both from above as well as from below. The individual as the object of integration on the one hand, and public policies that obviously affect integration processes on the other hand. These are summed up into three fundamental prerequisites; fair opportunities for employment, less restrictive naturalization laws and the commitment to combat racism and discrimination (Bauböck, 2006: 18; Nussbaum, 2013: 118; Thorud, 2017/2018: 53; Turner, 1993: 176).

The integration discourse articulated by the respondents extends beyond mere texts, toward a variety of practices and ultimately, toward the settlement of diverse subject positions and boundaries of social exclusion (Brochmann et al., 2012: 13; Ericson, 2011). From their perspective, the outcomes of dual citizenship may promote the capacity to change power relations, which is the object of struggle. This discursive reworking of integration is based on the idea that there is a section of the population that is excluded from mainstream society. Part of the differentiated situation between the immigrant and the citizen is reflected not only in rights, but in their social visibility and the use of formal participation channels (Castles et al., 2009: 46; Nussbaum, 2013: 118). In the Norwegian government's proposal to parliament regarding amendments to the Nationality Act, several consultative bodies were positive toward the dual citizenship discourse. In particular, the Norwegian Directorate for Integration and Diversity (IMDi) stressed that:

The formal approval of dual citizenship can have positive impact on immigrants' integration and affiliation with Norway. This is because, as a Norwegian citizen, you have several rights, which means opportunities for greater participation in Norwegian

workforce and social life (Ministry of Education and Research, 2018, 24 August: 15).

This position conveyed positive expressive values, indicating that dual citizenship is socially inclusive (Fairclough, 2015: 133). Furthermore, relational values of greater redistribution of resources are involved. Redistribution, according to Fraser (1995: 71) involves the essential elements of recognition of disempowered groups and respect for diversity. Non-recognition, as Fraser pointed out, can be a form of oppression and reduced mode of dignity. Beyond the simple lack of self-esteem, it can inflict a significant insecurity and vulnerability, saddling individuals with crippling animosity. Due identification is not just a courtesy, but a fundamental human necessity. More radically, it involves a change of sociopolitical representation and distribution in ways that modifies social orders. Social orders, according to Fairclough (2015: 163), are relative to particular power relations. Therefore, dual citizenship presents opportunities for greater immigrant incorporation, given that immigrants with the right to retain their citizenship of origin may be more willing to acquire the host society's citizenship (Bauböck et al., 2013; Vink et al., 2017: 212; Di Bartolomeo et al., 2017: 29). The opportunities might include the enjoyment of rights granted to naturalized citizens as well as the feeling of belonging to the community that defines the separation between being an "insider" and "outsider" (Crawford, 2012: 204; Waldinger, 2013: 762) as the following excerpt suggest:

Changes to the Norwegian Nationality Act allowing dual citizenship is of particular importance. It is the formalization of the social contract between the citizen and the state, and it comes at a time when this social contract is under intense pressure and sustained debate (Bransdal, 2018, 6 December, [10:34:39]: 1116).

This argument is ideologically significant because it denotes a constructive stance toward the community and the state at large (Fairclough, 2015: 135). Marshall (1964: 3) stressed

that the social contract goes beyond the more passive duties and obligations to an active idea of citizenship as a responsible practice. This contributes to the society based on ability and resources as well as through a positive impact. Along similar lines, Hagelund (2002: 407) stated that immigrant cultures seem to be recognized, but they cannot prefer to linger in mainstream society by not vigorously utilizing the opportunity to achieve integration that constitutes its very foundation. Hence, integration is a reciprocal process requiring both the readiness of the majority society to take up, as well as the willingness of immigrants to participate in the economic, social and cultural life of the receiving society. It is about mutual accommodation and a process in which both the immigrant and the host society approach each other. Yet, the welfare state must carry out selection and limitation to avoid overloading social budgets or eventually end up undermining solidarity (Brochmann et al., 2012: 13).

Similarly, Ericson (2011: 3) underscored a reframing of inclusion from a rights-based perspective that predominated until the 1990s, with equality of citizenship as the benchmark of immigrants' integration. In turn, Joppke (2017: 1156) articulated a duty-based concept that defines the immigrant as the main actor of integration. This resonates with Sinatti et al. (2015: 145), who argued that community membership cannot be conditional. It is a matter of rights, entitlements, and reciprocity. As emphasized by Kymlicka (1995: 31), because immigrants voluntarily leave their homeland, they thus waive the right to have their culture and identity resurrected abroad. Therefore, it is integration into the larger society that is indispensable, not self-government (Ibid: 32). These genres and powerful restrictive determinants in both the content and meaning of immigrants' integration are the product of unequal power relations within the dual citizenship discourse.

Political Identification and Engagement

Dual citizenship, vested with participatory rights and duties, has implications for immigrants'

political engagement (Alarian et al., 2017: 140). It is regarded as a central marker of membership in the political community and a common denominator of decision-making (Harinen et al., 2007: 123). Likewise, Faist (2007: 3) linked political engagement to the distribution of power, which resides in the rights that citizenship provides. The civil, political, and social dimensions of citizenship are often regarded as inevitable for an active participation in mainstream political, economic, and social life (Marshall, 1964: 4). In the Norwegian government's proposal to parliament about amending the Nationality Act, several consultative bodies, including Amnesty International Norway, Norwegian Centre Against Racism, and the UDI argued that Norway's acceptance of dual citizenship is in line with the development of society and the possibility of democratic participation of immigrants in the country in which they live (Ministry of Education and Research, 2018.8.24: 15).

This assertion revealed the causal effects of dual citizenship, shaped by two sets of causal powers and tensions. First, "social structures and practices" (Fairclough, 1992: 72), and second, the agency of citizens in the policy they are part. The relational values of words expressed by the consultative bodies act as the interactional practices of social actors whose actions are both sustained and compelled by public policies. The genres and related activities further revealed that Norway's dual citizenship policy appears more strongly as a matter of incorporating all classes of people into the national community (Bauböck, 2006: 18). A feeling of belonging is indispensable within the framework of a multicultural state. It is a process of meaning-making and has causal effects that activate democratic participation (Vink et al., 2013: 7). The immigrant, apart from being a social actor, is also a political actor, and participation at the national level is an essential element that defines the issues the individual is most often concerned about (Sinatti et al., 2015). The discourse thus activates access to basic rights and resources valued by the society.

The argument further throw light that citizenship indeed defines the individual's relationship with the state and the basic conditions for securing a position in society (Turner, 1993: 176). This includes both formal and legal dimensions as well as substantive material aspects in the form of real opportunities for social and economic engagement. However, how the society defines these membership rights and creates conditions for their practical realization is crucial for an inclusive understanding of participation that bridges unequal power relations in society (Fairclough, 2015: 130). Marshall (1964: 4) established that citizenship is the set of rights and duties that individuals possess, contributing toward building a democracy. Similarly, several respondents underlined the importance of citizenship for immigrant sociopolitical engagement. They stressed that, allowing dual citizenship in Norway is vital because it borders on transnational participation and also puts more weight on a persons' effective residence.

Citizenship is a sense of belonging, which ensures cohesion based on common reference values. It is a precondition to access political freedoms. Without citizenship, the power to participate fully in national decision-making is to some extent limited. At best, one can enjoy all rights that citizens of the state are entitled. Hence, it is a privileged form of expression through which one can reconcile diversity and the complexity of interests among the majority and the minority.

As a dual citizen, one can maintain affiliation and identify oneself with both cultures. One can also claim the rights of both states, as well as actively involve socially, politically, and economically in both societies. Yet, acquiring a second nationality comes with dual responsibilities to comply with sociopolitical norms of both states, as well as fulfil fundamental obligations.

The above excerpts from the respondents statements gives insight of a "pessimistic"

(Fairclough, 2015: 130) attitude regarding the dual citizenship discourse. The asymmetries of these perceptions are significant in terms of their positioning as non-citizens and identification with the polity. As Brannon et al. (2018: 59) rightly pointed out, real citizenship permeates formal channels of participation to activate political action. The ability of immigrants to participate in mainstream politics partly depends upon membership in the political community and ensuring that minority voices are heard. Dual citizenship can therefore facilitate inclusiveness and lower the risk of political marginalization (Basok et al., 2006: 268). Migrant political activism can influence the behavior of governments so that policies and practices are consistent with ideals of a constitutional state (Joppke, 2010: 88). Hence, dual citizenship is vital in defining legitimate relationships within the state as well as belonging in equal terms. However, the Norwegian government emphasized on the Jeløya platform that:

Inclusion is a two-way process whereby the authorities are to ensure good opportunities, and the individual immigrant must set up their efforts to participation (Office of the Prime Minister, 2018.1.14, point 5).

The “categorical expression” (Fairclough, 2015: 137) of immigrant active participation underlines both the procedural and reciprocal character of inclusion. It involves the receiving society, with its willingness to create viable equal opportunities and individuals responsibility to become an accepted part of society (Brannon et al., 2018: 59). So, for incipient immigrants, the primary question is about the degree of consciousness and capacity for engagement. There may be a lack of participation due to additional factors that condition their social and political apathy. They usually come with a lack of political culture rooted in their distrust of politics or lack of incentive to participate in sociopolitical life (Thorud, 2017-2018: 72). Yet, the right to political engagement is a fundamental and entrenched right, and its enjoyment does not depend on

state benevolence (Joppke, 2010: 88). Lower participation promotes the risk of access to resources in the form of knowledge, defense of one’s interests through community engagement as well as lack of understanding and respecting central democratic principles and practices (Harinen et al., 2007: 125). Participation thus infers overcoming the fracture of exclusion and pointing toward an ideal society where deprivation in all its forms is no longer a viable factor (Modood, 2007: 36; Parekh, 2006: 9). Dual citizenship thus articulates openness towards social, economic, and political membership (Joppke, 2010: 47).

However, the Centre Party (Norway) maintained a hardline stance towards the dual citizenship discourse. It believed the policy is allowed without it being thoroughly investigated to ascertain the consequences dual citizenship will have on citizens’ rights and obligations in Norway (Greni, 2018.12.6, [10:20:55]: 1114). The “relational values” (Fairclough, 2015: 134) of this position reiterate the communitarian and republican conceptualizations of citizenship that underline individual’s duties and responsibilities as well as participation in the state institutions (Dumbrava, 2014: 17; Sinatti et al., 2015). In a way, it established citizenship as a dual process of rights and the duty to participate within the webs of power in sociopolitical relationships. In this context, becoming a dual citizen presupposes in what way the individual exercises citizenship rights in what Fairclough (2010: 128) called, meaning making in shifting fields of power relations. These contested relations within the state and its hegemonic forms of discipline, control, and administration establish the criteria for belonging to the national community. Hence, Norway’s dual citizenship discourse assigns responsibilities to immigrants, as they face new demands and opportunities for democratic participation and decision-making to improve their lives as individuals and of the community as a whole.

Denaturalization and the Challenge of Statelessness

The integrative dynamic of Norway's dual citizenship discourse is challenged by the exclusive crust of denaturalization. Denaturalization is an ideological attribute that modifies the power relations of immigrants who aspire to become dual citizens. Increasing articulation of denaturalization in the context of securitization can be noticed in the policy documents in what Vollmer (2016: 3) called, the discourse of bordering that activates while envisioning the harmonizing practice of excluding a section of the population in state interests. How the discourse position immigrants' is an effect of unequal relations of power as the state dominates over social processes and practices. Exclusionary practices, as Vollmer (2016: 4) points out, are morally legitimized over a range of policy agendas and by considering the proposition that some individuals do not merit to be engaged in the manner 'we' treat 'others.' In the words of Fairclough (2015: 27), "power provides the conditions of possibility for the social," thus entailing the ability to change social practices despite resistance. Along similar lines, the Norwegian government's proposition allowing dual citizenship clearly affirmed that:

Dual citizenship is a prerequisite to denaturalize persons who commit acts of terrorism or similar. However, if the person does not have other citizenship apart from the Norwegian, it will not be possible to withdraw the Norwegian citizenship although this may be a decisive security measure (Ministry of Education and Research, 2018.8.24: 6).

The constrained configuration of experiential, expressive, and relational values of the proposition not only conventionalized the expanded power of the state to denaturalize certain categories of people, but operationalized unequal power relations (Fairclough, 2015: 142). In retrospect, the Norwegian non-recognition of dual citizenship had three noble purposes: promoting loyalty to the state, integrating foreigners into Norway, and avoiding practical challenges (Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2016.6.9).

Both Bauböck (2006: 16) and Dumbrava (2014: 124) showed that citizenship conveys hegemonic exercise of power and the struggle to challenge, transform or reassert the state's power to denaturalize. As the literature revealed, citizenship is a qualification for an individual to be a member of a particular nation. Yet, each country holds the power to determine who is its own citizen by the state's nationality law, and no other country can interfere with this. Dual citizenship discourse therefore reveals an ideology which obfuscates and conceals real interests as it considers a fraction of citizens as enemies to be chased (Fairclough, 2015: 73). The discourse produces and reproduces the desired social effects than simply mystifying integration and participation into the social fabric. However, the drive toward denaturalization encounters countervailing trends to prevent and reduce statelessness (UN General Assembly, 1954; 1961). Statistics Norway (2017) underlined that statelessness causes difficulties in a wide range of areas, from unequal power relations to denial of civil and political rights, and it may even harm social cohesion and stability. Nonetheless, a Conservative Party representative, in the Norwegian parliament seemed to extend the denaturalization discourse by asserting that:

A new important legal basis for the withdrawal of Norwegian citizenship under criminal conditions has been opened. That the power to revoke citizenship under new section 26 (a) of the Norwegian Nationality Act, may in some cases be decisive for safeguarding national security. The abolition of a single citizenship is a condition for this guiding principle to take full effect (Trellevik, 2018.12.6, [10:17:01]: 1114).

This ideological frame unquestionably resonates with Fairclough's (1992: 72) conception of discourse and power, which states that discursive practice is a means by which a specific social interest is manifested and aimed at social and political domination. The dual citizenship discourse is a means of concealment through which a

system of exclusion by denaturalization is legitimized, practiced, and perpetrated against immigrants who become dual Norwegian citizens. The denaturalization discourse coded in the policy documents can be seen as an ideology of misrepresentation, opposed to the real state of things, aimed at ensuring “non-recognition” (Fraser, 1995: 71) on the part of those subject to this ideology. However, Vollmer (2016: 4) retorted that, heightened securitization does not alleviate the fear of the “other.” Thus, the dual citizenship discourse is rarely pure or disjointed from political preoccupations and calculations (Fairclough, 2015: 65). Although the withdrawal of citizenship has several layers and is complex in its production and formation, it expresses a core message: dual citizens must be controlled and expelled (Wodak, 2015: 44). The prevalence of this discourse appears to be essential for the Norwegian authorities to construct an image of desirability and securitization to implement restrictive dual citizenship discourse that uses denaturalization as a capstone. Concerted efforts by political entrepreneurs to have their cause for denaturalization adopted and legitimized as core social discourse reflects the ideological frame that:

It will be easier to strip persons of their Norwegian citizenship as punishments for offences such as terror, as well as individuals who obtained Norwegian citizenship by providing incorrect information (Engen-Helgheim, 2018.12.6, [11:26:56]: 1125).

In turn, the Ministry of Justice and Public Security proposed that the withdrawal of Norwegian citizenship only apply to persons with other citizenship in addition to the Norwegian (Storting, 2017.3.8: 1). These asymmetries are enabled through discursive mechanism of denaturalization as encapsulated within processes and practices (Fairclough, 1992: 71). The construction of dual citizens as constituting a major social problem is not simply a natural and harmless representation. Instead, the arguments reflect the dynamics of power relations that result from repeated expressions of distrust and cynicism of immigrants within the dual citizenship discourse.

It is also partly grounded in the political eagerness of exclusion. Yet, citizenship remains a desired and sought-after status, particularly due to the protection and enhanced rights that come with it, despite responsibilities (Bauböck, 2006: 18). The arguments reinforce the changing resources that are deployed, appropriated, reworked, and accepted to ensure the subordination and domination of dual citizens (Castles et al., 2000: 118).

The distinctive dynamics of this discourse is an interactive balancing process within unequal power relations that reveals the capacity and power of public authorities to change institutional structures and practices (Fairclough, 2015: 47). However, why does the idea of belonging to mainstream society through dual citizenship generate such a stronger sense of identification and attachment? Ideally, it can be argued that people are responsible for the consequences of their actions, even when such consequences may not have been their intended purpose (van Dijk, 2013: 262). Eventually, reducing this wealth of social and political responsibilities ascribed to the dual citizenship discourse runs the risk of taking a delimiting position as practice, or as forms of political and social reality through which relationships and power positions are constructed and debated (Fairclough, 1992: 73).

Moreover, the respondents, though more positive toward the dual citizenship discourse, also expressed the challenge of denaturalization when asked what they consider to be the challenges of becoming a dual citizen. Majority of the respondents believed that becoming a citizen of Norway without having to give up their former citizenship was welcome. In contrast, a section of the respondents also noted that dual Norwegian citizens risk being deprived of their Norwegian citizenship. This they observed is a problem because they believe their legal status may be unstable. Such responses indicated how revoking dual citizens of their Norwegian citizenship, may produce, reproduce, and establish unequal power relations. This supports Fairclough’s conception of discourse, which stipulates that in

discursive practice, relations between groups are made visible (Fairclough, 1992: 88). However, the ideological groundwork of the discourse had been cemented through legislative instruments. As demonstrated by Fairclough (2010: 27), issues, concepts, and actions are central to the political sphere of power. Power lies in promoting and winning through one's own vision, thereby preventing competing perceptions from being supported. Normative boundaries between what is and what should be perceived as fair and unjust is an essential part of this power struggle (Ibid: 28).

Contrary, a member of the Socialist Left Party (Norway) in the Norwegian parliament disagreed with the premise that dual citizenship would make it easier to denaturalize immigrants of their Norwegian citizenship.

The involuntary loss of Norwegian citizenship is a penalty for a criminal act, and not the power to expel more. This is because, if terrorism is to be prevented, denaturalization is probably not the important instrument (Andersen, 2018.12.6, [10:24:43]: 1115).

Correspondingly, a recommendation from the Norwegian parliament on the loss of citizenship under criminal conditions pointed out that:

Public authorities must seek to achieve a situation that in the long term reduces or does not increase the danger of violence and fear in the Norwegian society. For those at risk of revocation of citizenship, a fair trial must not give way to frustration in society (Storting, 2017.3.8: 14).

These arguments can be placed in two contexts. First, they demonstrate that the rules on denaturalization encapsulated in Norway's dual citizenship discourse could weaken public confidence in the state. Second, they portray citizenship as something to be earned and which can be revoked if a person's actions and values do not match state interests. The later reveals the arbitrariness of citizenship, which results in disproportionate differential treatment of some groups.

This makes Fraser's (1995: 69) emphasis on redistribution, recognition and justice through enabling and empowering as well as moments of accepting people as worthy members in social relations valuable. Recognition, as Fraser suggested, shows the construction of active consent in what Fairclough (1992: 65) attested as social transformation and the construction of a society whose constitution requires not taking over an apparatus, but transforming social processes and practices. Denaturalization thus corresponds to the injustice of misrecognition. From this perspective any policy aimed at solving a type of injustice will have to repair other axes of subordination in social relations. Hence, Norway's dual citizenship discourse, with a markedly redistributive character, must also foresee the effects it may have on denaturalization and statelessness conditions so as not to aggravate injustice. There underlines the need to approach all axes of subordination and unequal power relations to achieve greater inclusion of immigrants. It is a necessary condition for the enjoyment of dual citizenship rights that systemic sociopolitical inequalities are eliminated. Thus, justice as participatory parity tries to relegate unequal power relations, eschewing the limitations imposed by relations of domination.

Concluding Remarks

As the findings and discussions shows, integration is often aligned to the responsibility to conform to the sociocultural practices of the majority population. In other times it is linked to inclusion and active participation, each revealing its strengths and limits. Specifically, Norway's dual citizenship discourse is a positive interaction based on mutual openness between the receiving society and immigrant citizens. Yet it seems evident that, a fundamental power differential exists within the confines of the dual citizenship policy, whereby the immigrant aspiring for dual citizenship can remain in an unequal power position. This power disparity is politically and ideologically inherent, which the immigrant is unaware of. The rules and the processes of appropriation of the discourse can thus be the

products of domination, polarized constructions, and exclusion, eschewing any sign of an identical and naturally constituted unit. Instead of being naturally granted, the policy is produced through discursive practice as something that must be earned, with set standards.

Arguably, tying withdrawal of citizenship to a person's origin in criminal cases has racist connotations because it not only creates two classes of citizens, but has multiple implications regarding social cohesion, integration, political participation, and unequal relations of power. That some criminals will be hosted in host state at the expense of the taxpayer, with all the privileges and recourse to rehabilitation, while others will be deported if a foreign link is proven sends a strong message to the children of dual Norwegian citizens that their Norwegian citizenship is not absolute. The notion of responsibility thus shifts from the state to the individual. Hence, it is prudent that any decision to strip a person's citizenship is based on distinct practices that are grievous enough to fall under the category of vital state interests. Power should not necessarily occupy the totality of social space, nor should it simply create status distinctions, but should instrumentalize them.

Furthermore, the apprehension that dual Norwegian citizens would not identify enough with the country of residence seems questionable. On the contrary, there are strong signals that the greater willingness to naturalize associated with the dual citizenship discourse can encourage sociopolitical integration. The discourse offers immigrants the opportunity to maintain ties with their homeland and facilitates their naturalization in the country of residence. This strengthens their position in the place where they live and at the same time benefit the country of origin. The is vital since mutual acceptance, equal exchange and active participation are decisive aspects of the inclusion of diverse groups. Though, community participation does not derive mechanically from dual citizenship. It must be conceived above all as a process, which extends over time. In this way, the discourse strengthens

immigrants desire to be perceived as a full-fledged actor of society. Greater involvement in the resident state make it possible to better support the legitimacy of democratic decisions. In a world of strong interdependence, dual Norwegian citizens can also act as spokespersons for external interests in decision-making as well as internal opinion-forming processes, a potential that could be exploited and expanded.

References

1. Alarian, HM and Goodman, SW. Dual Citizenship Allowance and Migration Flow: An Origin Story. *Comparative Political Studies*, 2017; 50(1), 133-167 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414015626443>.
2. Andersen, K. Stortinget - Møte torsdag den 6. desember 2018 [Minutes of the Storting, 6 December 2018]. *Storting Journal*, 2018.12.6: [10:24:43] available from: <https://www.stortinget.no/globalassets/pdf/referat-er/stortinget/2018-2019/refs-201819-12-06.pdf>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
3. Baker, P, Gabrielatos, C, KorsraviNik, M, Krzyzanowski, M, McEnery, T and Wodak, R. A Useful Methodological Synergy? Combining Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics to Examine Discourses of Refugees and Asylum Seekers in the UK Press. In: Wodak, R. *Critical Discourse Analysis. Volume II. Methodologies*. Sage Publications Ltd, 2013.
4. Basok, T, Ilcan, S and Noonan, J. Citizenship, Human Rights, and Social Justice. *Citizenship Studies*, 2006; 10(3): 267-273 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020600772040>.
5. Bauböck, R. (ed.). *Migration and Citizenship: Legal Status, Rights and Political Participation*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006 available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46mvkf>. [Last accessed 8.3.2020].
6. Bauböck, R, Honohan, I, Huddleston, T, Hutcheson, D, Shaw, J and Vink, MP. *Access to Citizenship and its Impact on Immigrant Integration: European Summary and Standards*, 2013 available from: <https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/29828/AccessstoCitizenshipanditsImpactonImmigrantIntegration.pdf?sequence=1>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
7. Berglund, N. Parliament Approves Dual Citizenship, 2018 available from: <https://www.news-in-english.no/2018/12/06/parliament-approves-dual-citizenship/>. [Last accessed 5.2.2020].
8. Brannon, TN, Carter, ER, Murdock-Perriera, LA and Higginbotham, GD. From Backlash to

- Inclusion for All: Instituting Diversity Efforts to Maximize Benefits Across Group Lines'. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 2018; 12(1): 57-90 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12040>.
9. Bransdal, T. Stortinget - Møte torsdag den 6. desember 2018 [Minutes of the Storting, 6 December 2018]. *Storting Journal*, 2018.12.6: [10:34:39] available from: <https://www.stortinget.no/globalassets/pdf/referater/stortinget/2018-2019/refs-201819-12-06.pdf>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 10. Brochmann, G and Hagelund, A. *Immigration Policy and the Scandinavian Welfare State 1945-2010*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
 11. Bryman, A. *Social Research Methods*. 5th Ed. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2016.
 12. Castles, S and Davidson, A. *Citizenship and Migration. Globalization and the Politics and Belonging*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
 13. Castles, S and Miller, MJ. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. 4th Ed. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
 14. Council of Europe. *Convention on Reduction of Cases of Multiple Nationality and Military Obligations in Cases of Multiple Nationality*. ETS 43, 1963 available from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b37814.html>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 15. Crawford, J. *Brownie's Principles of Public International Law*. 8th Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
 16. Di Bartolomeo A, and Kalantaryan S. *Counting the Uncountable - Measuring Migrant Integration Between Origin and Destination*. In: Di Bartolomeo A, Kalantaryan S, Salamońska J, Fargues P. (eds.) *Migrant Integration between Homeland and Host Society Volume 2. Global Migration Issues*, Springer, Cham, 2017; 8 doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56370-1_3.
 17. Dumbrava, C. *Nationality, Citizenship and Ethno-Cultural Belonging: Preferential Membership Policies in Europe*. England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
 18. Engen-Helgheim, J. Stortinget - Møte torsdag den 6. desember 2018 [Minutes of the Parliament. 6 December 2018]. *Storting Journal*, 2018.12.6: [11:26:56] available from: <https://www.stortinget.no/globalassets/pdf/referater/stortinget/2018-2019/refs-201819-12-06.pdf>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 19. Ericson, DF. *The Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion: Identity Politics in Twenty-First Century America*. New York and London: Routledge, 2011.
 20. Fairclough, N. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press 1992.
 21. Fairclough, N. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Ltd, 2010.
 22. Fairclough, N. *Language and Power*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2015.
 23. Faist, T. *Dual Citizenship in Europe: From Nationhood to Societal Integration*. Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007.
 24. Foucault, M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1972.
 25. Fraser, N. *From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a Post-Socialist' Age*. *New Left Review*, 1995; 212. 68(26) available from: <https://newleftreview.org/issues/I212/articles/nancy-fraser-from-redistribution-to-recognition-dilemmas-of-justice-in-a-post-socialist-age>. [Last accessed 8.3.2020].
 26. Greni, H. Stortinget - Møte torsdag den 6. desember 2018 [Minutes of Parliament 6 December 2018]. *Storting Journal*, 2018.12.6: [10:20:55] available from: <https://www.stortinget.no/globalassets/pdf/referater/stortinget/2018-2019/refs-201819-12-06.pdf>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 27. Hagelund, A. *Problematizing Culture: Discourses on Integration in Norway*. In: *Journal of International Migration & Integration*, 2002; 3: 401-415 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-002-1022-7>.
 28. Harinen, P, Pitkänen, P, Sagne, S and Ronkainen, J. *Multiple Citizenship as a Challenge for Finnish Citizenship Policy Today*. In: Devorah, KF and Pitkänen, P. *Multiple Citizenship as a Challenge to European Nation-States*. Sense Publishers, 2007 doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087901653_006.
 29. Joppke, C. *Citizenship and Immigration*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010.
 30. Joppke, C. *Civic Integration in Western Europe: Three Debates*. *West European Politics*, 2017; 40(6): 1153-1176 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2017.1303252>.
 31. Kymlicka, W. *Multicultural citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
 32. Marshall, TH. *Citizenship and Social Class*. In TH. Marshall, Class, Citizenship, and Social Development. *Essays by TH. Marshall*. New York: Anchor Books, 1964.
 33. Ministry of Education and Research. *Proposisjon til Stortinget (Forslag til Lovvedtak) Endringer i Statsborgerloven (Avvikling av Prinsippet om ett Statsborgerskap) [Proposal to Parliament on Amendment to the Norwegian Nationality Act (Termination of the Principle of a Single Citizenship)]*. Prop. 111 L. (2017-2018), 2018.8.24 available from:

- <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/be6fea2d8a1e496086e4cf48ce77762c/no/pdfs/prp201720180111000dddpdfs.pdf>. [Last accessed 16.2.2020].
34. Ministry of Justice and Public Security. Endringer i Statsborgerloven mv. (Tap av Statsborgerskap ved Straffbare Forhold eller av Hensyn til Grunnleggende Nasjonale Interesser) [Amendments to the Nationality Act (Loss of Citizenship Under Criminal Circumstances or for Reasons of Vital National Interests)] Prop. 146 L (2016–2017), 2016.6.9 available from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/prop.-146-l-20162017/id2555641/?ch=1>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 35. Modood, T. *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
 36. Norwegian Centre for Research Data. Official Data Protection for Research, 1971 available from: <https://nsd.no/nsd/english/pvo.html>. [Last accessed 19.2.2020].
 37. Norwegian Nationality Act. LOV-2005-06-10-51, Ministry of Education and Research, 2005 available from: <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2005-06-10-51>. [Last accessed 24.2.2020].
 38. Norwegian Directorate of Immigration. Innvilgede Statsborgerskap etter Opprinnelig Statsborgerskap [Naturalization by Former Citizenship], 2019 available from: <https://www.udi.no/statistikk-og-analyse/statistikk/innvilgede-statsborgerskap-etter-opprinnelig-statsborgerskap-2019/>. [Last accessed 12.2.2020].
 39. Nussbaum, MC. *Political Emotions*. Harvard University Press, 2013 available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt6wpqm7>. [Last accessed 24.2.2020].
 40. Office of the Prime Minister. Jeløya-Plattformen, Punkt fem' [Jeløya Platform, Point 5]. 2018.1.14 available from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/e4c3cfd7e4d4458fa8d3d2bb1e43bcbb/plattform.pdf>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 41. Onwuegbuzie, AJ and Collins, KM. A Typology of Mixed Methods Sampling Designs in Social Science Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 2007; 12(2): 281-316 available from: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol12/iss2/9>. [Last accessed 20.2.2020].
 42. Parekh, B. *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. 2nd ed. Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.
 43. Pettersen, SV. Overgang til Norsk Statsborgerskap de Siste 37 år: Stadig Lavere Andel som tar Norsk Statsborgerskap' [Acquisition of Norwegian Citizenship The last 37 years: Still Lower Percentage That Acquire Norwegian Citizenship], 2015.1.7 available from: <http://www.ssb.no/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/stadig-lavere-andel-som-tar-norsk-statsborgerskap>. [Last accessed 20.2.2020].
 44. Sinatti, G and Horst, C. Migrants as Agents of Development: Diaspora Engagement Discourse and Practice in Europe, 2015; 15(1): 134-152. Sage doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796814530120>.
 45. Statistics Norway. Statelessness: Many Worldwide, Few in Norway. Statistics Norway, 2017 available from: <https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/statelessness-many-worldwide-few-in-norway>. [Last accessed 11.2.2020].
 46. Storting. Innstilling fra Kommunal- og Forvaltningskomiteen om Endringer i Statsborgerloven mv. (Tap av Statsborgerskap ved Straffbare Forhold eller av Hensyn til Grunnleggende Nasjonale Interesser) [Recommendation from the Municipal and Administrative Committee on Amendments to the Nationality Act (Loss of Citizenship Under Criminal Circumstances or for Reasons of Vital National Interests)] Innst. 173 L (2017-2018), 2017.3.8 available from: <https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Publikasjoner/Innstillinger/Stortinget/2017-2018/inns-201718-173/>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 47. Storting. Stortinget - Møte torsdag den 6. desember 2018 [Minutes of Parliament 6 December 2018]. *Storting Journal*, 2018.12.6 available from: <https://www.stortinget.no/globalassets/pdf/referater/stortinget/2018-2019/refs-201819-12-06.pdf>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 48. Storting. Endringer i Statsborgerloven Prop. 111 L (2017-2018), Innst. 74 L (2018-2019), Lovvedtak 17 (2018-2019)' [Amendments to the Nationality Act. Prop. 111 L (2017-2018), Innst. 74 L (2018-2019), Legislative Decision 17 (2018-2019)], 2018.12.10 available from: <https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Saker/Sak/?p=73038>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].
 49. Thorud, E. Immigration and Integration 2017-2018, Report for Norway to the OECD, 2017-2018 available from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/fe206a22df754b8792740fb81109a761/immigration-and-integration-2017-2018-report-for-norway.pdf>. [Last accessed 20.2.2020].
 50. Trellevik, O. Stortinget - Møte torsdag den 6. desember 2018 [Minutes of the Storting, 6 December 2018]. *Storting Journal*, 2018.12.6: [10:17:01] available from:

<https://www.stortinget.no/globalassets/pdf/referater/stortinget/2018-2019/refs-201819-12-06.pdf>. [Last accessed 4.2.2020].

51. Turner, BS. *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: Sage Publications, 1993.
52. UN General Assembly. *Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons*. UN Treaty Series, 1954; 360: 117 available from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3840.html>. [Last accessed 12.2.2020].
53. UN General Assembly. *Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness*. UN Treaty Series, 1961; 989: 175 available from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b39620.html>. [Last accessed 12.2.2020].
54. van Dijk, T. *Discourse and the Denial of Racism*. In: Wodak, R. *Critical Discourse Analysis: Volume I. Concepts, History, Theory*. Sage Benchmarks in Language and Linguistics. London: Sage Publications Ltd, 2013.
55. Vink, MP, Prokic-Breuer, T and Dronkers, J. *Immigrant Naturalization in the Context of Institutional Diversity: Policy Matters, but to whom?* Forthcoming in *International Migration* (Accepted for Publication, February 2013), 2013 available from: http://eudo-citizenship.eu/docs/Vink,%20Prokic%20en%20Dronkers_IM%20forthcoming_immigrant%20naturalization%20in%20Europe.pdf. [Last accessed 12.2.2020].
56. Vink MP, Prokic-Breuer T, and Dronkers J. *Access to Citizenship and the Role of Origin Countries*. In: Weinar A., Unterreiner A., Fargues P. (eds). *Migrant Integration Between Homeland and Host Society Volume 1. Global Migration Issues*, Springer, Cham, 2017; 7 doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56176-9_9.
57. Vollmer, BA. *A Hermeneutical Approach to European Bordering*. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 2016; 25(1): 1-15 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2016.1148591>.
58. Waldinger, R. *Immigrant Transnationalism*. *Current Sociology Review*, Sage, 2013; 61(5-6): 756-777 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113498692>.
59. Wodak, R and Weiss, G. *Analyzing European Union Discourses: Theories and Applications*. In: Wodak, R and Chilton, P. *A New Agenda in Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. John Benjamins B.V.: Amsterdam, 2005 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/dap-sac.13.10wod>.
60. Wodak, R. *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*. London: Sage Publications, 2015 doi:

