**Appendix A**

In order to create my dependent variable for citizenship policy change, I coded formal state legislation and legal texts as well as scholarly reports on citizenship policies collected by EUDO Citizenship Observatory’s database of National Citizenship Laws (2014). Excessive care was taken to ensure that the universe of relevant legislation was included in the data, and I cross-checked my collection of laws and policies across subsequent legislation and against EUDO’s collection of legal documents. For each legal document reviewed, the relevant legislation was scanned for keywords related to any of the nine criteria analyzed here and coded according to the scheme presented in the table below. Subsequent policy changes were coded according to the same scheme for the years in which new legislation was passed. Peers’ linguistic proficiency as well as widely available language translation services were utilized for some country cases. Secondary sources, especially EUDO’s individual Country Reports, were also essential in filling in some annual gaps where legal sources were unavailable or ambiguous. I am especially grateful for the work of scholars in compiling such a database of legal texts and country reports.

Using these documents, I coded citizenship policies passed by the legislatures of sixteen Western European countries from 1975 to 2014 on the basis nine common criteria that immigrants must meet in order to acquire citizenship. The coding scheme adapts and expands upon the two-dimensional scheme first advanced by Goodman (2010), who combines Howard’s (2009, 2010) Citizenship Policy Index (CPI) with her own CIVIX measures. As discussed in the article, one set of criteria captures an *ascriptive* dimension of citizenship, and reflects the extent to which membership is costly to immigrants in terms of their eligibility and the non-performance barriers to membership. Higher policy scores on this dimension exact high standards of latent integration on those seeking eligibility for citizenship, incentivizing acquisition for those who may share certain ethnic, cultural, or social characteristics of the country, while restricting others entirely. Using revisions of Howard’s (2010) CPI, this dimension includes what I call social, cultural, lineal, and ethnic criteria for eligibility, the specific coding scheme for which is detailed in the table below.[[1]](#footnote-1) The second set of criteria fall along a *performative* dimension and reflect the extent to which citizenship is costly for immigrants in terms of their performance and achievement. These criteria are more descriptive than ascriptive, and reflect a state’s efforts to observe and measure the content and achievement of integration directly (Goodman 2010, 2012). Higher policy scores on this dimension exact higher standards of manifest integration and membership, incentivizing citizenship acquisition among immigrants who can bear such demonstrable costs of membership. The policy components captured within this set of measures also adapts and expands on aspects of previous scholarship, namely Goodman’s (2010) CIVIX and Janoski’s (2010) BNI, and include linguistic, economic, civic, legal, and familial requirements of citizenship.[[2]](#footnote-2)

All components are scored from 0-2 according to the coding scheme presented in the table below, with the exception of linguistic cost, which goes up to a score of 3 to account for the various levels of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages now formally incorporated by most countries. For the sake of comparability, all components were finally normalized from 0 to 1 and then aggregated to capture the relative level of restrictiveness of overall citizenship policy of a state in a given year.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The countries in the sample include Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. I restricted the analysis to these Western European countries in particular because that historical experiences with immigration differ from those of Eastern Europe, who have only recently begun to experience the same policy pressures associated with immigration. The year 1975 was selected as a start point since most Western European states by that year had settled upon a stable post-war citizenship policy, yet that is also a date prior to the period of increasing politicization of immigration and citizenship in Western European political discourse.



1. In contrast to the CPI, I do not include on this dimension ‘civic integration’ requirements here, such as mandatory language and civics tests, nor spousal naturalization criteria, which is more consistent with Goodman (2010). I also omit the CPI’s adjustment for naturalization rates, since these measures are the product of citizenship policy rather than a formal component of it. My coding does include an ethnic dimension that the CPI does not. With these adjustments, the Pearson’s *r* correlation statistic between my ascriptive critieria and the CPI is -0.78 (*p* = 0.000). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. My measures differ from CIVIX in that they only measure membership criteria at the stage of citizenship (Gate 3), whereas CIVIX incorporates requirements at the stages of immigrant entry (Gate 1) and immigrant settlement (Gate 2). My quantification also includes good character/criminality requirements and and economic self-sufficiency requirements that are not included in the CIVIX but are included in Janoski’s (2010) Barriers to Nationality Index (BNI). With these adjustments, the Pearson’s *r* correlation statistic between my performative criteria and CIVIX is 0.75 (*p* = 0.000). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For a discussion of coding and measurement issues in the literature on citizenship policy that I used to guide my quantification process, see Michalowski and van Oers (2012), Goodman (2012b), and Helbling et al. (2013). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)