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ABSTRACT

Very few empirical studies in migration and citizenship focus on immigrants' perceptions of the concept of citizenship and its prominent features. Based on the semi-structured interviews of 8 Pakistani immigrants (Swedish citizenship holders and non-citizenship holders) in Sweden, this study aimed to understand how these immigrants perceive and define Swedish citizenship, and how do they value it in material, symbolic, and emotional terms. Through conceptual framework and literature review of citizenship in its symbolic, materialistic, and emotional term, three central approaches mobility, sense of security, and sense of belonging were derived and analyzed. The findings of this research suggest that immigrants who participated in this study tend to value Swedish citizenship. They are very concerned about their security and protection which is provided by the state to a citizen in every sphere of life; economically, socially, politically; protection against the deportation; and while traveling anywhere in the world. These immigrants perceived that passport makes a difference, and during travel, it enables and constrains inequalities, restrictions, and uncertainties in the mobility arena. Furthermore, when it comes to belongings: the interviewee relate it to work, spending time in the country, and participation in the society. Finally, this study recommends further research with different migrants groups in Sweden to understand the true essence of Swedish citizenship in immigrants' worldview.
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01. INTRODUCTION

I, my husband and my 2-year child were traveling back from my homeland. At the Swedish airport, I had to stand in a separate queue than my husband and child, due to holding a non-European passport. My husband and son had Swedish passports. It took them only one minute to go to the counter and move on. For me, because I was holding my origin’s passport, the officer at the counter started questioning me, like how long have you been living here, Why, and so on. They were looking at me very strangely as if I am an alien. I was feeling that staying ten years in this country, getting the education, and working here do not make me belong to this country; I am still a stranger. Next thing which I did, when I reached home, I applied for the citizenship (Kiran).

People attach various meanings to citizenship, and they have their own perceptions about it. They value it differently and acquire it for different reasons. Their attached meanings, understandings, and opinions on citizenship are sometimes rather diverse than to what it mostly is. In most cases, after becoming a formal citizen, an immigrant gains many privileges such as the right to vote, immunity from deportation, access to the labor market, welfare benefits, and a passport — which makes travel comfortable and accessible to many countries (Aptekar: 2015: 1144). In Sweden, an immigrant who has permanent residence status (PR1) gets access to all the welfare benefits offered by the state, and a right to the family reunion with other privileges. In addition to this, citizenship provides mobility freedom, voting right, and unlimited right to stay in Sweden. According to Aptekar (2015) “given these rights and benefits, citizenship is an indicator of immigrant inclusion as well as a measure of social reproduction of the nation through immigration” (ibid.). Nevertheless, immigrants value citizenships according to their own understandings, by associating various meanings as mentioned above. Some of the immigrants link it to the freedom to travel, for some immigrants it is protection against deportation, some value it for political reasons, and some acquire it due to economic motives, and so forth (ibid.).

By discussing immigrants’ viewpoints on citizenship, which has been extensively left out within the literature, this study is interested in the empirical discussions on the meanings and salience of citizenship. Moreover, this study argues that immigrants’ perspectives are necessary to take into account. It is to understand what citizenship means to them— because these policies and laws are there to facilitate immigrants’ cohesion and integration within the society (Bevelander et al. 2015: Permanent residence permit (PUT) means that non-Swedish citizens are entitled to live and work in Sweden without a time limit. Permanent residence permit is issued by the Swedish Migration Board.
2). However, immigrants may consider and experience these affairs differently. Therefore, accounting their experiences can be helpful for better policy making and consequently for better integration and cohesion in the society.

1.1. Aim and Research Questions

According to Swedish Central Bureau of Statistics (SCB²), approximately 60,000 immigrants were granted Swedish citizenship in 2016 — which is an increase of 12 percent compared to the year before. It is the highest number of people ever granted the Swedish citizenship in a year (SCB: 2016). There are various motives behind their Swedish citizenship acquisition. Nevertheless, in most cases, scholars discuss macro perspectives of citizenship in relation to state, its policies, and immigration. However, the micro aspects of citizenship, which are based on immigrants' perceptions, are left unnoticed (Joppke 2010: 39). The scholars are more interested in talking about citizens than to talk with citizens (Leitner & Ehrkamp 2006: 1616). By taking this into account, this research aims to discuss these micro perspectives: How do Pakistani immigrants (citizenship holders and non-citizenship holders) in Sweden perceive Swedish citizenship. To reach this aim, I have stipulated the following research questions:

1- What does Swedish citizenship mean to Pakistani immigrants in Sweden?
2- How do these immigrants value Swedish citizenship in material, symbolic, and emotional terms?

1.2. Delimitations and Limitations

With some limitations such as time and resources, this study also has some delimitations. Therefore, some points are worth highlighting to delineate the process in which this research has been conducted, and also to explain what this thesis does not do. First and foremost, this study is based on the interviews of Pakistani immigrants due to the fact that it will provide the homogeneity in their social, cultural and political background which is crucial in their migration decisions. Secondly, according to the aim and research questions of this study, the qualitative method in general and semi-structured interviews in particular, was selected as a suitable method to use. However, a limitation is the number of interviews. The timeframe, scale of the study, and difficulties in finding informants did not allow to conduct more than eight interviews. However, this also helped the researcher to focus on significant issues, and minimize the risk of losing valuable

information; since it was easier to handle and keep track of the data for fewer people. It also helps other researchers to reconstruct a study or advance future studies on the same topic. Thirdly, this is a micro-level study which includes individual experiences, views, and perceptions; therefore, the position of the state is not a part of the investigation. Even though it may be relevant, this study chose an individual as the “analytical category” for investigations. However, state policies are discussed in the contextual background and provides sufficient ground to understand the relevance of this study.

1.3. Structure of the Thesis

The thesis endeavours to develop an ordering that will facilitate a steady transition from one section to the another. The thesis consists of eight chapters, including this Chapter 01 of introduction. Chapter 02 consists of a brief contextual background of this study and illustrates a brief overview of the Swedish citizenship legislation, ways to acquire and possibilities to lose the citizenship, and discussion on Pakistani immigrants in Sweden. Chapter 03 discusses a selection of previously done studies on the micro factors; immigrants' viewpoints, opinions, and perceptions on citizenship and its prominent features. Chapter 04 provides the conceptual framework that underpins this study. The concept of citizenship and its meaning is looked in detail while presenting a brief introduction on the meanings of citizenship in material, symbolic and emotional terms: those conclude in three main factors; mobility, sense of security and belonging. Chapter 05 describes the research method in about three stages: Development of the research design, conduction of the interviews, and processing the material. Chapter 06 presents and analyses the transcribed material in four themes namely; the meaning of citizenship, mobility, sense of security, and sense of belonging. Chapter 07 summarizes and concludes the study with closing remarks including the suggestions for future studies.
02. Contextual Background

European and North American immigrants tend to value their citizenship highly in their countries (Aptekar 2016; Galvez 2013; Leitner & Ehrkamp 2006). In this age of migration, citizenship became a matter of much significance in many countries. The debates about the meaning of citizenship and rights connected to it have become something very significant. According to Marshall (2000) “the history of citizenship is a narrative of a growing number of people who came to enjoy more and more rights and freedoms as part of being a citizen. Civil rights first developed, then political rights and, finally, social rights” (Nordberg 2006: 525). In the early ages, these civil rights were granted only for a small group of men belonging to noble families, however, after some time these rights were expanded to include mostly men of the society. Eventually, everyone is included, despite their race, gender, or social status (Goodin, 2003: 08).

Citizenship is now something more than rights and responsibilities. It is also about experiences of belonging and recognition (Nordberg 2006: 525). Citizenship entitled a person a formal membership in a nation-state (Joppke 2007: 39). The official citizenship status provides an immigrant the political and legal status which is almost as close as native-born (ibid.).


Citizenship always remained an insignificant matter within political debates in Sweden because the requirements for granting permanent residence are more in the discussions — since it holds almost equal rights as citizenship (Bernitz 2012: 19). Moreover, until recently, there are no clear politically motivated goals concerning naturalization in Sweden, aside from achieving the country’s international responsibilities on refugees (ibid.). However, being distinctly unique in this respect, “the trend of liberalization has been more extensive in Sweden than in Norway and particularly in Denmark” (Brochmann et al. 2017: 615). Above all, it has been more consistent (ibid.).

Furthermore, since ages the ‘ius sanguinis’ law had been prevalent in Sweden; nevertheless, it was initiated officially in the Citizenship Act of 1894 (ibid.). From that time, citizenship reforms have been done in 1924, 1950, and 2001, "and ius sanguinis has remained the principal rule, even though the principle of domicile gained much importance through the Citizenship Act of 2001” (ibid.). However, since 1979, children, who have Swedish mother, were allowed to grant citizenship at birth automatically. Moreover, the revision of citizenship Act in 1894 was a result of Nordic collaboration. Consequently, It was a continuation of old policies except for one addition legislation on the loss of citizenship and automatic acquisition of citizenship (ibid.:
03). The revision of Act of 1924, was substantially similar to previous Act with a slight change in the Act’s name from ‘citizen’s rights’ to ‘citizenship’. One notable change that came into force was the loss of citizenship (ibid.).

However, after the Second World War, the revision Act of 1924 was considered necessary in 1950. The Act of 1950, mirrored the previous Act; however, some points were more emphasized such as “the ius sanguinis tradition, the wish to avoid statelessness, and the fact that double citizenship should be avoided” (Brochmann 2017: 615). Moreover, one prominent development of this Act was acceptance of women as equal as men for applying and acquiring the citizenship (sect. 6) (Bernitz 2012: 06). After 1950, the Citizenship Act was revised in the year 2001. However, in the 1970s, requirements of residence period for naturalization were decreased from seven to five years; for refugees and the stateless four years; and two years for Nordic nationals (SOU 1974:69; Prop. 1975/1976:136). Unlike the 1950s Act, the Act of 2001 completely allows ‘dual citizenship’. That means a person who holds Swedish citizenship can acquire foreign citizenship and keep both, and vice versa (Brochmann, 2017: 615).

2.1.1. Ways of Acquiring and Losing Swedish Citizenship

The foremost principle of naturalization in Sweden is Ius sanguinis. However, Ius soli is also functional to avoid statelessness, and because of “Sweden’s ratification of the European Convention on Nationality” (Bernitz 2012: 11). There are three fundamental grounds for acquiring Swedish citizenship: “automatically, by notification, and by application for naturalization” (ibid.). Firstly, those who receive Swedish citizenship automatically are kids who get it by birth (Citizenship Act, sect. 1) (ibid.). Furthermore, according to the fundamental principle, a child obtains Swedish citizenship by birth if the mother is a Swedish citizen, whether the child is born in Sweden or not. Secondly, the citizenship through notification can be acquired by three types of groups: “stateless children born in Sweden (sect. 6), other children holding a permanent residence permit and who have been domiciled in Sweden for at least five years (three years if the child is stateless) (sect. 7), and young persons who have reached the age of eighteen but who are not yet twenty” (sect. 8) (ibid: 12).

Thirdly, a long-term residence in Swedish society is considered some degree of attachment to the state. Therefore, through an application for naturalization, an immigrant can apply
for citizenship after a required residence period which is in most cases five years, for refugees four years, and three years for an immigrant who married to a Swede (Brochmann, 2017: 616). Moreover, as far as loss of citizenship is concerned, there is no ground on which a person who already has been naturalized lose the citizenship, and “it means that a decision on citizenship can never be annulled” (Bernitz 2012: 15). Therefore, as already mentioned “there is a provision in the Instrument of Government (Chapter 2 art. 7) stating that no citizen who is domiciled in Sweden or who has previously been domiciled in Sweden may be deprived of his or her citizenship. Introduction of denaturalization had, however, been suggested in 2006, but so far the outcome of this proposal has not been decided” (ibid.). However, according to Citizenship Act. Section 14, there is only one ground on which a person can automatically lose citizenship at the age of 22. The ground for losing citizenship is that if the person was foreign-born, never been registered or reside in Sweden, and there was no considerable link between that person and the state (ibid.:16).

2.2. Pakistani Community in Sweden

According to Overseas Minisitry of Pakistanis, nearly 7.6 million Pakistanis are living overseas, and according to the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Pakistanis make the 6th largest diaspora of the world (The Tribune: 2016). According to a report by Statistiska Centralbyrån (Statistics Sweden), there are approximately 18,000 Pakistani immigrants are living in Sweden. These are the people who were born in Pakistan and migrated to Sweden later in their lives (SCB: 2017).

There is currently a deficit of studies on this diaspora which can provide information on the fact that when and why Pakistani immigrants started migrating to Sweden. However, some of the studies in Denmark and Norway indicate that Pakistani immigration to Sweden began in the 1970s as “guest workers” similar to other European Countries (Eriksen: 1997). The most of the Pakistanis who arrived in Sweden for general labour in the 1970s moved to other states due to severe weather and other settlement problems. After that period, most of the Pakistani immigrants came to Sweden for the family reunion or as students. More recently, family reunion and studies are the primary purposes of migrants arriving in Sweden from Pakistan until recently (ibid.). Most of them, live in the major cities of Sweden; Stockholm, Malmö, Gothenburg, Uppsala, and Helsingborg.
03. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Since the era of the 1980s, citizenship, and immigration appeared as a distinct area of research, the primary theories of citizenship argued widely, but still lacking a clear and precise explanation (Bauböck 2006:9). Citizenship is a social category that stratifies the immigrant groups and works as a symbol of immigrant's inclusion into the society. Furthermore, it is “a measure of social reproduction of the nation” through immigration (Aptekar: 2015: 1144). Although there is a lack of empirical studies on immigrants' opinions, perceptions, and experiences about citizenship, some studies can be found on immigrants in Australia, America, and Canada. Nevertheless, there is a shortage of studies on this subject in Swedish perspective. In general, scholars discover various aspects of citizenship which are of significance in immigrants' opinions and perceptions. The following section presents some of the previously done studies on the meaning of citizenship accounted by the immigrants.

Aptekar (2016) in a qualitative study interviews immigrants from the U.S and Canada to investigates “how immigrants explain their decisions to acquire citizenship” (p:1141). The study consists of an analysis of informants' understanding of citizenship in the light of various theories and dimensions. Immigrants from the U.S opposed considering citizenship as “identity-changing”, but they recognize it as a “common-sense move” for permanent settlement and “belonging” (ibid.). On the contrary, Canadian informants regard citizenship as a tool which tied them to a nation which has very favourable values (ibid.). However, both countries’ informants show interest in voting and mobility privileges which comes with citizenship. About half of the naturalizing immigrants brought up unrestricted mobility unprompted as one of their grounds for seeking citizenship, and above 70 % of the total while questioned (ibid. 1152). However, only American informants sought the “protection that citizenship would afford in an anti-immigrant policy climate” (ibid.). Only a few informants of the study reflected that they became American or Canadian after being naturalized. None of them mentioned that they acquired citizenship to become American or Canadian (ibid.). Nonetheless, many of the informants stressed that they were already American and Canadian because they were settled down there, working and paying taxes and contributing to the society before getting citizenship (ibid. 1157).

Furthermore, Galvez (2013: 729), in a study drawing on ethnographic data of two parallel investigations among Mexican immigrants in New York City, “examines the lived meanings of citizenship and the centrality of (im)mobility in immigrant claims for the rights of citizenship”. She
finds out that restricted mobility plays a crucial role in an immigrant's life, and that is the primary motivation behind their acquisition of citizenship which provides freedom to travel across the borders. Similarly, Coutin (2010) based on a case study discusses the policies about how undocumented Salvadoran immigrants in the USA have experienced the movement difficulties across the borders; and what citizenship and belonging means to them (p: 205). Coutin (2010) further explains that these policies, to secure the immigration, increased border protection, arrests and deportation to stop unlawful mobility, are troublesome for unauthorized travellers to cross the borders (ibid.). Therefore, undocumented and irregular migrants are scared to leave their origin countries due to the fear of losing “territorially conferred rights”. In this policy, national boundaries are more like “zones of confinement” (ibid.: 206). The U.S citizenship would provide them the freedom of movement, with an opportunity to visit their friends and families in El Salvador (ibid.: 200-3).

Moreover, Leitner and Ehrkamp (2006: 1615) in ethnographic research conducted in Germany and the United States between 1998 and 2001 discuss the value and meanings that immigrants assign to the citizenship and its practices. They argue how and why migrants' viewpoints conform in meaningful ways across these two countries, “while also varying among migrants. National citizenship remains meaningful in their struggle for mobility across borders, for equal protection under the law, and for equal access to social and political rights” (ibid.). Therefore, in both countries, immigrants attached high value to the passport of the host countries, because it brings freedom to travel to their origin countries and other parts of the world (ibid.:1629).

Nunn et al. (2015), in a qualitative study based on 51 in-depth interviews of young adults from refugee backgrounds in Australia, conclude that among those immigrants mobility and security emerge as the fundamental privileges of formal state citizenship. The study further illustrates that for several immigrants who have instability in their origin countries, security remains the citizenship's prominent aspect. The security that citizenship provides in case of travel with “right to come back, as well as the protection it offers overseas and during transit, both through consular assistance and, more generally, through the symbolic value of an Australian passport” is a “formal mechanism of belonging to a (stable, developed) nation-state” (ibid.: 391). However, for some of the participants, citizenship not only offer the freedom to come back to Australia and gives a sense of protection while abroad but also a sense of security in their status in Australia in the form of rights they get with citizenship (ibid.).
Consequently, a greater sense of belonging is not fully attached to legal citizenship status but great participation in “social, political and economic” life (Canefe, 2007). Immigration countries endeavor different policies and plan to integrate the immigrants into their societies, “but for all the opportunity, recognition, and protection these policies provide, significant challenges of cohesion, prosperity, and belonging still remain” (Goodman 2009: 01).

According to Mau et al. (2015) for immigrants who come from the South part of the world, passport of the democratic and Western countries is a fundamental purpose of acquiring citizenship (p. 1195). Leuchter (2014) in his qualitative study based on unstructured in-depth interviews with 23 Israeli immigrants concludes the same thing mentioned by Mau et al. (2015) that for some immigrants citizenship is not the tool of belonging but a link to have the passport. He further stresses “that citizenship is reinvented and reinterpreted through local contexts, understandings, and experiences” (p: 786).

Accordingly, in his study of Israeli citizens, he discovered the causes why Israeli immigrants obtain European citizenship. He points out that how Israeli immigrants who had acquired another citizenship constitute a contrast between their Israeli citizenship, which they conceptualize in the sense of identity and belonging, and their ‘European passport’, which they describe “as a ‘technical non-obliging document’ and acquire European citizenship to maximize their movement. Thus naturalizing poses a question on national loyalty. However, the other sought-after citizenship, which signifies a legally tying attachment to a nation-state, paradoxically becomes a powerful symbol of freedom, incorporating other life possibilities and allowing for an active negotiation of belonging” (ibid.: 787). He concludes that “the desired object is not citizenship but a foreign passport that functions as an instrument of bureaucratic control over their movement” (ibid.: 782). Leuchter (2014) quoted a young 27 years old Israeli computer analyst who explains the absence of a connection between the passport and the notion of citizenship (ibid.).

“I don’t consider myself to be a French citizen; I just have a French passport. For me, citizenship means belonging, but a passport . . . well, it’s just a possibility to belong”. (cited in Leuchter, 2014, p. 781).

Bloemraad (2006) argues that for immigrants, citizenship and belonging are connected to “social movement mobilization, involving friends, family, co-ethnic organizations and local community leaders and the strength of their ties to native-born citizens” (p. 666). Furthermore, Leitner and Ehrkamp (2006, 1676) ethnographic study on Turkish immigrants in Germany reveals
the dialectical correlation between immigrants and the host society. She discusses that immigrants' “identities are socially and politically constructed through individual and group formation, shared experiences and the narratives that groups tell about themselves” (ibid.). She continues that representations of immigrants in debates in the host society by “labels and ascriptions are integral to migrants' own constructions of identity” (ibid.). Turkish migrants sense the “animosity” of German community to them, which in turn guides them away from the host society by “invoking sentiments of cynicism and resistance toward expectations of assimilation. In this way, the sociality of emotions constitutes the social relations and structures associated with citizenship” (ibid.). Emotions are often mentioned in literature on identity, belonging, and citizenship (ibid.: 790)
4. Conceptual Framework

4.1. The Meaning of Citizenship in Literature

The Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary (2005, 7th ed.) defines citizenship as “the legal right to belong to a particular country” or the “state of being a citizen and accepting the responsibilities of it”. While dual citizenship implies to “the state of being a citizen in two different countries” (ibid.).

The definitions mentioned above are just merely constructed phrases which facilitate to understand what citizenship means in general. Nonetheless, in social sciences, the concept of citizenship is amongst those concepts which are simple to understand and recognize, but challenging to pin down and define (Tambakaki 2010: 36). Therefore, within the literature, the meaning of citizenship is heavily contested.

There are several debates on the various attributes of citizenship. The development of many Western definitions of citizenship has driven to a notion of citizenship that comprises of four different dimensions: “legal status, rights, (political) participation, and a sense of belonging” (Bloemraad 2000, Bosniak 2000: 109). These dimensions can supplement or withstand tension with each other. In its first dimension, citizenship in legal status refers to a person who is a citizen of the state based on two criteria: By birth (jus soli) or parents' origins (Jus sanguinis), or both. For those individuals who are not qualified to obtain citizenship through the birthright (jus soli)— as the majority of immigrants— citizenship can be acquired through naturalization (Bloemraad 2008: 156).

In the second dimension, a broader understanding of legal citizenship concentrates on the rights that one gets with it. This prospect prevailed in much in theorizing on citizenship, “resonates with liberalism’s understanding of the relationship” between people and the country as a contract in which both parties “have rights and obligations” (Bauböck1994, Janoski1998, Somers 2006, Tilly 1996, Yuval-Davis 1997). For maintaining this contract, the state ensures fundamental rights to individuals, and individuals have to oblige by paying taxes, getting a mandatory education, and becoming a law-abiding citizenry, and so forth (Janoski 1998: 56). This approach also assures full equality similar to other members of the state and before the law (Bloemraad 2008: 156).

The third dimension of citizenship refers to the political participation to govern the people of the state (Bauböck 2005, Somers 2005). This right was historically biased “by gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and class” (Yuval-Davis 1997). However, with the passage of time, these barriers were torn down, at least formally. In efforts against such exclusions, “participatory and
liberal orientations to citizenship converge as political participation is more seen as an individual right and, in some cases, a human right that should be separated from legal status” (Brysk & Shafir 2004). Finally, the last dimension of citizenship, which is belonging to the state, is much discussed and debated by the scholars. It has been treated in a variety of the ways in the literature as “notions of belonging inherently have exclusionary tendencies; some must fall outside the community in order for a “we” to exist” (Bosniak 2001). These “exclusions” usually prove to be right by the need of social cohesion. (Brubaker 1992, Joppke 1999).

Moreover, these four dimensions of citizenship have been explained in different ways by different scholars. Some scholars reinforce some aspects while undermining others. For example, Norman and Kymlicka emphasized three aspects of the citizenship (2000: 30-31), which are, the individualistic perspective (legal), identity (belonging), and civic virtue (rights). Furthermore, the civic virtue refers to the virtue of a good citizen which falls under the second dimension of citizenship (rights) (ibid.). Consequently, T.H. Marshall explained the concept of citizenship as full membership of a community. Therefore, everyone who holds this status has equality in those rights and duties which this status provides. However, “no universal principle determines what those rights and duties shall be” (Marshall 1992 [1950]:18). Furthermore, Joppke (2010) claims that “scholarly literature on citizenship has to a surprisingly low extent involved in empirical studies”. However, the theoretical augmentation has been extensive, and, therefore, “we know little about how different people understand their own citizenship” (Jones & Gaventa, 2002; Lister et al., 2003); hence, this is the central theme of this study.

4.1.1. Citizenship in Material, Emotional, and Symbolic Term

The citizenship in its material term denotes to have full rights in a country. However, it can be argued but to hold a passport of a liberal state is one of the most significant rights of citizenship. Owning a passport of a prosperous, liberal and democratic state like Sweden bring tremendous “mobility rights”. It is a right to the travel legally throughout the globe which provides an unlimited, uncomplicated, unrestricted way to cross the border of nearly every country of the world. Mau (2010) emphasizes that the right, to travel anywhere you want to travel, may be recognized as individual freedom. In other words, freedom to travel has an intrinsic value alongside other values, such as freedom of thought, speech, and association. It manifests a “core value of what it means to be free” (p: 342). Therefore, getting citizenship of a country like one of the Scandinavian country can bring the freedom of movement.
On the other hand, in its emotional term, citizenship means holding a stable constitutional status that offers safety, protection, and legal incorporation. Citizenship provides an unrestricted right of residency; live, and work in a country, and the immunity from deportation (Brochmann 2013:430). Some of the essential emotional features are “the sense of safety— economically, socially, and in terms of defence—and access and contribution to the welfare system” (Vera-Larrucea 2011: 177).

Moreover, in its symbolic term, citizenship denotes a full membership in the political arena of the state. Acquiring citizenship means to obtain the status legally similar to the majority population of the country (cf. Honneth 2005; Marshall [1950] 1992). Theoretically, citizenship can be seen as a symbol of associateship to the country that endorses the immigrants’ recognition and “sense of belonging” (Brochmann 2013:432). Moreover, the other way around as Simonsen (2018) describes that “in the connection of social belonging, a liberal approach to citizenship is perceived to signal to immigrants that the gateway to the society is open and that “immigrants should feel welcome to belong if they want to” (p.03). According to scholars, sense of belonging is one significant factor in naturalization process (ibid.).

Mouritsen (2012) asserts that there are three components of citizenship which are of high importance. Firstly, mobility or freedom of movement, especially for political refugees. They are helpless when it comes to mobility because they usually lose their origin's citizenship or passports on the way to enter the new country. Secondly, protection or security of the residents is considered as one of the fundamental prerogatives of the citizenship which even cannot guarantee for the permanent residence holders (p: 93). Mouritsen (2012) describes that third vital feature of citizenship is “symbolical recognition”. The particularity and compassion that encircles citizenship present it as an essential symbol of recognition or belonging or identification (ibid.: 96).

Mouritsen’s (2012) stress on the “renewed significance of citizenship” is a vital contribution to this study. Nevertheless, his explanation surrounds the issue of citizenship on macro-level similar to Joppke and Brubaker. Hence, his analysis lacks how these three essential features of citizenship; mobility, sense of security, and recognition (sense of belonging) are valuable in immigrants’ point of views and daily experiences. Therefore, this study observes these three significant features of citizenship, in detail to know how these matter in immigrants' lives.
4.1.1.1. Freedom of Movement, and Immigrants’ Immobility.

Mobility is a fundamental trait of contemporary times. It remains a matter of significance throughout the human history, but it has become more prevalent and widespread now (Mau 2010; Mau et al. 2011). Approximately three million passengers travel through the air every single day, and that is almost fifty folds more than what was after World War II (World Trade Organization 2007). However, against the backdrop of this immense mobilization, it is acknowledged that not all people are drawn into this modern mobility trend around the world. Despite increases in travel and the growing attraction and value of movement; “mobility remains a scarce resource” (Bauman 2002: 83). Furthermore, states are more focused on the policy-making and regulating migrants’ movements than ever before (ibid.).

Likewise, Mau (2010) states that mobility rights that mean a legal way to cross a border are now similar to other fundamental rights such as social, civil and political. However, according to Mau (2010), these rights of movements are not equally divided (P:345). The rejection of departure and arrival would deny people the prime opportunities and undermine their liberty of choice (ibid.). However, from a global prospect, freedom of movement would empower people to travel to those areas where they can enhance, or at slightest can change their living situations (ibid.). Mau (2010) further emphasizes that visa procedure are the central tool for monitorization and regulation of international travel, and hence a useful method of selective border control. The visa is a permit attached to passports or travel documents which prima facie grants an individual access to the issuing country's border and, subject to additional investigations, to cross that border for a specified period (Guild [2001: 31] quoted in Mau 2010: 345).

However, some of the travellers have an exemption from visa restrictions due to that “generalized trust” which they gained from being a citizen of a country whose passport is luxury to hold (Torpey 2000: 07). On the other hand, travellers from poor, undemocratic or emigration countries are the citizens of “suspect countries” (Shamir 2005: 203). Therefore, those are subject to “closer scrutiny” to filter them from unwanted migrants (Mau 2010: 345-6). In simple words, passports make differences. For those immigrants who are coming from 'suspect countries', acquiring citizenship of the wealthy and liberal states can be the primary reason for changing their citizenships statuses. (Mau et al. 2015: 1195).
4.1.1.2. Sense of Security and Safety

Protection and security which one gets from citizenship play the central role in immigrants’ decisions of acquiring citizenship. In most cases, people migrate from less developed countries to more developed countries to raise the living standards or to get the extended protection (Mau 2010: 345). Therefore, the privileges associated with citizenship are the foundation that appeals the immigrants to change or acquire new citizenship. The English scholar Thomas Hobbes viewed security as the purpose behind the making of a state. He explains that since the lives of people were under constant threat, they mutually formed a social agreement to build a political state. This state's duty was to protect its citizens from threats, both inside and outside (Pitch: 2014). The concept behind this rationale is that a group of people who build a state are the one who is citizens of it, and in this understanding citizenship and security has direct connections (ibid.).

The notion of security was there from many centuries, but during “the so-called ‘golden 30 years’” (nearly from 1945-1975), after the welfare state concept has come into existence, the boundaries of the meaning of security and protection granted by the state with citizenship were expanded (ibid.). From that period citizenship did not only protect its citizens from victimization, but it is also or maybe mainly – a symbol of social security. Furthermore, citizens were guaranteed their rights to every citizen “including pensions and family benefits, as well as health, disability, and unemployment insurances.” (ibid.). While the nexus of formal state citizenship to everyday belonging and participation has been challenged (Waite and Cooke 2011; Gow 2005), the nation-state continues to be the primary source to provide the fundamental, social, and legal rights. It plays a significant role in providing a sense of liberation and possibilities. Meanwhile, the security provided by the state build the confidence and comfort level of an immigrant for their present and future (ibid.). Together, the freedom of mobility and security which come from citizenship increase a “sense of ontological security” among citizens of the state. As conceptualized by Giddens (1990, 92), ontological security refers to “the confidence that most humans beings have in the continuation of their self-identity and the constancy of the surrounding social and material environments of action.”

Hence, the mobility and security provided by formal state citizenship address profound concerns about liberty and protection. In this regards not only the mobility make a difference, but also its opportunity; “not only the formal protection that citizenship grants but the insurance it provides against an uncertain future” (Nunn et al. 2015: 393). Thus, while participants’ statements of the meaning of citizenship usually “pertain to activities and events outside of every
day, the role these play in fostering ontological security suggest that, at least for some, formal state citizenship underpins daily life” (ibid.).

### 4.1.1.3. Sense of Belonging

According to Anant (1966) sense of belonging in its broader understanding is a “sense of personal involvement in a social system so that persons feel themselves to be an indispensable and integral part of the system” (p. 21). It is a feeling of being connected to the environment, people and places. Moreover, “it includes feeling secure, recognized, suitable, and capable of participating in the society” (ibid.).

Symbolically, citizenship attaches a person to the state by providing full membership of the country (Brochmann 2013: 432). Therefore, in general, citizenship denotes the symbol of the connection which provides the sense of belonging that helps an immigrant to naturalize into the society (ibid.). Furthermore, in today's contemporary world, citizenship indicates a symbolic presence of the “equality of its members” (Heater, 1999:1). It implies a bunch of rights and responsibilities, symbolizes a sense of identity, and shows a variety of civic virtues; so “that those members are able to live in an environment of social cohesion” (Kymlicka and Norman, 2000:30). Simultaneously, by dividing a clear line between “inclusion and exclusion”, citizenship holds the title of the most significant decisive element of the political community. On the other hand, the ambiguities which modern states face in today's world often create difficulties for the institution of citizenship to deal with the “paradoxes of inclusion and exclusion” (ibid.). As mentioned by Sassen (2002:05), “these signal a deterritorializing of citizenship practices and identities, and of discourses about loyalty and allegiance”.

Furthermore, according to Brochmann and Seland (2010), most recently, many countries begin to consider citizenship as a tool for belongingness and loyalty. Moreover, emotional side of loyalty consists of the intense feelings of patriotism towards country and recognition of the state, and “its institutional structures as well as a solid sense of belonging to the country” (Lee & Hébert 2006: 501). However, in some cases, belonging and membership do not stand together (Vera-Larrucea 2011: 168). Practically or legally a person can be a member of a group but do not feel the belongingness to it. On the other hand, belonging can be multiple and do not necessarily connect to the membership, for example, a person can have dual or multiple citizenships (memberships) but does not belong to all of the places (ibid).
Yuval-Davis (2004, p. 215), indicates that “communitarian perception of citizenship” is a process to belong to a society. However, she proposes that belonging is not simply about membership, rights, and responsibilities . . . Neither can it be decreased to “identities and identifications, which are about individual and collective narratives of self and other, presentation and labelling, myths of origin and destiny. Besides, belonging is a deep emotional need of people” (ibid.). Simultaneously, citizenship is “externally exclusive” to them who do not hold this membership (Brubaker 1992). Citizenship is more desirable for them who are socially exclusive because it consists of recognition of a person as equal as another member of the society, and have full rights as others. On the contrary, being denied these rights may result in the feelings of inequality and second-class citizen of the country (ibid.). Lastly, citizenship provides a symbolic identification which one can feel associate with. It ensures the immigrants’ identification and promotes their “sense of belonging” (Brochmann 2013:432). Therefore, It is essential to establish one's belongingness, and for the spirit of equality (ibid.).

4.2. Conclusion

This chapter discusses the meaning of citizenship, and its essential characteristics in the literature in its material, emotional, and symbolic terms. The outcome of this chapter is based on three approaches derived from these characteristics. In the first place, materially, mobility rights or freedom to movement are intimately bound to the citizenship of prosperous, liberal democratic states. Secondly, emotionally, a permanent and unrestricted right to residence is a crucial characteristic of the citizenship. It is a legal shield which protects and secure immigrants emotionally and materially against deportation, but also provide a sense of security for them, and their family's future. Lastly, symbolically, citizenship offers a symbolic identification. It ensures the immigrants’ identification and enhances their sense of equality and belonging (Brochmann 2013:432).

Therefore, based on these three derived dimensions; mobility or freedom of movement, sense of security and sense of belonging, I will now draw an empirical meaning of citizenship based on perceptions, opinions, and experiences of immigrants who participated in this study.
05. METHODOLOGY

This chapter aims to present and interpret the methodological procedure and methods utilized while carrying out this research. The research process from research design, the interview guide, sampling criteria and techniques, conduction of the interviews to the transcription, ethical considerations, coding, and analysis of the interviews will be discussed here.

5.1. Philosophical Considerations

My perception, about how the world works, has formed the way I preferred to carry out this research. Therefore, I desire to shed some lights on my underlying philosophical considerations that formulate this paper. It is necessary if I desire to argue that how sound this study design is, and how it is appropriate for the aim of this study. Taking a position on philosophical matters defines the scientific inquiries we believe crucial and answerable, as well as the techniques we use to answer them. Moreover, this position puts our commitment to a deeper understanding of knowledge construction. It allows us to realize what is the quality and limitations of the knowledge we are creating (6 & Bellamy, 2012: 49; Rosenberg, 2012: 02). Therefore, this current research is based on a “social constructivist” view of the world that means reality is socially constructed and “people construct their own understanding and knowledge of the world through experiencing things and reflecting on those experiences” (Cashman et al., 2008; see in Honebein, 1996). According to Lather (1986a: 259) “research paradigms inherently reflect our beliefs about the world we live in and want to live in”. The way I understand the world also influences how I perceive knowledge.

Moreover, Hall (in Ngeh, 2013:16) explains that for social actors’ culture and other representations methods are there to the construction of the meaning and “communicate that meanings to the others in a meaningful way” (Ngeh, 2013:07-16). Since, the present study intends to define, understand and describe the material I gathered from the participants through interviews, I am a constructor of the knowledge in the form of findings of this study (Merriam: 2014). The conclusion which I draw from analysis and presentation of the material is, therefore, based on my understanding of the knowledge. Furthermore, I try to convey it in a meaningful way which is based on the participants’ perceptions, opinion, and experiences. Finally, drawing on these philosophical understandings mentioned above, this study will take into consideration all the specific circumstances in which participants create meanings of citizenship and value it in various perspectives. Through the constructivist approach of this study, I consider it valuable to conduct research representing subjective facts seen in a particular context.
5.2. Research design

In order to get the expected outcomes of this study, a qualitative method is a best-suited method. Creswell (2007) recommends that a necessary prospect of a qualitative approach is that the researcher obtains knowledge by directly communicating with people and with a “face to face interaction” (p: 37). Taylor (2016) describes that qualitative method provides the direct insights of the actual life because the researcher is involved in discovering “the meaning people attach to things in their lives” (2016, p.7). Moreover, the qualitative approach is advantageous because it provides a “thick description” (Geertz 1973), practices and micro-level knowledge of the phenomena and in this case citizenship.

Therefore, to understand the meanings of realities, this research chooses an “inductive” approach due to acceptance of the fact that construction of social reality is created and defined by the people. This includes “developing, constructing, or enriching theories that are grounded in everyday activities by describing and deriving categories and concepts” that can develop the foundation for an understanding or interpretation of the problem at hand. As Vera-Larrucea (2011) mentions, it “produce understanding rather than an explanation, by providing reasons rather than causes” (p:89). Therefore, with an inductive approach, I analyze how immigrants imagine, describe and value Swedish citizenship in their own experiences. The semi-structured interview method was applied for meeting this target.

5.3. Semi-Structured Interviews

This research intends to critically analyze what sort of meanings or connotations immigrants attach to the Swedish citizenship; precisely, a particular portion of immigrants’ “lifeworld” (Kvale & Brinkmann 2015: 46). Therefore, this study uses the semi-structured interview as a suitable tool for information collection. Nevertheless, there are several reasons to choose the semi-structured interview. One of the most important reason is that face to face interaction was necessary in order “to get deeper meanings” (Patton, 2002, p.49). As Mason (1996) explains, semi-structured “interviewing may be [used] because your ontological position suggests that people’s knowledge, views, understandings, interpretations, experiences, and interactions are meaningful properties of the social reality which your research questions are designed to explore. Perhaps most importantly, you will be interested in their perceptions….or you may be interested in the constitution of language, or in discursive constructions of the social or the self” (p: 63). Similarly, this research
also requires the more profound understanding of immigrants’ opinions on the matter of citizenship and its significance.

Moreover, the notable depth, which open-ended interview produces to the inductive research is the capacity to proceed the topic that develops during the conversation. It provides the opportunity to research participants to explain and express their views, expressions, and experiences in a much better way (Morgan 2014: 54). The other strength of this method is that this sort of interview “inevitably emphasizes” not only interviewees' beliefs and understanding but also the “researcher's subjective processes. This is the major strength of the semi-structured interview because it gives the researcher an opportunity to learn more about other's belief and meanings” (ibid).

Moreover, the semi-structured interviews can provide several flexible ways to conduct an interview. On the one hand, researchers have the freedom to do a structured interview which is based on those questions which are already chosen. On the other hand, the interview can be entirely unstructured with some of the previously chosen themes for guidelines, and the interviewer is open to ask a question during the session. Even though this study is based on a small scale sample size, which is useful for providing the more detailed explanations and interpretation of the topic in short time. Hence, the typical semi-structured interview covers the questions that are important to you as a researcher and those additional details and insights that the research participants provide (Morgon 2014: 54). In case of present study, the semi-structured interviews were not fully structured neither entirely unstructured. The questions with few themes were “formulated in advance”, but the order was altered as the interview proceeds (Thagaard 2009: 89). The positive side of this approach is that the interviewees can raise some significant points that are not included in the interview guide, and that can help improve the analysis of the study.

5.4. Sample Criteria

In this study, the strategic sampling strategy was used. This strategy was adopted because the informants who have specific characteristics in the relevance of this study were sampled (Thagaard 2009: 55; Tjora 2012: 145). Four main characteristics were selected. Firstly, It was considered necessary to include a sample of both citizenship holders and non-citizenship holders to get a broader insight of the matter from both sides. Therefore, to “maximize variation” of the citizenship and naturalization processes both Swedish and non-Swedish citizenship holders were sampled (Flyvbjerg 2006: 128). By emphasizing mainly on Swedish citizenship holders, there was a risk of seeing one side of the picture. Aptekar (2016: 1160) accounts, it is quite interesting to explore
experiences of those who are still in the phase of acquiring the citizenship. Including non-citizenship holders in this study maintains “ethical duality of citizenship” (Bosniak 2006: 715). Furthermore, citizenship can be seen as “internally inclusive and externally exclusive” (Brubaker 1992: 71). Therefore, to obtain the full understanding about how immigrants value citizenship and what does it mean for them — it is necessary to sample legal “insiders” and “outsiders” equally (ibid).

Secondly, the residency requirement (time spent in Sweden) which is a fundamental requirement for acquiring the Swedish citizenship, which in most cases, is five years. Therefore, the immigrants who spend minimum eight years in Sweden were sampled. It helped the researcher to exclude those immigrants who are not eligible for the naturalization. Thirdly, including educated informants was considered suitable for this research; therefore, the informants who have university degrees were sampled. It helped in a sense that answers were consistent because of the similar level of understanding.

Lastly, it was considered beneficial to keep the country of origin fixed. Therefore, to sample the people from those immigrants groups who are more likely to naturalize because of the condition or instability in their country of origin were sampled (Pettersen 2017: 07). Keeping this factor “fixed” would provide a homogeneous background which can be an influential factor in decisions to acquire the citizenship in Sweden. Pakistani immigrants who are Swedish citizenship holder and non-citizenship holder were sampled for this research.

5.4.1. Sampling Techniques
As Tylor (2016) stated, participants can be found through different methods such as social networks, friends, relatives, or recruitment through agency and organization (p:108). Therefore, the participants of this study were reached through different techniques. First of all, the researcher was reluctant to do the interviews from social circle due to the level of frankness of the relationship with them; the interview would have been taken slightly unprofessional. For that reason, the researcher decided to choose those participants who were unknown to the researcher. Therefore, the first method used to reach the participants was approaching the social media. The group on facebook called “Pakistanis in Sweden” was reached for the first round of recruitment. A post was created describing the intentions of conducting this research and explaining which fixed characteristics are needed for this study.

While posting, it was perceived that there would not be a reasonable response due to the fact that immigrants are usually hesitant to discuss their migration stories to the strangers;
though the response was overwhelmed. Several messages of appreciation for choosing Pakistani community in this study were received; pointing out the fact that there is lack of studies in this community in Sweden. Furthermore, this technique helped to find the informants who were accurately fulfilling the sampling characteristics. On a positive note, this approach worked great for this present research since the research was designed for a sample with particular demographical criteria. Thus, this method helped the researcher to reach the suitable participants. It would have been much harder to find suitable candidate if another sampling method was used. Five most suitable candidates were sorted out for the interviews, by keeping location into consideration to avoid long travelling distances.

Then, the “snowball method” was adopted to reach more contacts. Previously picked participants were requested to refer to some more contacts. Through this technique, three more individuals were interviewed. The researcher was known to the fact that snowball sampling often lacks variety with key demographical and theoretical dimensions (Silverman 2011:168). This was assumed to be an obstacle in the sense of “theoretical analysis” as people can be influential on others, especially when it comes to the perception about things; therefore, the diversity of the thought seemed lost. However, by taking into account the fact that individual has different experiences of life, and these experiences are not similar to each other, the researcher expected a variety in the responses. Eight participants for this study were considered enough to keep track and authenticity of the study. A careful investigation, within this short period with, fewer people helped maintain the grip on this study. Otherwise, more interviews would have been created the problem of too much information which could have caused the potential risk of losing essential information (ibid.).

5.5. The Interview Settings

The interviews were between 50 to 70 minutes long. To let interviewees feel safe and comfortable, and interview process smooth, as Tjora (2012:120) recommends, the location of the interview was decided by the informants. Therefore, two meetings were conducted in the participants’ apartments in Malmö city, and two were held in the cafeterias in Malmö and Landskrona respectively. One was carried in the Mind Park Helsingborg. Furthermore, the rest of the three interviews were conducted online, one on the Skype, one on the FaceTime (smartphone application) with the camera, and one on the telephone— due to their locations in Stockholm and Göteborg respectively. However, the researcher was known to the pitfall and advantages of using these applications such as technical interruptions (Bryman 2012, p. 488). Nevertheless, the
interviews conducted on Skype and FaceTime were much similar to in-person meetings without any technical errors. When it comes to answering the questions, the researcher did not feel any interruption and problem; interviews were no different. The interviewer could note all the pauses, stresses, and physical interactions during the answer. One more advantage of using these applications was the accessibility. The researcher was able to get access to those informants who live far, and, it would not be feasible to travel to such places due to the distance.

Furthermore, interview conducted through the telephone has a pitfall of lacking the physical interaction such as body language as Bryman (2012, p: 488) explains that interview by phone is unpromising to work well, and it considers as time-consuming and most significantly it is hard to observe the body language of the interviewees. However, in my experience the best answers I got through the phone interview because there were no reservations such as body language and feelings of strangeness, these responses were smooth without any interruption, hesitation, and long pauses. However, the researcher was unable to note down the physical interaction. On the other hand, the interviews conducted in the apartments were challenging when it comes to concentration and flow of thoughts, which were sometimes interrupted in the form of a phone call or children needed attention. In that case, it took more time than estimated. It also seemed problematic when the interviewees were needed time to jot down their thoughts again on the question they were asked before the interruption. All in all, the researcher was able to gather data which was needed to answer the research questions without any trouble caused.

5.5.1. Data Recording
All conversations were recorded, and a smartphone's application was used to record the best quality recording. With the recording, the researcher also made notes of the expression, emotions, pauses, and stresses of interviewees for the analysis and transcription (Silverman, 2011). A debrief was presented at the end of the interviews, and interviewees were free to ask any question regarding interview and research project.

5.6. Role of the Researcher
In order to provide a principled representation of findings, this study demands the interpretation of not only the participants' positions but also the position of the researcher (Pettigrew & Miller-Day, 2012). Therefore, it is worth mentioning for the readers to know that, besides the researcher, I belong to Pakistan as well. I am a student and a holder of Swedish citizenship and possess almost all of the characteristics which were fixed for this research. The position I am holding makes me
subjective to the study. Consequently, being a constructor of the analysis of this study, my particular characteristics such as background, preferences, opinions, and life practice, in general, form how I view and interpret the truth and conversations of the informants (Creswell: 2007).

Therefore, while I aim to hold the position of an observer in this study, it is also known to me, the subjectivity that I bring to present study. Being aware of this fact, and giving due attention instead of ignoring it, makes me capable of realizing and overcoming the “subjective knowledge” (Silverman, 2011, p.141). It helped me to control it instead of allowing it to control the outcome of this research (ibid). Therefore, as a researcher, I was well aware of my position, and I tried to be neutral throughout this study from aim to analysis, especially during the interviews, where I controlled my opinions and expressions. Moreover, I tried to be a good listener and let the participant answer the questions without interpreting and commenting them.

However, Mclauren and Kincheloe (2011) view, “knowledge is never neutral, nor objective”; already while picking the subject of the research you are attempting to go away from objectiveness, same goes for your choice of methods and theories. But to have the practical knowledge or to have similar life experiences as informants make things more comfortable as well, for example, to “understand the underlying assumptions” (p:8). My position helped me to understand the informants’ feelings much better on sensitive topics such as attachment and belongingness, and their expressions regarding family, cultural values, and religion due to having the same background. As Silverman (2011, p.141) states that having properties similar to the participant is useful to understand them truly and to make reliable claims.

All in all, I noticed that my background helped me getting honest answers because even though participants were stranger to me, they discussed everything quite frankly without any sign of discomfort. I felt that participants were relaxed when they were answering the questions, because of the fact that I understand every single point they are pointing out about Pakistan and Sweden—because I know both places.

5.7. Ethical Consideration

Ethical considerations in a study are the choices that appear when we attempt to choose between two courses of actions not in terms of usefulness or efficiency, but by considering over standards of what is “morally right or wrong” (May 2012: 61). To conduct research which includes people, engagement with the ethical concerns that such research raises is indispensable. Although ethical practices should be followed from the start to the end of the study, most scholars have emphasized explicitly to consider ethics about the informants of the study. Therefore, to address ethical
concerns, the scholars emphasize on three crucial factors; full consent of the informants, the anonymity of the informants’ identity, and withdrawal at any stage (Rossman and Rallis, 2012). Nevertheless, the most meaningful action was to implement these guidelines in particular real-life situations.

Accordingly, the ethical guidelines were followed throughout this research from the designing, interviewing, presenting, to analyzing the material. As Mason (2004: 156) points out that “most interviewees will be unfamiliar with the principles and techniques of analysis which you use, and with the ontological and epistemological principles upon which your research is based”. Therefore, as much as possible information about this project was discussed such as the overarching aim and objectives of the research, an explanation why the study was conducted, and the outcomes of it after publishing. However, some of the ethical guidelines were more emphasized. Interviewees’ consents were taken before the interviews, and they were told about outcomes of the participation. As the researcher, kept in mind that consenting does not mean that they are consenting to answer whatever questions might ask. The consent was renegotiated at numerous stages throughout the communication, so the participants became familiarized entirely about what consenting to the interview actually means (Silverman, 2011: 418).

Furthermore, an opportunity was provided to withdraw their consent at any stage during the interview, after the interview, and even after some days —if they think they do not want to participate. Hence, a printed consent form was presented before all interviews (in case of online interview sent by email). This form was based on a clarification of the intentions of this research, and outcomes of the information which was provided by them (Thagaard 2009: 25-30). Furthermore, the clarification of the recording and consent beforehand the interview was provided. All of the interviewees were agreed to record their interviews. However, one interviewee was hesitant to record; therefore interview was noted down on paper instead.

In order desire to assure a satisfactory level of privacy and protection (Bryman, 2012: 142), the information about anonymity and confidentiality was provided. They were assured anonymity and confidentiality of their records. The participants were well assured that all the conversations would remain confidential, and would be deleted after completion of this research. They were assured that hidden identities would be used instead of their real names (Silverman, 2011: 418). Moreover, one more ethic of the research is that participants of the research should be protected from any harm (Ryen, 2011, p.419). And that can be done by the interviewer by implementing confidentiality and anonymity which was assured to them. With concerns about the
researcher's position, the researcher observed for any possible biases in the record and her reflexivity during the complete study session and in formulating the research paper.

5.8. Interview Language

Interviews were mainly held in the Urdu language because all interviewees were fluent in the Urdu language as it is the national language of Pakistan. However, to put an emphasis, some questions were posed in English so that participant would truly understand the full essence of questions such as “where do you belong or where do you feel your home is?” According to Rosenberg (2012: 63), meanings of particular terms in everyday experiences are essential to the realization of how the social world is seen by the people. Since the researcher is a native Urdu speaker, it was an added benefit to understand how citizenship was perceived, because of more than one language as a medium to convey the meanings (ibid.).

Beside Urdu, all the participants are fluent in English as well, because of their educational background as most of the studies in Pakistan are done in English. Even-though Urdu is the national language of Pakistan, English is the official language there. It is very common in Pakistan to mix English and Urdu while talking. Therefore, the interviewer way of questioning in English and Urdu, and answering in the same manners considered normal when it comes to everyday language. It also improved the quality of answers because language factor did not prevent participants from expressing their opinions. They were able to use the language they feel more comfortable when they replied, and it applied to asking questions too.

5.9. Reliability, Validity, and Generalisation

To assess the authenticity and trustworthiness of this study, it requires pursuing the system that enhances its reliability and validity (Silverman, 2014:198). Reliability, validity, and generalization are frequently referred as signs of quality in the research (Tjora 2012: 202). Reliability involves the uprightness of the study. Validity includes two sides: Internal validity that points out if the results are accurate for the sample, and external validity which is much similar to the generalizability describe that the results are transferable to another sample or circumstances. Therefore, in upcoming section reliability and external validity or generalizability of this study will be discussed. In general, reliability indicates “the level of consistency with which instances are allocated” to the same category by other observers or by the similar observer on other occasions. (Silverman, 2014: 108). In other words, if the research is repeated, it will show the same results and analyses (ibid). Seidman (2012, p. 23) shows that reliability is somewhat complicated to be examined in qualitative
interviews. Limitation nevertheless appears by the fact that the presence of the interviewer within the interview frame can influence the participants' interpretation which can limit the reliability of the study.

Moreover, in the study of people's opinions, sentiments, attachments, and belongings, uncertainty is a reasonable and common factor. In that case, the participants can hide their emotions, sentiments, and perceptions on few specific or conflicting issues, and it all depends on the situation they are in at the given time (Silverman, 2011). However, considering this research pattern which is based on the perceptions and opinions, it is difficult to claim the accuracy of the data provided by the informants. Furthermore, perceptions and opinions are subject to change with the passage of time. According to Mason (2017: 236), reliability is, therefore, “being conceptualized in terms of how reliable, accurate and precise the research tools or instruments are”. Accordingly, by keeping the non-biased approach and transparency in presenting the methods tools and by discussing all the limitations and restrictions which arise during the study— make this study reliable in itself. Therefore, to achieve reliability of the research design, all the steps which assisted in carrying out this research were laid out.

Another issue arises concerning generalisability or external validity of this study. Do the opinions and perceptions of Swedish citizenship holders and non-citizenship holders accounted for this study reflects the general views of Pakistani immigrants living in Sweden? Put otherwise: Can we consider these findings generalizable or transferable? At first, immigrants who already possess Swedish citizenship may value it less than those who are in the process of acquiring or have a strong desire to acquire citizenship. Thus, immigrants who have a strong desire to acquire Swedish citizenship may value it more— because they do not hold this “valuable” citizenship (Bauböck et al. 2013; Bevelander et al. 2015). Secondly, people with the high level of integration due to their literacy level, language skills, and political engagement, do possibly not represent the whole population precisely. Probably, immigrants on the other side of social scale have different viewpoints and experiences of citizenship. Furthermore, when it comes to transferability and generalizability, the aim of this study is not to make this study's findings transferable to other cases, but the purpose is not to transfer the findings to other cases. Instead, this research provides a broad understanding of the examined group and their opinions and perceptions on citizenships (Flyvbjerg, 2006: 228).

Furthermore, As Perri 6 and Bellamy (2012:19) state that, obtaining a “significant amount of data is important to the validity of the research because the better the account, the better the goodness of fit”. Therefore, the sample size of eight participants allowed the researcher to keep
control of the data and analysis of in-depth interviews. Hence, it helped the researcher to keep track of all the significant and vital factors which could affect the findings if ignored. Therefore, these measures heightened the validity of the study.

5.10. Coding, Presentation, and Analysis of Material

The interviews were continuously translated and transcribed. The interviews were 50 to 70 minutes long, and on average 60 minutes. It took at least four to five hours to transcript one interview with the translation. As Tjora (2012: 144) proposes; first I transcribed the interviews, and carefully added intervals, mimics, and emotional notes to include as much contextual data as possible. Then, I reread the transcript, word by word and line by line. These transcriptions were then coded. Coding is a well-known method of qualitative analysis, in which one works with the data material thoroughly (the interview transcriptions in this study). Then, picks and points out the pieces of text, and assigns codes to them. It is an effective way to summarize, characterize, classify, and prepare an overview of the data material (Kvale & Brinkmann 2015: 227). Several rounds of the coding were performed to get the actual outline of the content.

Firstly, I start labelling relevant words, phrases, sentences, and sections in relation to the theme of the study. I created topics which were essential for this study or viewpoints which participants raised again and again. Secondly, I decided which codes are significant for analysis, and created the categories by taking various codes collectively. Then I went through the codes repeatedly and created new codes, and combined two or more codes. I dropped unnecessary codes which were irrelevant to the study. I then combined the codes and created my themes after analyzing them correctly, if these are the most appropriate and connected to this research. Throughout the procedure, I was unbiased, open minded and stayed very close to the data, (the transcripts).
5.10.1 Profile of the Participants

Profile No: 01:
Participants one (Wahid *) is 35 years old man and has lived in Sweden for ten years. He did not have Swedish citizenship but applied for it. He is employed, married, and father of a child. They are currently Pakistani citizenship holders.

Profile No: 02:
Participants two (Imran*) is 28 years old man. He has lived in Sweden for eight years. He came to Sweden because of his marriage to a Danish lady. The couple moved to Sweden from Denmark after their marriage due to restrictions in Danish citizenship policy. He has a child, and they got divorced. He has been refused for the Swedish citizenship once.

Profile No: 03:
Participants three (Kiran *) is 35 years old lady. She is living in Sweden for ten years. She got married to a Pakistani man in Sweden. She has a child. She did not have Swedish citizenship yet. She holds Pakistani citizenship. She is studying right now.

Profile No: 04:
Participants four (Sehrish *) is 34 years old lady. She is a mother of a child and studying a higher degree. She does not hold Swedish citizenship.

Profile No: 05:
Participants five (Saqib*) is 31 years old man. He has lived in Sweden for nine years. He came to Sweden with his wife who was a student at a Swedish university. He is employed and got two children. The whole family has Swedish citizenship. They are currently dual citizenship holders.

Profile No: 06:
Participants six (Ahmer*) is 45 years old man. He is living in Sweden for ten years. He came to Sweden as a Political refugee. He is married, employed and has a child. He is a Swedish citizenship holder.
Profile No: 07:
Participants seven (Arif *) is 34 years old man. He is has lived in Sweden for eight years. He is married and has a child. He is Swedish citizenship holder, but his wife is a Pakistani citizen. He holds dual citizenships.

Profile No: 08:
Participants eight (Hira *) is 39 years old lady. She is living in Sweden for 15 years. She came here as a spouse. She is working on a good position in a good company. She is a Swedish citizenship holder and holds dual citizenship.
06. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FIELD MATERIAL

This chapter consists of the presentation and analysis of the material collected from the field. The responses from the participants are reported literatim and analyzed in relation to each other using the conceptual framework already discussed. This research aims to analyze the perceptions, opinions, and experiences about the meaning of Swedish citizenship and its significant factors involving in lives of Pakistani immigrants. Accordingly, to answer the research questions, this section can be divided into four themes: the first section will be based on the perceptions of the interviewees on the meaning of citizenship. Secondly, three crucial factors of citizenship mobility, sense of security, and sense of belonging which were driven from the materialistic, symbolic and emotional themes in the conceptual framework will be discussed.

6.1. Meaning of Citizenship

Meaning of the citizenship as already discussed is highly debatable in the literature. There is no unison among scholars on the definition of the citizenship. Citizenship for Pakistani immigrants who participated in this study has various meanings as well. Bloemraad et al. (2008) state that “immigrants’ understanding of citizenship and its acquisition engages several theoretical debates in the literature. Citizenship itself is a concept with multiple meanings, including legal status, rights, political participation, and belonging” (p: 156). However, the meaning of citizenship will be presented here as explained by the interviewees.

Sehrish* came here as a spouse (family reunion) and doing her higher studies from a Swedish university and is a mother: she sees citizenship in its legal and belonging dimensions. She stated that:

“For me it [citizenship] is a legal certificate to belong to this society which proves that you have integrated into this society……it means its a certification that they [state] gave you for that you belonged and integrated into this society”. (Sehrish*)

According to scholars of citizenship, the right dimension of legal citizenship is based on a contract which provide a relationship between state and individual and in which both parties have rights and responsibilities (Bauböck 2006, Janoski 1998, Tilly 1996, Yuval-Davis 1997, Bloemraad et al.: 2008). Where state ensures and protects the fundamental rights of a citizen, and on the other hand, a citizen is bound to fulfil those obligations which state decides such as paying taxes, follow the laws and getting the education (Bloemraad et al.: 2008: 155.). The similar notion of citizenship was
reflected by Kiran* and Hira. Kiran*, who does not hold Swedish citizenship, and is in the process of applying it. She views citizenship as two sides of recognition; from the individual to the state and the state to the individual. She explained:

“Citizenship for me is a proof to become a citizen of a particular country on paper and somehow in my heart as well. It is like you are a number which now is in counting in this country or state. Whenever they [state] will count their citizens, you will be included. And for me, personally, something as proof that yes, I live here, work here, and I have spent my life here. And have plans to live here for rest of my life [laugh] until now….you never know where life takes you…so for me citizenship is more of acknowledgment from both parties — from the state and my side. It's more like an agreement…one never-ending agreement of sharing resources and responsibilities with the state and by the state”. (Kiran*)

Hira*, who came here as a spouse and right now is working on a good position in a company, have similar views as Kiran*. She pointed out toward the rights one have and responsibility one possess towards the state:

“What I think in my perspective citizenship is a certificate of attachment. Its all about the rights you get in reward. For example, one immigrant comes to Sweden and stays here for a particular period selected by the government [paused] for acquiring the citizenship. So after a long time, this country considers you citizen because you have spent much time here, and share responsibilities, and took benefits. Therefore now you can become a citizen. I will repeat it; it is a certificate that says, you are entitled to all the similar rights and responsibilities as others”. (Hira*)

Kiran*, Hira* and Sehrish* refer to citizenship as a contract, symbol of belonging, and rights. They call it a certificate, agreement, and contract. Kiran* and Hira*'s perspective on responsibilities and getting rights is more alike what T.H. Marshall (1992 [1950]:18) argues that people who have citizenship have equality in rights and responsibilities provided by the state. But these rights and responsibilities cannot be determined. Kiran's explanation is more like sharing responsibilities and having rights make a good understanding of an ideal ‘citizenship’ that in Marshall's view is about the social responsibilities that state holds to its citizens or vice versa.

Ahmer* and Arif* stated that citizenship means security and protection for them. Ahmer* came to Sweden as a refugee, and he is now a Swedish citizen. For him, citizenship is more about feeling secure and equality by getting same rights as others. He described citizenship as:

“Citizenship in my mind is that you become a citizen of this country. You feel secure and you start thinking that you got same rights as all others,… you feel more relaxed in daily chores, you feel satisfied in the sense of future security such as employment, medical, welfare benefits, pensions, and so on”. (Ahmer *)
Similar to Ahmer*; Arif*, who is a Swedish citizenship holder considered that citizenship is all about the peace of mind which brings future security. He stated that:

“Citizenship is just a peace of mind and nothing else than that. Peace of mind in a way that if you come in the country as a student or other sources [other visa statuses] and stay in the society, then you are so unsure about your future that what will happen in upcoming days. You don't know what will be your visa status; you don't know that if your application gets one objection and gets refuse, and they [state] force you to go back. As there is a case like [person name]...it was a famous case, and I hope you have seen in the news [pointed towards me], the man served here [Sweden] for a long time and had rights. But due to some mistakes which he had not done, he got punishment [emphasis] for the offence that he did not commit and had to leave the country. In those circumstances that you came here, and after that you invested your time in this society, and after that, you live in an uncertain position, so that is a very horrible thing for you”. (Arif*)

Arif* further argued that if one lives in this society for a long period than it would be hard to go to another place and settle down there because you changed yourself according to new society’s requirements. He argued:

“If you have to go back to Pakistan, then you will not be settled there as well. For example, you live here [Sweden] for 7 to 8 years, and your children live here, so whatever you learned here [Sweden] you cannot implement these things into your society [Pakistan] because of the differences. So the main problem is that if after some time Migrationsverket (Migration Board of Sweden) refuses your stay here any more, so you cannot just go back and start living there [Pakistan].....so this thing or problem or stress level, I think you become free from these things after citizenship”. (Arif*)

Arif*’s considered if one does not have Swedish citizenship can be excluded from the society. Bloemraad (2000) reflected on the similar matter. He stated that citizenship “inherently have exclusionary tendencies; some must fall outside the community in order for a “we” to exist” (Bosniak 2001). These “exclusions” usually prove to be right by the need of social cohesion. The interviewees attach various meanings of Swedish citizenships, and they view this phenomenon through different lenses. Norman and Kymlicka (2000: 30-31) reflected the similar accounts mentioned in Sehrish*, Kiran*, Hira*, and Arif*’s statements by specifying that citizenship's third perspective is characteristics of a good citizen which in Sehrish's* point of view is an integrated citizen. For Kiran*, it is the one who shares responsibilities and rights.
Interestingly Imran*, who arrived in Sweden after his marriage to a Danish woman. They moved to Sweden due to the restrictive policies of citizenship in Denmark. For him, citizenship is a travel document nothing else; it is just an illusion for people. He states that:

“It's just a travel document which gives you access to work outside Sweden. .......A red bluff to attract people”. (Imran*)

On the other hand, for Wahid* citizenship is more like a reward which one gets after serving the country in shape of integration, employment, and paying taxes. It is a symbol of respect given by the state. He stated that:

“If there is a country that you think is excellent and you have its respect in your eyes.... mmmmm, and If I look at myself, I improved myself so much character-wise, so if that country gives you citizenship, so it's kind of big honour for me”. (Wahid *)

According to Bauböck (1999: 7), citizenship is not a membership to the political and cultural arena of state, but it is a legal alliance with the state. While discussing citizenship's meanings interviewees raised many perspectives which they think were necessary such as legal membership or certificate, belonging, sense of security and freedom to travel without asking any question; however, the political dimension of citizenship was not discussed and considered necessary by them. Many of informants said it was not an essential factor in their lives. Kiran replied:

Interviewer: Do you see citizenship as political membership of the state?

Kiran*: “For me, this is not important yet, I do not even know much about the [political] parties [laugh]…. a few days earlier, I was talking to my husband and suggested him that we should read the parties’ policies, so we know who to vote [which party] in upcoming elections this year [her husband is Swedish citizen]. But I think [pause] for immigrants who have so many other issues going on with their settlements in the new country, this issue is very very less of significance. And they do not even consider it when they acquire the citizenship. It is much like; first, let me eat something and then I will think of cake” [laugh].

However, in reply to a question; when you do not feel you are Swedish citizen? Wahid* pointed out that he feels that he is not a citizen when there is an election. He expressed that:

“I think when there are elections, and there are some people who cannot vote in the national election. At that time you feel a sense of isolation. You think that your voice cannot get heard, just because you do not have the passport [citizenship] …..you are isolated.” (Wahid*)
Furthermore, Imran* answered similarly:

"...It depends if you see only for the vote — then you become the citizen after getting citizenship — so you can vote — but not in daily lives...." (Imran *)

However, as Bauböck (2005) points out toward the third dimension of citizenship that refers to the political participation to govern the people of the state. The similar point was made by Ahmer*. He sees political involvement as a benefit which comes with the citizenship. He explained this:

".........and the big point for [not having citizenship of a country] that you cannot use your right to vote which is the biggest thing for me that you cannot choose the policymakers who are running this country". (Ahmer *)

All in all, the trend shows that the interviewees tend to value Swedish citizenship. They view citizenship in very diverse perspectives and attached meanings according to their current standings or circumstances or statuses. These differences appear in the theoretical debates of citizenship as well. These interviewees referred to three dimensions which are legal, rights and belonging in the reply of the question what citizenship means for them. However, only Ahmer* and Wahid* discussed political dimension of citizenship. As Mau et al. (2015), emphasize that citizenship is “reinvented” and “reinterpreted” by local contexts, opinions, practices, and experiences (p: 786). Similarly, the interviewees termed citizenship as a legal certificate, contract or an agreement, and belonging, reward and acknowledgment from the state, and for Imran* it is an illusion. A prominent factor of interpretation of the meaning of citizenship was security and peace of mind. However, political dimension was not mentioned and discussed by immigrants directly because it was a less significant matter in the acquisition of the citizenship.

Furthermore, some fundamental privileges of citizenship have been acknowledged by the social scientists and scholars which are essential in immigrants’ decisions for acquiring citizenships: such as mobility, sense of security, and belongingness and attachment. These are the most important privileges which were raised by the interviewees during interviews as well. However, some factors were more emphasized by the interviewees than others. The social scientists and scholars such as Coutin (2010), Leitner & Erkamp (2006), Leuchter (2014) and Mavroudi (2008) found out in their studies that mobility is the fundamental factor for acquiring the citizenship for most of the immigrants. However, in case of the participants of this study, sense of security was the main factor of the citizenship acknowledged by all of them. After security and protection, they emphasized on the mobility or freedom of travel. Therefore, in the following section, I will analyze the salience of
citizenship according to immigrants' stress on it. First, sense of security, then mobility, and later the sense of belonging will be discussed in the upcoming section.

6.2. Sense of Security and Protection

According to Nunn et al. (2015: 393), citizenship provides insurance against an uncertain future with formal protection. Those immigrants who have political, social, or “economic instability in their origin countries” — security is the fundamental and most significant reason for acquiring the citizenship for them. The protection that citizenship provides in traveling, overseas, during transit is essential. But the sense of security they get in their statuses in sort of rights they get with citizenship is more crucial. This was reflected in all of the interviewees' statements, and they considered that citizenship brings a sense of security for them. Kiran* defined what security means for her:

“When I think what citizenship bring for us then I can say with confidence first is security. Security in many senses; first is that no one can tell you to leave this country because you are part of it. Second, you are protected under welfare system of this country which will never let you be hungry if you don't have money. Third, for example, I am paying taxes here, so I know they are going to use it on my welfare, and you never think they will do corruption and your taxes will be wasted as there [Pakistan]……… You are safe, and your children are safer here”.

(Kiran*)

On the other hand, Wahid* also pointed out that being a permanent residence holder one can get all the benefits which a citizenship holder have; but citizenship will be a recognition from a state. He explained that how Swedish citizenship will give him feelings of protection and security:

“Yes, I feel myself as successful and secure after coming here as I am progressing day by day economically, carrier-wise (Job), personality wise, and knowledge-wise. In this society, I was integrated that is why I could achieve all these things, and I feel part of the community now. And citizenship will be an acceptance from them [state] for all of these things I did and will make me secure that now I can stay here [Sweden] as much as I want”. (Wahid*)

Surprisingly, the interviewees value Swedish citizenship in its emotional term; therefore, security is a fundamental perceived benefit of citizenship for them. The Swedish citizenship was vastly acknowledged as a sense of security, and they call it peace of mind. The perspective of being secure after getting citizenship was the most prominent trait of citizenship raised during the interviews. Among those interviewees who are holders of Swedish citizenship, and those who are not, sense of security equally appeared as the primary recognized advantage of the formal state membership. Therefore, this study now discusses in upcoming sections some essential features of security and
protection which were raised by these interviewees and that will help to understand clearly that why citizenship brings more sense of security for these interviewees.

6.2.1. Security: ‘if anything happens ….’

Waite and Cooke (2011) describe that the nation-state remains a primary source for providing fundamental, social and legal rights and performs a vital function in producing a sense of freedom and likelihood. Meanwhile, the security is given by the state to boost the confidence and “comfort level of a person or immigrant for their present and future”. Similar comments were raised by Saqib*, Hira* and Kiran* and by almost everyone. The factor “if anything happens…” was mentioned by the interviewees many times directly or indirectly. Saqib* explained this factor of uncertainty as:

“After [getting] citizenship a sense of security came into your mind that now nothing can happen to me. On the other side Swedish passport is a powerful passport of the world, so we got freedom in traveling. We do not have problems with parents visits because they can keep visiting us. You are more secure now [after citizenship granted] otherwise life is same”. (Saqib *)

Hira* has seen this phenomenon in the same sense that citizenship boosts the comfort level. She reflected that all rights would be secured after acquiring Swedish citizenship. She explained it as:

“The sense of security is for me that I am now a citizen here [Sweden] and my rights are secured, and if anything happens to me, Swedish government will protect me. I don't need anyone’s help. If anything happens to me; for example, if my neighbour disturbs me, I can complain. My children are throughout [their lives] safe now”. (Hira*)

Similar to Hira*, Kiran* stated sense of security as:

“I feel secure for my child and my husband [who are Swedish citizens]. They are protected now, in a sense if anything happens to them…for example, wherever they go and get into trouble, they will get the help from Swedish consulates, such as in any criminal case or war or anything like this. It feels safe”. (Kiran*)

There is a particular kind of uncertainty and insecurity which these interviewees feel or have— if they do not have Swedish citizenship. Mouritsen (2012) discusses similar account that “arguably, however, security of residence remains the most basic element of citizenship, which even permanent residence does not entirely guarantee” (P: 05)
6.2.2. Security Against Deportation

As Brochmann (2013:430) explains citizenship provides an unrestricted right to residency which allows immigrants to stay and work in the country, with all these incentives immigrants also gets immunity from deportation. These reservations about leaving the country were discussed by the interviewees as well. It was considered a problematic situation as Sehrish* described that citizenship makes these things more comfortable. While recalling benefits of permanent residence (PR), she said if you live outside of Sweden on PR [permanent residence] for two years then you can lose the ground to stay in Sweden; and that is why it is right and secure to have citizenship so wherever you go, you come back here. She stated that:

“You know in this life 30s and 40s where you have many jobs .... I have seen many people who integrated very well into this [Swedish] society, and suddenly they got the decision that they have to leave Sweden and this is so painful. In that case, you do not have the assurance that you have been integrated into this society, and you put much effort here, and suddenly you get a letter [from Migrationsverket] that you need to leave the country. But if you get the citizenship, then you are not scared that where I am putting all my efforts, they will not tell me suddenly that you can leave now because you don't belong here so that I will feel secure”. (Sehrish*)

Arif* discussed the same concerns that after getting citizenship one is protected in a sense, no one could throw one out. He explained it:

“Citizenship is like a piece of mind.................. but we can say like this if you serve in the company and after ten years you know they can terminate you any time so how you will work in that company. And if this company is one of its nature, and there is no other like this in the world or work like that so you cannot adjust into another company, same goes with citizenship. If you go to another society, then it will not be easy for us to fit into that society”.

Interviewer: So is it a sense of security so to say?

“Arif*: Yes, you chose the right word; it is a sense of security because you live in a country; you try to integrate; you work and serve the society, and pay taxes then off-course you should get reward [citizenship] for this”.

Interviewer: After getting citizenship, does one feel secure?

“Arif*: Yes and it is like there was a hanging sword that has been removed from your head. You don't need to apply for the visa and fulfil their requirements, again and again, so you are on the safe end. Citizenship brings peace of mind so you can plan your life further, your job and family and relations. So in a single line, it [citizenship] is the sense of security”.
Half of the interviewees are Swedish citizenship holders, and half of them are permanent residence (PR) holders, but almost everyone regardless of their citizenship status discussed that citizenship brings residential security and boost a comfort level as mentioned by Waite and Cooke (2011). The interviewees who have permanent residency (PR) feel uncertain and think in case the policy change or anything happens (as we discussed above) then we have to leave this country.

6.2.3. Sweden is a Good Country for the Family

According to Bloemraad (2006), for immigrants, citizenship is connected to “social movement mobilization, involving friends, family, co-ethnic organizations and local community leaders and the strength of their ties to native-born citizens” (p. 666). Sweden is a good country to raise up the children and live with the family. These sentiments were brought into discussions by almost all of the interviewees. Saqib* and Sehrish* explained that:

“You see..things float your boat, I came here,.....meanwhile, we got a child, so we got excited and .....we thought we should do something for our daughter and her future. **This country is very good for children**, I am telling you in my case there was nothing planned. I was not planning at all, for example,........ we never thought this would happen [getting citizenship]. To be honest for people it is very very important to get the citizenship, but for me, it was not a big thing as I thought if I never get it [citizenship] then I will go back as I can have good future there as well”. (saqib *)

While discussing family security in regards to citizenship Sehrish* stated that:

“For example, my daughter is staying in this system so I will not change country because of her. She goes to the Swedish school now. And if suddenly we have to leave the country then it will be a very tough situation for her. Because she got the citizenship here spent time here,.......and it will be hard for her to integrate into that new society, and then after growing up she comes back here ....it will be hard for her to integrate into this society again. For me, I have been here for a long time, studied here, learned a lot from this society so I will feel safe in regards of the job (.....) I feel secure in my professional life. It is much about me and my family’s security” (Sehrish*)

Saqib also shared the same emotions about his family. He sees his children are secure and protected in Sweden now, because of all the rights and norm they have in Sweden. He stated that:

“......but I cannot go back now, and there are many factors such as I am right now in the position that if something happens government will support me. If I lose a job and same goes for my children, the main reason I cannot go back is my children. Sweden is really good in some sense and not good in other, so for the children, I like this country........... we cannot play with their [children] lives,
now they belong here, and now they will be raised and grown up here. We will marry them here... so it is more about their belongingness, not mine...so my upbringing is very different than my children, I have lived a part of my life now”. (Saqib *)

Mouritsen (2012) explains that social citizenship of a welfare state has been intensified. These things such as good schools, subsidized care for infants and elderly, and mostly free hospitals remain enormously attractive for immigrants. The interviewees consider it security, in the case of if anything happens, unemployment, pensions, and welfare. With significant local exceptions, these benefits mentioned above are for permanent residence holders and citizenship holders equally (Mouritsen 2012: 96). However, the interviewees considered that citizenship provides lifetime security so one can enjoy these benefits forever (ibid.). These sentiments were reflected in interviewees’ statements. Ahmer* and Arif*’s statements are almost similar to what every interviewee reflected. Ahmer* compared Pakistan and Sweden in the sense of benefits and future’s perspectives. He reflected similar as Saqib* when it comes to family’s future. He explained this:

“...In comparison to your [Pakistan] country you feel that your future is more secure now in the sense of medical, education, in the sense of your family, and your children. Your children are safer here... better future for your family in the sense of your economic future compare to your country, [paused] you feel secure that you have a welfare state that can help you, in the case, you get some economic instability or become jobless” (Ahmer*).

Interviewer: These benefits come with PR (permanent residence) as well?

“It comes with the permanent residence permit, but inside you have an insecurity that something is missing. You feel something is lacking which others have but you don’t have, plus if you want to join the police, army or so, then it is only possible if you have citizenship”. (Ahmer *)

Arif had same concerns about family as other interviewees. He compared the eduction which is very expensive in Pakistan and why people feel secure in Sweden. He explained that:

“...It is good safe country for children, and in Pakistan, there is costly education and still not safe. But here we have different problems then there. So we prefer this country and accept these problems instead [of Pakistan]. I give you an example; I was studying and had a roommate [name] who came from Iraq after his mother and father who were doctors died in a bomb blast. He came here with his sisters. If a person like him, cannot go and work back there [Iraq], or spend time there and if we see all these problems are not here [in Sweden]. It is more secure for him and his family here [Sweden]”. (Arif *)
The interviewees tend to value their families so much. They consider family is a big part of their lives. They always think of their families first before deciding anything. Sweden was declared the best country for bringing and raising up the children by these immigrants. Some of them wished they want to go back but now their children have been raised here, and they learned this culture so it would not be easy for them to move and accept another or different culture like Pakistan.

6.2.4. Security: If you are a Women…..

As discussed by Giddens (1990, 92), security refers to the trust that most people have in the continuation of their “self-identity”, and in their surroundings socially and materially. Being a “woman” and “confidence” in the surroundings was looked in security perspective by these interviewees. Besides the family security women security in Sweden was also raised by these interviewees. Sehrish* pointed out that:

“I feel I have more rights here, so I feel secure in comparison to Pakistan…..after I came here I get to know many rights for myself. I appreciate the Swedish laws. But after becoming a citizen of this country, I will feel that I have more rights……this society do not have gender difference”. (Sehrish)

While talking about women’s security, culture, and norms in Sweden, Saqib* expressed his feelings on women’s freedom in Sweden:

“Security in every sense…..but I know she is [his wife] now from a secure society [citizen in Sweden]. She travels alone, and I did not even drop her at the airport. She went around three o clock at night, and this is one of the protection we got here. This is one example, in other cases economic security, mental security, and one of the best things I have learned here in Sweden is ethics. So no one can misbehave with you. That is a kind of security as well, and I like this thing here”. (Saqib *)

Hira*,similarly explained that being a mother and a citizen of Sweden give her a secure feeling in everyday relationships. She further pointed out the cultural difference for a woman in Sweden and Pakistan. She explained:

“I am a mom, and I am a citizen of this country which has more women rights than men. I feel this is a women state. I feel secure in my daily chores. I have a good life, good job and good husband [laugh]. He [her husband] knows I have some rights here, if something terrible happens with our relationship, I can have a life alone with my baby. I do not need a man for the support as it is in Pakistan. I have citizenship, and that makes me secure” (Hira*).
Almost everyone participated in this study considered women security is a very significant factor to live and stay in Sweden. This study has three female participants, and all of them were concerned and aware regarding their security and protection which they get with the citizenship status.

Finally, this section “sense of security” demonstrated that interviewees pointed out the significance of citizenship from security and protection's point of view. The security describes by these immigrants has a broader sense which means feeling secure after getting citizenship. They feel secure in every field of life such as economic, social, political, protection against the deportation, and while traveling anywhere in the world. These participants seemed very concerned about their security. They consider Swedish citizenship will provide them security in every walk of life from work to travel. If you are a man or a child or a woman, you will be secure if you got the citizenship of Sweden. Those immigrants who already possessed the permanent residency (PR) status are still concerned because they do not hold Swedish citizenship. They think that they are less secure than those who have it. The same account was raised by what Nunn et al. (2015) that at least for some immigrants, formal state citizenship underpins daily life.” (p: 393)

6.3. Mobility or Immobility

In the material term of citizenship, mobility or freedom to travel is vital in immigrants’ claim to citizenship (Coutin 2010; Galvez 2013; Leitner & Erkamp 2006; Leuchter 2014; Mavroudi 2008). Mau (2010) states that mobility rights that involve a legal route to pass a border are now similar to other fundamental rights such as social, civil and political. According to Mau et al. (2015) for immigrants who come from the South part of the world, passport of the democratic and prosperous country is a primary purpose of acquiring citizenship (p. 1195). The interviewees of this study considered mobility or freedom of movement as the comfort of the citizenship. Kiran* stated that:

“If you are not citizen of Sweden then it matters, for example, it does not matter in daily lives, but for example, if you want to travel then it becomes easy if you have [Swedish] citizenship”. (Kiran *)

Mau (2010) indicates that the right to travel everywhere you desire to visit may be seen as individual liberty. In other words, freedom to travel has an intrinsic value besides other values, such as freedom of thought, speech, and association. It displays a “core value of what it means to be free” (p: 342). As for Ahmer* who came to Sweden as a refugee, travel seemed essential privilege of the citizenship and freedom. He stated that:
“Traveling was the first factor [applying for citizenship] for me because I wanted to travel... especially back to my homeland. I felt free after I got citizenship”. (Ahmer*)

Ahmer* statement also confirms what Mouritsen (2012: 93) explained that mobility is of highly important for immigrants especially for political refugees. For Wahid* comfort in travelling that comes with Swedish citizenship was one of the primary factors for getting the citizenship. He expressed that:

"Three main things made me apply for Swedish citizenship; security, honor [respect for country], and comfort in traveling. These are the top reasons for me to apply [citizenship]". (Wahid *)

After security and protection, taking Swedish passport and the ability to travel freely was recognized by the interviewees as the most powerful and attractive benefit of Swedish citizenship. The importance of Swedish citizenship in term of mobility privileges was shared by the interviewees who both do and do not hold Swedish citizenship; and who did and did not still experienced benefits of international mobility. These interviewees discussed different aspects of movement such as mobility bonus, restrictions, challenges and behavioural problems at the airports or travel places. The interviewees valued Swedish citizenship because of its commitment to mobility freedom or visa-free international traveling.

6.3.1. Travel Restrictions and Immobilities

While immigrants’ “right to stay” has been discussed compellingly, insufficient attention has been paid to challenges, difficulties, and uncertainties they face with a less attractive passport (Mau 2010: 340). This section aims to analyze the relationships between citizenship status, mobility benefits, and inequalities. According to Mau (2010), these rights of movements are not equally divided. The major tool for monitoring international mobility – and thus people’s movement – is visa procedure and policy (Mau 2010). A Swedish passport gives its holders visa-free and unrestricted access to 161 countries around the globe in comparison to Pakistan where you can travel visa-free to only 29 states (Passport Index 2018). The interviewees discussed these inequalities, restrictions, and challenges. Sehrish* raised this concern regarding immobility while explaining when she doesn’t feel that she is a Swedish citizen; she stated that:

“I never felt that I am not Swedish in everyday life, but as a researcher when I want to go for a conference, people who are citizens here [Sweden], have many opportunities for them. They can apply to go wherever they want. But for me, for
example, in those countries where I can travel on Swedish residence permit (PR) it is OK, but if places are outside of Europe, then I have to go through a very hard procedure [visa process]. That is why for me, it is not that easy to avail these opportunities: for example, Australia, Canada, and America. But my colleagues can avail this opportunity but I cannot. I have to keep a time frame that I have to apply for a permit which takes time. So obviously, I will choose a conference from those countries where I can travel easily compare to those where I have trouble in traveling. But my colleagues will see the ranking and so... because for them there is no hindrance to travel there but for me it is....then I feel that I am not Swedish citizen”. (Sehrish)

Ahmer*, on the other hand, described the privileges which citizenship bring with it, and how he feels free now. He discussed:

“I can vote now, I can travel easily in 160 countries so I feel free, I can do business in the whole world, I can play role and travel without any restrictions of visas, I can travel”. (Ahmer *)

Accurately evaluated by Ahmer*, a Swedish passport is not only a legitimate travel document but also one of extraordinary and luxurious status in the world. It provides access to practically every border of the world and therefore, invokes a high feeling of physical freedom. In comparison to mobility on a Pakistani passport, a Swedish passport is much more worthy (passport Index: 2018). Ahmer* further elaborated:

“Travel becomes easy, you feel secure in your mind that anytime you can go the world. You just [need to] pick up the passport and go — you feel free. You don't feel pressurized that I want to go to that country and I need a visa”. (Ahmer *)

Citizenship of Sweden and other European countries is, according to Carens (1987: 252), “the modern equivalent of feudal privilege: an [inherited] status that greatly enhances one’s life chances” – in this case, the unrestricted right to move across international boundaries. Hence, citizenship does not only supply rights in the residence country but also provides a prominent status within the global mobility network (Mau et al. 2015: 1195). Ahmer* described it as:

“Compare to your previous country [origin] where you came from; after you got the citizenship of a welfare country then you become elite in your homeland. It doesn’t mean you got more money than those [living there], in many cases, they have more money than you, but they are lacking all these protections, and the system, we are having here [Sweden]. It is like a psychological thing [citizenship] for us and them. Traveling freedom can be one of them”. (Ahmer *)

Similar to Ahmer*, Wahid* compared both countries Sweden and Pakistan. He stated that:
“If we look at the benefits then on top it is traveling. Basically, if we will look at the benefits; then we will see that what we have now, and after getting the Swedish citizenship what we will get. And then we will compare both. So you know [pointed at me] how hard is traveling in foreign countries on Pakistani passport and getting the visa. Even after getting the visa things are not easy for you. And if you compare this with Swedish citizenship then it is a drastic difference mmmm…it brings freedom to travel and even how people will treat you when you travel for example authorities at the airport”. (Wahid *)

Significantly, all the interviewees valued the “mobility rights” (Mau 2010) inherent in Swedish citizenship. However, mobility can be considered as an unevenly divided thing on a global scale (Shamir 2005). The interviewees compared the value of Swedish passport for mobility during conversations. These differences, inequalities, difficulties, and challenges faced by the interviewees arguably reflected the “global mobility divide” (Mau et al. 2015) between citizens of Pakistan and Sweden.

6.3.2. Passport Makes Difference…..

Some of the travellers have freedom from visa constraints due to that “generalized trust” which they earned from being a citizen of a country whose passport is luxury to hold (Torpey 2000). On the other hand, travellers from poor, undemocratic or emigration countries are the citizens of “suspected countries” (Shamir 2005: 203). Those are subject to ‘closer scrutiny’ to purify them from undesired migration (Mau 2010: 345-6). In simple words passports make differences. The interviewees discussed restrictions they faced and unfair treatment of authorities while travelling. Saqib*, Arif*, Sehrish* and Imran* reflected on these concerns in a similar manner. Saqib stated that:

“When you show Swedish passport at the airport it makes really really a difference. I give you an example; when we had work permit we went to Saudi Arabia for Umrah [religious ritual for muslims]. At that time we had Pakistani passport even though we went from Sweden so their behaviour was very different and then we got Swedish passport so went [Saudi Arabia] for Hajj [religious ritual for muslims] there again. So they [authorities] behaved entirely different, same place, same flight, same airport same people, but their treatment was different than before [positively]". (Saqib *)

Arif* experienced unfair and unequal treatment at the airport holding different passports. He said that:

“...... authorities discriminate you on that basis [passport] and if you are from a developed country then you have an edge on many things…. so when I went to the Liverpool airport as a student in Sweden, ..... they were suspicious, and they
investigated me for one hour. They saw pictures from my phone and my camera [paused]. I felt really bad .... so that was discrimination. It was very problematic even though I had a return ticket and all the documents, they should not have done it and because they see you from a different angle. After that, I traveled with a Swedish passport and if you have it so you do not need to go to the counter sometimes you go out from airport directly. By getting a passport here [Sweden] it makes difference”. (Arif *)

Sehrish* explained her experience much similar to Arif*. She told that:

“I give you one example; three years ago at that time, we did not have PR [permanent residency]. We went to Finland through the ferry, then they asked some questions at the border control from my husband. My husband called me so I can talk to him because he was talking in Swedish. He was Finnish, but he was trying to speak in Swedish so they can judge if we are coming from Sweden. It means they were checking if we can speak Swedish.... and then I spoke two sentences in Swedish, and he said OK. At that time I felt that I have to prove that I am from Sweden”. (Sehrish*)

Similar concerns were raised by Imran*:

“My citizenship matters at the airports in the sense of treatment, and it brings free movement you can go visa-free in many countries”. (Imran *)

Finally, interviewees perceived and experienced that passports play a considerable role to cater inequalities, restrictions, and uncertainties in the mobility arena. They felt there is a difference of attitude of people at the airports and other places and it all depends on which passport you are holding as Mau (2010: 345-6) calls it “closer scrutiny” to filter from undesired migration. The same person with a different passport will be treated differently at the same place. It means passport in hand makes a difference. A person's status can be upgraded and degraded by the passport one holds. In that sense, Swedish citizenship brings high mobility freedom that can cause the change of behaviour at the airports and traveling experiences. Therefore, for these immigrants who participated in this study, mobility is the very significant benefit of the Swedish citizenship in the materialistic term. As Leuchter (2014: 787) rightly points out, citizenship is a strong symbol of freedom of travel. However, Wahid feels that there is a connection between mobility, belongings and a passport. Wahid* stated that:

“I feel less belong when I travel. Because I travel on my origins country’s passport so I cannot say I belong to Sweden...and they treat us very differently than people already living here with us [citizenship holders]. They make a different queue, and they behave very differently toward us”. (Wahid *)
6.4. Sense of Belonging

According to Brochmann (2013), citizenship in its symbolic term can be a symbol of the link between an individual and the state that guarantees the immigrants’ recognition and “sense of belonging” (p:432). This section will address some of the essential aspects which were raised by the interviewees.

6.4.1. Home is Where the Heart is……

As Yuval-Davis (2004, p. 215), suggests that: “belonging is not just about membership, rights, and duties”, but “belonging is a deep emotional need of people” (see in Brubaker 1992). The interviewees reflected their deep emotional needs in various aspects of belonging and not belonging. Although questions regarding belongings were especially difficult to explain for interviewees, and they were thoughtful while answered. Still, one thing was surprisingly interesting that the interviewees Saqib*, Sehirsh* and Ahmer* replied in an identical way when they were asked; where they feel home and where do they belong. Ahmer* replied:

“I feel home here in Sweden because you think it is the country you are residing for many years but if you ask where do you belong so I will say Pakistan”. (Ahmer*)

“I feel home in Sweden., But I still feel I belong to Pakistan, why because most of my life 24 years I have spent in Pakistan and only 9 years in Sweden. But there are somethings, for example, which I learned here, how we move in the society how to act but still, I cannot say that I am entirely from here, I feel like I have a home here, but I cannot say I belong [here]”. (Sehrish*)

“I feel home in Sweden, but I belong to Pakistan, as I have chosen my rest of life to be lived in Sweden... as it is difficult for me to go back to Pakistan. Belongingness is more for the family which I have here and there. So now I am divided as a person, and I belong here [Sweden] right now, but as a son, I belong to Pakistan because in our culture we cannot ignore family”. (Saqib*)

However, some of the interviewees replied otherwise. Such as Imran* considered that his home is in Pakistan because he has his parents there and Wahid* thinks that people can belong to more than one places. This account was also discussed by the Vera-Larrucea (2011: 168) that in some circumstances belonging and membership do not stay together.
Practically or legally an individual can be a part of a group but do not feel the belongingness to it: In other cases, belonging can be multiple (ibid). Imran* and Wahid* stated that:

“It is a tough question because for me my home is in Pakistan because you have family and friend in Pakistan, but if you have family then they visit to Pakistan, so for them, this [Sweden] is home because they have spent their time here, childhood here, and will be grown up here. For me, it is like this...but I don't know about next generation how it will be”. (Imran *)

“Home is a place where you live, and a human being can have more than one home. It is not right that one people should have only one home. So I feel belong to both countries. ....as we see many people have get feeling of belongingness before they get the citizenship. So they can have belong or sense of belonging to both countries and why not”. (Wahid *)

Nevertheless, On the other hand, Vera-Larrucea (2011: 168) considered that belonging does not necessarily connect to the membership. A person can have dual or more memberships but does not feel belong to all of the places.

6.4.2. Does Citizenship Modify belongings?

As Anant (1966) reflected that sense of belonging in its comprehensive understanding refers to the people’s engagements in the social system and It is a feeling of being connected to the environment, people or places. It includes feeling secure, recognized, suitable, and capable of participating in the society”. This was reflected in the interviewees’ discussion about belonging. They related their sense of belonging to work, spending time, and contribution to the society. As Sehrish explained:

“For example, I am contributing to this society so much, but if that society creates some conditions that society does not acknowledge that whatever we did for the society then I will not feel like doing it. Perhaps I will leave it. When we go to a new place, we start thinking how we can contribute to the society. That is a good thing you contribute, but if that society creates a hurdle for you [and considers that] its good you contribute but this thing [citizenship] is not for you. So then I will think if after contributing so much I can not become a part of it [society] then I will think why I should be a part of this society”. (Sehrish*)

In replying the question whether citizenship can enhance the feelings of belongingness; Sehrish* raised the factor of being loyal and connected it to the citizenship. It is a reflection of what Lee & Hébert stated: the emotional side of citizenship is based on the prevailing sentiments of patriotism.
towards the country, and its recognition and belongings can be seen in a strong spirit of loyalty (2006: 501).

“I think ...I think there is something you feel about belonging when you get citizenship. You start feeling that yes [emphasis added], you belong to this country and your feelings also usually change. For example, right now I have a very uncertain situation because I do not have it [citizenship] and you don't know when you have to go back or leave this country, but if you have citizenship you feel different. There is one loyalty factor wherever you go you know you belong to that country....you start feeling loyal”. (Sehrish*)

While sharing his belonging and emotions, Ahmer* explained how citizenship changed his feeling of belong to this country.

“...you feel more bond, and you feel now you have a relation in shape of citizenship...[paused] and you feel belong to this country. If I was only Pakistani citizen not Swedish than I could not have experienced these attachments which I feel now after I got citizenship”. (Ahmer *)

However, Wahid* considered that it is a two-way process: first, you take a step towards state and then state respect you and grant you citizenship in this acknowledgment, and you feel more belong and attach to the country.

“There will be the difference somehow [after getting citizenship] because if they give me citizenship, then I will think they respect me and it is a great step towards me. One step was that I took towards them [state] when I came here, and now they [state] are taking a step towards me. So I think I will appreciate this and it will bring a sense of belonging as well because of you become citizenry of the country. I don't want to compare here that this belonging will be more than your home country or not. I think we should not compare this. But I think it can be equal, less or more in some cases. I don't want to compare because I think we should not do this because both places have positive and negative sides. mmm...I believe citizenship make you express your belonging”. (Wahid *)

While discussing their belongings, these Interviewees expressed multiple views. The majority of interviewees showed that they belong to both states: Sweden by considering it home, working and paying taxes, and Pakistan because they belong and have the family and friends there. The same account which was recognized by Vera-Larrucea (2011: 168) that in some cases, belonging and membership do not go hand in hand.
6.4.3.  Becoming a Swedish Citizen on Paper Makes you a ‘Swedish’

Brubaker (1992) states that belonging cannot be reduced to identities and identifications; it cannot be discussed in individualist and collectivist perspectives by labelling people and creating myths about origin and destiny. The interviewees of this study responded the question do you become Swedish by getting Swedish citizenship in various forms. Imran* stated that:

“We become Swedish, but they [Swedish] do not understand that we are Swedish now. It happens in every society like in Pakistan there are Afghans whatever they do we call them immigrants”. (Imran *)

Wahid*, who is in the process of applying for the citizenship, replied the question — do you feel Swedish?

“Not yet, it is possible that in my eyes the requirements of being Swede already fulfilled, but I need confirmation [citizenship] from their side [state] as well if they accept me as citizens. Otherwise, if I will be like I call myself Swedish and they do not accept me — then it is not respectable for myself. It becomes documented, it will certify that I am Swedish — from the state”. (Wahid *)

On the other hand, Arif* and Hira*considered that we can never become a Swedish even by possessing citizenship. Arif* pointed out the matter that because we look different and we are from Asia that is the reason we can never become Swedish because we do not look like native Swede. He explains that we do everything like a Swedish does, such as work and pay taxes but that is not enough to be a Swedish. Arif stated that:

“No really, whatever you do you cannot become Swedish. For me we are immigrants, so we work here and pay tax so no not really [emphasis added], sometimes you feel that you are Swedish national….like at the airport and places like this so there I feel I am a Swedish citizen”. (Arif *)

However, Hira thinks that the religion is the factor involved in becoming a Swedish and that is why a Pakistani can never become a Swede. She reflected that:

“I guess no you can never become a Swede because of the religion. So then it becomes an issue”. (Hira*)

Ahmer* pointed out the political side of membership with belongingness and described that:

“It depends if you see only for the vote then you become Swedish after having citizenship so you can give vote but not in daily lives”. (Ahmer *)
These interviewees reflected that naturalization would not make them Swedish because they perceived that they still follow Pakistani culture. About half of the interviewees did not connect citizenship to become Swedish, because they think that they can never become Swedish—even after getting citizenship. Majority of interviewees stated that they believed they had same equal rights similar to Swedish before acquiring citizenship. The notable point here is that no one from the interviewees expressed that they want to or acquired citizenship to become Swedish.

Finally, the interviewees find that hard to express their feelings and emotions about their belongingness and attachments. In most cases, they needed to think before speak. They showed and said that it is a hard thing to explain or it is difficult to answer. The acceptance of the point that citizenship enhances belonging to the country was broadly prevailed and experienced by many of the interviewees. However, when questions such as where do you feel home or where do you belong were asked that caused some uneasiness as someone is challenging their boundaries. They find it hard to express it very precisely as they did in the other cases.
7. CONCLUSION

The thesis focused on the immigrants' understandings, opinions, and experiences about citizenship. Therefore, by discussing immigrants' views on the citizenship, this thesis aimed to account how these immigrants perceive and define their Swedish citizenship and what does it mean to them; and how do these immigrants value Swedish citizenship in material, symbolic, and emotional term. For this purpose, Pakistani immigrants who are Swedish citizenship holders and non-citizenship holders were chosen and interviewed.

According to the findings of this research, a general trend shows that Swedish citizenship is a matter of high importance to the interviewees; materially, symbolically and emotionally. In general, they assigned various meanings to citizenship and valued it in regards to the sense of security, mobility, and sense of belonging. In the literature, one can find out that mobility is the fundamental factor for an immigrant in acquiring the citizenship of the liberal and Western states. However, according to the findings of this study, the interviewees seem to value citizenship more in emotional term and are very concern about their security. Therefore, analysis and data were presented according to immigrants' emphasis on these terms.

Emotionally, Swedish citizenship provides a stable constitutional status that grants safety, protection, and legal incorporation. According to the findings of this study, the interviewees are very concerned about their security and protection which is provided by the state to a citizen. The sense of security offered by the citizenship was the most prominent and discussed factor in their interviews while explaining what citizenship means to them. They expressed that Swedish citizenship brings protection in every sphere of life; economically, socially, politically; protection against the deportation; and while traveling anywhere in the world. Furthermore, the interviewees tend to value their families highly. They consider Sweden is a safe and good country for their families, and for raising their children. In addition, women are more secure here. The Swedish citizenship provides security to them and their families in every walk of life.

Materially, Swedish citizenship provides full rights and equality within the country, but holding Swedish passport is one of the most vital advantages of citizenship in the material term. A Swedish passport gives its holder visa-free and unrestricted access to 161 countries around the globe, and in comparison, Pakistan's score is only 29 countries (Passport Index: 2018). After the sense of security, mobility and immobility were highly acknowledged factors by the interviewees regardless of their
citizenship statuses. According to the findings of this paper, these immigrants perceived that passport makes a difference, and during travel, it caters inequalities, restrictions, and uncertainties in the mobility arena. A person's status can be updated or discredited due to the passport one holds. The mobility of the interviewees who do not have Swedish citizenship, however, was restrained by travel restrictions, visa procedures, and selective border restrictions. Many informants discussed unfair treatments and inadequate authorities' behaviours at the airports. To them, acquiring Swedish citizenship would mean more respect, opportunities, and freedom to move across international borders.

Furthermore, citizenship is eventually an element of symbolical belonging and recognition. Citizenship can be seen as a symbol of association to the country that endorses the immigrants’ recognition and “sense of belonging” (Brochmann 2013:432). According to the findings of this research, the recognition of the fact that citizenship improves belonging to the country was broadly prevailed and recognized by many of the interviewees. However, when questions such as ‘where do you feel home or where do you belong’ were asked; it was inconvenient for the interviewees to express it very precisely as they did in other cases. However, one thing was surprisingly interesting that majority of the interviewees responded to this question that they have home in Sweden but belong to Pakistan. Furthermore, when discussed belonging to the Swedish society, they relate it to work, spending time in the country, and participation in the society. They did not agree that citizenship makes them Swedish because of cultural differences. The notable fact here is that none of the interviewees stated that they want/wanted to acquire citizenship to become a Swede.

To sum up, there was a tendency that these interviewees understand their citizenships quite differently than what policy and legislation define. The meaning of citizenship and its salience have many variations in it. Immigrants value it according to their current statuses, standings, and geographical background. As in the case of the interviewees of this study, they value citizenship more in the form of security than mobility. When it comes to the mobility, they regard it more for the freedom and comfort in their travel experiences without unfair treatment which they face in the case of travel on the Pakistani passport. Thus, like every institution, citizenship is both “enabling and constraining” (Giddens 1984): It mobilizes and immobilizes; it connects and disconnects, and it is exclusive and inclusive.
7.1. Suggestion for Future Research

The findings of this research emphasize the need for future research to understand and refine our understanding of citizenship and its salience from immigrants' point of views. As Joppke (2010; 39) claims that what people correlate with citizenship in everyday lives is one of the gaps in existing literature, therefore, further qualitative research is necessary to investigate immigrants' worldview on the matter of citizenship. It will help understand the notion of citizenship in a better way. Furthermore, it will also help the institution of citizenship to review policies and laws in the best manner which will benefit the society in the long run such as in cohesion and integration of immigrant. Since this study was based and limited on Pakistani immigrants, comparative research based on these themes is called for to line out how other immigrants view and value Swedish citizenship in Sweden.
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