



**nccr —→
on the move**

**Alicia Loretan and
Philippe Wanner**

**The Determinants of Naturalization in
Switzerland between 2010 and 2012**

**Working Paper #13
March, 2017**

**Alicia Loretan and
Philippe Wanner
(University of Geneva)**

The Determinants of Naturalization in Switzerland between 2010 and 2012

The nccr – on the move is the National Center of Competence in Research (NCCR) for migration and mobility studies, which has been operational since 2014. The overall scientific aim of the nccr – on the move is to offer a comprehensive and interdisciplinary framework for understanding the character of contemporary migration and mobility to Switzerland. It was established by the Swiss National Science Foundation with the objective of fostering an innovative and competitive field of research on migration and mobility in Switzerland. Managed from the University of Neuchâtel, the network consists of some 60 researchers from social sciences, economics and law, who collaborate in 19 projects that are based at the universities of Neuchâtel, Basel, Bern, Fribourg, Geneva, Lausanne, Lucerne, and Zurich.

The Working Papers Series is an online platform for academic debates by members and cooperating partners of the nccr – on the move. The authors are responsible for the analyses and arguments, which do not necessarily reflect those of the nccr – on the move.

nccr – on the move, University of Neuchâtel, Faubourg de l'Hôpital 106, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland
Contact for the Working Paper Series: info@nccr-onthemove.ch

Abstract

Naturalization is an important phenomenon for countries, not only because of its implications (it grants duties and rights to new citizens) but also because of its policy-sensitive aspect. In Switzerland, it is also a complex phenomenon because of the diversity of procedures at the canton and commune levels. Knowledge of the determinants of naturalization is still lacking. In this context, this study presents two explanatory models of naturalization in Switzerland between 2010 and 2012, using statistical data prepared in the framework of the nccr – On the Move IP 1 Project, and analyzes their impacts on the naturalization (or lack thereof) of individuals, using binary logistic regressions. These models include sociodemographic variables, migration-linked variables and commune-related variables. Age, employment status (particularly unemployment), length of residence, country of origin and proportion of foreigners within the commune are the most explanatory variables of the naturalization of individuals, confirming the results of previous studies in Switzerland and abroad.

Keywords

Naturalization, Integration, Switzerland

Acknowledgments

This research was undertaken in the framework of an internship at the Institute for Demography and Socioeconomics at the University of Geneva, and with the support of the NCCR - On the Move (IP1).

Contacts

loretan.alicia@gmail.com, philippe.wanner@unige.ch

Institute for Demography and Socioeconomics (IDESO), Geneva School of Social Sciences
University of Geneva, 40, Bd du Pont d'Arve, 1211 Genève 4

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 5 |
| 2. General framework | 6 |
| Legal framework of naturalization in Switzerland. | 6 |
| Evolution of the federal legislation concerning ordinary naturalization | 7 |
| Cantonal and communal legal frameworks for naturalization | 7 |
| Naturalization in Switzerland and other determinants | 8 |
| 3. Data and methodology | 11 |
| Data and methodology | 11 |
| Description of the sample | 12 |
| 4. Results | 13 |
| Naturalization rates | 13 |
| Determinants of naturalization | 16 |
| 5. Discussion and conclusions | 22 |
| Annexes | 23 |
| Bibliography | 26 |

1 Introduction

Out of all European countries, Switzerland has one of the highest proportions of foreigners: in 2014, close to one inhabitant in four (24.3%) was a foreign national (FSO, 2015). This proportion certainly reflects the attractiveness of Switzerland – a stable country for migration candidates from an economic and political standpoint – and is a result of the large waves of economic and political migration that have marked the second half of the 20th century. However, it is also the result of a naturalization policy and naturalization practices that have a long history of being restrictive. Indeed, Swiss citizenship is governed by the "*jus sanguinis*", or blood right, inherited directly from Roman law. To date, naturalization has not been linked to birth place (*jus soli*) and is transmitted from parents to children. The criteria for naturalization are therefore stringent: as well as lengthy residence period criteria, there are integration criteria that are vague and therefore leave room for subjectivity, as well as a complex procedure at the three levels of the Confederation.

However, although the diversity of these procedures is known and recognized, it is nevertheless interesting to investigate the importance of this diversity in the naturalization process and the extent to which it is influenced by individuals' characteristics. In particular, it seems important to identify the social, cultural and economic factors that are most favorable for the acquisition of the Swiss passport.

This study focuses on the phenomenon of naturalization in Switzerland from 2010 to 2012. It aims at measuring the effects of different individual and collective characteristics on naturalization. In the first part, it presents the overall framework of the determinants of naturalization based on literature from Switzerland and abroad. In the second part, the data and methodology are introduced. Then, the results are presented and discussed in two steps: the first addresses the computation of naturalization rates by year, age, sex, canton of domicile and country or region of origin; the second addresses the statistical determination of the factors influencing the probability that a foreigner will obtain access to citizenship.

2 General framework

In Switzerland, the naturalization procedure occurs at three levels: federal, cantonal and communal. The 1952 Law on Citizenship sets the general framework for naturalization at the Swiss federal level but gives cantons and communes the opportunity to include naturalization criteria in their own laws, and these can be more restrictive than at the federal level (CFM, 2012). The margin of interpretation at the cantonal and communal levels is therefore very wide, which can lead to significant differences among the different communes of Switzerland in terms of the frequency of naturalization (Wanner and Steiner, 2012). In 2018, a new Law on Citizenship should come into force. Even if this law is, in some ways, more restrictive than the 1952 Law, it will not fundamentally alter cantons' and communes' flexibility.

In this section, we present the general legal framework of naturalization: the types of naturalization, their criteria and procedures, and their evolution since 1952. We then include a short review of the literature, both Swiss and international, on the different determinants of naturalization.

Legal framework of naturalization in Switzerland.

The Federal Act on the Acquisition and Loss of Citizenship (Swiss Citizenship Act, SCA), which came into force in 1952 (CFM, 2012), sets the conditions for three types of naturalization: ordinary naturalization, simplified naturalization and re-naturalization.

Ordinary naturalization requires two criteria presented in articles 14 and 15 of the SCA. The first criterion concerns suitability: the candidate for naturalization must prove, on the one hand, that he/she "is integrated in Swiss society and is familiar with Swiss habits, customs and practices" (SCA, art. 14) and, on the other hand, that he/she "abides by Swiss law and does not pose a risk to Swiss internal and external security" (SCA, art. 14). The second criterion is of a formal nature and concerns the minimal residence requirements in Switzerland. The candidate for naturalization must have been a resident in Switzerland for a total of 12 years, including three of the five years prior to the application being made. Furthermore, the years spent in Switzerland by the candidate between the ages of ten and twenty years count double (SCA, art. 15, para. 1 and 2). In the first instance, for an ordinary naturalization request, the Confederation only examines the information related to respect for the legal order and to the security of the State, as well as to the candidate's eligibility according to the federal level's residence criteria. It leaves it up to the cantons and the communes to assess the other conditions, such as the residence duration requirements fixed by cantonal and communal laws, and the extent of integration (SEM, 2013).

The residence period can, however, be reduced to five years, provided the applicant has lived in matrimony or in a registered partnership for three years with a spouse who has Swiss citizenship or is himself/herself a candidate for naturalization and eligible according to paragraphs 1 or 2 (SCA, art. 14, para. 3 to 6). In such a case, a simplified naturalization procedure (SCA, art. 26 to 31b) is granted to the partners of Swiss citizens. This type of naturalization falls solely within the responsibility of the Confederation, although cantons and communes are consulted and have a right of appeal (CFM, 2012).

Re-naturalization concerns people who have lost their citizenship by forfeiture, marriage or release from Swiss citizenship (SEM, 2012). Re-naturalization is granted if the candidate has close connections with Switzerland and he/she does not pose a risk to internal or external security. As with simplified naturalization, cantons and communes only have a right of appeal, and the

Confederation alone has decision-making competence (SEM, 2012). This type of naturalization was mainly used in the 1950s for women who had lost their citizenship following marriage to a foreign husband. Currently, the number of re-naturalizations does not exceed 20 cases per year.

Evolution of the federal legislation concerning ordinary naturalization

The law has been modified several times between 1952 and 2016. The most important modification occurred in 1992; it abolished the automatic acquisition of citizenship for wives of Swiss citizens and allowed dual citizenship (CFM, 2012). This modification has had a double effect: on the one hand, it has reduced the number of, and delays in, naturalizations of foreign women married to a Swiss because marriage to a Swiss man does not lead to his wife's automatic naturalization; on the other hand, it has increased the attractiveness of the Swiss passport by taking away its exclusive character and authorizing dual citizenship.

Other provisions concerning the discretion accorded to cantons and communes have also been introduced since 2003. Accordingly, as of 2003, the naturalization of an individual cannot be subjected to a vote, and cantons and communes must justify any refusals of naturalization (CFM, 2012). The purpose of these two modifications is to reduce the risk of discrimination in naturalization procedures at the commune level. Since 2009, judicial authorities have been established at cantonal level to examine appeals, and cantons and communes must henceforth ensure that naturalization procedures are conducted properly. Finally, as of 2012, the Federal Supreme Court can intervene if a refusal to grant citizenship is discriminatory or insufficiently substantiated (CFM, 2012).

A revision of the Act on the Acquisition and Loss of Citizenship was approved in June 2014 and should come into force in 2018. The new Act lowers the required period of residence to 10 years; it also double-counts the years of residence between the ages of eight and eighteen, although the number of years of effective residence must be at least 6. The Act restricts naturalization to holders of a settlement permit (C permits). The periods of cantonal residence are themselves set between two and five years, with a view to harmonizing and simplifying procedures (SCA, art. 18). The criteria concerning integration are also modified, and the following requirements have been added to the element of respect for security and public order: « the respect for the values of the Constitution; the ability to communicate on a daily basis in a national language, both orally and in writing; participation in economic life or the acquisition of a qualification; and the encouragement and support for the integration of the spouse, of the partner, or of non-adult children over which the candidate has parental authority (SCA, art 12, para.1). The cantons retain the right to include additional criteria.

Cantonal and communal legal frameworks for naturalization

As mentioned above, cantonal and communal legislations are determinants of naturalization, and there are important disparities between them. Furthermore, in most cantons, the first decision-making level concerning ordinary naturalization is the commune, which thereby contributes to the multiplication of procedures and makes communes one of the main determinants explaining naturalization (Wichmann et al, 2011).

Cantons have different ways of calculating an applicant's number of years of residence in Switzerland. Some only consider the years spent in Switzerland with a B or C permit, while others consider the years spent under another permit. Differences also exist in terms of procedure, with

some cantons organizing an interview prior to the submission of a request in order to ensure that the formal requirements are fulfilled, while others ask for attestations confirming the language skills and sociopolitical knowledge of the candidate for naturalization. Wichmann et al (2011) have, for instance, classified Swiss cantons into three groups according to their barriers to naturalization, identifying six cantons¹ that have barriers considered to be low (Wichmann et al, 2011).

The margin of manoeuvre at the cantonal level is very large, both in the procedures and in the way requests are handled, as well as in the analyses of the notion of integration. A degree of professionalization concerning the procedures has also been introduced in many communes, particularly in urban areas, with a view to reducing the costs and to making decisions less partial.

Naturalization in Switzerland and other determinants

Although the criteria for the length of residence are fixed at each of the three levels (federal, cantonal and communal) for ordinary naturalization, the criteria concerning “aptitudes” (of art. 14 of the SCA) are subject to greater interpretation. Indeed, despite the different modifications of the Swiss Citizenship Act (SCA), the differences among cantons remain large in terms of practice and procedures for naturalization. Furthermore, an applicant’s integration and degree of being accustomed to a country, a region and its culture are general and abstract notions that are difficult to formally define, which makes them difficult to objectively and impartially evaluate. The application of the integration criteria is therefore not systematic, leading to several inequalities in the treatment of migrants in relation to the place of residence (Fibbi, 2012). However, factors other than location can influence the decision of whether to ask for naturalization, as well as the success of the application procedure.

In recent years, several studies have described the regional variations in the rate of naturalization. Based on statistical data, Piguet and Wanner (2002), and subsequently Wanner and Steiner (2012), have noted important differences among Swiss communes and significant variations among cantons, although the latter were found to occur at a lower level (Piguet and Wanner, 2002; see also Hainmueller and Hangartner, 2011). Wichmann et al. (2011) observe more important cantonal variations between 2005 and 2008 and highlight the correlation that exists between naturalization and the linguistic region and the extent of urbanization (Wichmann et al, 2011). Generally, naturalization is more frequent in urban areas and in densely populated communes, and this is true for both sexes (Wanner and Steiner, 2012; Wichmann et al, 2011). It is clear that naturalization is more frequent in communes with a higher socio-professional level, but more rare in communes with a high proportion of foreigners (Piguet and Wanner, 2002). It is, however, important to keep in mind that naturalization and foreign citizenship are closely linked and that the direction of the causal relationship is not always clear: a high proportion of foreigners can be explained by either a practice of restrictive naturalization or by a low interest in acquiring citizenship. According to Bollinger (2004), the communal naturalization rates can be explained by the composition of the foreign population in terms of its origins, by the levels of integration and education, as well as by the stability of residence location, but they do not depend on the decision-making authority (Bollinger, 2004). Amongst other less important factors, the author also mentions the cantonal naturalization conditions and the political climate within communes. Finally, the proportion of the

¹ BE, BS, GE, TI, VD, ZG

foreign population and the size of the commune do not seem to influence the naturalization rates (Bolliger, 2004).

Naturalization research can also be conducted by looking at the rejection rate at the commune level, as Helbling and Kriesi have done for 207 communes in 2003 (Helbling and Kriesi, 2004). They highlight the decision-making authority's fundamental importance as a factor in the rejection of naturalization: the rejection rate is higher in communes where the decision is made by the population (for example by the communal assembly) and lower in communes where the decision is made by the legislative or the executive powers (Helbling and Kriesi, 2004). It is also higher in communes considered to be xenophobic (taking into account the influence of the Swiss People's Party – SVP), while discrimination against a nationality is greater when the number of citizens of that nationality is substantial in the commune (Hainmueller and Hangartner, 2011). The latter element could be closely correlated with those citizens' integration and the community's image of their integration: hence, the assimilation of an individual of foreign nationality could be restricted by the presence of a large community of the same nationality within a commune.

It is not possible for research on the rates of naturalization to consider the whole range of individual characteristics of those who are naturalized and of candidates for naturalization. Yet, if naturalization is to be generally linked to a symbolic dimension (the degree of attachment to Switzerland), which is difficult to assess, other more factual dimensions can be related to changes in citizenship. The analysis of individual determinants is also of prime importance to understanding the phenomenon of naturalization.

The original citizenship of a candidate for naturalization is a key explanatory factor (Wanner and Steiner, 2012). Some of the observed differences related to the citizenship of origin could be explained by variable rejection rates. Hence, Hainmueller and Hangartner (2011), who studied the factors explaining naturalization rates in Swiss communes that voted through the ballot box prior to its prohibition in 2003, observed less frequent naturalization amongst individuals of Turkish origin and from the countries of ex-Yugoslavia, confirming the observation made by the Federal Commission against Racism in 2007 (CFR, 2007). Differences according to citizenship can also be explained according to criteria other than attachment to Switzerland or aspirations concerning return to one's country of origin. More practical dimensions, such as the consolidation of one's presence in Switzerland through naturalization, easier access to the labor market or the reduction of constraints on travel abroad, can explain variations according to citizenship (particularly between EU and non-EU citizens).

Amongst other causal factors often proposed concerning individuals, one can cite the standard demographic dimensions such as gender, age, marital status and the presence of children in the household. Other dimensions associated with migratory patterns are also mentioned, such as being born in Switzerland or having lived in a commune far longer than the residence criteria applied by the commune (Hainmueller and Hangartner, 2011). Meanwhile, Pecoraro (2012) analyzes the propensity for naturalization amongst eligible foreigners between 1990 and 2000. He also highlights other factors, such as proficiency in the local language or living in an urban area – supporting Wichmann et al.'s (2011) conclusions – or being a home-owner (Pecoraro, 2012). However, according to Hainmueller and Hangartner (2011), near-perfect proficiency in the regional language does not offer a significant advantage in terms of naturalization being accepted in the communes in their study.

Although the legislation and the practices concerning naturalization differ significantly among countries, some individual characteristics tend to emerge in the international literature.

Hence, Liang (1994) focuses on naturalization in the United States of America and highlights the importance of the socio demographic characteristics of the individual, such as age at immigration, gender or marital status, as well as social capital and networks. Socio-economic status seems, nevertheless, to have a significant impact on naturalization only up to a certain length of stay (Liang, 1994). For the acquisition of American citizenship, Yang (1994) shows the importance of language proficiency and of the political system of the country of origin. More recently, Zimmermann et al. (2009) have challenged the positive linear relationship between naturalization and length of stay, showing the latter to have a positive impact on naturalization only up to a certain length of stay. The authors also mention the ambivalent influence of the urban factor: a high availability of facilities (schools, sports and cultural centers, etc.) in urban areas would tend to have a positive effect on naturalization; however, the numerous national communities in the area studied could also constitute a hindrance to integration and naturalization (Zimmermann et al, 2009).

In Germany, Diehl and Blohm (2003) study the high naturalization rates amongst Turks, a community with a low socio-economic status compared to that of Germans and other prominent foreign nationalities. The authors compare the desire to naturalize amongst Yugoslav and Turkish populations in light of different characteristics (socio-economic dimensions, relations with the German population and with relatives living in the home country, interest in politics), and they find that the degree of individual assimilation is a determinant more closely correlated with naturalization than social status (Diehl and Blohm, 2003). They also highlight the positive impact of the use of the national language in the home, as well as the existence of a network of German friends, on the naturalization of Turks, while these variables have no impact on the naturalization of Yugoslavs (Diehl and Blohm, 2003). The authors propose several hypotheses to explain this difference. For example, for an individual coming from a young country, naturalization could be perceived as distancing oneself from one's original culture, which could reduce the desire to naturalize (Diehl and Blohm, 2003). More generally, the costs of naturalization for the candidate vary according to culture and to the impact in the country of origin. Beyond the costs, the benefits also vary, depending on the geographical proximity of the country of origin and the stability that the acquisition of the citizenship of the host country can bring.

New data are necessary to better understand the determinants of naturalization. In this context, this study uses personal data to analyze naturalization in Switzerland. The database, which has been set up within the framework of the NCCR – On the Move project, contains the results of a merging between two statistical datasets and includes numerous relevant data, including many socioeconomic and demographic data mentioned by the existing literature. The sociodemographic characteristics of the individual can be directly linked to the occurrence of naturalization in the following year. Therefore, the results can accurately determine the factors, measured objectively, that influence naturalization in Switzerland.

3 Data and methodology

Data and methodology

The data used in this study are derived from two different sets of statistics available since 2010: Population and Household Statistics (STATPOP) and the Structural Survey (RS).

The STATPOP statistics are based mainly on the communal and cantonal Population Registers and are therefore exhaustive. They contain information on individuals' general characteristics, such as gender, birthplace, and household structure, and on mobility as well as acquisitions of Swiss citizenship.

The Structural Survey is carried out annually on a sample that is representative of the overall population and covers more than 200,000 people. It provides details on the languages spoken, religion, educational achievements and employment situation of individuals aged 15 and over residing in private households in Switzerland and who have permanent residence status or a residence permit valid for twelve months or longer (Qualité, 2014). The sample framework is the Population Register. The sampling process for the Structural Survey (RS) occurs in two phases: first, a random sampling² of households with a probability of being included that is proportional to the number of eligible persons (aged 15 years or over) in the household; second, a random selection of eligible persons in the household (Qualité, 2014). After data collection, weightings are calculated to allow extrapolation of the results to the whole population; such weightings are applied in our analysis.

Within the framework of the NCCR – On the Move Project, the two data bases have been merged to create a longitudinal data base. This enables the information from the numerous statistics to be centralized to track each individual over time and to document his/her sociodemographic characteristics. The linking of the different data bases is made easier by the availability and use of the social security number as the individual's identifier (Steiner and Wanner, 2015).

A first step in the analysis aims to define the target population, made up of persons who are eligible for ordinary naturalization. This population is then split into two groups: those naturalized in 2011, 2012 and 2013, and those who have remained foreigners. It was not possible to include those characterized by facilitated naturalization and reintegration in the definition of the eligible foreign population due to lack of necessary information (for example, year of the partner's or of the parents' naturalization). Ordinary naturalization includes 78% of individuals who were naturalized during the three years under study (FSO, 2016). Those who were naturalized under the facilitated process or by reintegration were excluded from the analysis.

The definition of the population eligible for ordinary naturalization depends on the length of residence. Included in this population are those who have resided in Switzerland for at least 12 years, with the number of years of residence between the ages of 10 and 20 counting double. The suitability criteria at the federal, cantonal or communal level (integration, threat to security, etc.) cannot be verified with the available data.

The calculation of the twelve years of residence is based on the year of arrival in Switzerland and on the year of the assessment; it is not possible to consider eventual to-and-fro movements from abroad. Nor are the residence criteria at the cantonal and communal level considered. Indeed, based

² The SFSO used the Poisson approach, with a sample in which "the inclusion or exclusion of a unit is independent in terms of probability from the inclusion of other units of the population" (Qualité, 2014).

on the available data, these criteria are not verifiable for all individuals, cantons and communes, and to apply only some of them could introduce a bias.

Our interest is to explain the probability of naturalization over the period 2011 to 2012. A binary dependent variable is therefore created. It has a value ranging from 1 in 2010, 2011 and 2012 when an individual is naturalized in 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively, and the value 0 if the non-naturalized individual is eligible according to the criteria mentioned above. Once naturalized, the individual is excluded from the target population the following year. This allows us to focus on the characteristics preceding an eventual naturalization and to ensure our understanding of the causal relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

The nature of the dependent variable has therefore impacted the choice of the statistical model used, i.e., binary regression analysis. Such models measure the probabilities of naturalization for a variable (for example, gender), expressed in relation to a category or a reference modality (for example, men), while considering the effects of other variables included in the model (age, nationality, etc.). The net effects, expressed as odds ratios, are hence available (cf. Cox and Snell 1989). An odds ratio greater than 1 indicates a higher probability of naturalization for the category studied compared to that for the reference category. The analysis of explanatory variables and of the models is undertaken, on the one hand, using statistical tests (Chi squared, -2 LL, Nagelkerke's R^2) and the forecasts (classification error rate, predictions of the model) and, on the other, by an analysis of the odds ratios, given by the exponential of the B coefficient along with the results of Wald's test on each category of variables.

The choice of independent variables was made considering the existing literature on naturalization, particularly in Switzerland, and was also guided by Wald's test and the significance of the tested variables. The collinearity relationships between the independent variables have also been minimized by choosing a single variable for each dimension of interest.

Description of the sample

The Structural Survey interviewed a total of 885,588 people aged 15 and over between 2010 and 2012, representing, after weighting, a cumulated total of 19,760,329 people over three years of the survey (2010 to 2012).

The target population (corresponding to the criteria concerning the length of residence fixed for ordinary naturalization) represents a weighed total of 2,243,772 individuals over the three years, i.e., 11.4% of all those interviewed. Of these, 90,822 were naturalized in 2011, 2012 or 2013.

Based on those data, the naturalization rates by year, age, sex, canton of domicile and country or region of origin will be presented and briefly analyzed in the next section.

Results

Naturalization rates

Table 1 presents, after weighting, the population interviewed through the Structural Survey. Those who have been naturalized and those who have not are categorized separately. By way of comparison, we also include those naturalized according to the FSO statistics, i.e., the exact number of people naturalized annually (whatever their age). A slight decrease in the number of naturalizations can be observed between 2011 and 2013. The number of naturalized persons according to the Structural Survey data underestimates, by approximately 5000 persons, the number registered exhaustively: the difference can be explained by the limitation on the age group to those aged 15 and over. We can therefore assume that the Structural Survey correctly captures the ordinary naturalization phenomenon for adults.

Table 1: Numbers aged 15 and over, according to the (ordinary) naturalization status and year. Weighted values

| Year of Survey | Non- naturalized | | Naturalized | | Total | | Naturalized (SFO) |
|----------------|------------------|-------|-------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------------------|
| | Number | Prop. | Number | Prop. | Number | Prop. | All ages |
| 2010 | 690'886 | 95.6% | 31'781 | 4.4% | 722'667 | 100.0% | 36'012 |
| 2011 | 715'119 | 96.0% | 29'615 | 4.0% | 744'734 | 100.0% | 33'500 |
| 2012 | 746'946 | 96.2% | 29'426 | 3.8% | 776'372 | 100.0% | 34'061 |
| Total | 2'152'951 | 96.0% | 90'822 | 4.0% | 2'243'773 | 100.0% | 103'573 |

Source: FSO, Structural Survey and STATPOP statistics

There is a high variation – according to cantons – in the proportion of naturalized persons in the sampled population, ranging from 0.8% in Glarus to 5.7% in Zürich (Table 2). The high percentage observed in Zürich confirms the results obtained by Wanner and Steiner (2012) for the years 2005 to 2010. For the small cantons of Central Switzerland, and for some cantons of Eastern Switzerland, the results must be interpreted with care given the small sample size of naturalized persons. One must also bear in mind that some cantons or communes have restrictive criteria in terms of the length of stay in the canton, criteria that one cannot consider when defining the eligible population: the latter probably includes persons who, in practice, cannot obtain citizenship.

Table 2: Population aged 15 and over, according to the (ordinary) naturalization status and canton of domicile. Weighted values.

| Canton | Non-naturalized | | Naturalized | | Total | |
|------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------------|-------|-----------|--------|
| | Number | Prop. | Number | Prop. | Number | Prop. |
| Lake Geneva Area | 501'555 | 95.8% | 22'023 | 4.2% | 523'578 | 23.3% |
| Geneva | 178'688 | 96.3% | 6'824 | 3.7% | 185'512 | 8.3% |
| Valais | 75'193 | 94.7% | 4'222 | 5.3% | 79'415 | 3.5% |
| Vaud | 247'674 | 95.8% | 10'978 | 4.2% | 258'652 | 11.5% |
| Mittelland Area | 358'291 | 95.9% | 15'407 | 4.1% | 373'698 | 16.7% |
| Bern | 155'834 | 95.7% | 7'012 | 4.3% | 162'846 | 7.3% |
| Fribourg | 57'837 | 96.7% | 2'001 | 3.3% | 59'838 | 2.7% |
| Jura | 12'671 | 95.2% | 634 | 4.8% | 13'305 | 0.6% |
| Neuchâtel | 53'717 | 95.6% | 2'452 | 4.4% | 56'169 | 2.5% |
| Solothurn | 78'232 | 95.9% | 3'309 | 4.1% | 81'541 | 3.6% |
| N-W Switzerland | 340'761 | 96.9% | 10'798 | 3.1% | 351'559 | 15.7% |
| Aargau | 195'504 | 97.3% | 5'483 | 2.7% | 200'987 | 9.0% |
| Basel-Landschaft | 75'882 | 96.2% | 2'969 | 3.8% | 78'851 | 3.5% |
| Basel-Stadt | 69'375 | 96.7% | 2'346 | 3.3% | 71'721 | 3.2% |
| Zürich | 361'216 | 94.3% | 21'685 | 5.7% | 382'901 | 17.1% |
| Eastern Switzerland | 306'233 | 97.2% | 8'843 | 2.8% | 315'076 | 14.0% |
| Appenzell Ausserrhoden | 9'179 | 98.0% | 191 | 2.0% | 9'370 | 0.4% |
| Appenzell Innerrhoden | 1'754 | 96.1% | 72 | 3.9% | 1'826 | 0.1% |
| Glarus | 12'551 | 99.2% | 107 | 0.8% | 12'658 | 0.6% |
| Graubünden | 32'399 | 96.4% | 1'200 | 3.6% | 33'599 | 1.5% |
| Schaffhausen | 23'923 | 97.8% | 537 | 2.2% | 24'460 | 1.1% |
| St-Gallen | 149'460 | 96.9% | 4'796 | 3.1% | 154'256 | 6.9% |
| Thurgau | 76'968 | 97.5% | 1'939 | 2.5% | 78'907 | 3.5% |
| Central Switzerland | 157'644 | 95.7% | 7'166 | 4.3% | 164'810 | 7.3% |
| Luzern | 79'431 | 94.6% | 4'571 | 5.4% | 84'002 | 3.7% |
| Nidwalden | 4'983 | 97.3% | 138 | 2.7% | 5'121 | 0.2% |
| Obwalden | 4'954 | 94.8% | 269 | 5.2% | 5'223 | 0.2% |
| Schwyz | 34'840 | 97.2% | 1'016 | 2.8% | 35'856 | 1.6% |
| Uri | 3'954 | 96.3% | 150 | 3.7% | 4'104 | 0.2% |
| Zug | 29'482 | 96.6% | 1'023 | 3.4% | 30'505 | 1.4% |
| Ticino | 127'251 | 96.3% | 4'900 | 3.7% | 132'151 | 5.9% |
| Total | 2'152'951 | 96.0% | 90'822 | 4.0% | 2'243'773 | 100.0% |

Source: FSO, Structural Survey and STATPOP statistics

Table 3 suggests that women are more frequently naturalized than men. The proportion of naturalized persons is highest amongst youth aged 16 to 19. These individuals have not only benefited from the fact that years spent in Switzerland between the ages of ten to twenty count double and from a simplified process in some cantons; they have also spent a large part of their lives in Switzerland, notably within the education system, which provides them with the basis for

successful linguistic, cultural and structural integration. Moreover, the notable proportion of those naturalized amongst the 20-44-year-olds can be explained by a “life cycle” effect and by the wish to settle. However, amongst older people, particularly those who are retired, the very small proportion of those who have naturalized could be due to Swiss citizenship being less attractive and to the necessary procedures sometimes being difficult and likely to lead to frustrations, while the anticipated advantages (for example, on the labor market) are smaller.

Table 3 : Population aged 15 and over, according to (ordinary) naturalization status, gender and age. Weighted values.

| Variable | | Non- naturalized | | Naturalized | | Total | |
|------------------|---------|------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| | | Number | Proportion | Number | Proportion | Number | Proportion |
| Gender | Men | 1'189'471 | 96.5% | 43'699 | 3.5% | 1'233'170 | 55.0% |
| | Women | 963'480 | 95.3% | 47'123 | 4.7% | 1'010'603 | 45.0% |
| Age class | 15-19 | 153'055 | 92.3% | 11'807 | 7.7% | 164'862 | 7.4% |
| | 20-29 | 265'055 | 94.3% | 16'020 | 5.7% | 281'075 | 12.5% |
| | 30-44 | 547'677 | 93.4% | 38'597 | 6.6% | 586'274 | 26.1% |
| | 45-64 | 828'772 | 97.4% | 21'979 | 2.6% | 850'751 | 37.9% |
| | 65-79 | 300'317 | 99.2% | 2'337 | 0.8% | 302'654 | 13.5% |
| | 80 et + | 58'076 | 99.9% | 82 | 0.1% | 58'158 | 2.6% |

Source: FSO, Structural Survey and STATPOP statistics.

The proportion of the target population according to nationality shows that the majority of the eligible foreign population is of European origin and originates mainly from Italy.

The proportion of those naturalized within the eligible population varies widely depending on the country of origin. The type of migratory flux and the possibilities of returning to the country of origin indeed have an impact on naturalization (Wanner and Steiner, 2012). Amongst those eligible, those not originating from the European continent naturalize more frequently, a result indicating that there is a relationship between geographical and cultural proximity and naturalization: the rates of naturalization are lower amongst those from countries that are culturally and geographically closer to Switzerland. These individuals would feel less of a need to obtain Swiss citizenship, as they are already citizens of European countries, and their return migration would also be more frequent (Piguet and Wanner, 2000).

Table 4 : Population aged 15 and over, according to the (ordinary) naturalization status and original nationality. Weighted values

| Country or Region of origin | Non-naturalized | | Naturalized | | Total | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| | Number | Proportion | Number | Proportion | Number | Proportion |
| Italy | 592'982 | 98.3% | 10'298 | 1.7% | 603'280 | 26.9% |
| Germany | 166'992 | 94.2% | 10'360 | 5.8% | 177'352 | 7.9% |
| Portugal | 235'654 | 97.8% | 5'247 | 2.2% | 240'901 | 10.7% |
| Serbia | 187'779 | 95.7% | 8'443 | 4.3% | 196'222 | 8.7% |
| France | 84'039 | 96.0% | 3'545 | 4.0% | 87'584 | 3.9% |
| Europe others* | 725'997 | 95.8% | 31'576 | 4.2% | 757'573 | 33.8% |
| Africa | 38'867 | 86.5% | 6'087 | 13.5% | 44'954 | 2.0% |
| America | 41'706 | 86.2% | 6'652 | 13.8% | 48'358 | 2.2% |
| Asia | 77'149 | 90.3% | 8'254 | 9.7% | 85'403 | 3.8% |
| Australasia + Islands | 1'754 | 84.7% | 317 | 15.3% | 2'071 | 0.1% |
| Total | 2'152'919 | 96.0% | 90'779 | 4.0% | 2'243'698 | 100.0% |

*including Turkey

Source: FSO, Structural Surveys and STATPOP statistics

Determinants of naturalization

Two models are presented that highlight the determinants of naturalization. The variables that we incorporate can be classified into three categories: the sociodemographic characteristics of the individual, those linked to the migration and those related to the commune or canton of residence. The variables for each category have been selected based on their explanatory weight and their significance, as well as to minimize the collinear relationships between variables. For example, the variables concerning religion and marital status have not been included, and the length of residence in Switzerland has been preferred over the proportion of the individual's life spent in Switzerland.

Table 5: Variables included in the models

| Sociodemographic | | Linked to migration | | Commune/canton of residence | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| Age | <i>Continuous</i> | Family reunification | <i>Categorical</i> | Size of the commune | <i>Continuous</i> |
| Gender | <i>Binary</i> | Country/region of origin | <i>Categorical</i> | Proportion of the foreign population in the commune | <i>Continuous</i> |
| Level of qualification obtained | <i>Categorical</i> | Length of residence in CH | <i>Continuous</i> | Country/region of origin * Canton of residence | <i>Categorical</i> |
| Household size | <i>Continuous</i> | Born in CH | <i>Binary</i> | | |
| Employment status | <i>Categorical</i> | Regional language spoken at home | <i>Binary</i> | | |
| Level of education * age | <i>Categorical</i> | Regional language * learned | <i>Binary</i> | | |

The first model only retains the first two criteria, i.e., the variables concerning the individual. This selection enables one to highlight the importance of individual characteristics in the phenomenon of naturalization, as well as in terms of the meaning of these relationships.

In the second model, the category of variables concerning the commune and the canton of residence is also incorporated, enabling one to consider some of the communal and cantonal differences. We will therefore be able to observe, on the one hand, the influence of these contextual variables on naturalization and, on the other, the impact of their inclusion on the significance and interpretation of the individual variables.

Each block of variables has been tested alone to highlight its explanatory power. However, because of the different natures of the variables in each block, the number of observations (N) and the proportion of those naturalized vary between blocks.

For the analysis and the interpretation of the results of the logistic regressions, each variable will be presented when it first occurs (concerning the variables of the first model); then, their variations will only be discussed as the third block is included within the second model. Further, given that most the results are highly significant (***, i.e., $p < 0.01$, often with a value of 0.000), the significance level will only be mentioned when it is negative (“ns” in the table, i.e., “not significant”). As for the results of the Wald test, it will not be commented on systematically, nor will the confidence level (CF) of the odds ratio be commented on systematically. It should be remembered that the results presented below are obtained after taking into account the other variables included in the model.

The first model highlights that women naturalize more frequently: the probability of women naturalizing is 27% greater than amongst men. We can suggest several hypotheses to explain this higher probability. It could be due to factors linked to the cause of migration (less economic migration, more family related migration) or simply to the qualities attributed to the female gender, such as women more frequently demonstrating signs of better integration in the eyes of political decision makers. Furthermore, it is possible that Switzerland’s compulsory military service limits the willingness of men to naturalize up to the age of 30 because Swiss citizens aged 18 to 30 are obliged either to perform military or civilian service or to pay an exemption tax.

However, there is a slightly negative relationship between age and naturalization, with each additional year reducing the chance of naturalization by an average of 2%. This confirms that naturalization’s attraction varies with the age of the individual. Indeed, older individuals with a longer duration of residence and a more stable situation (professionally, from a family point of view, and also in terms of residence permit) have less need to acquire citizenship, as its benefits are less important. It is also possible that the integration factor has an influence: compared to young people, older people have spent, on average, more years abroad and may have arrived in Switzerland later in life, resulting in a negative influence on their level of integration. The costs of obtaining citizenship would also be different depending on age because investment in the naturalization procedure is higher for an older person (who, on average, has more family or professional responsibilities) than for a younger person.

The probability of naturalization increases with family size, with each additional member within a household increasing the chances of naturalization by 9%. However, this is not a perfectly linear relationship, and taking into account the precise number of people in the household provides interesting results (Annex 2): it is the households with 4 to 5 people that have the highest likelihood of naturalization, a phenomenon that can probably be associated with Swiss family norms and

integration. Being a family could encourage integration and increase the advantages of naturalization; however, having many children could reflect a difference from Swiss family norms and affect families that are less well integrated. This hypothesis should, however, be evaluated by further research.

The level of educational achievement has a positive influence on naturalization, with a university graduate (or equivalent) being 3.5 times more likely to naturalize than an individual who has only finished compulsory education. It is also interesting to note that having a moderate level of training (technical school) does not significantly increase the likelihood of naturalization compared to finishing compulsory school.

The last variable of the first block refers to the employment status of the individual. Overall, an employee without staff under his/her supervision has a greater chance of being naturalized compared to other categories of employees, the self-employed, or those working within a family business. This result must be interpreted carefully because professional status depends on age (as the young are often being employees without staff under their supervision), and it is possible that some of the age effect could be captured by this variable. Lastly, it appears that unemployment, be it imposed or by choice, obstructs naturalization because the unemployed and the inactive have, respectively, 44% and 22% less chance of being naturalized than employees with no staff under their supervision. For these two categories, we suggest that the explanation is the high importance of the work ethic in Switzerland.

The relationship between the length of residence in Switzerland and naturalization is negative. On average, each additional year spent in Switzerland reduces the likelihood of naturalization by 8%. One should, however, bear in mind that the length of stay considered here is a minimum of 12 years and that it has been calculated based on the year of arrival and the year of the assessment, as complete information concerning eventual migrations within this period is unavailable. The result can, however, be explained in a similar way to the age effect on naturalization: as the number of years in Switzerland increases, the importance of obtaining Swiss citizenship decreases.

Having benefited from family reunification is a factor that facilitates naturalization. The spouses who have benefited from family reunification have, therefore, more than twice the chance of naturalization than individuals who did not come to Switzerland for that reason: this is probably because naturalization is more frequent for families or for spouses of Swiss nationals and less frequent amongst people living alone. Regarding those who arrived as children in the context of family reunification, they are 25% less likely to be naturalized than people who have not migrated for that reason.

Not surprisingly, being born in Switzerland has a positive effect on naturalization: individuals born in Switzerland are more than twice as likely to be naturalized as people born abroad. This can be explained by the simplified procedure for the young born in Switzerland, but it can also be linked to integration, particularly through schooling and socialization.

Although speaking a regional language at home increases the chances of naturalization by 29%, it is not an important factor according to the Wald test. However, it must be born in mind that not using the regional language at home does not mean that the regional language is not mastered. However, the interaction between the use of the regional language at home and originating from a country in which none of the national languages corresponds to one of the cantonal languages is more interesting. The effect is positive and more significant than the single variable concerning the regional language. Hence, it seems that having had to learn the regional language and mastering it

does, nevertheless, increase the chances of naturalization. This can be explained by the fact that the effort invested in language acquisition may symbolize an individual's will to integrate. The acquisition and use of the German language by a German in Switzerland will therefore only have a weak positive impact on his/her chances of naturalization, in contrast to the acquisition and use of the same language by a Portuguese or an Italian.

Concerning the country or region of origin, the reference category represents individuals originating from European countries (including Turkey) and excluding Germany, France, Italy, Portugal and Serbia, which constitute separate categories because of the high number of nationals from these countries in Switzerland. The comparison between different continents appears to confirm the hypothesis that geographical distance has a positive impact on naturalization, with nationals from distant countries more often acquiring Swiss citizenship than nationals from European countries. For people originating from another continent, international mobility within Europe is easier for European passport holders, notably due to the free movement of persons. An individual of non-European origin residing in Switzerland, could, therefore, unlike European nationals, be refused reentry to Switzerland if he/she has left the country for a sufficiently long period. Naturalization guarantees one's ability to return to Switzerland. However, this result could be equally linked to the cause of migration, which, for European nationals, is less frequently of an economic nature. Individuals of non-European origin may come from potentially more complex political situations in their countries of origin. The results are more varied for nationals of the five countries most represented in Switzerland. Thus, while Germans, and especially Italians, have 64% and 96% (respectively) more likelihood of becoming naturalized than individuals from other European countries, the advantages for French and Serbian nationals are much lower (15% and 8%, respectively), and the chance of naturalization for Portuguese nationals is half. The possible explanations are as varied as the countries. First, the phenomenon of migration from Italy is long standing and relatively stable, with Italians integrating comparatively easily due to the relatively close cultural links with the Latin region of Switzerland, where most Italians have settled. The Germans, who are present mainly in German-speaking Switzerland, also represent a long standing foreign population. Their high level of naturalization is also explained by the fact that Germans recently gained the right to acquire a second citizenship without losing their original one, which has led to an important, and probably temporary, increase in naturalization. Cultural proximity to Switzerland appears to play a lesser role for the French, whose relative advantage is much lower. It must be remembered that this category has a lower weighting in terms of the Wald Test, as is the case for individuals originating from Serbia. The situation concerning Portuguese nationals could be symptomatic of a lower wish to naturalize within that community, which is quite strong in Switzerland and which has relatively close ties with the country of origin, particularly through return migration.

There is a strong relationship between the share of foreigners in the commune and naturalization. Thus, an individual residing in a commune in which the proportion of foreigners is greater than or equal to 10% is only half as likely to obtain citizenship compared to an individual living in a commune in which foreigners make up less than 10% of the population.

One should, however, bear in mind that the proportion of foreigners in a commune is strongly linked to the naturalization practices of the commune. A restrictive practice in terms of naturalization could, therefore, artificially increase the share of foreigners within it, and the reverse is also true. The presence of a large foreign community within a commune could also be a

hindrance to integration or reduce the relative benefits of naturalization. However, the size of the original community within the commune has only a very slight impact on naturalization (results not presented here), and the variable reflecting the proportion of foreigners was ultimately retained.

Living in a town has a positive effect on naturalization. Indeed, an individual living in a commune of more than 30,000 people has more than twice the chance of being naturalized than if he/she lives in a commune with fewer than 5000 people. Several explanations are possible. First, greater openness and more of a cultural mix could be more common in large communes, thereby facilitating foreign nationals' integration. Furthermore, being rejected from naturalization could be perceived as stigmatizing in small communes, where most people know each other; hence, requests could be less common, with applications being submitted only by those who are certain they fulfill all the conditions. The professionalization of the practice of naturalization is greater in large communes, which could result in the naturalization procedure being less restrictive and more objective. Finally, in the more populous communes, the existence of a larger network of people with the same nationality could facilitate, at the time of arrival, foreigners' integration (language learning, etc.) because they have the help of their community of origin.

Table 6: Results of a logistic regression on the fact of being naturalized between 2011 and 2013

| Variable | | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| | | Wald | Exp(B) | IC | Wald | Exp(B) | IC |
| Gender | Man (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | Woman | 782.5 | 1.27*** | 1.25-1.29 | 773.9 | 1.27*** | 1.25-1.29 |
| Age | | 1207.0 | 0.98*** | 0.97-0.98 | 1166.2 | 0.98*** | 0.98-0.98 |
| Household size | | 858.4 | 1.09*** | 1.09-1.1 | 905.7 | 1.10*** | 1.09-1.11 |
| Level of education attained | Compulsory schooling (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | <8 years of school | 34.1 | 0.79*** | 0.74-0.86 | 23.5 | 0.82*** | 0.76-0.89 |
| | Technical training | 0.07 | 1.0 (ns) | 0.94-1.08 | 2.15 | 1.05 (ns) | 0.98-1.13 |
| | General school | 154.1 | 1.74*** | 1.59-1.9 | 152.7 | 1.75*** | 1.60-1.91 |
| | Higher level technical training | 118.8 | 2.04*** | 1.79-2.31 | 122.6 | 2.09*** | 1.83-2.38 |
| | Univ., EPF, HEP/HES, ... | 664.9 | 3.51*** | 3.19-3.86 | 622.8 | 3.46*** | 3.14-3.82 |
| Employment status | Employee without staff (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | Self-employed with employees | 32.3 | 0.82*** | 0.76-0.88 | 36.4 | 0.80*** | 0.75-0.86 |
| | Self-employed without employees | 28.3 | 0.87*** | 0.83-0.92 | 35.1 | 0.86*** | 0.82-0.90 |
| | Employee (Family business) | 30.7 | 0.84*** | 0.79-0.89 | 24.9 | 0.85*** | 0.80-0.91 |
| | Director/Board member | 0.6 | 0.97 (ns) | 0.91-1.04 | 1.2 | 0.96 (ns) | 0.90-1.03 |
| | Employee with staff | 13.0 | 0.95*** | 0.93-0.98 | 11.4 | 0.95*** | 0.93-0.98 |
| | Employee without indic. | 180.3 | 0.79*** | 0.77-0.82 | 206.5 | 0.78*** | 0.75-0.80 |
| | Active without indic. | 106.0 | 0.75*** | 0.71-0.79 | 96.2 | 0.75*** | 0.71-0.80 |
| | Apprentice | 13.5 | 1.08*** | 1.04-1.13 | 19.1 | 1.1*** | 1.05-1.15 |
| | Unemployed/ Unemploy. benefit | 773.7 | 0.56*** | 0.54-0.58 | 723.3 | 0.56*** | 0.54-0.59 |
| | Without prof. activity | 748.0 | 0.72*** | 0.71-0.74 | 638.3 | 0.74*** | 0.72-0.76 |
| Level of educ. * age | Compulsory schooling (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | <8 years schooling | 30.1 | 0.99*** | 0.99-1.0 | 39.2 | 0.99*** | 0.99-1.0 |
| | Technical training | 186.5 | 1.01*** | 1.01-1.01 | 145.2 | 1.01*** | 1.01-1.01 |
| | General school | 1.2 | 1.00 (ns) | 1.00-1.00 | 2.1 | 1.00 (ns) | 1.00-1.00 |
| | Higher level technical training | 0.3 | 1.00 (ns) | 1.00-1.00 | 0.1 | 1.00 (ns) | 0.99-1.00 |
| | University | 25.865 | 0.99*** | 0.99-1.00 | 24.7 | 0.99*** | 0.99-1.00 |
| Length of residence | | 20487 | 0.92*** | 0.92-0.92 | 19355 | 0.92*** | 0.92-0.92 |
| Family re-unification | No family re-unification (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | Spouse | 1852.1 | 2.34*** | 2.26-2.44 | 1921.9 | 2.45*** | 2.35-2.55 |
| | Child | 251.0 | 0.75*** | 0.72-0.77 | 232.0 | 0.75*** | 0.72-0.78 |
| Born in CH | No (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | Yes | 2736 | 2.16*** | 2.10-2.22 | 2719.2 | 2.18*** | 2.11-2.24 |
| Regional language | No (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | Yes | 98.2 | 1.29*** | 1.23-1.35 | 54.3 | 1.22*** | 1.15-1.28 |
| Regional language * learned | No * no (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | Yes * yes | 563.2 | 1.79*** | 1.71-1.88 | 646.0 | 1.90*** | 1.81-2.00 |
| Country / region of origin | Europe ** | | | | | | |
| | Africa | 1790 | 2.15*** | 2.08-2.23 | 446.7 | 2.51*** | 2.30-2.73 |
| | America | 1396 | 1.94*** | 1.87-2.00 | 770.0 | 2.49*** | 2.34-2.66 |
| | Asia | 1350 | 1.77*** | 1.72-1.83 | 359.6 | 1.75*** | 1.65-1.85 |
| | Australasia+ Islands | 222.9 | 2.88*** | 2.50-3.31 | 240.4 | 5.84*** | 4.67-7.30 |
| | Germany | 364.9 | 1.64*** | 1.56-1.73 | 503.8 | 2.03*** | 1.91-2.16 |
| | France | 20.5 | 1.15*** | 1.08-1.22 | 1.3 | 0.85 (ns) | 0.64-1.12 |
| | Italy | 441.7 | 1.96*** | 1.84-2.09 | 0.00 | -- (ns) | -- |
| | Portugal | 1592.5 | 0.50*** | 0.48-0.51 | 193.9 | 0.45*** | 0.41-0.51 |
| | Serbia | 29.2 | 1.08*** | 1.05-1.11 | 757.4 | 2.06*** | 1.96-2.17 |
| % foreigners in the commune | | / | | | 2500.1 | 0.06*** | 0.05-0.06 |
| Commune size | < 5'000 (ref.) | | | | | | |
| | 5'000 to < 10'000 | / | | | 2.0 | 1.02 (ns) | 0.99-1.04 |
| | 10'000 to < 30'000 | / | | | 36.0 | 1.47*** | 1.43-1.51 |
| | 30'000 and more | / | | | 786.3 | 2.18*** | 2.11-2.24 |
| Country / region of origin * Canton | | / | | | 4769.0 | Annex I | |

4. Discussion and conclusions

Naturalization is a complex phenomenon, particularly in Switzerland, where the procedural diversity at the commune level is compounded by the impossible task of being objective in the evaluation of an individual's integration. Naturalization is also an important phenomenon for the country that grants rights and duties to new citizens; in parallel, it is important for the naturalized person, who thereby completes the legal process of integration that began with their arrival in Switzerland and who accedes to the rights of a citizen. At the same time, naturalization is not universal, and a significant proportion of the foreign population in Switzerland does not accede to it, either by choice or because they do not fulfill the required criteria. This lack of access to naturalization acts as an obstacle to civic participation and integration with the host population. The factors that explain relatively low naturalization rates are difficult to identify, as well as complex to study, because they refer to sometimes-subjective dimensions.

For these reasons, a statistical analysis of the determinants of naturalization is useful because it provides information on the factors, measured objectively, that influence naturalization. The limits of this analysis are, however, obvious. First, it is not possible to integrate subjective dimensions that could influence behavior with respect to naturalization, such as the feeling of attachment towards the country of origin and towards Switzerland, or aspirations concerning an eventual return. Furthermore, it was impossible to distinguish the type of naturalization (ordinary, facilitated, re-integration) through which an individual had been naturalized. The definition of the notion of eligibility for naturalization, according to the criterion of length of residence, has also been constrained by the lack of data on the duration of residence at the cantonal and commune levels, as well as by the lack of data on eventual periods of stay abroad. Finally, we have compared those individuals who have not naturalized – but were eligible to do so according to federal residence criteria – with naturalized individuals. However, this comparison does not provide an assessment of an individual's desire to naturalize; it only captures the fact of having been naturalized following a procedure that can take a long time. Nevertheless, this study is one of the first to model individual dimensions that influence naturalization, which was made possible by the availability of original data.

Hence, different determinants concerning naturalization could be identified. Generally, the individual characteristics included in the model explain more than 20% of naturalization. The addition of two variables on the commune and of one variable on the canton has, not surprisingly, enabled significant improvements to the explanatory model, even though these three variables are only a large approximation of the inter-communal and inter-cantonal differences.

Some variables have a relatively important impact, including age, employment status (and more particularly, unemployment), length of residence, the country of origin and the proportion of foreigners within the commune. These different results confirm the studies cited in the literature review, which were undertaken in both Switzerland and abroad.

Finally, if one were to venture to suggest a typical profile of a foreign citizen who has a greater chance of being naturalized, both models propose a profile that is coherent with what we learn from the literature: it is a woman, aged 16 to 19, born in Switzerland, living in a 4-person household in which a regional language is spoken; she has recently qualified and is at the start of her professional career or still studying; she originates from another continent and lives in a city.

Annexes

Annex 1:

NB: Only significant results are included here.

| Country/region | * | Canton | Model 2 | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|---------|-----------------|------------|
| | | | Wald | Exp(B) | IC |
| Europe (ref.) | * | Zürich (ref.) | | | |
| Africa | * | Bern | 36.1 | 0.66*** | 0.58-0.78 |
| | * | Luzern | 29.8 | 0.43*** | 0.31-0.58 |
| | * | Schwyz | 16.7 | 2.59*** | 1.64-4.07 |
| | * | Zug | 45.4 | 10.35*** | 5.24-20.42 |
| | * | Fribourg | 29.4 | 1.46*** | 1.28-1.68 |
| | * | Basel-Stadt | 22.75 | 1.58*** | 1.31-1.91 |
| | * | Basel-Landschaft | 6.9 | 1.36*** | 1.08-1.71 |
| | * | St-Gallen | 25.1 | 0.51*** | 0.39-0.66 |
| | * | Aargau | 19.5 | 0.54*** | 0.41-0.71 |
| | * | Thurgau | 8.2 | 1.91*** | 1.22-2.99 |
| | * | Ticino | 15.0 | 0.54*** | 0.40-0.74 |
| | * | Vaud | 12.8 | 0.82*** | 0.73-0.91 |
| | * | Valais | 4.7 | 0.79** | 0.63-0.98 |
| | * | Bern | 70.5 | 0.56*** | 0.49-0.64 |
| America | * | Luzern | 11.6 | 0.72*** | 0.60-0.87 |
| | * | Schwyz | 13.3 | 0.52*** | 0.37-0.74 |
| | * | Obwalden | 8.1 | 2.07*** | 1.26-3.41 |
| | * | Fribourg | 66.3 | 0.41*** | 0.33-0.50 |
| | * | Solothurn | 30.1 | 0.45*** | 0.38-0.60 |
| | * | Basel-Stadt | 50.2 | 0.51*** | 0.43-0.62 |
| | * | Basel-Landschaft | 17.0 | 0.68*** | 0.56-0.81 |
| | * | Aargau | 40.6 | 0.58*** | 0.50-0.69 |
| | * | Thurgau | 8.7 | 0.62*** | 0.45-0.85 |
| | * | Vaud | 7.1 | 0.87*** | 0.79-0.97 |
| | * | Valais | 77.6 | 2.42*** | 1.99-2.95 |
| | * | Neuchâtel | 72.8 | 0.32*** | 0.25-0.42 |
| | * | Genève | 28.7 | 0.75*** | 0.67-0.83 |
| | * | Jura | 15.1 | 2.28*** | 1.50-3.44 |
| | * | Bern | 84.4 | 0.61*** | 0.55-0.68 |
| Asia | * | Luzern | 5.8 | 1.16** | 1.03-1.31 |
| | * | Zug | 3.3 | 0.81* | 0.64-1.02 |
| | * | Fribourg | 32.1 | 0.35*** | 0.24-0.50 |
| | * | Basel-Landschaft | 32.1 | 1.43*** | 1.26-1.61 |
| | * | St-Gallen | 12.9 | 0.79*** | 0.70-0.90 |
| | * | Aargau | 16.7 | 0.78*** | 0.70-0.88 |
| | * | Thurgau | 12.5 | 0.66*** | 0.53-0.83 |
| | * | Ticino | 62.5 | 2.11*** | 1.75-2.54 |
| | * | Vaud | 66.9 | 1.52*** | 1.37-1.68 |
| | * | Valais | 8.1 | 0.65*** | 0.49-0.88 |
| | * | Vaud | 5.5 | 0.45** | 0.23-0.88 |
| | * | Bern | 26.6 | 0.81*** | 0.75-0.88 |
| | * | Bern | 26.6 | 0.81*** | 0.75-0.88 |
| | * | Bern | 26.6 | 0.81*** | 0.75-0.88 |
| | * | Bern | 26.6 | 0.81*** | 0.75-0.88 |
| Australasia+ Islands | * | Vaud | 5.5 | 0.45** | 0.23-0.88 |
| Germany | * | Bern | 26.6 | 0.81*** | 0.75-0.88 |

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|------------------------|-------|---------|-----------|
| | * | Luzern | 14.5 | 0.81*** | 0.73-0.90 |
| | * | Uri | 4.1 | 0.67** | 0.44-0.99 |
| | * | Schwyz | 133.4 | 0.11*** | 0.08-0.16 |
| | * | Zug | 5.3 | 0.84** | 0.72-0.98 |
| | * | Fribourg | 38.4 | 0.42*** | 0.32-0.55 |
| | * | Solothurn | 201.1 | 0.30*** | 0.26-0.36 |
| | * | Basle-Stadt | 20.8 | 0.75*** | 0.67-0.85 |
| | * | Schaffhausen | 80.1 | 0.42*** | 0.35-0.51 |
| | * | Appenzel Ausserhoden. | 34.4 | 0.45*** | 0.34-0.58 |
| | * | St-Gallen | 86.1 | 0.62*** | 0.56-0.69 |
| | * | Aargau | 95.1 | 0.67*** | 0.61-0.72 |
| | * | Thurgau | 41.9 | 0.71*** | 0.64-0.79 |
| | * | Valais | 72.2 | 0.23*** | 0.16-0.32 |
| France | * | Bern | 11.9 | 0.53*** | 0.37-0.76 |
| | * | Fribourg | 19.2 | 0.45*** | 0.31-0.65 |
| | * | Vaud | 29.1 | 2.16*** | 1.63-2.86 |
| | * | Valais | 67.23 | 3.41*** | 2.55-4.58 |
| Italy | * | | | NS | |
| Portugal | * | Bern | 26.0 | 0.55*** | 0.44-0.70 |
| | * | Luzern | 10.5 | 0.65*** | 0.50-0.84 |
| | * | Schwyz | 188.7 | 7.27*** | 5.48-9.64 |
| | * | Glarus | 40.4 | 3.59*** | 2.42-5.32 |
| | * | Fribourg | 87.8 | 0.38*** | 0.31-0.47 |
| | * | Aargau | 5.7 | 0.75** | 0.59-0.95 |
| | * | Thurgau | 19.3 | 0.44*** | 0.30-0.63 |
| | * | Vaud | 37.9 | 1.49*** | 1.31-1.70 |
| | * | Valais | 96.7 | 1.95*** | 1.71-2.23 |
| | * | Neuchâtel | 6.8 | 1.23*** | 1.05-1.44 |
| | * | Genève | 74.6 | 1.78*** | 1.56-2.02 |
| Serbia | * | Bern | 52.2 | 0.69*** | 0.62-0.76 |
| | * | Luzern | 80.0 | 0.67*** | 0.61-0.73 |
| | * | Schwyz | 210.6 | 0.08*** | 0.06-0.12 |
| | * | Obwalden | 3.0 | 0.8* | 0.61-1.03 |
| | * | Zug | 34.4 | 0.59*** | 0.50-0.71 |
| | * | Fribourg | 25.1 | 0.63*** | 0.53-0.76 |
| | * | Solothurn | 6.7 | 0.88** | 0.80-0.97 |
| | * | Basle-Stadt | 106.5 | 0.34*** | 0.28-0.42 |
| | * | Basle-Landschaft | 125.5 | 0.41*** | 0.35-0.48 |
| | * | Schaffhausen | 89.8 | 0.23*** | 0.17-0.31 |
| | * | Appenzell- Ausserhoden | 24.2 | 0.42*** | 0.29-0.59 |
| | * | St-Gallen | 490.2 | 0.34*** | 0.31-0.37 |
| | * | Graubünden | 119.4 | 0.17*** | 0.12-0.23 |
| | * | Aargau | 536.2 | 0.29*** | 0.26-0.32 |
| | * | Thurgau | 73.3 | 0.51*** | 0.44-0.60 |
| | * | Ticino | 126.2 | 0.38*** | 0.32-0.45 |
| | * | Vaud | 56.5 | 0.69*** | 0.62-0.76 |
| | * | Valais | 96.1 | 0.42*** | 0.36-0.50 |
| | * | Neuchâtel | 16.3 | 0.55*** | 0.41-0.74 |
| | * | Genève | 16.6 | 0.71*** | 0.60-0.84 |
| | * | Jura | 53.0 | 4.74*** | 3.12-7.21 |

Annex 2:

| Variable | Simple effect of the variable | | | Model 2 | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| | Wald | Exp(B) | IC | Wald | Exp(B) | IC |
| Age | 27496.9 | 0.97*** | 0.96-0.97 | 1166.2 | 0.98*** | 0.98-0.98 |
| Household size | 9577.9 | 1.27*** | 1.26-1.27 | 905.7 | 1.10*** | 1.09-1.10 |
| Proportion of foreigners in the commune | 3546.1 | 0.12*** | 0.11-0.13 | 2500.1 | 0.06*** | 0.05-0.06 |
| Age groups | 16-19 years (ref.) | | | | | |
| | 20-29 years | 1499.6 | 0.613*** | 6.1 | 1.05 (ns) | 1.01-1.09 |
| | 30-44 years | 929.7 | 0.72*** | 23.6 | 0.91*** | 0.87-0.94 |
| | 45-64 years | 12326.0 | 0.27*** | 458.1 | 0.60*** | 0.57-0.62 |
| | 65-79 years | 12291.7 | 0.079*** | 97.9 | 0.67*** | 0.61-0.72 |
| | 80 years and over | 1464.1 | 0.014*** | 185.5 | 0.17*** | 0.13-0.22 |
| Household | 1 pers. (ref.) | | | | | |
| | 2 pers. | 837.453 | 1.55*** | 959.6 | 1.73*** | 1.67-1.79 |
| | 3 pers. | 3489.2 | 2.44*** | 1427.4 | 1.95*** | 1.89-2.02 |
| | 4 pers. | 6357.9 | 3.16*** | 2181.1 | 2.22*** | 2.15-2.30 |
| | 5 pers. | 5944.5 | 3.51*** | 1656.9 | 2.19*** | 2.11-2.27 |
| | 6 pers. | 2249.2 | 2.96*** | 681.4 | 1.97*** | 1.88-2.08 |
| | 7 pers. | 380.2 | 2.39*** | 84.2 | 1.56*** | 1.42-1.72 |
| | 8 pers. | 186.4 | 2.96*** | 117.7 | 2.49*** | 2.11-2.93 |
| | 9 pers. | 0.482 | 1.16 (ns) | 4.6 | 0.63 ** | 0.41-0.96 |
| | 10 pers. | 0.0 | -- | 0.0 | -- | |
| | 11 pers. | 0.0 | -- | 0.0 | -- | |
| | 12 pers. | 0.0 | -- | 0.0 | -- | |
| | 13 pers. | 0.0 | -- | 0.0 | -- | |
| | 14 pers. | 0.0 | -- | 0.0 | -- | |
| | 15 pers. | 0.0 | -- | 0.0 | -- | |
| Foreigners | < 10 % (ref.) | | | | | |
| | 10% to < 20% | 2044.3 | 0.53*** | 902.6 | 0.57*** | 0.55-0.59 |
| | 20% to < 30% | 2925.2 | 0.49*** | 1808.4 | 0.44*** | 0.42-0.45 |
| | 30% and over | 4917.1 | 0.38*** | 2735.9 | 0.32*** | 0.30-0.33 |

Bibliography

- Aguirre, Benigno E., Saenz, Rogelio (2002). Testing the Effects of Collectively Expected Durations of Migration: The Naturalization of Mexicans and Cubans. *The International Migration Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 103-124.
- Bolliger, Christian (2004). Spielt es eine Rolle, wer entscheidet? Einbürgerungen in Gemeinden mit Parlaments- und Volksentscheid im Vergleich, 21 p. Dans : Steiner, Pascale, Wicker, Hans-Rudolph (éd.). *Paradoxien im Bürgerrecht. Sozialwissenschaftliche Studien zur Einbürgerungspraxis in Schweizer Gemeinden*. Zürich : Seismo.
- Boner, Barbara (1999). *Les procédures cantonales de naturalisation ordinaire des étrangers*. Berne : Commission fédérale contre le racisme CFR, Commission fédérale des étrangers CFE, Office fédérale des étrangers OFE.
- Commission fédérale contre le racisme CFR (2007). *Discrimination dans le cadre des naturalisations. Avis de la CFR sur la situation actuelle*. Berne, 30 p.
- Commission fédérale pour les questions de migration CFM (2012). *Naturalisation : Propositions et recommandations pour un droit de cité contemporain*. 25 p.
- DeSipio, Louis (1987). Social Science Literature and the Naturalization Process. *The International Migration Review*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 390-405.
- Diehl, Claudia, Blohm, Michael (2003). Rights or Identity? Naturalization Processes among "Labor Migrants" in Germany. *The International Migration Review*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 133-162.
- Eggert, Nina, Murigande, Anita (2004). Modèles de citoyenneté et mobilisation politique des migrants en Suisse : Le rôle des cantons. *Swiss Political Science Review*, Vol. 10, No 4, pp. 125-145.
- Fibbi, Rosita (2012). *L'intégration dans la pratique*. Colloque: L'intégration des étrangers à l'épreuve du droit suisse, 24 p.
- Fibbi, Rosita, Lerch, Mathias and Wanner, Philippe (2007). Naturalisation and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Youth of Immigrant Descent in Switzerland. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33:7, pp. 1121 – 1144.
- Hainmueller, Jens, Hangartner, Dominik (2011). *Who gets a swiss passport? A natural experiment in immigrant discrimination*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology and London School of Economics and Political Science, 56 p.
- Helbling, Marc, Kriesi, Hanspeter (2004). Staatsbürgerverständnis und politische Mobilisierung: Einbürgerungen in Schweizer Gemeinden. *Swiss Political Science Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 33-58.
- Koller, Christophe (2010). *Services de migration et évolution de la population étrangère dans les cantons suisses 2002-2008*. Cahier de l'IDHEAP 258. 130 p.
- Liang, Zai (1994). Social Contact, Social Capital, and the Naturalization Process: Evidence from Six Immigrant Groups. *Social Science Research*, 23, pp. 407-437.
- Office fédéral de la statistique OFS (2015). Migration et intégration – Indicateurs. Consulté en ligne le 28/06/2016, <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/themen/01/07/blank/key/01/01.html>
- Office fédéral de la statistique OFS (2016). Acquisition de la nationalité suisse selon le sexe, l'état civil, l'âge et la durée de résidence. Consulté en ligne le 22/06/2016, <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/themen/01/07/blank/key/03.html>

- Pecoraro, Marco (2012). Devenir Suisse. Les facteurs intervenant dans le choix de se naturaliser. Dans : Wanner, Philippe (éd.). *La démographie des étrangers en Suisse*. Zürich : Seismo.
- Piguet, Etienne, Wanner, Philippe (2000). *Les naturalisations en Suisse. Différences entre nationalités, cantons et communes, 1981-1998*. Neuchâtel: Office fédéral de la statistique (OFS), 85 p.
- Qualité, Lionel (2014). *Sélection et pondération de l'échantillon pour l'enquête structurelle suisse*. Neuchâtel: Office fédéral de la statistique (OFS), 6p.
- Secrétariat d'Etat aux migrations SEM (2012). Réintégration. Consulté en ligne le 24/05/2016, <https://www.sem.admin.ch/sem/fr/home/themen/buergerrecht/einbuergerung/wiedereinbuergerung.html>
- Secrétariat d'Etat aux migrations SEM (2013). Naturalisation ordinaire. Consulté en ligne le 24/05/2016, https://www.sem.admin.ch/sem/fr/home/themen/buergerrecht/einbuergerung/ordentliche_einbuergerung.html
- Sheldon, George (2007). Migration, Integration und Wachstum: Die Performance and wirtschaftliche Auswirkung der Ausländer in der Schweiz. Basel, 81 p.
- Steiner, Ilka, Wanner, Philippe (2015). *Towards a New Data Set for the Analysis of Migration and Integration in Switzerland*. Working Paper Series No. 1, NCCR on the Move. 22 p.
- Steiner, Pascale, Wicker, Hans-Rudolph (éd.) (2000). *Paradoxien im Bürgerrecht. Sozialwissenschaftliche Studien zur Einbürgerungspraxis in Schweizer Gemeinden*. Zürich : Seismo, 215 p.
- Van Hook, Jennifer, Brown, Susan K., Bean, Frank D. (2006). For Love or Money? Welfare Reform and Immigrant Naturalization. *Social Forces*, Vol. 85, No 2, pp. 643-668.
- Wanner, Philippe (2001). L'apport démographique de la migration en Suisse. *Discussion Paper. Forum Suisse pour l'étude des migrations*, Vol. 5,
- Wanner, Philippe, D'Amato, Gianni (2003). *Naturalisation en Suisse: le rôle des changements législatifs sur la demande de naturalisation*. Rapport, Avenir Suisse. 43 p.
- Wanner, Philippe, Piguet, Etienne (2002). The Practice of Naturalization in Switzerland: A Statistical Overview. *Population*, Vol. 57, No. 6, pp. 917-925.
- Wanner, Philippe, Steiner, Ilka (2012). *La naturalisation en Suisse: Evolution 1992-2010*. Commission fédérale pour les questions de migration CFM, 57 p.
- Wichmann, Nicole, et al. (2011). *Les marges de manœuvre au sein du fédéralisme : La politique de migration dans les cantons*. Berne : Commission fédérale pour les questions de migrations CFM, 126 p.
- Yang, Philipp Q. (1994). Explaining Immigrant Naturalization. *The International Migration Review*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 449-477.
- Zimmermann, Klaus F., Constant, Amelie F., Gataullina, Liliya (2009). Naturalization proclivities, ethnicity and integration. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 30, pp. 70 – 82.