



CENTRO STUDI LUCA D'AGLIANO

WWW.DAGLIANO.UNIMI.IT

CENTRO STUDI LUCA D'AGLIANO  
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES WORKING PAPERS

N. 211

March 2006

**The Evolution of Citizenship:  
Economic and Institutional Determinants**

*Graziella Bertocchi\**

*Chiara Strozzi \*\**

\* University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, CEPR, CHILD and IZA

\*\* University of Modena and Reggio Emilia

# The Evolution of Citizenship: Economic and Institutional Determinants\*

Graziella Bertocchi

Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, CEPR, CHILD and IZA

Chiara Strozzi

Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia

December 2005

---

\*This paper represents a substantial revision of parts of CEPR Discussion Paper 4737. Previous versions have been presented at the North American Summer Meetings of the Econometric Society, the WDI/CEPR Conference on Transition Economics, the Conference on “Economic Growth and Distribution”, the CEPR Conference on “Understanding Productivity Differences Across Sectors, Firms and Countries”, AIEL, ENGIME, ESPE, the CEPR Conference on “Institutions, Policies and Economic Growth”, the CEPR Conference on “The Long Run Growth and Development of the World Economy: Measurement and Theory”, the Winter Meeting of the Econometric Society, the 2nd IZA Migration Meeting, the 4th Europaeum Economic Workshop, and workshops in Paris, Padova, Toulouse, Milan, Bologna, IZA and Berlin. We thank discussants and participants for helpful comments and suggestions. Financial support from the Italian University Ministry and the European Commission is gratefully acknowledged. Corresponding author: Graziella Bertocchi, Dipartimento di Economia Politica, Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Viale Berengario, 51, I-41100 Modena, Italy, phone 39 059 2056856, fax 39 059 2056947, e-mail bertocchi.graziella@unimore.it, web [http://www.economia.unimore.it/Bertocchi\\_Graziella/](http://www.economia.unimore.it/Bertocchi_Graziella/).

## ABSTRACT

We investigate the origin and evolution of the legal institution of citizenship. We compile a new data set on citizenship laws across countries of the world which documents how these institutions have evolved from the legal tradition of common and civil law established in the course of the 19th century. We show that in the postwar period citizenship laws have responded endogenously and systematically to economic and institutional determinants. Original citizenship laws tend to affect the current legislation persistently, with a particularly strong tendency for jus sanguinis to be preserved despite discontinuities in the transplanting process for former colonies. The presence of a large stock of migrants tends to limit the application of jus soli elements, although there is also evidence of a contrasting tendency for those jus sanguinis countries exposed to large immigration. The results hold after controlling for additional factors such as the degree of democracy, border stability, the welfare burden, demographics, and cultural characteristics.

JEL Classification Numbers: P16, K40, F22, O15.

Key Words: citizenship laws, international migration, legal origins, democracy, borders.

# 1 Introduction

Each country of the world has established a complex system of rules that govern the attribution of citizenship. Citizenship is the legal institution that designates full membership in a state and the associated rights and duties. By regulating the inclusion of newcomers within societies that exhibit unprecedented diversity, citizenship laws represent powerful tool to promote social cohesion and preserve common traditions, with implications not only for immigration policy, but also for labor markets, welfare programs, and international relations.

Citizenship laws come from the two broad traditions of common and civil law. The former applies the *jus soli* principle, according to which citizenship is attributed by birthplace: this implies that the child of an immigrant is a citizen, as long as he is born in the country of immigration. The latter applies the *jus sanguinis* principle, which attributes citizenship by descent, so that a child inherits citizenship from his parents, independently of where he is born. By the end of the 19th century, *jus soli* predominated in common law countries across the world, while *jus sanguinis* was the norm in most civil law countries. During the 20th century, however, citizenship laws have gone through a process of continuous adaptation, with a marked acceleration after WW2 in conjunction with the decolonization phase, the collapse of the socialist system, and the pressure of international migration.

Modern sociopolitical theories have advanced several hypotheses concerning the determinants of citizenship laws dynamics, on the basis of case studies and non-quantitative cross-country comparisons. The legal tradition established in a given country is generally believed to exert a persistent impact on current legislation. Pressure from a large stock of migrants is perceived as a factor that shapes a country's attitude toward a more inclusive legislation, i.e., a legislation that reflects elements of *jus soli*, when originally absent. On the other hand, it has been pointed out that at the same time immigration could drive *jus soli* countries toward restrictions of the automatic entitlement to citizenship for all newborn. According to some political theories, the combination of these forces would induce convergence toward a mix of *jus soli* and *sanguinis* provisions for countries coming from different legal traditions, provided that two preconditions are met: a consolidated democratic system and stable state borders (Weil, 2001). A commitment to democracy is in fact expected to lead to a more assimilative attitude toward aliens, while the

stabilization of borders should reduce the pressure to preserve a national identity through *jus sanguinis*. Moreover, since citizenship rights also determine the ability to enjoy welfare benefits, the shaping of nationality laws has been linked with the nature of the welfare state, with a large government representing a potential obstacle to the retention of *jus soli* (Joppke, 1998). This argument, however, has to be weighted against the potential gain coming from the acquisition of relatively young new citizens for countries with expensive pension systems and in the midst of a demographic crisis. Finally, an additional factor that has been the subject of debate is the influence of national character and culture. The theory advanced by Brubaker (1992) focuses on France and Germany as two antagonistic kinds of nationhood, the former more assimilationist, the latter more ethnocentric, which also differ in their definitions of citizenship.

In this paper we test the above hypotheses from a political economy perspective through an empirical investigation of the determinants of citizenship laws and their evolution. Our first goal is to assemble a new data set which codifies citizenship laws across the countries of the world in the postwar period, with a specific focus on the provisions that regulate the access to citizenship at birth. The data set is then used to study the dynamic adaptation of these laws, by relating the observed patterns to a number of potential determinants, including economic and non-economic factors.

Our empirical findings indicate that indeed in the postwar period citizenship laws have responded endogenously and systematically, through a slow but steady process of adaptation, to the following economic and non-economic factors. First, the persistence of legal tradition is confirmed by our data, with a particularly strong tendency for *jus sanguinis* to be preserved. Second, the presence of a large stock of migrants has shaped national legislations in the direction of more exclusiveness, rather than inclusiveness, despite some evidence of a tendency toward adding *jus soli* provisions for those *jus sanguinis* countries which have experienced large immigration. These results hold after controlling for additional factors such as the degree of democracy, border stability, colonial history, the welfare burden, demographics, and cultural characteristics. We also find that a high degree of democracy is significantly associated with more inclusiveness, and that border instability has been a decisive factor in shaping citizenship laws, particularly following the decolonization phase.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the related economics

literature. Section 3 reviews the historical and legal background for the issues we address. Section 4 describes our data set on citizenship laws around the world. Section 5 investigates the determinants of current citizenship laws and presents our main results, together with a set of robustness checks. Section 6 develops an alternative empirical strategy that highlights the determinants of change in citizenship laws. Section 7 concludes and indicates directions for future research. The Data Appendix collects information about the data employed.

## 2 Related literature

While the institution of citizenship has not yet been the subject of investigation by economists, our work is closely related with several branches of the economics literature. First of all, this paper contributes to the research program which has focused on the historical determinants of institutions. Engerman and Sokoloff (2002) highlight the relevance of wealth inequality and political factors in accounting for how fundamental economic institutions developed over time. Acemoglu et al. (2001) contribute to the understanding of how institutions evolve by using historical variables as instruments for contemporary measures of the quality of institutions.

This paper also relates to the comparative-legal approach initiated by La Porta et al. (1998). The basic premise of this research line is the recognition that laws in different countries are adopted or transplanted from a few legal traditions and that the resulting legislative bodies reflect both the influence of the legal origin and the subsequent revision specific to individual countries. We add to this stream by focusing on the determinants of the dynamic adaptation of nationality rules.

Furthermore, our work adds to research on international migration and migration policy in a long-term perspective. Timmer and Williamson (1998), Hatton and Williamson (2004) and Bertocchi and Strozzi (2005) empirically analyze immigration policies enacted in different historical phases, while O'Rourke and Sinnott (2003) and Mayda (2005) estimate voters' attitudes toward immigration. The political economy of migration has been modeled by Benhabib (1996), Razin et al. (2002), and Gradstein and Shiff (2004). None of these papers, however, considers the specific role of citizenship laws.

Finally, recent work by Alesina and Spolaore (1997) and Bolton and Roland (1997) on the optimal determination of the size of nations, and thus state borders, is also relevant to our approach,

both because country size in this literature is the same as population size and is potentially influenced by migration and by the legal status of immigrants, and also because borders play an important role on the determination of citizenship rules.

### **3 Citizenship laws in historical perspective**

Citizenship is associated with a precise set of rights and duties. It provides benefits such as the right to vote, better employment opportunities, the ability to travel without restrictions, legal protection in case of criminal charges, and the possibility to obtain a visa for a relative. There are also costs to citizenship, such as the military draft, renunciation of the original citizenship, and the pecuniary and non pecuniary costs that may be required for naturalization and for recognition at the age of majority (language and culture tests, waiting periods, and a commitment to avoid activities leading to disqualification).

Citizenship policy can be viewed as part of broader migration policy. However, contrary to other migration policy measures such as quotas and visa requirements, that are typically adjusted to the business cycle and to the current government orientation, citizenship laws reforms tend to be the outcome of long-term processes of adaptation often involving constitutional amendments.

There are several ways to acquire citizenship: at birth, by naturalization, by marriage. As mentioned, citizenship at birth is closely related to the well-defined bodies of common and civil law, since the first traditionally applies *jus soli*, the second *jus sanguinis*. Citizenship at birth regulates citizenship acquisition by second-generation immigrants, i.e., the children born of first-generation immigrants in the immigration country.

In 18th century Europe *jus soli* was the dominant criterion, following feudal traditions which linked human beings to the lord who held the land where they were born. The French Revolution broke with this heritage and with the 1804 civil code reintroduced the ancient Roman custom of *jus sanguinis*. Continental modern citizenship law was subsequently built on these premises. During the 19th century the *jus sanguinis* principle was adopted throughout Europe and then transplanted to its colonies. By imitation, Japan also adopted *jus sanguinis* in this phase. On the other hand, the British preserved their *jus soli* tradition and spread it through their own colonies, starting with the United States where it was later encoded in the Constitution. By the

end of the 19th century, the process of nation-state formation and the associated codification effort were completed in Continental Europe. At the same time, the revolutionary phase was over in those countries that had been the subject of the earlier colonization era, and 19th century colonization had extended the process of transplantation of legal tradition to the rest of the world. Therefore, at that stage, most countries of the world had established specific provisions regarding citizenship acquisition within a relatively well-developed legal system, with *jus soli* being the norm in common law countries, and *jus sanguinis* regulating citizenship law in most civil law countries. However, the next century witnessed a continuous process of transformation of citizenship laws across the world. Below are some specific cases, drawing mostly from Joppke (1998), Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer (2000, 2001) and Brubaker (1992).

**The United States** *Jus soli* was encoded in the US Constitution through the 1868 Fourteenth Amendment, with the specific purpose to protect the birthrights of black slaves. Consistently with its history as a country of immigrants, and with a general positive attitude toward economic liberalism, the US approach is still remarkably inclusive in all its aspects, ranging from immigration policy to naturalization requirements. Debate about possible restrictions did arise recently, but never led to actual change.<sup>1</sup> In particular, *jus soli* came under attack in the 1980s regarding its applicability to the children of illegal immigrants. A relatively young and thin welfare state contributes to the fiscal sustainability of *jus soli* in this country.<sup>2</sup> As a result of these combined elements, current citizenship law in America differs considerably from that of another classic land of immigration such as Australia, where *jus soli* had similarly been introduced by the colonists. In the postwar period, Australia went through numerous legislative and administrative reforms. *Jus soli* survived until 1986, while afterwards a person born in Australia must have at least one parent who is either an Australian citizen or a permanent resident in order to acquire citizenship.

**Latin America** In the face of a civil law tradition which had been transplanted by the European powers, this area has followed a rather peculiar pattern. At independence, most of the incipient

---

<sup>1</sup>In his analysis of Mexican immigration, Huntington (2004) has criticized current nationality regulations on the grounds that they represent a “devaluation of citizenship”.

<sup>2</sup>The relative thickness of the concept itself of citizenship, if compared to residency, is a related, potentially relevant consideration: in the US, for instance, citizenship is relatively thin, in the sense that it confers few additional benefits if compared with residency.



states chose jus soli as a way to break with the colonial political order and to prevent the metropolises from making legitimate claims on citizens born in the new countries. Jus soli was encoded in the Constitution of Brazil in 1824, of Venezuela in 1830, of Argentina in 1853. Therefore, most of Latin America was already a jus soli country before the 19th century immigration waves began. Jus soli is still the prevalent rule in the area, even if it is no longer attracting immigrants. Mexico represents a special case where jus soli was also adopted in the 1814 insurgent Constitution, but was then abandoned in 1836, only to come back to stay with a Constitutional Amendment in 1937.

**The United Kingdom** British nationality law has been deeply affected by the imperial experience. Because of its colonial history, the concept of nationality in the UK was, up to WW2, particularly extensive, since all subjects of the British Empire had equal access to British citizenship simply by establishing residence in the UK. The 1948 Nationality Act created the status of Citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies for people with a close connection to the UK and its colonies. Following a postwar wave of colonial immigration, this open-door policy was progressively restricted, even though special status is still attributed to citizens of the British Commonwealth. Redefinitions of national citizenship have been effectively employed, since the 1980s, as a form of selective immigration policy. The 1984 British Nationality Act restricts jus soli by establishing that a child born in the UK qualifies for British citizenship only if at least one parent is a British citizen or resident.

**France** The emergence of the nation-state in Continental Europe was the main factor that shaped citizenship law in this area. The revolutionary experience was particularly important for France, where jus sanguinis was first introduced with the 1804 Civil Code and maintained for the entire course of the 19th century, even though military consideration introduced early on elements of jus soli. In order to secure immigrants' children born in France to the draft, in 1889 double jus soli became automatic, making the experience of this country a unique one. After WW2, large-scale immigration, especially from North Africa, raised concern regarding assimilation. Citizenship issues and the rights of immigrants became the object of heated debate in French politics. In 1993 Chirac introduced a restrictive revision to the legislation, that required a formal citizenship request from second-generation immigrants. With the Left regaining political power in 1997, however,

these restrictions were considerably revised, with the automatic assignment of citizenship at age 18 to those immigrants' children born in France who had neither requested, nor declined it. The case of France is frequently compared with Germany. Brubaker (2002) has influentially argued that the different path followed by these countries has been shaped by their cultural difference, with France sticking to its tradition of assimilationist nation, and Germany to its ethnic identity.

**Germany** The single most relevant event in the history of German citizenship law is certainly the fall of the Berlin wall, which paved the way for the achievement of stable national borders. Prior to that, the massive guest-worker immigration of the postwar period, mostly from Turkey but also from Southern Europe, had started to put under strong pressure, but to no avail, the original Wilhelminian citizenship law of 1913, which had established strong sanguinis ties with German overseas emigrants. With the foundation of the GDR and the consolidation of the Eastern Block, Germany found itself in the paradoxical situation of having to live with a large population of disenfranchised foreigners born on its soil at home, and at the same time with millions of ethnic Germans living behind the Iron Curtain. Achieving border stability was a decisive factor in pushing Germany toward the long-delayed adoption of jus soli elements. A first step in this direction was the new Foreigner Law in 1990, which turned naturalization from the discretionary exception into the rule. A major overhaul of the legislation, following an intense political struggle, was finally approved in 1999. Jus soli is now the norm in Germany (under the mild requirement that one parent has lived in the country for eight years). In the evaluation of the German experience, other factors that may have delayed the introduction of jus soli are, as previously suggested, the strong ethnic character of German national identity, and the thick nature of the German welfare state. The latter aspect may have played a role in shaping the evolution of citizenship policies in several other European countries and especially the Scandinavian ones, where jus sanguinis was functional to the large past emigration flows, but had recently to adapt to the quickly changing conditions, especially for high-immigration Sweden. As documented by Weil (2001), restricted forms of double jus soli are de facto applied, by now, in the vast majority of European countries, which recently adapted their legislation to the globalization of international migration and its increasing impact on Europe. In particular, in the entire EU, with the exceptions of Austria, Greece and Luxembourg, access to citizenship by second and third generation is facilitated.

**Decolonization** Postwar decolonization had a major impact on citizenship rules applied around the world, and not only through the indirect impact on the metropolitan countries we previously examined. The vast majority of the African colonies that were subject to civil law countries practicing jus sanguinis stuck to this principle after independence. On the other hand, many former UK and Portuguese colonies rejected the jus soli tradition and switched to an often strongly ethnically tinged version of jus sanguinis. For instance, Sierra Leone's 1961 Constitution established that citizenship is transmitted only by descent and only to children whose father and a grandfather were Sierra Leoneans of African-Negro descent. In situations where instability was pushed to an extreme degree by the young age and the arbitrary borders of these countries, and was compounded with deep ethnic division, jus sanguinis tended to prevail as a way to control more easily the formation of national entities. At the same time, however, the associated exclusive notion of ethnic and tribal identity caused enormous problems in countries where colonial rule had left shaky democratic institutions. To these days, ethnic conflict lies at the roots of a chronic manipulation of citizenship rules in favor of one ethnic group over others. The 1964 Congolese Constitution, in an effort to exclude Rwandan immigrants, recognized citizenship only for persons whose parents were members of one of the tribes established within the territory by 1908. In 1981 Mobutu signed a new law on nationality requiring an ancestral connection to the population residing in the territory as far back as 1885. Marginalization and de-facto statelessness of significant strata of the population is the unavoidable outcome of these policies.

**The disintegration of the USSR** Another major wave of citizenship law codification followed the disintegration of the USSR. The area had been sealed toward international migration but, as for all empires, there had been considerable migration within. The Soviet Union had occupied Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in 1940. During the following decades millions of Russians were encouraged to settle in Latvia and Estonia (less so in Lithuania) in order to Russify them. To these days, large Russian-speaking, stateless, sizeable minorities are still present. After independence, the new citizenship laws of these three states reflected this heritage with an emphasis on jus sanguinis as the basis for acquiring citizenship. Lithuania, which was the least affected by Soviet immigration policy, showed the most inclusive, and Latvia the most exclusive attitude toward ethnic Russians. The issue for these states was how to balance a need to reconstitute their national identity around an ethnic model, and a commitment to democratic values with respect to the rights of minorities.

Estonian and Latvian laws were sharply criticized by international organizations on the grounds of human rights. In the anticipation of EU integration, these recommendations were indeed fulfilled in the more recent legislation of the Baltics, while most other countries of the area still persist with discriminatory policies. By contrast, for the case of the Russian Federation, the salient fact in shaping current citizenship policy is the perception that many of its citizens are outside its borders, spread around the former regions of the USSR. Again, this perception as a country of emigrants pushes toward the persistence of *jus sanguinis* as the main principle, even though small concessions to *jus soli* have been made.

## 4 The data: Citizenship laws of the world

We compile a data set of citizenship laws across the countries of the world for the postwar period. The principal source for the information we codify is a directory published by the Investigations Service of the United States Office of Personnel Management in 2001, which provides synopses of the citizenship laws currently practiced in 190 countries. The sources for this directory were Embassies, the Library of Congress, and the Department of State. We supplement this information with additional one from the CIA World Factbook (2002), the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (2003), and the survey in Weil (2001).

The principal focus of our codification is citizenship acquisition at birth, but we also collect information about naturalization requirements.

### 4.1 Citizenship at birth

We attribute to each country an appropriate code for citizenship laws in 2001 and for citizenship laws at the beginning of the postwar period. We take 1948 as the starting point, even though there were nearly no reforms in citizenship laws during the first half of the century, so that most of the legislation in place in 1948 had actually been developed much earlier. On the other hand, 1948 predates the decolonization phase and the related legislative reforms.<sup>3</sup> We also code citizenship

---

<sup>3</sup>By treating 1948 as the initial year, we include in our sample the postwar decolonization phase with the exemption of the Middle East, which gained independence from the British and French administration in the 1943-1948 period.

laws in the intermediate year 1975, which divides the postwar sample into two subperiods of equal length.

Since we focus on the degree of inclusiveness of the law toward immigrants, our classification stresses the degree to which a country's legislation applies elements of *jus soli*. For 1948, 1975 and 2001, we divide countries into three groups: countries subject to *jus sanguinis* without any *jus soli* element (Group 1), countries that apply a mixed regime (Group 2), and countries subject to full *jus soli* (Group 3). A mixed regime includes elements of both *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*.<sup>4</sup> Our data set includes those 162 countries for which we were able to collect information on both original and current citizenship laws, and for which migration data were available for the postwar period.<sup>5</sup>

The differential patterns of evolution that citizenship laws generate in 1948, 1975 and 2001 are summarized by the transition matrices in Table 1, which reveals considerable variations both across countries and over time. The table shows that in 1948 *jus soli* was the rule in about 47% (i.e., 76 out of 162) of the countries, while *jus sanguinis* dominated in 41% (i.e., 67 out of 162), and the mixed regime was adopted in the remaining 12% (19 countries). Among the countries that were under *jus soli* in 1948, we find the United States, Canada, all the Oceanian countries, most of Latin America, within Africa and Asia the British and Portuguese colonies, within Europe the UK, Ireland and Portugal. On the other hand, in 1948 *jus sanguinis* predominated in most of Europe, including its Eastern part. As explained in Section 3, France was unique in its early choice of a mixed regime. Since we treat colonial territories as subject to the metropolitan countries' regime until independence, the group applying the mixed regime in 1948 includes France and its colonies.

By 1975, 31% (i.e., 50 out of 162) of the countries had *jus soli*, 62% (101) *jus sanguinis*, and 7% (11) a mixed regime. The main event justifying this evolution is decolonization, with many former colonies switching to *jus sanguinis*, from *jus soli* when the UK and Portugal were the metropolitan country, and from the mixed regime in the case of France (see Section 3). As of 2001, 24% (i.e., 39 out of 162) of the countries apply *jus soli*, 54% (88) *jus sanguinis*, and 22% (35) a mixed regime. It has mostly been the adaptation of the legislation of many European countries, relaxing pure *jus*

---

<sup>4</sup>For details on our classification criteria see the Data Appendix, part A.

<sup>5</sup>For details on migration data see the Data Appendix, part C.

sanguinis in favor of a mixed regime, that explains the pattern observed for the second subperiod.

Among the countries that still adhere to the jus soli principle in 2001 are the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Ireland (which - however - recently introduced restrictions to jus soli with a June 2004 referendum). The UK and Australia, on the contrary, no longer adhere to it. Overall, jus sanguinis is currently the most common regime, with 69% of the countries in Africa, 83% in Asia, and 41% (down from 88%) in Europe. The growing group where a mix of provisions is applied is particularly well-represented in Europe, with 56% of the European countries including the formerly jus soli United Kingdom. On the other hand, jus soli predominates in the Americas, with 89% of the countries in Latin America, and the entire North America (i.e., the US and Canada).

Table 1 reveals three different patterns of transitional dynamics: stability, switch, and convergence. Stable countries lie along the diagonal. Looking at the 1948 to 2001 transition, we see that a large fraction (28%, i.e., 46 out of 162) have started and ended as jus sanguinis. In other words, it is 69% (i.e., 46 out of 67) of the originally jus sanguinis countries that have remained so. By contrast, 22% (36 out of 162) are steadily jus soli countries: this means that only 47% (36 out of 76) of the originally jus soli countries have not changed their policies. Off diagonal, there is a sizeable proportion of countries (19%, or 31 out of 162) that have switched from jus soli to sanguinis, by completely eliminating birthplace as a criterion: most of them - as mentioned - are former African colonies of the UK and Portugal, which made this radical choice at independence. Looking at the two subperiods, we see most of these switches occur between 1948 and 1975. Finally, there is evidence of a process of convergence to a soli/sanguinis mix, which affects 18% of the countries (29 out of 162, of which 20 converge from jus sanguinis by adding jus soli elements, while 9 converge from jus soli by restricting it) and intensifies between 1975 and 2001.

In Table 2 we present further information on citizenship laws evolution by reporting changes in citizenship laws, organized by original laws. Over the 1948-2001 period, 74 countries (46%) have gone through a change in the laws, with 45 changes occurring in the first subperiod, and 33 in the second.<sup>6</sup> In particular, in the first subperiod, the majority of the countries that went through a change (29, or 64%) were originally jus soli. As mentioned, this pattern is determined largely by the behavior of former colonies. In the second subperiod, the majority of the countries that went

---

<sup>6</sup>A few countries went through more than one change.

through a change (20, or 61%) were originally jus sanguinis, most of which adopting a more open legislation.

Summary statistics for our citizenship laws data set are reported in Table 3. The correlation between 1948 and 2001 citizenship laws is 0.42, which points to some persistence, as confirmed by the even higher correlation between 1948 and 1975 (0.60) and 1975 and 2001 laws (0.81).

## 4.2 Citizenship by naturalization and the general inclusiveness index

Naturalization policies are also relevant to the issues at hand. Indeed, to facilitate naturalization for immigrant parents may represent a substitute mechanism to attribute citizenship to children born in jus sanguinis countries. Besides, the general attitude revealed by a country's regulation of citizenship at birth is also reflected in its naturalization laws, with jus soli countries traditionally making naturalization much easier, at least for resident aliens. Within jus sanguinis countries, naturalization requirements again tend to be correlated with the revisions introduced for citizenship at birth. Basic rules for naturalization may include a period of residence, renunciation of other citizenship, familiarity with the language and customs of the country, and the availability of adequate means of support.<sup>7</sup>

We code data for naturalization only for 2001. We classify countries on the basis of the number of years of residence required for naturalization, by constructing four classes (more than 14 years, 6 to 14 years, 5 years, 4 years or fewer). Alternative ways to define classes yielded similar conclusions.<sup>8</sup> In our data set 62 countries (i.e., 44%) require five years of residence, which can be considered a relatively open attitude, while 46% require more time and only 10% are more open.

We then combine the information we collected on citizenship at birth and naturalization within a single measure. To this end, we treat citizenship laws in 2001 as an ordinal variable, by imposing that jus sanguinis corresponds to minimal, and jus soli to maximal inclusiveness. Next, by averaging with equal weights the two indexes just described, we construct a general inclusiveness index defined on the 0-1 interval, with maximum inclusiveness being associated with 1. The corrected Cronbach's alpha of the indicator is 0.54, which assures sufficient reliability.

Table 3 reports summary statistics for naturalization and the inclusiveness index. The correla-

---

<sup>7</sup>We do not consider naturalization by marriage, since it is heavily dependent on family law.

<sup>8</sup>For naturalization we have information on 142 of our 162 countries.

tion between citizenship laws and naturalization is 0.37. The inclusiveness index has a correlation of 0.77 and 0.70 with citizenship laws and naturalization, respectively.

## 5 The determinants of citizenship laws

### 5.1 Empirical specification

To investigate the determinants of citizenship laws evolution in the postwar period, we estimate multinomial logit models with current citizenship laws as dependent variable. To achieve maximum generality we do not impose any order among the three available regime choices. Our dependent variable is categorical and can take three values: 1 if the country has a jus sanguinis regime, 2 if the country has a mixed regime, and 3 if the country has a jus soli regime. The sample we consider includes two cross sections of 162 countries: the first cross section refers to the 1950-1975 subperiod, the second cross section to the 1976-2000 subperiod. In the full specification we present, the multinomial logit model we run has the following form:

$$C_{it} = aS_{it} + bM_{it} + cS_{it}M_{it} + dP_t + \mathbf{Z}'_{it}\mathbf{e} + \epsilon_{it}, \quad (1)$$

with  $i = 1, \dots, 162$  and  $t = 1, 2$  (where  $t = 1$  refers to the 1950-1975 period and  $t = 2$  refers to the 1976-2000 period).<sup>9</sup>

In specification (1),  $C_{it}$  represents citizenship laws in country  $i$  at the end of period  $t$ ,  $S_{it}$  is a dummy for the presence of jus sanguinis in country  $i$  at the beginning of each subperiod,  $M_{it}$  is migration stock in country  $i$  in period  $t$ ,  $S_{it}M_{it}$  is the interaction between the previous two variables,  $P_t$  is a time dummy,  $\mathbf{Z}_{it}$  is a vector of additional explanatory variables, and  $\epsilon_{it}$  is the error term.<sup>10</sup>

The set of explanatory variables  $\mathbf{Z}_{it}$  can be divided into two groups. The first group includes dummies capturing the country's geopolitical position. Within this group we consider a set of dummies capturing a country's history of border changes (decolonization, Berlin wall, other border

---

<sup>9</sup>We also run multinomial logit models for two types of more parsimonious specifications, for comparison purposes.

<sup>10</sup>In particular,  $C_{i1}$  and  $C_{i2}$  are citizenship laws in country  $i$  in 1975 and 2001, respectively;  $S_{i1} = 1$  if country  $i$  has jus sanguinis in 1948 and  $S_{i2} = 1$  if country  $i$  has jus sanguinis in 1975;  $M_{i1}$  is migration stock in country  $i$  in 1960 and  $M_{i2}$  is migration stock in country  $i$  in 1980;  $P_1 = 0$  and  $P_2 = 1$ .



changes)<sup>11</sup> and dummies for Latin American, Southern European and small countries. The second group of explanatory variables includes a measure of democracy, proxies for cultural characteristics such as religious affiliation and ethnolinguistic fractionalization, the size of government, and the share of young in the population.

The Data Appendix collects information on the definitions and sources of all variables we employed. Table 4 presents their summary statistics.

We can now suggest a number of specific hypotheses regarding the potential role of the above mentioned factors, starting with the variables we consider focal to our analysis, i.e., legal tradition and immigration. Throughout the following, we will organize our comments in terms of our multinomial logit estimates, taking the group of countries which at the end of the period have a jus sanguinis regime as the reference category.

Legal tradition is identified by a dummy for countries that apply jus sanguinis at the beginning of each subperiod ( $S_{it}$ ). We select this dummy because jus sanguinis is the most persistent of the three regimes, thus suggesting a particularly significant role of this initial legislation. A negative value of the dummy's coefficient for a mixed and jus soli regime would imply that jus sanguinis countries are less likely to end up in the mixed and jus soli groups, thus confirming persistence of the original laws.

Migration ( $M_{it}$ ) is measured by the stock of migrants in percent of the population at the beginning of each subperiod. For the first subperiod, we enter the stock in 1960, while for the second we enter the stock in 1980. By entering the migrant stock near at the beginning of each period, we avoid any potential endogeneity problem of migration with respect to citizenship laws, since it is unlikely that stocks evaluated at the beginning of the period could be affected by subsequent changes in citizenship laws. A positive coefficient for the mixed regime would indicate that high migration pushes toward it rather than toward jus sanguinis, and similarly for the jus soli regime.

The interaction between the jus sanguinis dummy and migration should reveal additional information: if positive, its coefficients would indicate that indeed those jus sanguinis countries facing high migration tend to add jus soli elements. In particular, a positive coefficient for the mixed regime would suggest convergence toward the intermediate group. On the other hand, the

---

<sup>11</sup>The Appendix, part B describes how the three border change dummies are constructed.

coefficients of the interaction could also turn out to be negative since, in the presence of a large stock of migrants, the natives' reaction could be a conservative one.

Turning to our geopolitical dummies, if border stability really counts as a prerequisite for the introduction of birthrights for the immigrants, as suggested by some of the political theories introduced in Section 1, we should expect negative signs for the coefficients for our border change dummies. We introduce the Latin America dummy to capture the peculiarity of this continent's experience. As explained in Section 3, most of Latin America adopted *jus soli* long before our sample period, so its current position is not determined by postwar developments and in particular by its postwar migration experience. If indeed the behavior of Latin America differs significantly from the rest of the sample in being associated with a higher probability of adopting *jus soli*, it should exhibit a positive coefficient for this kind of legislation. For Southern Europe, we should expect a positive coefficient for the mixed regime since these countries have been experiencing quickly increasing migration during the second subperiod, with most of the revision to the legislation toward mixed regimes occurring in the past 15 years or so. Finally, since migration data reveal that countries with a small population tend to have large and erratic figures, with a disproportionately small impact on their legislation, we should expect negative signs for this dummy's coefficients.

The establishment of a consolidated democracy - measured by the political rights variable - should exert a positive effect on inclusiveness even though, once again, even in a democratic country exclusionary forces against outsiders may persist for a protracted period of time. The possible impact of cultural factors is proxied here by two different regressors, in an effort to capture several dimensions of cultural differences. In particular, we include the share of Catholics in total population and an index of ethnolinguistic fractionalization.

The size of government is meant to proxy for the nature of the welfare state: if a thicker, more expensive and more redistributive structure would represent an obstacle to the inclusion of relatively poor immigrants, we would find negative coefficients. On the other hand, if young immigrants could offer a solution to domestic demographic imbalances, we would find that countries with a higher share of young in total population would be less prone to adopt *jus soli* elements, thus displaying negative coefficients.

Pairwise correlations among our dependent and independent variables are presented in Table

5. Current citizenship laws, the dependent variable, is highly correlated (-0.64) with the initial citizenship laws as identified by the jus sanguinis dummy, while its correlation with the civil law dummy is much lower (-0.15). Citizenship laws are also significantly correlated with migration, the small country dummy, political rights, the Catholic share, and ethnolinguistic fractionalization.

Pairwise correlations between all our independent variables can be found in the Table Appendix (Table A.1). The dummy reflecting jus sanguinis as the initial law is negatively correlated with decolonization (-0.31) and Latin America (-0.43). The Latin America dummy is positively associated with the Catholic share (0.52). Political rights tend to be low in countries with high ethnolinguistic fractionalization (-0.36). The share of young in population is positively associated with migration stocks (0.35). Overall, these stylized facts are in line with previous research and economic intuition. It is also clear that several of our independent variables are closely interrelated and that it may be difficult to disentangle their specific effect on the evolution of citizenship laws.

## 5.2 Results

The results of our multinomial logits are presented in Table 6. The table reports three different specifications. Multinomial logit (a) is the core specification, which includes only the core variables, i.e., migration and jus sanguinis as initial citizenship law, plus the dummy period. Multinomial logit (b) is an expanded specification, which adds to (a) the dummies we discussed above. Finally, multinomial logit (c) is our full specification, which adds to (b) the other potentially relevant regressors. Jus sanguinis is the reference category for all the results shown. Hence, the results reported in the table indicate the impact of the explanatory variable on the probability of choosing either the mixed or the jus soli regimes, relative to jus sanguinis.

Starting with the core specification, we find that the core variables are all significant. In particular, migration and jus sanguinis display negative coefficients for both the mixed regime and jus soli, while both coefficients are positive for the period dummy. This means that high migration and a jus sanguinis origin decrease the probability of applying a mixed or a jus soli legislation rather than jus sanguinis, and that in the second subperiod the probability of applying a mixed or jus soli legislation increases.

In the specification which includes the dummies, the jus sanguinis origin still exerts a negative impact on the probability of applying a mixed or jus soli regime, while migration only remains

significantly negative for the probability of applying a mixed regime. The period dummy is significantly positive only for the probability of a mixed regime. As expected, the decolonization dummy displays two negative coefficients, i.e., having gone through a decolonization border change negatively affects the probability of applying either a mixed or jus soli regime. South Europe has a positive coefficient for the mixed regime, confirming that Southern European countries have a higher probability of becoming mixed. Latin America has a positive coefficient for jus soli, since these countries have a higher probability of applying this regime. The small country dummy is not significant in this specification.

Finally, in the full specification, the impact of migration, a jus sanguinis origin and the period dummy are confirmed.<sup>12</sup> The interaction term between migration and jus sanguinis origin is significant and positive for both the mixed regime and jus soli, uncovering a tendency for countries with a jus sanguinis origin which are exposed to high migration to be more inclusive and, in particular, to apply a mixed regime with highest probability. In this extended version the coefficient for decolonization loses significance. However, inspection of the marginal effects for decolonization (see Table 7) confirms that even in the full specification the regressor retains a significantly negative impact on the probability of jus soli.<sup>13</sup> The role of the Latin America and Southern Europe dummies is confirmed, while the small country dummy now reveals a negative impact on the probability of applying a mixed regime. The size of government has a positive and significant coefficient for the probability of applying a jus soli regime, while the share of young in the population exerts a negative impact on inclusiveness, in support of the hypothesis that countries with a relatively old population are more likely to choose mixed and jus soli regimes. The variables meant to capture cultural characteristics, i.e., the share of Catholics and ethnolinguistic fractionalization, are both insignificant, while a high degree of democracy positively affects the probability of applying either a mixed or jus soli regime.<sup>14</sup>

We also consider additional covariates that have often been found significant in related research on the determinants of institutions. Quantitative and qualitative development indicators such

---

<sup>12</sup>For both multinomial logit (a) and (b) we obtain the same results using a balanced sample composed by the 224 countries which constitute the reference sample for the estimation of our full specification.

<sup>13</sup>Moreover, with the mixed regime as the reference category, decolonization displays a significantly negative coefficient for the probability of being jus soli.

<sup>14</sup>For all three specifications, we verified that our results are not driven by outliers.

as income per capita and inequality could reveal if a richer, more equal country is more open to inclusiveness. However, both per capita GDP and the Gini index of inequality tend to be associated with migration, and also with democracy and fractionalization, so they are unlikely to add independent explanatory power to a regression. In fact they fail to add any further significance to the previous results. Moreover, a dummy for oil countries could account for the fact that most of them have been experiencing huge immigration which has had no impact on their still very restrictive legislation (often based on Islamic family law). A dummy for socialist countries could instead work as an alternative to our Berlin wall border change dummy.<sup>15</sup> However, we cannot include in the regressions the socialist and oil dummies, as well as the Berlin wall and the other border changes dummies, due to the fact that all countries identified by them do not exhibit enough variability with respect to the dependent variable.<sup>16</sup>

Table 7 reports the marginal effects of the covariates for the full specification. They reveal further insights such as the significant role of decolonization previously mentioned. In particular, having gone through a decolonization border change decreases the probability of being *jus soli* by about 14%. Moreover, an increase in migration of one percentage point increases the probability of being a *jus sanguinis* country by about 2.5%, and decreases the probability of having a mixed regime by 2.3%. Besides, an increase in migration of one percentage point for a *jus sanguinis* country decreases the probability of being *jus sanguinis* by about 2.7%.

Overall, our results indicate that migration, the original laws and our geopolitical dummies exert a significant impact on current citizenship laws, and that other factors such as government size, demographics and democracy also contribute to their determination. In particular, we show that legal tradition tends to affect the current legislation persistently, even though the process of transplantation can prove discontinuous in the case of former colonies. In addition, we show that a *jus sanguinis* origin, which is associated with a civil legal origin, is less conducive to adaptation than a *jus soli* origin. This suggests that different legal traditions tend to be associated with different degrees of flexibility. We also find that high migration has a negative impact on the degree of inclusiveness of a country's legislation, and in particular on the probability of applying a mixed regime. However, the full effect of migration is also determined by the interaction term,

---

<sup>15</sup>The correlation between Berlin wall and socialist is 0.48.

<sup>16</sup>For example, no country affected by Berlin wall has ever applied *jus soli*.

which is positive for jus sanguinis countries, suggesting that for these countries migration causes a shift of the legislation toward a mixed regime. The hypothesis of convergence toward a mix of provisions, suggested by some political theories (see Section 1), finds partial support in our results, since it is verified only for countries with a jus sanguinis origin moving toward a mix, while it is denied for the rest of the countries. Contrary to our prior, the welfare burden proves not to be an obstacle for a jus soli legislation. However, this could be explained by the fact many of the countries with extended welfare systems may favor immigration because of their demographic crisis. Indeed demographic stagnation encourages the adoption of mixed and jus soli regimes. Moreover, the impact we observe for the size of government could be explained by the fact that it proxies for European-style, relative inclusive social-democracies. Finally, the evidence demonstrates that a high degree of democracy is associated with more inclusiveness, while culture as captured by religious affiliation and ethnolinguistic fractionalization appears to be irrelevant.

### 5.3 Robustness

In this section we present a number of alternatives to our benchmark regressions to investigate whether they are robust to different specifications, samples and estimation techniques.

#### 5.3.1 Alternative specifications

We experiment our multinomial logit specifications with alternative covariates. First, we replace our measure of migration with a range of alternative measures. As outlined above, our migration measure was chosen because it is likely to minimize a potential endogeneity bias. When we replace our migrations stocks with average migration flows (computed with reference to each subperiod),<sup>17</sup> the coefficients for migration turns out to be insignificant in all three specifications. This could suggest that migration flows are endogenous with respect to citizenship laws. Further tests involve alternative measures of migration stocks. Rather than entering the stock of migrants over population in 1960 for the first subperiod and in 1980 for the second subperiod, we select the years 1970 and 1990, respectively, and the 1960-70 and 1980-90 averages, respectively. In the Table Appendix, Table A.2, column (1) presents the full specification with the 1960-70 and 1980-

---

<sup>17</sup>Migration stocks and flows show a correlation of 0.45.

90 averages (average migration stock). With these alternative stock measures, some differences emerge in the coefficients for migration and its interaction with *jus sanguinis*, with the latter losing significance, while the coefficients for the other regressors are largely unaffected. Since in the postwar period migration has been highly regulated by policy in most receiving countries, and citizenship laws could be viewed as part of migration policy, the simultaneous determination of citizenship laws and migration does represent a serious concern when we enter within-the-period data on migration instead of beginning-of-period data. To sum up, our beginning-of-period migration stocks prove to be the most adequate measures of the role of migration.

Since *jus sanguinis* and *jus soli* are closely linked to the civil and common systems of laws, respectively, the influence of the legal tradition can also be analyzed through a dummy capturing the presence of a civil law tradition (i.e., a dummy equal to 1 if a country belongs to the civil law tradition and equal to 0 if a country belongs to common law). The correlation between the two dummies is 0.35. If the coefficients of the two alternative dummies were the same, one could conclude that our detailed codification of the original citizenship laws does not add much to what we already knew from a country's broader legal tradition. However, when we replace the *jus sanguinis* with the civil law dummy (see Table A.2, column (2)), the latter turns out to be substantially less significant, and to reduce the significance of most other regressors. This demonstrates that civil law is a much weaker predictor of current citizenship laws than the original citizenship laws themselves and implies that our citizenship laws classification does contain novel information which is not already embedded in the legal origin data.

We also replace our decolonization dummy with a dummy for British or Portuguese colonies (identifying those countries that were characterized by a *jus soli* legislation during the colonial period), and with the sub-Saharan Africa dummy.<sup>18</sup> Both alternatives are associated with insignificant coefficients and marginal effects. This implies that our dummy for a decolonization border change does capture more precisely an important determinant of current citizenship laws.

---

<sup>18</sup>Decolonization shows a significant correlation with the dummies for British or Portuguese colony (0.30) and for sub-Saharan Africa (0.31). Regression results are omitted for brevity.

### 5.3.2 Alternative estimation techniques

Alternative estimation techniques broadly confirm the same results from Table 7. In particular, an (unreported) alternative multinomial probit model delivers the same qualitative results.

We also run ordered logit regressions where current citizenship laws are treated as an ordinal variable, ordered by increasing inclusiveness, with *jus sanguinis* corresponding to minimal and *jus soli* to maximal inclusiveness. These results are reported in Table A.3 in the Table Appendix. Even though the single coefficient for each covariate that characterizes an ordered logit regression fails to capture some facets of the issues which are more clearly disentangled by the two coefficients of the multinomial logit, overall the previous results are confirmed, with migration and a *jus sanguinis* origin exerting a negative impact on inclusiveness.

### 5.3.3 Alternative sample criteria

We also run multinomial logit regressions on a cross-sectional sample composed by country averages over the 1950-2000 period. In this specification the dependent variable is citizenship laws in 2001, while migration stock refers to the year 1960 and *jus sanguinis* in 1948 is the initial citizenship law. All other covariates are adapted accordingly. Therefore, for instance, the decolonization dummy identifies all decolonization events occurring during the 1950-2000 period, and the size of government is an average over the entire period. The results for this cross section reveal a much lower level of significance for several covariates, in particular for migration and for its interaction with the initial laws.<sup>19</sup> This suggests that our panel includes more information on the determinants of citizenship laws than a simple cross section. An alternative ordered logit regression for the cross section also achieved much weaker results than those found in the panel.<sup>20</sup>

For the same cross section, we also run an ordinary least squares regression with an alternative dependent variable, i.e., our general inclusiveness index developed in Section 4, which merges information from both citizenship laws at birth and naturalization in 2001. Migration turns out to be insignificant in these regressions, as it does in a comparable ordinary least squares regression with an indexed version of 2001 citizenship laws as dependent variable (see Table A.4 in the Table

---

<sup>19</sup>We also experiment with migration stocks in 1970 and 1980, and with average migration flows, with similar results.

<sup>20</sup>We also apply to the above results the Cook's distance method to show that they are not driven by outliers.



Appendix).<sup>21</sup> This confirms that our variable reflecting citizenship at birth does capture a broader set of considerations concerning citizenship.

## 6 An alternative approach: The determinants of change in citizenship laws

We also study citizenship laws evolution using an alternative approach which is able to provide us with additional insights about the issue at end. While specification (1) focuses on current citizenship laws as the dependent variable, we developed an alternative specification which is designed to capture more specifically the determinants of a change in the laws.

### 6.1 Empirical specification

In the alternative specification, the dependent variable is the occurrence of a change in citizenship laws. For our panel, we run a logit model of the following form for its full specification:

$$D_{it} = \alpha S_{it} + \beta M_{it} + \gamma S_{it}M_{it} + \delta P_t + \mathbf{Z}'_{it}\boldsymbol{\eta} + \xi_{it}, \quad (2)$$

where  $D_{it}$  is a dummy variable which is equal to 1 if any change in citizenship laws occurred in country  $i$  and period  $t$  and is equal to 0 if no change occurred. The regressors are all the variables previously described and  $\xi_{it}$  is the error term.

Pairwise correlations among our new dependent variable, changes in citizenship laws, and the independent variables are presented in Table 5. The dependent variable is correlated negatively with a jus sanguinis origin (-0.24) and with the Latin America dummy (-0.22), positively with the decolonization dummy (0.36).

---

<sup>21</sup>The main difference between the two OLS regressions is that jus sanguinis as initial law becomes insignificant when the dependent variable is the inclusiveness index. This difference is to be attributed to the fact this initial condition does not exactly match the dependent variable, since data limitations on naturalization in 1948 do not allow us to compute an initial condition for the inclusiveness index.

## 6.2 Results

Regression results for the logit models are presented in Table 8. Once again we develop three alternative specifications of increasing complexity. Jus sanguinis as the initial law always exerts a negative impact on change in all three specifications, suggesting that this kind of regime is the most resistant to adaptation. While migration has a positive impact on change in the core version (a), no significant effect survives the inclusion of additional covariates. In version (b), decolonization and Southern Europe appear to exert a positive impact on change, while Latin America resists it. This confirms our previous findings, with added implications. In particular, a decolonization border change - as well as belonging to Southern Europe - tends to induce change, while belonging to Latin America implies resistance. In the full specification, among the additional covariates we find a negative effect on change for the share of young, meaning that relatively old countries are more likely to adapt their legislation, and a positive effect for the period dummy, i.e., change is more likely to occur in the second subperiod.

Overall, these results are complementary to those of Section 5 since they highlight which factors have induced the observed evolution of the legislation. In particular, we have identified a jus sanguinis origin as a factor of resistance to change, while migration has an insignificant impact on adaptation. The latter effect is probably due to the fact that migration has a complex impact on a country's legislation which is not captured by the binary nature of the dependent variable used in these regressions. Decolonization and the wave of legislative reforms recently occurred especially in Southern Europe clearly emerge as the major forces that have contributed to the adaptation of citizenship laws in the postwar period.

## 6.3 Robustness

As for specification (1), we perform a full set of robustness checks for (2). Additional covariates such as per capita income and the Gini index once again fail to add any significance to the logit estimates and are therefore omitted from the specification in Table 8. Alternative measures of migration confirm an irrelevant impact on change in the laws.

When we replace the dummy reflecting jus sanguinis as the initial law with the civil law dummy, we find the latter insignificant. Similarly, when we replace our decolonization dummy with the

dummy for British or Portuguese colonies, or with the sub-Saharan Africa dummy, both of them are insignificant.

Alternative estimation techniques include a probit version of the model, which delivers results substantially similar to the logit. We also develop parallel sets of fixed and random effects logit regressions. Results appear in Table A.5. With fixed effects, the decolonization dummy remains the only significant determinant of change. With random effects, all the covariates which were found significant in the pooled logit remain significant. In particular, the decolonization, Latin America, and Southern Europe dummies still retain a significant impact on change.<sup>22</sup>

## 7 Conclusion

We studied the determinants and evolution of the legal institution of citizenship around the world in the postwar period, on the basis of a new data set we compiled. We found that citizenship laws have responded endogenously and systematically to migration and the legal tradition, as well as to postcolonial history, the degree of democracy, the welfare burden, and demographic factors. In particular, our data confirm the persistence of legal tradition, with a particularly strong tendency for *jus sanguinis* to be preserved. The presence of a large stock of migrants tends to limit the application of *jus soli* elements, even though for countries with a *jus sanguinis* origin a large stock does induce adaptation. Border instability emerges as a decisive factor in shaping citizenship laws, particularly following the decolonization phase, reflecting discontinuities for the transplanting process of legal institutions. Countries with larger welfare systems, older population and more political rights tend to be associated with more extended elements of *jus soli*.

More generally, a clear implication of our investigation is that institutions should not be presumed to be exogenous, since they do adapt both to economic and non-economic factors. The endogeneity of institutions to economic factors represents a first, well-known challenge for research aimed at demonstrating that institutions are crucial determinants of economic performances. By showing that citizenship laws are shaped not only by the broader legal origins, but also by other institutions such as the internal system of political rights and the international system of relations

---

<sup>22</sup>For the sake of comparison, we also run a logit over the cross section, and find that the regression yield results that were similar, even though weaker, than those from the panel.

as reflected by state borders, we also establish that different institutions are interrelated. This is a second challenge for further research on the process of formation of legal rules the impact of institutions on economic outcomes.

Citizenship laws are still changing. Further research could study the future evolution of citizenship policy, by using projections of international migration patterns in combination with the available predictions about the future course of democratization and border changes. Finally, citizenship laws can be viewed as a link, within a legal system, between the public and the private sphere of influence. Many issues that fall within the former - such as commercial law, labor regulation, and government activities - have already been investigated. Our methodology could be extended to the study of other evolving bodies of the law, such as family law, rules of inheritance, and women's rights.

## DATA APPENDIX

### A. The citizenship-at-birth classification

**Group 1 (jus sanguinis countries):** We include countries where citizenship is passed on to a child based upon at least one of the parents being a citizen of that country, regardless of the child's actual country of birth, and where citizenship is not granted due to birth within the country. In the application of jus sanguinis, countries may differ on some factors, for example on the father's vs. mother's right to transmit citizenship by descent, the requirement of citizenship for one or both parents, the relevance of the marital status of the parents. Most of these factors depend on the interaction between local family law and citizenship law. A common exception to the general principle of jus sanguinis is automatic citizenship attribution to children of unknown parents. Since we focus on the degree of inclusiveness of the law toward immigrants, our classification does not emphasize how narrowly jus sanguinis can be specifically applied to emigrants. Examples of restrictions are generational requirements limiting the principle of citizenship by descent to the first or second generations of individuals born and residing abroad, residence requirements for parents, and the requirement that parents must be citizens other than by descent.

**Group 2 (countries with a mixed regime):** We include those countries where elements of jus soli are recognized, albeit in a restrictive form, and coexist with varying degrees of jus

sanguinis. For example, a frequent provision that limits jus soli is double jus soli (i.e., automatic citizenship for the children of those immigrants who were also born in the country). Another is the ability, for a child born in a country where jus sanguinis prevails, to acquire citizenship at some later point (e.g., the age of maturity) subject to either residence requirements or application. Moreover, we interpret as an element of jus soli, that justifies the inclusion of a country within Group 2, the existence of a provision that birth in the country matters for naturalization.

**Group 3 (jus soli countries):** We include those countries where citizenship is automatically granted due to birth within the country, regardless of the parents' citizenship or status. Normally countries that apply jus soli combine it with jus sanguinis provisions for the children of their citizens born outside of their territory (although limitations to the ability to transmit citizenship acquired in this manner to the next generation usually apply through, for example, residence requirements).

## **B. The border change dummies**

We construct three border change dummies (i.e. Decolonization, Berlin Wall, and Other Border Changes) based on data collected from Polity IV (2002). In particular, from the Polity IV variable CHANGE we record information on four types of events capable of affecting state borders, i.e. State Disintegration, State Transformation, State Demise, and State Creation. Even if we set 1948 as the initial date for our citizenship laws analysis, for border changes we include a few earlier events occurred in the 1943-1948 period that fit within the phase of post-colonial independence. Examples of the events contained in the Polity IV (2002) data set are the State Disintegration of Yugoslavia in 1991; the State Transformation of Germany in 1990, East Germany in 1945, West Germany in 1945, and Russia in 1992); the State Demise of Germany in 1945, East Germany in 1990, West Germany in 1990, and the USSR in 1991. The countries affected by State Creation are the most numerous. They include the new countries gaining independence - and therefore state borders - in the postwar decolonization phase, the new countries formed in Europe after the fall of the Berlin wall, plus a few additional observations not linked to these two waves. Clearly, there is substantial overlap among the observations recorded in the Polity IV data set. We adapt these data to our needs by matching them to the 162 countries appearing in our citizenship laws data set. For instance, we count as a single event, occurring to Germany, the State Transformation of East and West Germany in 1945, but also the State Demise of Germany in the same year.

Likewise, we treat as another single event, occurring again to Germany, the State Transformation of Germany in 1990 and the State Demise of East and West Germany in the same year. On the other hand, the separation of Bangladesh from Pakistan counts for two events, because it concerns two countries which are in our sample. Additional information, when necessary, was obtained from the CIA (2002). On this basis, we construct our three border change dummies for each period under consideration: Decolonization (identifying countries which went through a post-colonial redefinition of their borders), Berlin wall (identifying countries which went through a post-1989 Berlin wall border change), and other border changes (identifying countries which went through other types of boundary changes, of which examples are the split between Pakistan and Bangladesh, and the unification of Vietnam).

### C. Definitions and sources of other covariates

**Migration stock:** International migration stock (% population). Migration stock is the number of people born in a country other than that in which they live, including refugees. The data are taken from United Nations (2003) and are available for 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000.

**Net migration flows:** International net migration rate. The data refer to incoming international migrants less outgoing international migrants, per 1,000 total population. The source is the United Nations (2005). The data are available over five year intervals from 1950, with projections until 2050.

**Civil law:** The source is the legal origin classification in La Porta et al. (1999). We retain only the two main families of common and civil law, without distinguishing, within the broader civil law tradition, among the French, German, and Scandinavian versions, since they do not present any significant difference for the issue of citizenship. Moreover, while La Porta et al. (1999) introduce a separate class for socialist-law countries, we assign them to their own class of common or civil law as it prevailed before the communist period.

**Latin America, Southern Europe and sub-Saharan Africa:** Dummies for countries belonging to Latin America, Southern Europe and sub-Saharan Africa. The classification is from UN (2002).

**British or Portuguese colony:** Dummy for countries that were British or Portuguese colonies any time after 1918. The source is the "Correlates of War 2 Project" (2004).

**Small country:** Dummy for countries with a population size of less than one million over all available years between 1960 and 1995, as in Easterly and Kraay (2000).

**Socialist:** Dummy for socialist countries. Information is from La Porta et al. (1999).

**Oil:** Dummy for oil countries (OPEC countries plus Oman, Angola,

Qatar, Bahrain, and Brunei). **Government consumption:** Government share of GDP in current prices, taken from Penn World Tables (2002). **Share of young:** Share of young between age 15 and 34 (% population). The data are taken from United Nations (2005). **Ethnolinguistic fractionalization:** Composite index of ethnolinguistic fractionalization, taken from Easterly and Levine (1997). **Catholic share:** Percentage of Catholics in 1980, taken from La Porta et al. (1999). **Political rights:** Political rights index, taken from Freedom House (1996). **GDP per capita:** Logarithm of real GDP per capita at current international prices, taken from Penn World Tables (2002). **Gini index:** Gini index of inequality, taken from Deininger and Squire (1996).

## REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D. , Johnson, S. and Robinson, J.A., 2001, The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation, *American Economic Review* 91, 1369-1401.
- Aleinikoff, T. A. and Klusmeyer, D. (eds.), 2001, *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington.
- Aleinikoff, T. A. and Klusmeyer, D. (eds.), 2000, *From Migrants to Citizens: Membership in a Changing World*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington.
- Alesina, A. and Spolaore, E., 1997, On the Number and Size of Nations, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112, 1027-1056.
- Benhabib, J., 1996, On the Political Economy of Migration, *European Economic Review* 40, 1737-1744.
- Bertocchi, G. and Strozzi, C., 2005, *The Age of Mass Migration: Economic and Institutional Determinants*, mimeo, University of Modena.
- Bolton, P. and Roland, G., 1997, The Breakup of Nations: A Political Economy Analysis, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112, 1057-1090.
- Brubaker, R., 1992, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Central Intelligence Agency, *The World Factbook 2002*, CIA, Washington.

- Correlates of War 2 Project, 2004, Department of Political Science, The Pennsylvania State University.
- Deininger, K. and Squire, L., 1996, A New Data Set Measuring Income Inequality, *The World Bank Economic Review* 10, 565-91.
- Easterly, W. and Kraay, A., 2000, Small States, Small Problems? Income, Growth, and Volatility in Small States, *World Development* 28, 2013-2027.
- Easterly, W. and Levine, R., 1997, Africa's Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112, 1203-1250.
- Engerman, S. L. and Sokoloff, K.L., 2002, Factor Endowment, Inequality, and Paths of Development Among New World Economies, NBER Working Paper 9259.
- Freedom House, 1996, *Freedom in the World. Political Rights and Civil Liberties*, Freedom House, New York.
- Gradstein, M. and Schiff, M., 2004, The Political Economy of Social Exclusion with Implications for Immigration Policy, IZA Discussion Paper No. 1087.
- Hatton, T.J. and Williamson, J.G., 2004, International Migration in the Long Run: Positive Selection, Negative Selection and Policy, NBER Working Paper No. 10529.
- Heston, A., Summers, R. and Aten, B., 2002, Penn World Table Version 6.1, Center for International Comparisons at the University of Pennsylvania (CICUP), October.
- Huntington, S.P., 2004, *Who Are We: The Challenges to America's National Identity*, Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Joppke, C. (ed.), 1998, *Challenge to the Nation-State: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R.W., 1999, The Quality of Government, *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 15, 222-279.



- La Porta, R., Lopes-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R.W., 1998, Law and Finance, *Journal of Political Economy* 106, 1113-1155.
- Mayda, A.M., 2005, Who is Against Immigration? A Cross-country Investigation of Individual Attitudes towards Immigration, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, forthcoming.
- O'Rourke, K. and Sinnott, R., 2003, Migration Flows: Political Economy of Migration and the Empirical Challenge, mimeo.
- Polity IV, 2002, Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2002, Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland.
- Razin, A., Sadka, E. and Swagel, P., 2002, Tax Burden and Migration: A Political Economy Theory and Evidence, *Journal of Public Economics* 85, 167-190.
- Timmer, A. and Williamson, J.G., 1998, Immigration Policy Prior to the Thirties: Labor Markets, Policy Interaction, and Globalization Backlash, *Population and Development Review* 24, 739-771.
- UN, 2005, World Population Prospects: Population Estimates and Projections, United Nations, New York.
- UN, 2003, Trends in Total Migrant Stock: The 2003 Revision, United Nations, New York.
- UN Common Database, 2002, United Nations, New York.
- UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Country of Origin and Legal Information, 2003, United Nations, Geneva.
- United States Office of Personnel Management, Investigations Service, Citizenship Laws of the World, 2001.
- Weil, P., 2001, Access to Citizenship: A Comparison of Twenty-Five Nationality Laws, in Aleinikoff, T. A. and Klusmeyer, D. (eds.), *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, 17-35, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington.

**Table 1**  
**Citizenship Laws Evolution: Transition Matrices**

<b>Citizenship laws in 2001</b>				
<b>Citizenship laws in 1948</b>	Jus sanguinis regime	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime	<i>Total</i>
Jus sanguinis regime	46	20	1	67
Mixed regime	11	6	2	19
Jus soli regime	31	9	36	76
<i>Total</i>	88	35	39	162
<b>Citizenship laws in 1975</b>				
<b>Citizenship laws in 1948</b>	Jus sanguinis regime	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime	<i>Total</i>
Jus sanguinis regime	63	3	1	67
Mixed regime	10	7	2	19
Jus soli regime	28	1	47	76
<i>Total</i>	101	11	50	162
<b>Citizenship laws in 2001</b>				
<b>Citizenship laws in 1975</b>	Jus sanguinis regime	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime	<i>Total</i>
Jus sanguinis regime	81	20	0	101
Mixed regime	2	9	0	11
Jus soli regime	5	6	39	50
<i>Total</i>	88	35	39	162

**Table 2**  
**Changes in Citizenship Laws**

<b>Changes in citizenship laws (1948 to 2001)</b>			
<b>Citizenship laws in 1948</b>	No change	Change	<i>Total</i>
Jus sanguinis regime	46	21	67
Mixed regime	6	13	19
Jus soli regime	36	40	76
<i>Total</i>	88	74	162
<b>Changes in citizenship laws (1948 to 1975)</b>			
<b>Citizenship laws in 1948</b>	No change	Change	<i>Total</i>
Jus sanguinis regime	63	4	67
Mixed regime	7	12	19
Jus soli regime	47	29	76
<i>Total</i>	117	45	162
<b>Changes in citizenship laws (1975 to 2001)</b>			
<b>Citizenship laws in 1975</b>	No change	Change	<i>Total</i>
Jus sanguinis regime	81	20	101
Mixed regime	9	2	11
Jus soli regime	39	11	50
<i>Total</i>	129	33	162

**Table 3**  
**Citizenship Laws Data Set: Summary Statistics**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Obs.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>
Citizenship laws in 2001	162	1.698	0.835	1	3
Citizenship laws in 1975	162	1.685	0.916	1	3
Citizenship laws in 1948	162	2.056	0.941	1	3
Changes in citizenship laws (1948 to 2001)	162	0.457	0.500	0	1
Naturalization in 2001	142	2.458	0.920	1	4
Inclusiveness index in 2001	142	0.442	0.272	0	1

**Table 4**  
**Summary Statistics, 1950-2000<sup>§</sup>**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Obs.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>
Current citizenship laws	324	1.691	0.875	1	3
Changes in citizenship laws	324	0.241	0.428	0	1
Jus sanguinis as initial citizenship law	324	0.519	0.500	0	1
Civil legal origin	324	0.673	0.470	0	1
Migration stock	300	5.646	9.713	0.011	70.673
Net migration flows	318	-0.116	8.551	-47.95	63.35
Decolonization	324	0.250	0.434	0	1
Berlin wall	324	0.052	0.223	0	1
Other border changes	324	0.022	0.146	0	1
Latin America	324	0.173	0.379	0	1
Southern Europe	324	0.043	0.204	0	1
Small country	324	0.160	0.368	0	1
Sub-Saharan Africa	324	0.265	0.442	0	1
British or Portuguese colony	324	0.333	0.472	0	1
Socialist	324	0.173	0.379	0	1
Oil	324	0.086	0.281	0	1
Political rights	276	3.730	2.040	1	7
Catholic share	324	31.535	35.572	0	97.3
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization	272	0.349	0.299	0	0.890
Government consumption	263	19.617	11.342	2.492	72.233
Share of young	324	34.54	3.47	27.01	53.36
Log GDP per capita	263	7.488	1.249	4.979	10.060
Gini index	155	40.425	9.966	20.495	63.180

<sup>§</sup> The sample includes two cross sections of 162 countries. The first cross section refers to the 1950-1975 subperiod while the second cross section refers to the 1976-2000 subperiod. For details about the construction of the variables see the text.

**Table 5**  
**Pairwise Correlations Among Dependent and Independent Variables, 1950-2000<sup>§</sup>**

	Citizenship laws	Changes in citizenship laws
Migration stock	-0.12**	0.08
Net migration flows	-0.11*	-0.03
Jus sanguinis as initial citizenship law	-0.64***	-0.24***
Civil legal origin	-0.15***	-0.15***
Decolonization	-0.09	0.36***
Berlin wall	-0.08	0.09*
Other border changes	-0.07	-0.03
Latin America	0.60***	-0.22***
Southern Europe	-0.05	0.09*
Small country	0.14**	0.05
Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.12**	0.15***
British or Portuguese colony	0.02	0.15***
Socialist	-0.25***	-0.10*
Oil	-0.13**	0.01
Political rights	0.29***	0.05
Catholic share	0.39***	-0.07
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization	-0.10*	0.17***
Government consumption	-0.03	-0.05
Share of young	-0.03	-0.13**
Log GDP per capita	0.05	-0.03
Gini Index	0.22***	-0.09

<sup>§</sup> The sample includes two cross sections of 162 countries. The first cross section refers to the 1950-1975 subperiod while the second cross section refers to the 1976-2000 subperiod. For details about the construction of the variables see the text.

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%

**Table 6**  
**The Determinants of Citizenship Laws: Multinomial Logit Estimates, 1950-2000<sup>§</sup>**

	(a)		(b)		(c)	
	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime
Migration stock	-0.051 [-1.86]*	-0.055 [-2.81]***	-0.054 [-1.79]*	-0.032 [-1.61]	-0.167 [-2.30]**	-0.045 [-1.53]
Jus sang. as init. cit. law	-2.044 [-4.39]***	-6.048 [-5.43]***	-2.712 [-4.99]***	-6.117 [-4.90]***	-4.568 [-5.24]***	-7.59 [-4.38]***
Period	1.887 [4.28]***	1.193 [3.02]***	1.409 [2.28]**	-0.272 [-0.47]	2.385 [2.65]***	0.211 [0.27]
Decolonization			-1.296 [-1.87]*	-2.211 [-3.41]***	-0.084 [-0.09]	-1.523 [-1.55]
Southern Europe			1.224 [2.03]**	-0.153 [-0.14]	1.234 [1.69]*	1.187 [0.87]
Latin America			-0.799 [-0.70]	2.866 [3.73]***	-0.621 [-0.51]	4.495 [2.93]***
Small country			-0.804 [-1.23]	0.415 [0.69]	-2.566 [-1.88]*	0.523 [0.64]
Jus san. X migration stock					0.156 [1.81]*	0.084 [1.75]*
Government consumption					0.035 [1.07]	0.063 [2.68]***
Share of young					-0.193 [-1.75]*	-0.397 [-2.43]**
Catholic share					0.012 [1.46]	0.01 [0.70]
Ethno. fractionalization					0.023 [0.02]	1.277 [1.02]
Political rights					0.548 [2.84]***	0.426 [2.46]**
Constant	-1.092 [-2.73]***	0.626 [2.48]**	-0.024 [-0.03]	1.353 [2.43]**	3.716 [1.05]	11.165 [2.09]**
Observations	300	300	300	300	224	224
Log likelihood	-195.77		-155.94		-95.24	
Maximum Likelihood R2	0.45		0.58		0.68	
McFadden's R2	0.32		0.46		0.57	
McFadden's Adj R2	0.29		0.4		0.44	
Cragg & Uhler's R2	0.53		0.68		0.79	
Count R2	0.71		0.81		0.83	
Adj Count R2	0.32		0.55		0.64	

<sup>§</sup> Jus sanguinis is the reference category. Robust z statistics in brackets, clustered at country level.

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%

**Table 7**  
**Marginal Effects for Multinomial Logit Estimates, 1950-2000, Full Specification<sup>§</sup>**

	Jus sanguinis regime	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime
Migration stock	0.025 [0.010]**	-0.023 [0.011]**	-0.001 [0.004]
Jus sanguinis as initial cit. law	0.875 [0.047]***	-0.193 [0.075]**	-0.681 [0.086]***
Period	-0.303 [0.155]*	0.336 [0.117]***	-0.034 [0.077]
Decolonization	0.123 [0.155]	0.016 [0.125]	-0.139 [0.079]*
Southern Europe	-0.291 [0.193]	0.170 [0.166]	0.121 [0.236]
Latin America	-0.611 [0.147]***	-0.194 [0.068]***	0.805 [0.140]***
Small country	0.088 [0.149]	-0.203 [0.064]***	0.114 [0.133]
Jus sanguinis X migration stock	-0.027 [0.011]**	0.021 [0.014]	0.006 [0.007]
Government consumption	-0.010 [0.005]**	0.004 [0.005]	0.007 [0.003]**
Share of young	0.061 [0.023]***	-0.018 [0.016]	-0.043 [0.020]**
Catholic share	-0.002 [0.002]	0.001 [0.001]	0.001 [0.002]
Ethno. fractionalization	-0.124 [0.219]	-0.028 [0.171]	0.152 [0.159]
Political rights	-0.107 [0.031]***	0.069 [0.027]***	0.037 [0.02]*

<sup>§</sup> The full specification refers to specification (c) in Table 6. Robust standard errors in brackets.

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%

**Table 8**  
**The Determinants of Change in Citizenship Laws: Logit Estimates (pooled), 1950-2000<sup>§</sup>**

	(a)	(b)	(c)
	Changes in citiz. laws	Changes in citiz. laws	Changes in citiz. laws
Migration stock	0.021 [1.89]*	0.014 [1.18]	0.031 [1.08]
Jus sanguinis as initial citizenship law	-1.182 [-4.04]***	-1.672 [-4.62]***	-1.133 [-2.14]**
Period	-0.417 [-1.46]	0.763 [1.60]	1.466 [1.84]*
Decolonization		1.798 [3.82]***	2.677 [3.06]***
Southern Europe		1.968 [3.18]***	1.943 [3.75]***
Latin America		-2.731 [-3.45]***	-2.356 [-2.29]**
Small country		-0.135 [-0.33]	-0.636 [-0.98]
Jus sanguinis X migration stock			-0.017 [-0.35]
Government consumption			-0.023 [-1.24]
Share of young			-0.199 [-1.77]*
Catholic share			0.000 [0.07]
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization			1.227 [1.46]
Political rights			0.112 [0.95]
Constant	-0.596 [-2.74]***	-1.326 [-2.88]***	3.844 [1.04]
Observations	300	300	224
Log likelihood	-154.7	-124.25	-85.05
Maximum Likelihood R2	0.08	0.25	0.27
McFadden's R2	0.07	0.25	0.29
McFadden's Adj R2	0.05	0.21	0.18
Cragg & Uhler's R2	0.11	0.37	0.41
Count R2	0.77	0.85	0.85
Adj Count R2	0.04	0.37	0.33

<sup>§</sup> Robust z statistics in brackets, clustered at country level.

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%

**TABLE APPENDIX**

**Table A.1  
Pairwise Correlations Among Independent Variables, 1950-2000<sup>s</sup>**

	Jus san. as initial c. l.	Civil legal origin	Migrat. stock	Net migr. flows	Decol.	Berlin wall	Other border chang.	Latin Amer.	South. Europe	Small coun.
Jus sanguinis as initial c. l.	1.00									
Civil legal origin	0.35 (0.00)	1.00								
Migration stock	0.02 (0.75)	-0.16 (0.01)	1.00							
Net migration flows	0.03 (0.54)	-0.01 (0.88)	0.45 (0.00)	1.00						
Decolonization	-0.31 (0.00)	-0.19 (0.00)	0.05 (0.39)	-0.02 (0.74)	1.00					
Berlin wall	0.23 (0.00)	0.16 (0.00)	-0.06 (0.33)	-0.06 (0.27)	-0.14 (0.01)	1.00				
Other border changes	0.06 (0.30)	-0.03 (0.56)	-0.03 (0.56)	0.01 (0.87)	0.06 (0.27)	-0.03 (0.53)	1.00			
Latin America	-0.43 (0.00)	0.04 (0.47)	-0.12 (0.03)	-0.18 (0.00)	-0.15 (0.01)	-0.11 (0.05)	-0.07 (0.22)	1.00		
Southern Europe	0.11 (0.04)	0.15 (0.01)	-0.10 (0.07)	-0.02 (0.73)	-0.12 (0.03)	0.09 (0.12)	-0.03 (0.57)	-0.10 (0.08)	1.00	
Small country	-0.20 (0.00)	-0.27 (0.00)	0.09 (0.14)	-0.05 (0.41)	0.14 (0.01)	-0.10 (0.06)	-0.01 (0.90)	0.11 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.85)	1.00
Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.11 (0.06)	-0.09 (0.12)	-0.10 (0.09)	-0.03 (0.65)	0.31 (0.00)	-0.14 (0.01)	-0.09 (0.11)	-0.27 (0.00)	-0.13 (0.02)	0.08 (0.15)
Brit. or Portug. colony	-0.21 (0.00)	-0.60 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.03 (0.58)	0.30 (0.00)	-0.17 (0.00)	0.08 (0.18)	-0.01 (0.84)	-0.09 (0.12)	0.44 (0.00)
Socialist	0.34 (0.00)	0.28 (0.00)	-0.15 (0.01)	-0.07 (0.24)	-0.17 (0.00)	0.48 (0.00)	0.04 (0.43)	-0.17 (0.00)	0.06 (0.25)	-0.20 (0.00)
Oil	0.08 (0.17)	-0.02 (0.72)	0.35 (0.00)	0.36 (0.00)	0.05 (0.36)	-0.07 (0.19)	-0.05 (0.41)	-0.08 (0.14)	-0.07 (0.24)	-0.01 (0.79)
Political rights	-0.10 (0.11)	-0.15 (0.01)	0.04 (0.52)	-0.00 (0.98)	-0.27 (0.00)	0.09 (0.13)	0.01 (0.93)	0.11 (0.06)	0.16 (0.01)	0.12 (0.05)
Catholic share	-0.24 (0.00)	0.26 (0.00)	-0.15 (0.01)	-0.14 (0.01)	-0.20 (0.00)	-0.05 (0.40)	-0.11 (0.05)	0.52 (0.00)	0.26 (0.00)	0.03 (0.58)
Ethno. fractionalization	-0.12 (0.06)	-0.25 (0.00)	0.01 (0.89)	0.09 (0.13)	0.24 (0.00)	-0.06 (0.31)	-0.09 (0.15)	-0.27 (0.00)	-0.16 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.73)
Government consumption	0.05 (0.44)	0.03 (0.61)	0.07 (0.25)	-0.02 (0.72)	0.02 (0.75)	0.19 (0.00)	0.03 (0.66)	-0.04 (0.51)	-0.07 (0.24)	0.10 (0.09)
Share of young	-0.10 (0.08)	-0.18 (0.00)	0.35 (0.00)	0.40 (0.00)	0.10 (0.08)	-0.21 (0.00)	-0.07 (0.19)	0.10 (0.06)	-0.22 (0.00)	0.10 (0.06)
Log GDP per capita	0.24 (0.00)	0.06 (0.32)	0.26 (0.00)	0.18 (0.00)	-0.54 (0.00)	0.25 (0.00)	-0.09 (0.16)	0.03 (0.64)	0.18 (0.00)	0.11 (0.08)
Gini index	-0.34 (0.00)	-0.08 (0.33)	-0.08 (0.33)	-0.12 (0.12)	0.05 (0.50)	-0.28 (0.00)	-0.11 (0.16)	0.49 (0.00)	-0.16 (0.05)	0.23 (0.00)



	Sub-Saharan Africa	Brit. or Portug. colony	Socialist	Oil	Polit. rights	Catholic share	Ethn. fract.	Gov. cons.	Share of young	Log GDP p. c.
Jus sanguinis as initial c. l.										
Civil legal origin										
Migration stock										
Net migration flows										
Decolonization										
Berlin wall										
Other border changes										
Latin America										
Southern Europe										
Small country										
Sub-Saharan Africa	1.00									
Brit. or Portug. colony	0.17 (0.00)	1.00								
Socialist	-0.27 (0.00)	-0.29 (0.00)	1.00							
Oil	-0.09 (0.13)	0.11 (0.05)	-0.14 (0.01)	1.00						
Political rights	-0.39 (0.00)	-0.08 (0.18)	-0.18 (0.00)	-0.20 (0.00)	1.00					
Catholic share	-0.06 (0.31)	-0.17 (0.00)	-0.15 (0.01)	-0.16 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)	1.00				
Ethno. fractionalization	0.61 (0.00)	0.15 (0.01)	-0.18 (0.00)	0.09 (0.12)	-0.36 (0.00)	-0.18 (0.00)	1.00			
Government consumption	0.16 (0.01)	0.17 (0.01)	0.14 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.62)	-0.25 (0.00)	-0.06 (0.37)	0.05 (0.48)	1.00		
Share of young	0.07 (0.21)	0.27 (0.00)	-0.19 (0.00)	0.43 (0.00)	-0.37 (0.00)	-0.19 (0.00)	0.24 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	1.00	
Log GDP per capita	-0.48 (0.00)	-0.17 (0.00)	0.18 (0.00)	0.07 (0.24)	0.55 (0.00)	0.07 (0.25)	-0.40 (0.00)	-0.03 (0.62)	-0.14 (0.02)	1.00
Gini index	0.31 (0.00)	0.18 (0.03)	-0.44 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.94)	-0.27 (0.00)	0.25 (0.00)	0.27 (0.00)	0.05 (0.58)	0.50 (0.00)	-0.34 (0.00)

<sup>§</sup> The sample includes two cross sections of 162 countries. The first cross section refers to the 1950-1975 subperiod while the second cross section refers to the 1976-2000 subperiod. For details about the construction of the variables see the text. P-value in parentheses.

**Table A.2**  
**The Determinants of Citizenship Laws: Multinomial Logit Estimates, 1950-2000<sup>§</sup>,**  
**Alternative Covariates**

	(1)		(2)	
	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime	Mixed regime	Jus soli regime
Migration stock			-0.056 [-0.81]	-0.013 [-0.36]
Average migration stock	-0.152 [-2.12]**	-0.052 [-1.62]		
Jus sanguinis as initial citizenship law	-4.533 [-5.09]***	-7.344 [-4.12]***		
Civil legal origin			0.941 [1.21]	-1.742 [-1.88]*
Period	2.397 [2.68]***	0.260 [0.33]	1.834 [2.84]***	-0.649 [-1.31]
Decolonization	-0.140 [-0.16]	-1.525 [-1.54]	1.509 [1.79]*	-0.003 [-0.01]
Southern Europe	1.218 [1.64]	1.062 [0.76]	0.908 [1.22]	0.595 [0.42]
Latin America	-0.667 [-0.55]	4.317 [2.73]***	-0.046 [-0.03]	5.436 [3.64]***
Small country	-2.503 [-1.90]*	0.560 [0.67]	-1.894 [-1.89]*	1.128 [1.29]
Jus san. X average migration stock	0.140 [1.65]*	0.040 [0.61]		
Civil legal origin X migration stock			0.019 [0.23]	-0.110 [-1.10]
Government consumption	0.036 [1.09]	0.063 [2.65]***	0.043 [1.25]	0.068 [2.59]***
Share of young	-0.197 [-1.78]*	-0.402 [-2.46]**	-0.096 [-1.16]	-0.247 [-1.98]**
Catholic share	0.012 [1.52]	0.011 [0.75]	0.006 [0.81]	0.017 [1.38]
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization	-0.035 [-0.03]	1.290 [1.03]	1.029 [0.85]	1.950 [1.74]*
Political rights	0.539 [2.78]***	0.436 [2.52]**	0.563 [2.58]**	0.276 [1.56]
Constant	3.831 [1.08]	11.273 [2.11]**	-3.567 [-1.04]	4.527 [1.01]
Observations	224	224	224	224
Log likelihood	-95.74		-132.01	
Maximum Likelihood R2	0.68		0.55	
McFadden's R2	0.57		0.41	
McFadden's Adj R2	0.44		0.28	
Cragg & Uhler's R2	0.78		0.64	
Count R2	0.83		0.75	
Adj Count R2	0.64		0.48	

<sup>§</sup> Jus sanguinis is the reference category. Robust z statistics in brackets, clustered at country level.

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%

**Table A.3**  
**The Determinants of Citizenship Laws: Ordered Logit Estimates, 1950-2000<sup>§</sup>**

	<b>(a)</b>	<b>(b)</b>	<b>(c)</b>
	Citizenship laws	Citizenship laws	Citizenship laws
Migration stock	-0.048 [-2.80]***	-0.032 [-1.95]*	-0.048 [-1.71]*
Jus sanguinis as initial citizenship law	-3.356 [-11.80]***	-3.452 [-9.25]***	-4.113 [-6.40]***
Period	0.882 [3.22]***	0.084 [0.24]	0.204 [0.37]
Decolonization		-1.761 [-3.90]***	-1.187 [-1.58]
Southern Europe		0.643 [1.31]	1.071 [1.80]*
Latin America		2.616 [4.02]***	3.756 [4.45]***
Small country		0.27 [0.55]	0.502 [0.74]
Jus san. X migration stock			0.045 [1.13]
Government consumption			0.044 [2.59]***
Share of young			-0.24 [-2.32]**
Catholic share			0.001 [0.17]
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization			1.28 [1.52]
Political rights			0.357 [2.93]***
Observations	300	300	224
Log likelihood	-210.85	-174.82	-117.59
Maximum Likelihood R2	0.4	0.52	0.61
McFadden's R2	0.26	0.39	0.47
McFadden's Adj R2	0.25	0.36	0.4
Cragg & Uhler's R2	0.46	0.62	0.7
Count R2	0.71	0.78	0.79
Adj Count R2	0.32	0.5	0.56

<sup>§</sup> Jus sanguinis is the reference category. Robust z statistics in brackets, clustered at country level.

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%

**Table A.4**  
**Inclusiveness index and citizenship laws index: OLS Estimates , 1950-2000<sup>§</sup>**

	Inclusiveness index	Citizenship laws index
Migration stock in 1960	0.003 [1.12]	-0.002 [-0.43]
Jus sanguinis as citizenship law in 1948	-0.078 [-1.24]	-0.223 [-2.10]**
Decolonization	-0.153 [-2.08]**	-0.166 [-1.71]*
Southern Europe	-0.096 [-1.20]	0.110 [1.29]
Latin America	0.387 [3.78]***	0.555 [5.30]***
Small country	0.020 [0.27]	0.049 [0.40]
Jus san. in 1948 X migration stock in 1960	-0.007 [-2.14]**	0.002 [0.30]
Government consumption	0.005 [1.62]	0.007 [1.95]*
Share of young	-0.025 [-2.18]**	-0.035 [-2.12]**
Catholic share	0.000 [0.23]	0.000 [0.37]
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization	0.147 [1.48]	0.190 [1.62]
Political rights	0.026 [1.57]	0.038 [1.45]
Constant	1.098 [2.57]**	1.259 [1.95]*
Number of observations	104	119
R-squared	0.549	0.536
Adjusted R-squared	0.489	0.483

<sup>§</sup> The sample is a cross section with averages over the 1950-2000 period. Robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered at country level.

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%

**Table A.5**  
**The Determinants of Change in Citizenship Laws: Logit Estimates, 1950-2000<sup>s</sup>,**  
**Fixed and Random Effects**

	<b>Fixed effects</b>	<b>Random effects</b>
	Change in cit. laws	Change in cit. laws
Migration stock	0.115 [0.74]	0.031 [0.84]
Jus sanguinis as initial citizenship law	-0.979 [-0.94]	-1.133 [-2.03]**
Period	1.256 [1.64]	1.466 [2.32]**
Decolonization	3.019 [2.15]**	2.677 [3.91]***
Southern Europe		1.943 [2.09]**
Latin America		-2.356 [-2.04]**
Small country		-0.636 [-0.97]
Jus san. X migration stock	0.009 [0.08]	-0.017 [-0.29]
Government consumption	0.057 [0.81]	-0.023 [-1.10]
Share of young	-0.067 [-0.24]	-0.199 [-2.00]**
Catholic share		0.000 [0.06]
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization		1.227 [1.44]
Political rights	-0.009 [-0.02]	0.112 [0.87]
Constant		3.844 [1.13]
Observations	92	224
Number of groups	46	118
Log likelihood	-16.282	-85.046

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%