

From: Participation, Responsibility and Choice: summoning the active citizen in western European welfare states.

Eds: Janet Newman and Evelien Tonkens

Amsterdam University Press, 2011

## Ch 1 Introduction

Janet Neman and Evelien Tonkens

New formations of citizenship occupy a central place in the modernisation of welfare states across Europe and beyond. A range of governmental and political projects swirl around the remaking of citizenship: the restoration of national identity, the responding to the challenges of social cohesion in a globalising world, and the attempt to reinvent relationships between people and the state. But at the centre of these struggles are notions of the 'active' citizen: one who is no longer dependent on the welfare state, and who is willing to take a full part in the remaking of modern societies. The active citizen is invited, cajoled and sometimes coerced to take on a range of responsibilities for the self, for the care of others and for the well being of communities. S/he is offered a range of opportunities to participate in a devolved and plural polity, as well as to exercise choice in the expanding marketplace of care and welfare services. And s/he is expected to take up opportunities for self-development and paid employment in order to contribute to national projects of survival and success in a globalising world. While there is now an extensive body of work on the encouragement of citizens to be active in the labour market, our focus is on three related but distinct dimensions of activation that focus respectively on:

- '*choice*' in the marketplace of welfare services;
- extended *responsibility* for individuals, carers, families and communities, and
- '*participation*' in service delivery, policymaking, governance and the polity.

These three comprise a new policy focus on 'active citizenship' in many nations – a focus that transforms older meanings of citizenship and that seeks to incorporate (or at least rework) older struggles. But although our focus is on current processes of

modernisation, it is important to acknowledge that the active citizen is not an image invented by all powerful governments: modern conception of the active citizen draw on older traditions and struggles.

### **The paradoxical rise of active citizenship**

How can we understand this rise of policies directed towards the active citizen? On the one hand, it can be argued to be a triumph of new social movements of the later decades of the 20th century. The women's movement, movements of patients and carers, disabled people's movements and the gay liberation movement, amongst others, all claimed more citizens' rights, both in terms of the redistribution of power and resources and in terms of recognition and voice. Three themes can be discerned in these demands. Firstly, a demand for participation: a demand to have more of a say in public debate, in politics and policy making, and wherever power is exercised. Secondly, a demand for recognition of the political and public aspects of what were considered private issues, such as sexuality and caring. Thirdly, a demand for more autonomy and choice: for the ability to shape one's own life, to be recognised as an independent person rather than a dependent subject.

There are valid reasons to argue that active citizenship is the crowning achievement of the work of new social movements. Many issues that a few decades ago were considered private and thus hardly issues of public deliberation and citizenship rights and concern have been brought into the public domain. Governments have come to recognize the importance of a citizen participation and choice, and some now acknowledge the political importance of care. 'Choice' and 'empowerment' have often become a seamless coupling, as in new policies on disability and elder care in some countries in western Europe. New issues as well as new topics have been included as issues of public importance, and citizenship itself – its inclusions and exclusions as well as its rights and duties – has become the focus of extended political attention.

From a different perspective we might suggest that active citizenship is not the triumph but rather the ultimate disowning or even devouring of social movements. The term active citizenship itself is an invention of policy makers, and the ideals of social movements, it can be argued, have been appropriated, adapted for policy purposes, and led to new strategies of responsabilisation or incorporation. That is, the idea of active citizenship is used to discipline rather than liberate and empower

citizens (Cruikshank 1990). For example, participation as a right and a form of empowerment may be transformed into participation as a duty in the service of policy aims. Policy makers try to activate as many citizens as possible, in order to manage tensions emerging from the transformation of welfare states: providing higher quality care with lower budgets, providing more safety by devolving responsibility for the management of social control to 'communities', or promoting healthy lifestyles in a climate of growing health care costs. Citizens' demands for inclusion are being remodelled as duties to be included and to include others. And while social movements sought to render so called private issues public in order to extend rights, transform politics and enhance their power, these same private issues are now the object of ever more intensive state intervention and state control. For example government policies now seek to stimulate unpaid care, to mould ideas on sexuality, to shape behaviour on parenting, diet and exercise, and to seduce or even coerce citizens into volunteering (Jones 2003).

Moreover, government policies have transformed the claims for choice, transforming it from a collective issue and as such an issue of solidarity, to an individual consumer issue. Now all are expected to make the best choices for themselves, regardless of others and, if need be, even at the expense of others. As such government policies can be viewed as transforming choice from a right to a duty; citizens sometimes have to choose between goods and services in order fulfil their citizen duties as 'demand steerers': to punish bad quality service providers by rejecting or withdrawing from their services and rewarding good quality by choosing in favour of these services.

Governmental promotion of active citizenship thus draws on the success of social movements and other struggles, recognising the capacities and competencies that marginalised and disadvantaged groups offer and utilising these in new policy framings. But which of the two perspectives on active citizenship sketched here makes most sense? Is active citizenship primarily a sign of disciplining and disempowering social movements, co-opting their demands for empowerment? Is citizenship in this manner stolen from those struggling for expansive conception of citizenship? Or does it crown three decades of efforts of new social movements to ensure participation and choice and to politicise the personal?

This question, we suggest, cannot be answered at an abstract level: we need more nuanced accounts of how different forces and pressures come together in particular

places, services and struggles. We also need to uncover the experiences of citizens themselves as they negotiate the identities which governments seek to bestow on them. That is, we need detailed empirical research of the kind offered by the contributions to this volume. Here we draw together contributions from Germany, the Netherlands, France, the UK, Norway, Finland and Italy, countries chosen because they demonstrate the range of reform trajectories in western Europe, and allow in-depth analysis of the issues that arise at the interface of different political projects and programmes. The contributors trace the emergence of new formations of 'active' citizenship, setting these in national historical, political and cultural contexts. They examine what happens as struggles 'from below' meet new governmental discourses in the context of the reform of welfare services. They suggest ways in which diverse policies, enactments and meanings of active citizenship interact in specific sites. And many of our contributors also drawn on detailed ethnographic research with service users, carers and citizens, so offering data on citizens' own meanings and practices of active citizenship. In doing so they point to important divisions and distinctions, patterns of inclusion and exclusion, and the reconfiguration of relationships between states and services, professionals and citizens, politics and policy.

The aims of the volume are, then,

1. To analyse the ways in which policies on active citizenship encounter and are overlaid on citizenship struggles within specific nations, regions or sectors;
2. To explore ways in which notions of choice, participation and responsibility are being translated and enacted in particular sites and services;
3. To highlight ways in which the policies and practices on active citizenship are transforming notions of public and private, and reworking patterns of inclusion and exclusion;
4. To explore how new relationships and identifications are negotiated, by citizens, professionals, carers, activists, consumers, residents and others.

These broad aims are delivered through a focus on processes of reform in western European welfare states. Gender is important to our project: in selecting the themes of responsibility, participation and choice we have been particularly concerned to identify their implications for women as citizens, whether as service users, providers, carers or activists (though where we deal with care, our focus is on social care rather than childcare). Gender has also informed our methodologies; several chapters have used ethnographic work to capture the everyday experience of citizens, and have preferred grounded analysis to grand theory, including that of welfare regimes but

also mainstream theoretical work on citizenship. Our volume privileges gender since our focus is primarily on the institutions of social welfare and the gender settlements on which these were founded. However such settlements were often inflected through colonial projects and national(ist) programmes of expansion and renewal. They are also based on forms of solidarity that assume homogenous, rather than heterogenous, populations. Such settlements are now of course profoundly contested and it is these contestations that are in part producing the struggles we are concerned with in this volume: struggles that cannot, we argue, be contained within specific nation states.

In the remainder of this introduction we develop a little further our three core concepts; highlight the importance of situating studies of active citizenship in the context of wider citizenship struggles and claims; and set out the contours and contributions of a multi-national approach. Each discussion is necessarily brief, but each provides important contexts for the studies which follow.

### **Key concepts**

#### *Choice*

Choice has been a long standing claim of many citizens burdened by dependent relationships with state services. The introduction of consumerist models of participation in a marketplace of public and private goods can be viewed, in part, as a response to long standing struggles by service users for more flexible and accessible models of service delivery – albeit struggles that are now largely becoming de-collectivised and depoliticised as the focus shifts to the individual, choosing citizen-consumer. Citizens are being invited to view themselves as market actors, expressing choice in a new market place of public and private goods (Sulkunen et al 1997). However many ‘free choices’, it can be argued, are not so free, as in practice there are no realistic alternatives, or the choices to be made are too complicated and unforeseeable to be attractive (Schwartz 2003, Tonkens and Swierstra 2002, 2005).

Consumerism is usually associated with the individualization of agency, stripping it from collective or solidaristic associations; it privileges choice while marginalizing issues of voice. This makes it highly attractive to some modernizing governments, offering a means of both de-collectivising social and welfare provision while at the same time promising both the empowerment of disadvantaged groups and new

routes towards a fair society (Clarke et al 2007; Clarke and Newman 2008, Newman and Vidler 2006). However, consumerism can also be considered as a new form of collective, solidaristic agency. A range of literatures now focus on the significance of agency expressed through the exercise of consumer power, with consumerism seemingly offering new ways of expressing solidarities and exercising political power both within and beyond the polities of individual nation-states. For example Hajer (1997) considers claims that the public, by exercising choices that move in the direction of a better environmental quality of life, produce new environmentally oriented policy discourses and give manufacturers an incentive to improve technologies that protect the environment. Sassatelli (2007) traces both the ways in which traditional consumerist organisations and other social actors – environmental groups, Fair Trade organisations, organisations concerned with ethical finance, organic food and many others - are framing consumer action in more political terms. In the context of this volume, we might point to struggles on the part of older people, disabled people and people with learning disabilities; each has opened up consumerism as a route to empowerment for groups traditionally dependent on a malignant combination of professional and bureaucratic power.

In this volume, these two faces of consumerism are scrutinized. When, where and under what conditions might we view consumerism as individualising or as having the potential for collective agency? And might there be other framings of 'choice' that might be significant? For example in what contexts might choice invoke ethical and moral, rather than market based, judgements?

### *Responsibility*

*Responsibilisation*, that is the tendency to stress active citizens taking responsibility for their own and each other's welfare and for community wellbeing, is a second pillar of the new care and welfare order (Garland 2000, Paddison et al 2008, Ilcan and Basok 2004). Notions of the active citizen bring into view forms of activity that have tended to remain invisible and unrecognised, part of the informal – and highly gendered - economies of care provision, neighbourhood participation and community self organisation. Processes of responsibilisation seek to extend these unpaid activities, and to open out new areas of both individual and collective responsibility. The idea of the responsible citizen, caring for others, nurturing and protecting communities and engaging practically in a whole range of projects, draw on highly gendered conceptions of the capacities of family, civil society and community.

The reshuffling of public and private in today's appeal for active citizenship is a key theme of this volume. One might argue that the successful slogan of the women's movement, 'the personal is political', has been turned upside down: governments policies promoting active citizenship in fact demand that citizens take more responsibility, particularly for those issues that were put on the agenda to be recognized as public to begin with by social movements. Now that they have been recognized successfully, governments tend to throw these successes back to citizens, with the more or less implicit message that, yes, these are indeed important topics, so we will from now on see to it that you go ahead and broaden your scope of personal responsibility to include these issues too: to live a healthy life style, to care for your neighbours, to behave in a sexually responsible manner. As such, the notion of active citizenship encompasses the enlargement of citizen responsibility in a range of social spheres (much broader than labour market activation policies, to which most attention has been placed in the academic literature on active citizenship).

### *Participation*

Conceptions of active citizenship invoke issues of agency, politics and power. Active citizens are invited to deliberate on policy options or service developments, or to contribute to an ever expanding array of new governance and partnership bodies. Such modern conceptions of the citizen participating in the polity draw on – but also transform - older republican conceptions of citizenship. Feminist scholarship had criticized the narrow conception of agency inherent in republican traditions (voting and other forms of participation in the formal polity), drawing attention to the importance of participation in the 'politics of everyday life', and broadening notions of both citizenship and of politics (Lister 2003). Such a politics potentially widens the social inclusion of groups whose citizenship status has been problematic, transforming children, disabled people and others from the 'objects' to the 'subjects' political agency (Lister 2007).

Citizens are thus invited to engage in a range of opportunities to participate in community based, policy related, service or governance decisions. We are witnessing a proliferation of deliberative forums such as citizen's panels, citizen's juries, service user consultations, governance boards and evaluation projects. Governments are also turning to web based and other technologies to expand

opportunities for participation. This turn to collaborative governance has diverse origins (Barnes et al 2007, Pollit 2003), bridging concerns about the health of civil society, the decline of trust between governments and people, the performance of services and problems of social exclusion. It thus offers different images of citizenship rights, duties and responsibilities (Doheny 2007, Jenson and Philips 2001).

### **Citizenship struggles**

The three discourses traced in the preceding section are not imposed onto a static and settled formation of European citizenship. Rather, they are overlaid onto existing patterns of contestation and struggle over the boundaries to, and meanings of, citizenship. In the next paragraphs we set out some frameworks that offer ways of conceptualising some of the dynamics and struggles taking place at the interface between 'active' and 'activated' forms of citizenship.

Our starting point is Marshall's (1950) pivotal work depicting a long march of liberal democratic citizenship through civic, political and social rights, with each stage of this evolution producing a thickening of the concept. This evolutionary framing of citizenship carries an implicit notion of natural development, rendering invisible the struggles that led to the expansion of rights and rendering citizens as the passive receivers of benevolent state reforms, patiently waiting to be served. It masks, that is, the struggles that produced a progressively more inclusive and substantial institutionalization of citizenship. Such struggles – on the part of workers, women, migrants and a range of social movements - mean that citizenship remains one of the most contested images in the political lexicon (Lister, 2003).

Newman and Clarke (2009) suggest that citizenship struggles can be understood as expansive or transformational. Expansive struggles focus on questions of access and inclusion to a more or less public realm of citizenship rights and entitlements. Transformative struggles seek to remake the relationship between the public realm and the 'private' realm of personal and domestic life, and to challenge structured forms of domination and subordination. Many social movements had a significant role in transforming the meanings and practices of citizenship, changing the public domain itself rather than simply demanding access to it and voice within it, and in the process changing the boundaries between what are deemed to be public, private and personal matters. Feminist politics and scholarship in particular has challenged the



separation of a public world of citizenship and justice from the personal world of relationships and care, noting how such a separation has bracketed care and other contributions to social well being from wider public recognition (Daly and Lewis 2000, Lister, 2003; McKinnon, 1989; Uberoi, 2003). Responses to this challenge include the attempt to expand a 'feminist ethic of care' from the private to the public domain (Tronto 1993; Sevenhuijsen 1998), or to link issues of care to dimensions of social justice (Lister et a. 2006, Barnes, 2006). In practice, transformative and expansionist citizenship claims can easily be entangled, for example in struggles around care.

Both expansionary and transformatory struggles may be subject to processes of cooption or retrenchment, thereby turning active citizenship from a citizen's demand into a governmental strategy. Expansive struggles may be subject to attempts on the part of dominant political projects to accommodate radical demands for access through a form of normative universalism (Duggan, 2003). This has certainly been the case where social movements, disability rights movements and forms of community activism have been co-opted in the political projects of making of new images of the active citizen, being potentially stripped of their radicalism in the process (Marinetti 2003).

The distinction between expansive and transformative is related to another pair often contrasted in citizenship debates: redistribution versus recognition. Though the vocabulary differs, the idea of citizenship as an issue of redistribution fits well with Marshall's message that citizenship is an evolution of rights with, for him, a stress on socio-economic rights to be guaranteed by the welfare state. The distinction between 'redistribution' and 'recognition' in citizenship struggles was added by feminist scholars (Fraser, 1995, Fraser and Honneth 2003, Lister, 2003, Young 1990). A focus on redistribution as the principle means of addressing inequality, it is argued, privileges class based inequalities to the neglect of other dimensions of differential access to power and resources. It also offers a narrow view of the person as producers and consumers of resources, neglecting other capacities and needs. The concept of recognition directs attention to how far particular groups have access to cultural and symbolic resources, how far their voices and contributions are recognised and the extent to which disadvantaged groups are afforded dignity and respect (Young 1990, Sennett 2003). The distinction between recognition and respect has been challenged (Lister 2004, 2007, Phillips 2003), and Fraser herself adds a third dimension, variously designated as participation (Fraser 2003) and representation (Fraser 2008) to the couplet of redistribution and recognition.

Nevertheless the distinction between redistribution and recognition still offers a helpful way of engaging with the transformations associated with the emergence of active citizenship in public and social policy.

While the development of welfare states had largely been founded on class based claims for redistribution, in the second half of the 20th century and beyond they became the focus of extensive – and sometimes competing – claims for recognition, as women, lone parents, black and minority ethnic groups, asylum seekers, ‘sans papiers’, lesbians and gays, disabled people, mental health service users, older people and others demanded political and social rights. These claims varied considerably, reflecting the history of oppression of and struggle by particular groups. But across these diverse movements we can see the emergence of claims for more ‘voice’ (the capacity to influence treatment by welfare institutions) and in some cases more ‘choice’ (the capacity to live independent lives). We can also see the emergence of claims for greater recognition for the skills and capacities citizens brought to their encounters with welfare institutions, challenging the ‘knowledge-power knot’ of professional power (Clarke et al 2007, Kremer and Tonkens 2006). The expertise and voice of ‘ordinary’ citizens now claims a legitimate space in both welfare interactions and the wider polity.

The current (often called neo-liberal) transformation of welfare states, and its stress on active citizenship, is tending to subordinate claims for redistribution. This draws on at least two dominant policy tropes: the idea that class based inequalities have largely been resolved in modern European states; and the idea that pressures of global economic restructuring now challenge the sustainability of welfare states. Each of these brings issues of recognition to the fore. The shift of responsibility from state to civil society and community, and thus to active citizens, draws on claims for recognition on the part of a range of constituencies, including faith based groups, black and minority ethnic associations, self help groups and alternative forms of provision. Yet if the claim for recognition leads to the devolution of responsibility, can we understand that as recognition? Is it indeed empowering? Or is it merely a matter of retrenching political responsibility (Schram 2000)? Again: is active citizenship disciplining and/ or empowering, or is there some other way of framing this question?

The extent to which we can see a fit between claims for recognition and welfare state restructuring is one of the questions we raise in this volume. We anticipate that this relationship will be played out in very different ways in specific sectors and services,

and in different welfare states. We do not wish to offer overly simplistic – and conspiratorial – interpretations of history, but instead want to draw attention to the idea that active citizenship is not just a new set of policy discourses but draws on already embedded resources and claims. We also do not wish to suggest that claims for recognition are now being tidily resolved through the elaboration of new welfare discourses. This is far from the case. Access to civic and political rights remains highly contested, and indeed struggles are intensifying as responses to patterns of inward migration in western European welfare states produces new categories of partial and conditional citizenship; as security concerns challenge long standing civic and political rights; and as new discourses of transnational citizenship emerge (Dwyer, 1998, Dryzek, 2006, Fraser 2008). At the same time the welfare settlements that inscribed social rights and thus worked at redistribution– albeit partially and differentially - are rapidly becoming unravelled in many states. Not only does this produce new patterns of activation, but also a range of coercive policies and strategies directed towards non citizens, marginal citizens and disruptive citizens (see Flint, 2009; Ruppert, 2006, Neveu, this volume).

### **The contribution of multi-national study**

This volume has contributions from a range of European researchers. As such this volume takes forward and extend previous comparative work, e.g. that of Siim (2000), who contrasted forms of politics and agency in France, Britain and Denmark from feminist perspectives, and Lister et al's (2007) study exploring gendered citizenship across Europe: see also Bellamy et al 2004. The concepts of active citizenship which we address in this volume – those of choice, responsibility and participation – each draw on forms of agency represented, to different degrees and in different ways, in particular national histories and traditions of citizenship.

But while recognising the significance of national formations ours does not set out to be a comparative project. Rather, our focus is on how different meanings of active citizenship collide, intersect and perhaps stand in tension with one another within – and across - nations. In unravelling contested meanings several contributors refer to common typologies of citizenship: for example that distinguishing between socio-liberal, communitarian and republican ideals of citizenship, each of which may be unevenly aligned with newer neo-liberal rationalities. In brief, socio-liberal citizenship – in the tradition of T.H.Marshall – affords citizens some measure of civic, political and social rights, and in return expects citizens to fulfil legal duties and meet other

obligations. Communitarian citizenship emphasises traditional values and virtues, including those of responsibility, and looks towards the family and to civil society rather than the state. Republican citizenship focuses on the citizen as member of the polity, exercising their citizenship through participation in the public sphere and democratic deliberation. Neo-liberal citizenship may draw on each of these, together with strands of libertarian thinking, but primarily strips the citizen from ties of solidarity and inserts him or her into the global market place as a mobile, flexible worker and consumer<sup>1</sup>. Such categories map unevenly onto theories of welfare regimes, long the focus of extensive critical engagements. Feminist scholarship in particular has continued to highlight the contested relationship between work and care, challenging Esping-Andersen's class based typology of welfare regimes in order to accommodate the state-family nexus and the gendered divisions of work (Lewis, 1992, Lewis and Ostner 1994; and see review in Lister et al 2007).

We find these 'ideal types' of citizenship or of welfare regimes less than helpful for our purpose since what is at stake are highly dynamic political processes which reshape and rearticulate these idealised formations. The divergent origins and enactments of active citizenship mean that the figure of the active citizen is complex, condensing often contradictory trends and embodying different forms of agency. The dilemmas and tensions produced by these contradictions are likely to take different forms in different nation states, as new conceptions of citizenship are inflected through older meanings and practices, and as the politics of specific national reform programmes are negotiated. Furthermore the nation state may however not always be the most useful focus of analysis: we have to take account of the 'rescaling' of citizenship within and beyond the nation (Grundy and Smith, 2005) and the multi-tiered character of citizenship in a globalising world (Lister 2007).

As such we have attempted to avoid forms of 'methodological nationalism' that assume a coherent relationship between people and place (Clarke and Fink, 2009). Instead in the next chapter we explore active citizenship as a travelling idea that is translated and enacted in plural ways not only in nations but also in regions, localities and sectors, and that is inflected through transnational processes of migration and care. Our project, then, is not one of systematic comparison, but of the development

---

<sup>1</sup> more nuanced typologies, linked to labour market activation, are to be found in Johansson and Hvinden (2005 and XXX).

of theoretical insights enabled by looking across a range of interesting studies by leading authors in their fields. The agency of researchers themselves is also implicated here. The diverse approaches to the topic of active citizenship taken by our contributors reflect their starting points in different *problematics* raised by the turn to active citizenship in different countries, and also by the political and cultural contexts in which they work. Not only are our contributors asking different questions, they are also inevitably studying different things. That is, the discourse of active citizenship in each country, municipality, sector or profession raises different policy and political problems as it confronts established ways of thinking in specific national or sub-national contexts – as contemporary imagery is overlaid on historical tracings, and as new political projects confront sedimented institutional and cultural forms.

The rich resources – theoretical and empirical – that this offers mean that the volume as a whole, we think, offers new ways of engaging with the notion of active citizenship. This is, we suggest, not just a category called forth by new governmental strategies but a figure that condenses a range of struggles, relationships and practices; that connects historical formations to current strategies; and that works across different scales and sites of analysis.

### **The structure of the book**

We begin with a chapter on active citizenship as a travelling idea. As we argue here, this volume takes forward previous work comparing citizenship regimes, is not itself a comparative project. In chapter 2 we establish two framings for the country specific chapters that follow. The first explores active citizenship as a travelling idea, whose meanings are translated not only by national political and policy actors, but also by regional and municipal governments, civil society organisations and citizens themselves. The emphasis here is on the fluidity of meanings and the active role of those interpreting and enacting policy. The second framing focuses on active citizenship as a series of political projects that seek to ‘fix’ the meaning in particular ways in particular places. We argue that both framings are needed to avoid the ‘methodological nationalism’ that often characterises comparative projects, and to surface tensions and dynamics that arise in specific sectors, services and territories.

The next two chapters offer studies of the politics of reform in continental European nations as the imperatives of modernisation confront established welfare regimes and embedded formations of citizenship. In chapter 3 Ellen Kuhlmann focuses on

the place of active citizenship in the modernisation of health care in Germany, where citizens are invited to be 'governments little helpers' in the projects of challenging institutional and professional power. She demonstrates how trajectories of active citizenship are shaped by existing cultural and institutional formations – in this case the pillarised system of health care provision (in which choice is already deeply institutionalised) and the Bismarkian notion of citizenship. She also shows how new configurations of welfare and citizenship are mediated by citizen professionals. Kuhlmann uses the idea of 'patchy activation' to suggest tensions between different discourses of citizenship and the constraints placed on the new agenda of choice.

Evelien Tonkens (Chapter 4) traces the evolution of different notions of active citizenship in the Netherlands. She shows how the democratic movements of the 1970s paved the way for the elaboration and recognition of 'voice'. However from the 1980s onwards she highlights the withdrawal of state responsibility for welfare provision linked to a process of delegating responsibility to citizens. In asking 'why did the communitarians win', despite the power of patient's and other social movements, she notes the significance of responsibility as appealing both to governments (as a way of delegating problems and achieving cost reductions) and to citizens themselves (as a way of challenging individualism and achieving social cohesion).

We then move to the ways in which Nordic welfare states are inscribing new norms of active citizenship in contexts marked by strong public values and rights based citizenship cultures. Both focus on services for older people. In chapter 5 Anneli Anttonen and Liisa Häikiö trace the evolution of the idea of active citizenship in official policy in one city, showing how responsibility, participation and choice work with and against each other. They then turn to the experience of those providing unpaid care and highlight major tensions between official discourse and everyday care practices. They also show however how unpaid carers can bring a critical discourse into their negotiations with municipalities responsible for care, but how this voice is becoming individualized as consumer logics displace collective citizenship norms.

Mia Vabø, in Chapter 6, traces the evolution of norms of active citizenship in Norwegian elder care through the era of welfare expansion, an era of radical decentralisation and the new era of rationalisation, regulation and consumerism. While the focus in chapter 5 was on unpaid care and active citizenship, here the

primary focus is on consumers, but again attention is drawn to the uneven articulations of rights based discourse and new norms of active citizenship. Vabø tells the story of the Norwegian elder revolt of the 1990s and the later emergence of a campaigning organisation fighting for improvements in elder care. She also draws on empirical research to highlight some of the paradoxes of the consumerist turn in social policy, and the inequalities that may result.

Consumerism is also a key theme of Janet Newman's chapter on the UK (Chapter 7). The UK tends to be viewed as a prime example of a neo-liberal state, in which work and consumerism dominate current programmes of modernisation and welfare reform. But she argues that such a depiction tends to simplify what have been complex trajectories of change. She highlights differences between the forms of active citizenship mobilized in health, social care and in policies directed towards community participation, highlighting the significance of institutional mediations. She also traces some of the tensions that are produced, and the erasures and displacements of other forms of citizenship attachment and activity.

Sectoral and regional differences are highlighted by Ota de Leonardis in Chapter 8. She draws on empirical research on social/health care and social housing policies, focusing in particular on their impact on the 'weakest recipients'. She traces new models of contractualisation and how far these produce support for the exercise of citizen's rights and how far they lead to dynamics of discipline and exclusion. She draws out key distinctions between different regions, and suggests the significance of the territorial modes of governance through which emergent models of active citizenship are becoming crystallised.

Catherine Neveu (Chapter 9) continues the theme of territorial governance. She shifts the focus to local democratic participation, with an exploration of the variety of roles assigned to citizen-agents in democratic forums. The constitution of citizens according to an array of discursive categories – users, consumers, citizens, residents, actors or 'the public' – matters, she argues, since each offers specific roles and implies particular competences and positions. They can thus provide insights into the political projects at stake in a particular context. But they also draw attention to the representations of different publics held by institutions, and to the conceptions of democracy and citizenship on which such representations draw. The distinction between individual conceptions of citizenship and those which draw on some kind of collective belonging or imaginary is, she suggests, particularly significant.

The continued significance of collective struggles is brought into view in Chapter 10, where Marian Barnes examines the significance of the Carers' movement in England, highlighting ways in which different discourses of active citizenship in relation to care are being mobilised. The movement, she suggests, has had considerable impact in terms of the recognition given to the carer role in public policy, and in terms of specific policies designed to support and 'empower' carers. However she also highlights tensions between the different notions of responsibility elaborated in government policy and by carers themselves; and suggests ways in which the consumerist image of citizenship that dominate the discourse fail to reflect the relational, moral and ethical perspectives on care held by carers themselves.

Together these contributions raise key issues that are examined in four cross cutting thematic chapters. Chapter 10 explores active citizenship as both a travelling idea and as a set of political projects. It argues that these two forms of analysis need to be brought together in cross national research in order to capture tensions and dynamics rather than static pictures of national difference. It treats the nation as more than just the 'context' in which notions of active citizenship are enacted, exploring ways in which such notions are generated, negotiated and mediated at multiple scales and in multiple sites of analysis. Such an approach, we suggest, enables us to surface key tensions that work across, as well as within, national reform projects.

Ch 11 – *Responsibility, participation and choice* - reviews the contributions of this volume to an understanding of these interrelated pillars of reform. In relation to each concept – or 'keyword' – we highlight its contested meaning; trace its evolution in policy discourse in particular countries; and review the data from our contributors on the experiences and perspectives of citizens themselves. The chapter then suggests the significance of ways in which these different discourses are being articulated, and the inclusions, exclusions and inequalities that may result from dominant formations. Finally it returns to the issue of the relationship between social movement claims and new policy discourses, arguing for a nuanced and situated analysis of the relationship between discourse and social agency.

Ch 12 - *Active citizens, active professionals? Diverging paths of new professionalism* explores the impact of active citizenship on professionals and other workers. We suggest three different regimes of professionalism that shape the interaction between



providers and consumers in different ways; trace the impact of changing landscapes of power on traditional conceptions of the professions; and explore ways of conceptualising professionals as both active and activated citizens.

Ch 13 – *Publics, politics and personal lives* – reviews the contributions of this volume in relationship to the claim that we are witnessing a wholesale privatisation of formerly public duties and responsibilities. It explores the public/private boundary as a dynamic around four relationships: state/market; collective/individual; public/personal; and personal/political. These each offer a way of understanding the shifting dynamics of welfare reform; but the focus on the relationship between public, personal and political opens up issues brought into visibility by feminist politics and scholarship. The chapter then reviews some of the resources on which a feminist project of researching active citizenship might draw, and identifies issues for future research.

## References

- Barnes, M (2006) *Caring and Social Justice*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beckett, A.E. (2005) 'Reconsidering citizenship in the light of the concerns of the UK disability movement', *Citizenship Studies*, 9 (4): 405-421.
- Bellamy, R, Casiglione, D, and Santoro, E, eds (2004) *Lineages of European Citizenship*. Basingstoke, Palgrave,
- Benhabib, S, ed (1996) *Democracy and Difference: contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brown, M (2006) 'Sexual Citizenship, political obligation and disease ecology in gay Seattle', *Political Geography*, xx: 1-25.
- Chatterjee, P (2004) *The Politics of the Governed*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Clarke, J, Newman, J, Smith, n, Vidler, E and Westmarland, L (2007) *Creating Ciizen Consumers: Changing publics and changing public services*. London, Sage.

Cruikshank, B (1990) *The Will to Empower: democratic citizens and other subjects*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Daly, M and Lewis, J (2000) 'The concept of social care and the anlysis of contemporary welfare states' *British Journal of Sociology*, 51 (2): 281-98.

Desforges, L, Jones, R and Woods, M (2005) 'New Geographies of Citizenship'. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (5), 439-451.

Dobson, A (2003) *Citizenship and the Environment*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Doheny, S (2007) 'Responsibility and the Deliberative Citizen: theorising the acceptance of individual and citizenship responsibilities. *Citizenship Studies* 11 (4): 405-420.

Dryzek, J (2006) *Deliberative Global Politics: discourse and democracy in a divided world*. Cambridge: Polity.

Duggan, L (2003) *The Twilight of Equality*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Dwyer, P (1998) 'Conditional citizens: welfare rights and responsibilities in the late 1990s'. *Critical Social Policy*, 18: 493-517.

Flint, J (2009) 'Subversive subjects and conditional, earned and denied citizenship' in Barnes, M and Prior, D, *Subversive Citizens: power, agency and resistance in public services*. Bristol, Policy Press.

Fraser, N (2008) *Scales of Justice: reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. Cambridge, Polity.

Fraser, N and Honneth, A, eds (2003) *Redistribution or Recognition? A political-philosophical exchange*. London, Verso.

Fung, A. and Wright, E.O. (2003) *Deepening democracy. Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance*. London, Verso

Garland, D. (2001) *The culture of control. Crime and social order in contemporary societies*. Oxford, Oxford U.P

Grundy, J and Smith, M (2005) 'The politics of multi-scalar citizenship: the case of lesbian and gay organizing in Canada'. *Citizenship Studies*, 9 (4); 380-409

Hajer, M (1997) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Huysmans, J (2005) *The Politics of Insecurity. Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU* London: Routledge.

Ilcan, S. and T. Basok (2004) Community government: voluntary agencies, social justice and the responsabilisation of citizens. *Citizenship studies* vol 8 nr 2, 129-144

Isin, E.F and Wood, P.K. (1999) *Citizenship and Identity*. London, Sage.

Jenson, J. en S. Philips (2001) 'Redesigning the Canadian citizenship regime: remaking institutions for representation.' In: 'C. Crouch, K. Eder and D. Tambini (eds.) *Citizenship, markets and the state*. Oxford U.P., Oxford

Jones, P.S. (2003) 'Urban regeneration's poisoned chalice: is there an *Impasse* in (Community) Participation Based politics? *Urban Studies*. Vol. 40 (3) 581-601

Kremer, M. en E. Tonkens (2006) 'Authority, trust, knowledge and the public good in disarray.' in: T. Knijn and M. Kremer, *Professionals between people and policy*. Amsterdam University Press, pp. 122-136

Latta, A (2008) 'The ecological citizen', in E.F.Isin, ed *Recasting the Social in Citizenship*. Toronto. University of Toronto Press.

Lewis, G, ed (2004) *Citizenship: personal lives and social policy*. Bristol, Policy Press.

- Lewis, J (1992) 'Gender and the development of welfare regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy* 2 (3) 159-173.
- Lewis, J and Osnter, I (1995) 'Gender and the Evolution of European Welfare States' in S.Leibfried and P. Pierson, eds, *European Social Policy: between fragmentation and integration*. Washington, Brooking: 159-194.
- Lewis, J, Knijn, T, Martin, C and Ostner, I (2008) 'Patterns of Development in Work/Family Reconciliation Policies for Parents in France, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK in the 2000s. *Social Politics*, Fall: 261-286.
- Lister, R (2003) *Citizenship: feminist perspectives*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lister, R (2002) 'Sexual Citizenship', in E.F.Isin and B.S.Turner, *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London, Sage.
- Lister, R (2004) *Poverty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lister, R (2007) 'From object to subject': including marginalized citizens in policymaking' *Policy and Politics* 35, 3: 437-55.
- Lister, R, Williams, F, Anttonen, A, Bussemaker, J, Gerhard, U, Heinen, J, Johansson, S, Leira, A and Siim, B (2007) *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe*. Bristol, Policy Press.
- Marinetto, M. (2003) 'Who wants to be an active citizen? The politics and practice of community involvement.' *Sociology*, 37 (1), 103- 120
- MacKinnon, C.A. (1989) *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marshall, T.H (1950) *Citizenship and social class*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Morris, J (2005) *Citizenship and Disabled People*. London, Disability Rights commission.
- Mouffe, C (1992) 'Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics', in J. Butler and J.W. Scott, eds, *Feminists Theorise the Political*. London, Routledge.
- Newman, J and Clarke, J (2009) *Publics, Politics and Power: changing the public in public services*. London, Sage.
- Newman, J, Glendinning, C and Hughes, M (2008) 'Beyond Modernisation: social care and the transformation of welfare governance', *Journal of Social Policy* 37 (4): 531-558.
- Newman, J and Vidler, E (2006) 'Discriminating customers, responsible patients, empowered users: consumerism and the modernisation of health care', *Journal of Social Policy* 35 (2): 193-209.
- Paddison, R., I. Docherty, R. Goodlad (2008) 'Responsible participation and housing: restoring democratic theory to the scene', *Housing Studies*, vol. 23, n.1, 129-149
- Phillips, A (2003) 'Recognition and the struggle for political voice', in B. Hobson, ed, *Recognition struggles and social movements*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Pollitt, C. (2003) *The essential public manager*. Berkshire, Open U.P.
- Prokhovnik, R (1998) 'Public and Private Citizenship: from gender invisibility to feminist inclusiveness'. *Feminist Review*, 60: 84-104.
- Richardson, D (1998) 'Sexuality and Citizenship'. *Sociology*, 32, 1: 83-100.
- Ruppert, E (2006) *The Moral Economy of Cities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sassatelli, R (2007) *Consumer Culture: history, theory, politics*. London, Sage.

- Schram, S. F. (2000) *'After Welfare. The culture of postindustrial social policy.* New York U.P., New York/ Londen,
- Schwartz, B. (2003) *The paradox of choice. Why more is less.* New York: Harper Collins
- Sennett, R. (2003) *Respect in an age of inequality* Norton, New York
- Sevenhuijsen, S (1998) *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care.* London, Routledge.
- Siim, B (2000) *Gender and Citizenship: politics and agency in France, Britain and Denmark.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Sulkunen, P., J. Holmwood, H. Radner and G. Schulze (eds.) (1997) *Construction the new consumer society.* Londe, MacMillan
- Swierstra, T. en E. Tonkens (2002) 'Klakkeloze keuzevrijheid. Kanttekeningen bij de dominantie van keuzevrijheid in hedendaags beleid.' [Freedom of choice unlimited. Reflection on the dominance of the ideal of free choice] *Filosofie en praktijk*, jrg. 23, nr.2, pp.3-18
- Swierstra, T. en E. Tonkens (2005) 'Kiezen als burgerplicht. Conclusies', [Choice as citizens'duty.] in: M. Hurenkamp en M. Kremer *Vrijheid verplicht. Over tevredenheid en de grenzen van keuzevrijheid.* Amsterdam, Van Genneep
- Tronto, J (1993) *Moral Boundaries.* New York, Routledge,
- Uberoi, P (2003) 'Feminism and the public-private distinction', in G. Mahajan and H. Reifeld, eds, *The Public and the Private: issues of democratic citizenship.* London and New Delhi, Sage.
- Weeks, J (1998) 'The sexual citizen', *Theory Culture and Society* 15 (3-4): 35-52.
- Young, I.M. (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* Oxford, Princeton University Press.

