

Concepts, Theories and Components of Citizenship Sociology

Farrokh Ghorbani Namvar¹, Isa Abedini^{*2}, Mohammad Reza Hassani³

¹Lecturer Executive Management in Farhngyan University (Pardis Allameh of Tabriz)

²Lecturer in Farhngyan University (Pardis Allameh of Tabriz) and Education zone 1

³PhD in sociology at the University of Mazandaran, Iran

*Corresponding Author Email: esaabedini@gmail.com

Received: 30 July 2015

Accepted: 20 October 2015

Published: 26 November 2015

Abstract: Citizenship is one of the most important social concepts that work in understanding the relationship between individual and society. The citizen is defined as a member of the political community who enjoys all the rights and accepts all responsibilities dedicated to membership. In fact, civil rights include the rights of citizens in relation to public institutions, such as political rights, the right to employment, the right to choose and be chosen, the right of the authorities, the right to be a judge. Therefore, the word is too general than political rights. So we can say that civil rights are considered when the human rights are applied within a civil society under a special rule for certain people in certain territories, legislation. In this article, the concept of citizenship, civil rights, concepts of citizenship, civic culture, history and theories of citizenship and citizenship views, including citizenship, liberal, communitarian, republican, feminist and ecological citizen are studied.

Keywords: Concept of citizenship, Civil rights, Citizenship culture, Citizenship perspective, Feminism, Ecological citizenship

Introduction

Originally, citizenship is called membership of the individual in a society. One who has rights and duties and equally participate in public affairs. Although the Euro-American domination on the concept of citizenship is obvious, Moncrieff, following the tradition of civic-republican, liberal and communitarian, recognized the essential elements as follows: dignity, rights, duties and participation (Ghosh, 2014).

Citizenship is one of the most important concepts and social ideas that work in understanding the relationship between individual and society. A citizen is defined as a member of a political community that enjoys all the rights and accepts the dedicated responsibilities. So what is clear is that members of a community are not considered as citizenship only for living in the city, but citizenship is a developed and evolved form of urban life that does not look only at the presence of "physical body" in the city. It mainly refers to the need of being aware of the citizenship rights, fulfilling the responsibilities and duties in the society and calls them necessary conditions for the promotion from the position of urban life to citizenship (Mani Far, 1997).

Concepts of Citizenship

The citizenship and its related concepts have been developed, limited and got varied meanings in different historical periods. The following includes some definitions of the most important concepts and terminology associated with citizenship.

Citizenship

Citizen composed of two words "City" which means the humane society and "zen" as the member of the community. Clearly, the mere gathering of people in a particular place and forming the human society, city, the citizenship cannot be formed. In other words, human society is a prerequisite for citizenship, but not a sufficient condition. People are called citizenship when they take the rights and responsibilities and fulfill them. Citizenship is a two-way relationship between the individual and society. From one hand, it implies guarantees the faithfulness of people in the society and on the other hand involves government support for the individual. It can be described as membership in the society and political institutions (Enayati, 2013).

Citizenship is a complex word with multiple meanings. Its political success in the past does not mean that the current status rests on the resolution or unity in the context of the election, political leaders or intellectuals. Different meanings represent different applications. First, citizenship is a moral judgment. The so-called good or true citizenship is a positive judgment about the morality of the person. This concept implicitly implies that the person is interested in the collective interest and well-being. Second, citizenship is an objective, empirical and descriptive expression. In this sense,

Citizenship is a particular set of duties and rights given to qualified individuals in a particular nation-state. Even though there were periods in which citizenship was related to a city government, in the present era, citizenship is linked solely to the nation state. Thirdly, citizenship can be regarded as an analytical interpretation. That is, citizenship includes a) maintaining a state and its leading members, b) government opportunities in creating the main members for political participation, or c) a combination of A and B (Morris, 1980).

Civil Rights

It includes rights for the citizens in public institutions, such as political rights, the right to employment, the right to choose and be chosen, the right to give a certificate and the right to judge. Therefore, we can say that this word is more general than political rights. Civil rights will be mentioned when it is formed within a civil society, under a special rule for certain people in a certain area (Amou Gholi Mir Akhouri, 2010). Civil rights are defined as follows:

- 1-it literally means something that by being responsible towards something, someone deserves it.
- 2- Because of protection from law, person deserves it.
- 3- Privilege
- 4- Power to create legal relations (Lotfi, 2009).

There are three types of rights related to civil rights:

1. Civil rights referring to individual rights in the law, which includes freedom of people to live in the desired place, free expression and religion, property and equal process of law
2. Political rights, especially the right to vote, elect and be elected
3. Civil rights which refers to the natural right of the individual to benefit from minimum standard of economic welfare and security, health benefits, social security and the minimum wage (Razavi, 2008).

Citizenship Culture

Along with several definitions of culture, different divisions of the concept (such as civic culture, organizational culture, rural culture, etc.) are presented. One of the divisions is citizenship, culture. Citizenship culture is a set of values, attitudes and fundamental common law that contains a sense of belonging, commitment and respect for common heritage and also recognize the rights and obligations of citizens. It is a vast concept that is close to the collective soul. This concept not only refers to learning the collective life, it also includes the acquisition of values, attitudes, skills and loyalty to the obligations of citizenship which sometimes called as "Democratic Citizenship". A key issue in the citizenship culture is to attain social capital. Social capital is the capacity and capability to interact with people and institutions and achieve the collective goodness. Among the features of

citizenship, trust and hope for future, self-esteem, humility, general partnership, open vision and the unity of tradition and modernity can be mentioned (Fatemi Nia, 2007).

Citizenship culture is the intersection of good governance, efficient organizations and active citizens. Citizenship culture is not created unless the government, organizations and citizens to be responsible and committed. There are two basic common elements in different levels; collective goodness and the citizens. The most important common goal in this arena is an attempt to get the collective goodness. It is a concept that unlike liberalism, there are greater consensuses over its meaning and evidences. In comparison to other concepts, it was less stressful and disputable.

History of Citizenship Theories

Citizenship is an idea which firstly flourished in Western Europe in the nineteenth century and spread along with sweeping. However, the beginning of a new attention to citizenship roots in English sociologist T. H. Marshall treatise published in 1971. He believed that citizenship is the necessary result of modern politics, and social-political consequences of the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. In this sense, citizenship includes all changes resulting from the transformation of traditional society into an industrial one.

The concept of citizenship is derived from a Latin word "Levinas" that in Greece refers to people who in "Police" city and had the political rights. Although in the Greek police was the politically independent unit which lived near the slaves and non-citizens, this situation did not mean that they could enjoy having citizenship authority and participation right in political affairs. Right to benefit from these privileges referred to the essence of human beings or some virtues. Those who failed in achieving the virtues and did not have the political virtue, they were deprived of this right (Navabakhsh, 2006).

Citizenship Approaches

Liberal Citizenship

Liberal theory, whether of citizenship or of anything else, begins with the individual; Liberalism's view of the individual shapes its views of all other social aggregations, including the state. Yet its (and our) understanding of the nature of individuals is both dynamic and woefully incomplete. In particular, new advances in the fields of psychology, evolutionary biology, human genetics and social science constantly unsettle received understandings about how individuals apprehend the world, about their motivations, rationality, spirituality, and behavior, and about the causal relationships that determine how these factors operate, and with what effects, in the real world. Partly for this reason, liberal theory has had to take individuals much as it finds them on the surface, while the scientists proceed with deeper investigations. This inability of liberal theory to advance an authoritative and convincing account of the individual poses a fundamental challenge to its coherence, one that I discuss below. The most influential early expositors of systematic liberal theory were John Locke and John Stuart Mill. Locke ([1690] 1960) viewed individuals as endowed with and animated by reason, characterized as the 'Voice of God,' through which they can discern and act upon the dictates of divinely given natural law (Isin & Turner, 2002).

According to Luck, the state is a collection of people which has been formed just to maintain, protect and advance the interests of civil society. He defines the civic interests in life with items like liberty, health, the welfare of persons and possessing some objects such as money, land, housing, furniture and appliances. This is the civil ruler's duty to fairly defend the right of all people and specifically each individual under its lordship and protect their legitimate ownership of what belongs to the earthly life. If a person thinks about violation of the law relating to social justice and equality for ensuring the protection of life, the state prevents him by threatening to punish and deny of benefits and the blessings of civil life.

John Stuart Mill is mainly thinking in the context of the liberal discourse and seeks to defend individual rights and prevent violations of them. Mill is always concerned with the total domination of the society and government on individual and afraid of this fact that it may limit the sphere of thought and action of the people. Locke and Mill intersection is in their defense of the individual and the right of the individual against society. The systems of "liberal democracy" that govern modern societies can be considered as a bridge. If we consider two poles for this bridge, one pole includes John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau and other thinkers who designed the bridge of liberal democracy and the other pole includes Mill (Zibakalam, 2009).

Communitarianism

Community is rooted in something prior to the political order of the state and, in the former it is based on something more substantive than the associational order of modern society. For many, community presupposes a social ontology which when examined closely turns out to be a non-social category and is frequently conceived of in cultural terms. Thus, political community is often seen to be rooted in a prior cultural community, for it is held neither the state nor society can provide enduring normative ties. The appeal to community thus inevitably invokes a certain opposition to modernity and the liberal tradition of individualism with its too 'thin' understanding of community. In the debate on citizenship this is particularly apparent. Communitarians argue that citizenship is rooted in a culturally defined community, while liberals argue that citizenship rests on individuals and that therefore political community is derivative of its members, who are always individuals. Whether citizenship as membership of a political community rests on the individual or a prior cultural or moral community is what divides the protagonists in this debate (Isin & Turner, 2002).

Communitarian philosophy may be related to the tradition of "conservative" sociology that tied with Tönnies, and partly Durkheim. Meanwhile, the critique of the Enlightenment project is seen. It may be argued that Communitarianism deconstructs the traditional ideas belonging to the left and right parties. For example, according to Communitarianism thinking, both the market and the welfare state are considered as dangerous to the lively and organic body of the community. Liberalism's emphasis on individual rights and abstract notions such as Enlightened Self-Interest, because of the neglect of the inherent nature of human beings and the collective nature of human existence, is subject to criticism.

Much of the popularity and appeal of Communitarianism results from its focus on real people in especial and real communities instead of abstract notions of freedom and individual rights. Communitarianism also tends to a socialist society in which the Collectivity and social justice issues are focused more than personal freedom and bourgeois. Recently, attention to the duties and responsibilities of people in the society, rather than the individual rights and freedoms, have been strongly emphasized by all Communitarians. Social compliance, in turn, firstly results of the informal controls based on domestic relations lie (Hughes, 1996).

Republicanism

Citizenship is a key concept in the ideas and policies of the Republicans or the tradition of civic republicanism. Citizens are considered as the equal and definite members of a political community. Their identity is defined along with their responsibilities and tasks in the political community. In Republicanism, citizenship is an action and a person who is not involved in the action, is not considered as a citizen; that is, the full membership in the political community is only possible through performing the citizenship duties and responsibilities. Doing public service is necessary for citizens by whom the political community will be able to define, explain and fix the equal citizens (Nourouzi, 2011).

The republican standards embedded in the ethical dimension of citizenship thus provide an ideal of what a citizen should be. Like other ideals, however, republican citizenship can take more or less stringent forms. At its most stringent, the republican conception seems to demand unquestioning loyalty and total sacrifice from the citizen. The Spartan mother who supposedly told her son to come back a hero from the war or to come back on his shield gave voice to this view. In its less stringent forms, the republican conception acknowledges that even good citizens should not forsake self-interest Tocqueville articulated this position when he praised the doctrine of 'self-interest properly understood'. Paying taxes, serving on juries, obeying the law, and attending to public affairs require the sacrifice of time, attention, and treasure, but such sacrifices are necessary if we are to preserve republican government and continue to enjoy the rights of the citizen (Isin & Turner, 2002).

Feminism

Feminism theories argue that the social systems oppress women and they believe that this oppression should be eliminated. However, the feminists have different approaches about the inequality and the way of overcoming these differences. Marxist feminists claim that the capitalist economic structures support the men with high paid jobs. Theorem solution is not merely the fall of capitalism as the source of the problem. Liberal feminism argues that all inequalities root in a lack of opportunities, education for women and the traditional attitudes to gender that limit the women's roles. It says that if there has been an equal opportunity for women's competition in all spheres of society, they will succeed. Radical feminists argue that regardless of the economic system and other inequalities that women are facing in their lives (such as racism), male dominance is the main problem and violence is a basic way of

controlling women. The solution lies in eliminating all forms of sexual violence and promoting the women's culture (Stolley, 2005).

Liberal feminism is somehow seems like feminism in the nineteenth century, while radical feminism refers to the twentieth-century feminism. Liberal feminism is sometimes dealt with the idea of reconciliation, while the radical feminist refers to conflict ideas whose story was once common in the 1970s, but perhaps more accurate interpretation is that liberal feminism liberal feminism was inspired to know that, without necessarily compromising Joe always has a superficial appeal. Precisely, radical feminism is one that roots in liberalism. It is not necessarily aiming reconciliation, it has the superficial demands, and it does not see the radical changes necessary for achieving the goals, while radical feminism has opposite ideas (Paak Nia, 2009).

Liberal feminism has long had the aim of getting right equal for women. This means that women enjoy equal civil rights with men. Liberal feminists have fought against the laws and traditions that see men deserved for getting the right but not women. Recognizing that formal equality is not enough, these groups want laws that call discrimination against women illegal. It allows women to have maternity leave and benefit in the workplace (Abbott & Wallace, 2001).

Recently the most important feminism criticism of liberal citizenship is that liberal citizenship has been created based on a masculine vision and therefore institutionalized a masculine measure. Contemporary feminists believe that women have been absorbed in a liberal democracy in an unfair and discriminatory manner. As a result, they are constantly faced with so-called problem "same-different". If the women's movement emphasizes on the women's rights and equal treatment or focuses on the especial gender-specific rights, will it be able to value the man and female differences and consider them as a tool for achieving full equality between the genders?

Forms Citizenship

Sexual Citizenship

Both women and 'sexual minorities' experience exclusionary citizenship practices. Women's exclusion from citizenship can be traced back to classical Greece where women, together with slaves, were non-citizens and only free men were deemed worthy to participate as citizens in the *polis*. In the modern era, the triad of liberal citizenship rights identified by Marshall were typically won by women in Western societies later than men and not necessarily in the order identified by Marshall. In particular, as late as the nineteenth century, when civil rights were generally well established for men in many Western countries, married women still did not exist as independent individuals with civil rights but were subject to the will of their husbands. Full civil rights were not achieved until well after the franchise. Women also typically won the vote later than men in the West; in postcolonial societies, in contrast, they won the vote at the same time, often reflecting their involvement in liberation struggles, although this has not necessarily translated into effective equal political citizenship with men (Isin and Turner, 2002).

Women are half of the human and they have received little attention on the evolution of science, history and politics. By playing role in the traditional system of division of labor, women perpetuated their historical role in capitalism system. Along with the continuation of patriarchy in the roles and functions of individuals in the society, the gender issue was traditionally absent in the social and political issues, especially the citizenship theories. The woman's presence in the private sphere led to their retardation and lack of enjoying some social and political freedom in the public sphere. The consequence of less presence was the powerlessness of women in decision-making processes in their life. In fact, humans, who are not agents, are powerless and in the present situation, a powerless person is not considered as a citizen (Nourouzi, 2010).

Environmental Citizenship

The resurgence of citizenship as a fashion able idea in the last decade of the twentieth century has been well documented. One side effect of this renewed interest has been the emergence of a long list of adjectival citizenships. For example, MacGregor and Szerszynski identify 'cyber citizenship, scientific citizenship, corporate citizenship, consumer citizenship, and global citizenship' as just a few of the pairings that have made an appearance in the literature'. In the environmental literature, at least environment al citizen ship', 'ecological citizenship', 'sustainability citizenship' and 'green citizenship' have been seen.² One problem with all of these adjectival citizenships is that it is not clear what the adjective does to the idea of citizenship. It is common knowledge what 'British citizenship' means – a British citizen is a member of a particular political community with a particular set of institutions and defined territorial borders. 'British' is a qualifier that can be understood because it clearly relates to the core idea of citizenship as membership of a political community. But what does 'environmental citizenship' mean? (Bell, 2005).

At a basic level, ecological citizenship is concerned with the status, entitlements, and processes of participation that citizens enjoy in relation to the natural environment. However, as we shall see, the various terminologies of environmental citizenship embrace a wide spectrum of opinion on the shape and relative importance of these features. In this article, we therefore want to explore these different perspectives and examine their specific implications for our understanding of corporations.

The recognition and development of a form of citizenship appropriate for environmental issues and politics has spurred a growing stream of academic literature across the politics, philosophy, ecology, law, and sociology disciplines. Although some authors seek to make conceptual distinctions between alternative labels here—for instance, Dobson (2003) distinguished between *environmental citizenship* and *ecological citizenship*—for the sake of simplicity we will use ecological citizenship as a catch-all umbrella term in this article. This stream of literature has been characterized by a considerable degree of heterogeneity, and often a fair degree of imprecision, about what exactly ecological citizenship might constitute. In general, though, it is possible to discern three main strands, each of which characterizes ecological citizenship rather differently. First, there is the notion grounded in pre-modern ideas of identity and status being intimately tied to a certain physical territory or ecological environment rather than to a nation state and/or government (Curtin, 1999). Second, there is the notion of citizenship being grounded in the modern apparatus of liberal or republican citizenship and focusing predominantly on environmental rights (Shelton, 1991) or the common good (Sagoff, 1988), respectively. Third, there is notion predicated on non-territoriality that seeks to establish an entirely new basis for citizenship (Dobson, 2003; Kran, 2008).

Environmentally sensitive citizens must be world citizens. Ecological processes disregard the artificial and contrived borders of nation-states. Now this model of citizenship is nothing more than an environmental movement. That is why the question that what will eventually be the nature of environmental citizenship has not yet got a definitive answer. However, there are some comments in this regard that how the environmentalists should go beyond the Marshall's model of citizenship and create a global environmental citizenship.

The first issue relates to civil rights and this problem that who should be considered as citizens. Civic rights expanded by the social movements and now the environmentalists argue that it need to be expanded more than before. Firstly, the future generations must benefit from civil rights. In some respects, this proposal does not seem as controversial as in the first glance.

The rights of citizens, who are children now, are somehow considered. For example, the education and welfare services can be named. In addition, it is execrated that citizenship is also granted to those who are not yet born and it is expected that the current situation leads to this direction. It seems that Norway's constitution has met the expectation related to the environment in an amendment article. This article says that everyone has the right to benefit from an environment which provides health and preserves the forces of production and the diversity of natural environments. Natural resources should be exploited based on long-term and comprehensive considerations so that future generations also have the right to be protected (Nash, 2008).

The second issue is that global environmental citizenship is often seen as a liability in the nature. It is sometimes called environmental monitoring. Emphasis on responsibilities rather than rights has made a profound difference and conflict among the environmental movements and other social movements. The notion of responsibility is not a new idea, and in fact, it has been an inherent and permanent element of citizenship. However, social movements are mainly fighting to expand the rights of the citizens not to expand the duties and obligations. Therefore, there may be a conflict on this issue between environmental movements and other social movements because the expansion of welfare rights depends on the development of the capitalist economy. While some members of the green movement believe that the concerns of environment are compatible with the reproduction of capitalism, others argue that economic growth in the long run is not beneficial to the environment.

Thirdly, responsible citizens towards the environment are often linked to wider participation in political life. There are various proposals to increase the rate of participation. Eastward suggests that citizens should participate with experts in assessing the environmental risks that affect them and find solutions for dealing with it. Christopher offered some issues in transnational and international levels and argues that regional parliaments (such as a democratic European Parliament) should be established in areas with ecological importance so that they can tie the national boundaries to together. He says that a referendum should be held on environmental issues (Nash, 2008).

Conclusion

In fact, the civil rights are a mixture of duties and responsibilities of citizens towards each other, the state or ruler, the country's constitution and also the rights and privileges which determined by the city managers and authorities (municipalities), government or the ruling authorities. A set of these rights and responsibilities is called

"Civil Rights". Citizenship refers to everyday life, both personal and business activities of community members as well as their social activities and generally a set of individuals' behaviors and actions. So we can say that civil rights arises only when the human rights is formally and legally applied within a civil society following a particular rule in a particular territory and about specific people.

Finally, we can say that women are half of the human being population and have been disregarded during the evolution of science, history and politics. Women perpetuated their historical role in the traditional system of division of labor in capitalism's history. Along with continuation of the patriarchal roles and functions in the society, the gender dimension has traditionally been absent in the social and political issues, including the theories of citizenship. They are absolutely contradictory were deprived of full citizenship rights. That is, when women must have had such legal rights as men, they have been discriminated as opposite gender.

Second, when only the distinct behaviors could create full equality, women were considered as men. In such cases, physical and historical differences are neglected and it stopped women from the actual participation in the institutions and actions prepared for men, although they enjoy the rights associated with such participation. Third, some civil rights, especially social rights are differently allotted to women and men. In these situations women are treated as inferior citizens. According to feminists, the women contradictions and inconsistencies dates back to this fact that their citizenship is subordinate to men's one. Historically, until recently, men were considered as heads of households and the women's rights emerged in a framework which was based on the masculine rights (Nash, 2008).

At present, participation in environmental policy is largely informal and the environmental mobilization is mainly based on influence on government and the international institutions to legislate on environmental standards, media and advertising campaigns to influence consumer choices and the decisions related to the joint investment, providing education and environmental information. In other words, environmental policy is one that is driven out of the traditional political institutions and aims to promote a new political culture in relation to environmental awareness (Nash, 2008). As a result, citizens who are sensitive to the environment must be global citizens so that they can be influential in environmental policy.

References

- Abbott P, Wallace C, 2001. *Women Sociology*. Tehran: Ney Publication.
- Amou Ghoul Mir Akhouri N, 2010. Studying the civil rights in Islam, with an emphasis on the ideas of Imam Khomeini, *Theologian Letter*. 13: 83-67.
- Bell DR, 2005, *Liberal Environmental Citizenship*, *Environmental Politics*. 14(2): 179 – 194.
- Crane A, Dirk M, Jeremy M, 2008. *Ecological Citizenship and the Corporation: Politicizing the New Corporate Environmentalism*, *Organization and Environment*. 21(4): 371-389.
- Enayati T, Arasteh H, Zamani F, Nezafati Y, 2013. Relationship between Students' Knowledge of Civil Rights and their Social Behavior, *Journal of Ethics in Science and Technology*, 7 (2): 154-158.
- Fatemi Nia S, 2007. The culture of citizenship: the product of good governance, efficient organization and active citizen, *Journal of Social Welfare*. 7(26): 246-260.
- Ghosh S, 2014. Citizenship in Practice: Poverty Reduction and Self-Help Groups, *Journal of Asian and African Studies*. 49(4): 442 –456
- Isin EF, Bryan ST, 2002. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, Sage Publications Inc, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Joppke C, 2002. *Multicultural Citizenship*, in *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hughes G, 1996. *Communitarianism and Law and Order*, *Critical Social Policy*. 16: 17-41.
- Lotfi H et al., 2009. *Urban Administration and its position in the promotion of citizens' rights*, *Human Geography Quarterly*. 2: 1.
- Mani Far MR, 1997. *Urban radios and citizenship education*, *Media Seminars and Citizenship Education Book*.
- Morris J, 1980. *Observations on the Sociology of Citizenship: Obligations and Rights*, *Social Forces*. 59(1): 1-24.
- Nash K, 2008. *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics and Power*. Tehran: Kavir Publication.
- Navabakhsh M, 2006. Exploring the concept of citizenship from the perspective of sociology, *Journal of Sociology*. 2(1): 54-58.
- Nowruzi FU, Gul Parvar M, 2011. Evaluation of the sense of women from the citizenship rights and the related factors, *strategy quarterly*. 20: 167-190.
- Paak Nia M, Mardia M, 2009. *Sex domination*, Tehran: Ney Publication.
- Razavi M, Khazaei SA, 2008. Civil Rights in the discovery of the crime, *Journal of Law*. 9(4): 110-114.
- Stolley KS, 2005. *The Basics of Sociology*, United States of America.
- Zibaklam S, 2009. *Five Words about the government*. Tehran: Rouzaneh Publication.