

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Wiesner, Claudia; Björk, Anna; Kivistö, Hanna-Mari; Mäkinen, Katja

**Title:** Introduction: Shaping Citizenship as a Political Concept

**Year:** 2018

**Version:** Accepted version (Final draft)

**Copyright:** © 2018 Routledge

**Rights:** In Copyright

**Rights url:** <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

**Please cite the original version:**

Wiesner, C., Björk, A., Kivistö, H.-M., & Mäkinen, K. (2018). Introduction: Shaping Citizenship as a Political Concept. In C. Wiesner, A. Björk, H.-M. Kivistö, & K. Mäkinen (Eds.), *Shaping Citizenship : A Political Concept in Theory, Debate, and Practice* (pp. 1-16). Routledge. *Conceptualising Comparative Politics*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315186214-1>

## **Shaping Citizenship as a Political Concept**

Claudia Wiesner, Anna Björk, Hanna-Mari Kivistö, and Katja Mäkinen

This volume focuses on citizenship as a contested concept. We understand citizenship—as well as other key concepts in politics and Political Science—as objects of interpretative disputes both in their empirical reality and when they are used as analytical categories. This theoretical and methodological perspective on concepts challenges the common understanding and usage of concepts in Political Science in general, and in Comparative Politics in particular.

A widely shared understanding in Political Science is that concepts serve as our tools, or lenses, with which we analyse reality. This is why it is important to carefully reflect on the concepts used. The way we choose and interpret a concept also shapes the lens with which we analyse reality—it shapes our angle, our way of analysis and our research design. The character and properties of the lenses and tools we use affect the way we obtain different views on reality and they can change our analytical results.

To carefully reflect upon a concept is especially important where it is the basis for the comparative method of analysis. This is why a number of renowned comparativists such as Giovanni Sartori (1970) or Philippe Schmitter (2017) have underlined that it is crucial to be precise and reflected in defining and operationalising the research concepts. In a positivist approach, which is not infrequent in Comparative Politics, a concept then is understood as something that just needs to be defined and operationalized, in order to measure something on this basis.

In this volume we argue contrary to such a positivist and essentialist view and suggest a reflexive and constructivist perspective on concepts instead. This opens up a broader

perspective, related to an understanding of concepts that has been opened up in the introductory volume to the book series “Conceptualising Comparative Politics”, where Spanakos (2015, 10-11) argues that researchers can use concepts as lenses, scripts and building blocks in Comparative Politics. As stated above, concepts are often used as lenses, which affect how things are seen and also make phenomena visible that might not be recognized otherwise. When used as building blocks, concepts serve as tools for categorising the phenomena under analysis. Concepts can also be understood as scripts, which emphasize the ambiguity, contradiction and change inherent in concepts. Sharing particularly the idea of concepts as scripts, we argue that a concept such as citizenship does not have one single meaning, let alone an essential meaning. Rather, it should be regarded as being socially constructed and used in a reflexive way.

This also means—and it is one of our key points—that a concept is not only a tool for analysis, but can also become an object of political controversy and struggle *itself*. The approach we propose hence does not only entail to reflect upon the usage and understanding of concepts as research instruments and categories of analysis. We also take concepts themselves as research objects and study how they are socially constructed by various actors. Usages, meanings and interpretations of concepts come into focus: how are concepts used in arguments and what is done with and through them? The approach suggested, then, is based on understanding linguistic activity as political activity and vice versa. Therefore, in this book, we analyse citizenship as a concept that is subject to political dispute. The policies related to citizenship, or the political reality, and the political practices that are tied to the concept, vary in different contexts and circumstances, and they are topics of political conflict.

In sum, we are not only interested in citizenship as an analytical lens, a script, and a building block of comparative studies, but also as a historical, changing, contested and controversial

political concept. We explore how it is constructed through the usages of the concept in various theories, debates and practices.

### **The Contestedness of Concepts: A reflexive approach**

We argue that it is important for the usage of concepts in the Social Sciences and Comparative Politics in general to study concepts such as citizenship in their contestedness and their various meanings. To regard concepts in terms of their changing character, and also their historicity, entails a reflected and reflexive usage of concepts as categories. This raises a number of crucial points regarding the usage of concepts in the Social and Political Sciences in general that we want to elaborate on with this contribution.

In Political Science, the most common understanding of concepts is as analytical categories. While we do not share Sartori's (1970, 60) view that a concept can easily be equated with a variable, we agree with him in that concepts serving as analytical categories all too often are not reflected before they are being used:

“Traditional, or the more traditional, type of Political Science inherited a vast array of concepts which had been previously defined and refined – for better and for worse – by generations of philosophers and political theorists. To some extent, therefore, the traditional political scientist could afford to be an ‘unconscious thinker’ – the thinking had already been done for him” (Sartori 1970, 1033-1034).

[Please leave one blank line between these paragraphs]

Extending Sartori's point further, we regard concepts as being always contingent and controversial in their use, meaning, content, range of reference, normative colour, or tone. This goes for both the academic usage of concepts and the everyday language. As mentioned above, there are no essential or exclusive meanings of concepts, but only different potential

understandings and usages. It is, therefore, possible to use specific definitions of a concept for analytical purposes, but this means having to choose one meaning of a concept out of a potentially plural set.

We propose discussing concepts in a reflexive, anti-essentialist and constructivist perspective: this perspective allows for the *exploration of potential alternative interpretations of concepts*—such as citizenship and its dimensions in this volume—that could also be used or that have been used. Furthermore, this approach is particularly suited to exploring how a concept is, and has been, defined and re-defined, used and constructed—it allows us to analyse the *politics of a concept*. Hence it becomes possible to recognise also less evident power relations, political agencies and loci for politics that are linked to a concept in both theory and practice. Our reflexive and constructivist approach is elaborated in the chapters as a way of analysing, problematising and politicising concepts, which makes the book an important contribution to the field of conceptual studies in Political Science and Comparative Politics.

With this perspective, our aim is moreover to take part in the academic debate in two more respects. The book both contributes to the tradition of citizenship studies by analysing the politics of the concept of citizenship through an approach that focuses on the contestedness of concepts and, vice versa, on the tradition of conceptual studies and conceptual history through a conceptual historical exercise focusing on citizenship.

### **The reflexive and constructivist approach to concepts: Background**

The theoretical and methodological perspective of the book in which concepts are seen as reflexive and socially constructed is inspired by the approach of conceptual history or

*Begriffsgeschichte*. This perspective guides us to pay attention precisely to changes, disputes and diverse interpretations, meanings and usages of key political concepts (see Fernández Sebastián 2011 for a recent overview). So far, this approach has not often been applied to the concept of citizenship (for exceptions, see Koselleck 2006; Magnette 2005; Pocock 1998; Skinner 1993). The chapters of the book each apply, in their own ways, heuristic ideas developed in the field of conceptual history.

The field of conceptual history has developed in different strands of thought in Political Theory and History, namely those around Reinhart Koselleck, on the one hand, and Quentin Skinner, on the other. Quentin Skinner, a British intellectual historian and political theorist concentrates on what he and others have called a *rhetorical perspective* on conceptual change (Palonen 2003b; Skinner 2002a, 179, 182). He insists that language always has two dimensions that must be examined: meaning and linguistic action (Skinner 2002b, 3). For Skinner, concepts are tools in political debates and also tools for viewing and conceptualising reality:

“[...] I wanted to treat the understanding of concepts as always, in part, a matter of understanding what can be done with them in argument. [...] in announcing this belief I declared my allegiance to one particular tradition of twentieth-century social thought. [...] It is characterized by the belief that our concepts not only alter over time, but are incapable of providing us with anything more than a series of changing perspectives on the world in which we live and have our being. Our concepts form part of what we bring to the world in our efforts to understand it. The shifting conceptualizations to which this process gives rise constitute the very stuff of ideological debate, so that it makes no more sense to regret than to deny that such conceptual changes continually take place.” (Skinner, 1999, 62).

In his work, Skinner mainly applied this perspective to analyses of texts in Political Theory, arguing that theorists always take part in political controversies with their texts and that, hence, they have to refer to the background of the value systems, beliefs and dominant ideas of their time (Skinner 2002c).

Another key strand in conceptual history is offered by Reinhart Koselleck, a German historian, and the other editors of the first major work of conceptual history, *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe (GG, Basic Concepts in History)*. They wanted to grasp the interrelations of social and political changes and the meanings attributed to key concepts which were both brought about by and encouraging the development of a modern nation state in Germany. This strand can be termed the *temporal perspective* on conceptual change.

The GG team famously termed the relevant time period “Sattelzeit” (*saddle period*; Koselleck 1967, 82) because they argued that the old world broke down and a new world developed (in the German case between 1750 and 1850, following the GG authors). They wanted to understand this process by grasping its mental and linguistic conceptualization, and hence by analysing the key concepts that preceded, described and followed the changes under way (Koselleck 1967, 81). Using a concept in this context always means to refer to previous and more historical layers of meaning that have been attached to the concept as well.

Following a broadly Koselleckian line, several teams have been studying the conceptual histories of other nation states. These examples include France (Reichardt 1985 - 1996), Finland (Hyvärinen et al. 2003) and the Netherlands (Tilmans 2012). Furthermore, a project which attempts a European overview has recently been undertaken (European Conceptual History Project 2012) and the first volume on ‘Parliamentarism’ has just been published (Ihalainen, Ilie, and Palonen 2016).

What has just been said about rhetorical and temporal perspectives to conceptual change does not imply a clear-cut division. Rather, we suggest that the two approaches can be integrated (Palonen 2004; Richter 1995), as they open up a broad horizon of analytical and interpretative

perspectives on conceptual change (Palonen 2004, 13). The rhetorical perspective concentrates rather on short-term processes, rhetorical and contextual studies, and the role of key actors, thus concerning the micro-aspects of conceptual change. The temporal perspective, on the other hand, is focused on mid-term and long-term processes and temporal and structural aspects of conceptual change and, hence, the macro-aspects. Both strands emphasise the importance of context: as the concepts are always fought over, debated, and interpreted differently, they must be analysed against their specific intellectual and historical background (Skinner 2002a; Koselleck 1996; Palonen 1997).

Today, research based on the conceptual historical approach has not only become increasingly common, but also pluridisciplinary. An international research network on conceptual history began to develop around the ‘History of Political and Social Concepts Group’ (since 2012 History of Concepts Group), founded in 1998 by Melvin Richter and Kari Palonen (see Palonen 2005). In 2015, a Standing Group on “Political Concepts” was set up in the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR), chaired by Claudia Wiesner and Kari Palonen, and the approach was thus also established in Political Science. Several chapters in this volume originated in the sections organised by the Standing Group in the recent ECPR General Conferences.

### **The added value of our reflexive and constructivist approach to concepts**

We argue that to apply the resources of the conceptual-historical approach in Political Science and its usage of concepts can be especially fruitful for a number of reasons:

First, the perspective of conceptual history *focuses on the interrelations of political, institutional and social changes in the material world, and changes in the meaning of*

*concepts* (Ball and Pocock 1988; Koselleck 1996, 65; Palonen 1997, 64; Skinner 1999, 60). Concepts can be seen as nodal points of these changes, because they both influence and indicate institutional, political and social changes. Concepts serve as pivots, or factors, and indicators (Koselleck 1965, 61-62) for controversies, conflicts, and changes under way in material, social and political reality. In that context, changed interpretations of key concepts are both reflecting and encouraging political, social and value changes. The related controversies are, hence, situated at the intersection of empirical changes and changes of meaning of concepts (Koselleck 1996, 61, 65), both influencing the changes in question before they occur as well as possibly legitimising them afterwards (Skinner 2002c; Koselleck 1967). Conceptual history offers a methodology that was explicitly designed for studying the conceptual consequences of the establishment of new political spaces (Koselleck 1967, 81).

Second, *conceptual history as a theoretical and methodological approach explicitly focuses on the linguistic activities* that occur in processes of social, institutional and political changes in the material world. It highlights the debates, conflicts and differences that are related to these changes, and the ways they are driven by the respective actors and their interests, using specific arguments and rhetorical moves (Skinner 2002a; Koselleck 1996; Palonen 1997).

Third, this view *is a fruitful frame for analysing* how the legitimacy of ideas and institutions can be constructed, as it is through concepts that meaning is associated to a certain state, or a citizenship (Skinner 1999, 66–67).

Fourth, conceptual history offers heuristic tools for analysing how institutional and conceptual change are related in different patterns and ways. A concrete example is provided by Koselleck (2006, 62) and Schulz (1979), who distinguish four possible interrelations between institutional and conceptual changes: 1) Both political, institutional and social reality and the

meaning of the respective concepts stay the same (i.e. no change). 2) There is change of political, institutional and social reality before or without conceptual change. 3) There is conceptual change before change of political, institutional and social reality: this case mainly occurs when concepts are invented with the purpose of transporting a certain meaning, or to create legitimacy. Conceptual innovation is often shaped by key actors, “innovating ideologists” (Skinner 2002b, 148) aiming to create positive expectations with regard to future developments (*Vorgriffe*, Koselleck 1997). 4) Political, institutional and social reality and concepts can go in opposite directions: new concepts are coined but they are not (yet) related to reality, or reality changes and old concepts no longer fit.

Importantly, the relation between institutional and conceptual change does not imply causal relation, but mainly a temporal one: it allows for a distinction to be made as to whether a concept was first invented or changed or institutions changed first and the conceptualization followed. Therefore, the interrelation between conceptual and institutional change can be of a different character. It can be direct, when a concept is invented and then put into practice, it can be mediated, when concepts are factors of change or influence institutional change, and it can be indirect, when conceptual change indicates institutional changes. But it is difficult to fix the moment or the amount of change that marks that a “change” has indeed occurred.

Interpretative techniques only provide the means to study dominant interpretations as well as changes in the institutional practice, but they do not allow for measurement of whether and to what degree a conceptual change is, e.g., supported by the citizens. A way to close that gap can be to use micro-data (see Zvereva 2014 for an exemplary study). Finally, in addition to the types of temporal interrelations between institutional and conceptual change, different directions of the interrelations between conceptual and material world changes can be distinguished: Top-down, bottom-up and sideways.

[Please leave one blank line between these paragraphs]

In sum, the added value of the reflexive perspective on concepts we suggest is that it not only allows us to reflect on the conceptual resources and lenses that we employ in our analyses, but it also offers us the theoretical and methodological background and the heuristic tools for systematically tracing and using the different understandings of a concept in a research design, in Political Theory, and as an object of political controversy. Thus, the approach systematically opens up a panorama of different possibilities of understanding a concept, to see how a concept is understood and interpreted in various ways in theory and practice, and to study how it is contested and controversial in both. This also includes the historical usages of a concept—Quentin Skinner (2009) in this context termed the notion of “genealogy” of a concept. To acknowledge that there is a huge treasure of different possible understandings of a concept helps to sharpen or change our analytical lenses, and also to adapt them to new realities. The chapters of the book will each apply parts of this methodological and heuristic toolkit that had just been described.

### **Dimensions of citizenship as sites for controversy**

Citizenship is one of these ever-contested concepts. During the centuries, definitions and criteria of citizenship have been contested both in Political Theory, and in political and social practice (e.g. Clarke et al. 2014). If citizenship is thus ever-contested, it may seem difficult to pinpoint exactly what is left to mark it out, except for the fact that it defines the relation between a citizen and a polity. More concretely: if there are so many different understandings, controversies and contestations, is there anything left that conceptions of citizenship have in common?

In both theory and practice of citizenship in Western Europe, there are arguably four dimensions that shape most conceptions of citizenship: Access, rights, duties and the active content of citizenship, which in the following we term “political activity”. The four dimensions are covered by most national concepts of citizenship which define conditions of *access* (i.e. mostly nationality rules and the related laws), the legal consequences of citizenship in the sense of a citizen's *rights* and a citizen's *duties*; and how citizen's *political activity* is carried out.

These four dimensions, then, are also at the core of studying citizenship in Comparative Politics, as they have manifold practical and normative implications for shaping and realising the relationship between citizens and a polity. The dimensions are also relevant for analysing the changes and struggles around the concept of citizenship as they have been the classical foci of conceptual controversies. The chapters in this volume will each take up one or more dimensions.

The dimension of *access* to citizenship is key to the whole concept (Brubaker 1994; Gosewinkel 2001). Most of the common interpretations of citizenship agree that it defines the *demos* (or the democratic subject, or the sovereign) in a polity, drawing a border with regard to who is a citizen and who is not. Access to citizenship and the related rights is usually formalised in nationality laws. Access criteria also entail demarcating between “us and them”, concerning both citizens and non-citizens, and referring to the normativity and legitimation of political and cultural ideals behind them. Thus, citizenship is also governance of the population through categorization, exclusion and inclusion (see Ilyin in this volume).

The definitions of who should be considered a full citizen have changed over the centuries in the history of democratization and democratic theory: In Antiquity, only a small group of

wealthy men were entitled to citizenship. Women and unfree men were excluded until the 20<sup>th</sup> century in most Western representative democracies (see in detail Wiesner 2007). These exclusions became foci of political struggle: Key conflicts turned around the inclusion of women and foreigners in a formally male-oriented concept of citizenship that was related to different ideas of a nation (see e.g. Gosewinkel 2001 for a detailed study of the German case). Such struggles drove the development of citizenship while nation states developed into representative democracies over a long period (see e.g. Weber 1979; Marshall 1950).

In today's reality, nationality laws define access to nation state citizenship. Even in the European Union it is the sole access criterion to Union Citizenship to be a member state national, as there is no EU nationality. National regulations range from *ius sanguinis*, conceptualised around an ethnic concept of nationality, to *ius soli*, related to a political concept of nationality. Naturalisation has raised political debates in most representative democracies in recent years. One outcome has been the growing number of integration courses and tests for immigrants which have been introduced all over Europe within the past ten years (see Björk in this volume).

*Rights* linked to citizenship have been developing—mainly due to conflicts and struggles over an extension of democratic and citizenship rights—in relation to and during the processes of democratisation, and especially the establishment of representative democracy. A classical distinction made by T. H. Marshall (1950) differentiates between three types of rights: freedom rights, political rights such as the right to elect and to be elected, and social rights. We suggest expanding the list to include rights that belong to the next generation after Marshall, *cultural rights* (see, e.g., Kymlicka 2002; Young 1990), and also a *right to protection through the state* (internal security), which can be regarded as one of the oldest rights of citizenship, although omitted by Marshall (Wiesner and Björk 2014).

Marshall's categories are both broadly used by social scientists as well as critiqued by them (see Turner 1997 for an overview) because his division relies on 1940s Western nation-states and employs their norms in terms of gender and ethnicity. However, Marshall emphasises several important points: Citizenship rights are multi-dimensional, they are political constructions, and they are intermediate outcomes of historical processes, conflicts and practices (on these aspects see Kivistö; Nielsen; Nyysönen and Metsälä; Wiesner in this volume). Moreover, citizenship rights are not uniform and they refer to different domains of an individual's relation to a polity (see Lillie and Wagner, and Wiesner in this volume).

Over the course of centuries and up until the present day, therefore, the widening of citizenship rights has been related to significant political controversy, exemplified among others by the fight for women's suffrage, the feminist movement, as well as in the civil rights movement. Current debates on these issues include the claim to rights by non-citizens, or the recognition of particular rights (see Björk; Kivistö; Nielsen; Valkonen and Valkonen in this volume), as do new theoretical conceptions of what ensues from the right to political activity (see García-Gutián and Gil in this volume).

Citizen's *duties*, such as the duty to go to school, to do military service, or to pay taxes, are the third conceptual dimension classically associated with citizenship in representative democracies (Brubaker 1994; Weber 1979; Gosewinkel 2001). Both military service and schooling have been important for developing the figure of the loyal citizen, decisive for the ideal of nation states (Brubaker 1994; Weber 1979), and taxation constitutes the basis for modern welfare systems. Nevertheless, the duties pertaining to citizenship have been seldom studied, although this topic seems to be on the rise in current Political Theory (see García-Gutián and Gil in this volume).

Finally, *political activity* refers to the question of *what the demos does*, and includes a variety of activities from participation in elections to political protest. In contemporary democratic theory, the catchword of “participatory turn” has become one of the new key terms, as the forms of participation are constantly developing (see García-Gutián; Gil; Lietzmann; Mäkinen in this volume), through new technologies and social engagements, as well as new international institutions and supranationalisation.

As such, citizenship in all its dimensions is never neutral, but positioned. Citizenship intersects with various factors and various types of belonging, such as class, ethnicity, indigeneity, gender and age (Yuval-Davis 2003; Yuval-Davis 2011). These aspects all lead to the overarching area of questions about diversity, difference, and recognition (Bauböck 2008; Kraus 2008; Parekh 2006; Taylor 1994; Tully 1995). Diversified identifications may serve as a base for political action (Connolly 1992; Isin and Wood 1999; Parekh 2008). Thus citizenship can be seen as a relational “act”, also involving statelessness and non-citizenship, rather than as a fixed structure (Clarke et al. 2014; Isin and Nielsen 2008). The chapters of the book will discuss questions and situations where different kinds of belonging intersect with citizenship, with regard to migrants (Björk; Kivistö; Lillie and Wagner; Nielsen), ethnic minorities (Valkonen and Valkonen), and class (Lillie and Wagner). New constellations of citizenship set old conceptions and categories in motion, and into more diversified frameworks. Changes in the national and international setting for citizenship, such as European integration, regionalism, globalisation, and increasing mobility, have been recognised by several scholars (Bellamy and Warleigh 1998; Ibid. 2001; Benhabib 2006; Soysal 1996; Delanty 2002; Isin and Turner 2002; Joppke 2010), but thus far, an explicit account of a conceptual analysis remains to be undertaken.

## **Citizenship as a contested concept: Case selection and the contents of the book**

As has been said, citizenship is a key category in the Political and Social Sciences in general and in Comparative Politics in particular in numerous respects. The cases of the book are selected in such a way that they provide crucial and illustrative examples as according to where the debate on the concept of citizenship currently stands a) in Political Theory, b) regarding real-life debates around citizenship, and c) changes in current citizenship practices and policies.

The book's regional focus is set on Europe, where many crucial developments of modern Western citizenship took place: It was in Europe where the ancient *poleis* have been situated, and where subjects successively developed into citizens. In Europe a "citizenship *acquis*" developed that became central for a generalised understanding of citizenship, and it was also in Europe that many of the battles over inclusion and exclusion regarding citizenship have been fought. Hence, conceptual changes and conflicts around citizenship have been a central issue in the political and conceptual history of the democratisation of European nation states. A recent conceptual innovation in Europe is citizenship of the European Union, and at present, citizenship is also re-interpreted in the context of migration and globalisation.

For this book, therefore, we have selected studies, which illustrate and analyse these changes. The cases focus on representation and participation, migration and mobility as well as transnational forms of citizenship. These three topics are central in current academic research and theorisation regarding citizenship, but also in political debates and practices.

Citizenship is a core concept for conceptualising democracy: In democratic nation states, citizenship relates closely to the democratic subject, the *demos*, or the sovereign in a legal and

political sense. As it defines the demos, it also predestines who may participate in elections or political parties and organisations and, thus, conceptualising citizenship is essential in the measurement of the quality of democracy or the comparative analysis of welfare states.

Citizenship development also indicates successes in democratization as the admission of new population groups to full citizenship rights and political participation is a classical indicator here (see, e.g., Dahl 1971). In the current “participation-boom” participation is given new and increasingly diverse interpretations. Its ongoing, both qualitative and quantitative, changes regard forms, channels and effects of participation as well as supranational contexts of participation, and they raise questions on representation: all forms of participation are not automatically representative, which has important implications on democracy. Participation and its connections to citizenship are discussed in this volume by García-Gutián. Electoral participation is the topic of the chapters by Gil and Nyysönen and Metsälä, and participatory governance is discussed by Mäkinen. Lietzmann specifically addresses representation.

In today’s Europe, citizenship is increasingly debated in the context of migration and mobility. There are heated political debates about the real-life implications of migration to citizenship, and academic research focuses on how different forms of migration and mobility diversify the conceptions of citizenship. The chapters by Björk, Kivistö and Nielsen discuss how citizenship is shaped in different ways in the context of immigration, refugees, asylum and naturalisation. Through boundaries drawn in these contexts, new categories regarding citizenship are created, such as non-citizens, irregular migrants or permanent residents.

Paying attention to those excluded or marginalized from (full) citizenship increases our understanding of citizenship and the demarcations it includes.

Citizenship is more and more discussed in contexts that transcend nation states. Multilevel and complex governance and many other international and sub-national transformation

processes—such as globalisation, regionalism, localisation, European integration, migration and the changing significance of nation states, all of which are also core questions in Comparative Politics —have transformed the contexts of citizenship and the concept itself. Citizenship has been both down-scaled and up-scaled; we talk about local citizenship, global citizenship and multi-layered or multi-level citizenship, for instance. Citizenship may hence be attached to various territorial and administrative layers simultaneously. Therefore, some of the cases in this volume indicate how citizenship is practised beyond the nation state. The chapter by Nyysönen and Metsälä focuses on voting practices of dual citizens across state borders. Indigenous citizenship of the Sámi people living in the area of several states is analysed in the chapter by Valkonen and Valkonen.

One of the new frameworks of citizenship is the European Union. At present, all nationals of one of the member states are also “Union Citizens”, but there are ongoing debates related to the rights and rights claims of non-EU-citizens regarding what kind of positive rights “third country nationals” should have in the EU (Bauböck 2006; Kostakopoulou 2002; Maas 2008; Rigo 2009; Vink 2005). The Europeanisation of citizenship challenges the national concepts of citizenship and the practices of citizenship in the member states (Wiesner 2007). It also offers new territorial and administrative layers to which formal definitions of citizenship and citizens' practical experiences of rights and participation as well as individual identifications can be attached. Transnational forms of citizenship in the context of the European Union are discussed in the chapters by Wiesner, Lillie and Wagner and Mäkinen. These chapters show how mobility in the EU context can have most varied implications for different people in terms of citizenship and hence for the concept of citizenship.

[please leave a blank line here]

Each chapter thus approaches citizenship in a specific context. The reflexive approach to concepts requires sensitivity towards these specific contexts and their languages which often means concentrating on one demonstrative case in a single study. The approach nevertheless is inherently comparative since it focuses on similarities, novelties or commonalities of each of the cases, as well as their histories. It is then the common analytical lens that will bring the specialised analyses together: Rather than exercising a more traditional comparative method of discussing two or more cases together with shared variables, the different aspects of citizenship will be studied comparatively through the reflective approach to concepts and the heuristic tools that were just presented. The point is to identify links and differences in usage as well as continuities and changes in the conceptual development between the cases, in a way that allows a comparative reading of the different cases, materials and contexts. The composition of the book moreover opens a comparative perspective insofar as it explicitly combines national level analyses with theoretical and supra-national insights.

The politics of the concept of citizenship, hence, in this book are explored by studying how the concept of citizenship is used and shaped by, and through, theories, debates and practices. Access, rights, duties and political participation in this context have a cross-cutting function in the structure of the book. They are to be interpreted as both heuristic dimensions of the concept of citizenship and as foci of the controversies in theory, debate and practice.

The *theory* section, relating to normative ideas on what citizenship in representative democracy should be, will show that the concept is contested in itself, as are the areas that are thought to be relevant. The contributions focus on the conceptual history of citizenship and its link to democracy, participation and representation.

The chapters analysing *debates* on citizenship examine current political debates and struggles over the concept of citizenship in different arenas and show how new questions have come into focus. They study parliamentary, political, and mediated debates on what should be happening in citizenship policies. Special attention is given to the margins of citizenship, i.e., on the inclusions and exclusions of citizenship and the conditions of access. The chapters thus show that concepts have a function in political real-life, and that the debates around interpretations of concepts center on the both empirical realities of a concept and normative ideas about what the reality should be.

The section discussing *practices*, finally, will show that empirical reality sometimes challenges mainstream interpretations of concepts. It underlines that we need to rethink our analytical categories in order to grasp these changes. A special emphasis is put on a new political space, the European Union, and the question how new practices regarding mobility, labour and participatory governance interact with new and established usages and meanings of the concept of citizenship.

### **Acknowledgement**

The book has been edited with the support of the following research projects: “Legitimation of European cultural heritage and the dynamics of identity politics in the EU” (EUROHERIT), funded by the European Research Council (grant number 636177) the Finnish Distinguished Professorship Project “Transformations of Concepts and Institutions in the European Polity” (TRACE), funded by the Academy of Finland, and “Politics of human rights: conceptual and rhetorical reading of the postwar debates”, funded by the KONE Foundation.

## References

- Ball, Terence, and John Pocock, ed. 1988. *Conceptual change and the constitution*. Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas.
- Bauböck, Rainer, ed. 2006. *Migration and citizenship: legal status, rights and political participation*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- . 2008. "Beyond culturalism and statism. Liberal responses to diversity." *Eurosphere working paper series*. Online working paper No. 06.
- Bellamy, Richard, and Alex Warleigh. 1998. "From an ethics of integration to an ethics of participation – Citizenship and the future of the European Union." *Millennium* 27:447–70.
- . 2001. "Introduction: The puzzle of EU citizenship." In *Citizenship and governance in the European Union*, edited by Richard Bellamy, and Alex Warleigh, 3–18. London & New York: Continuum.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 2006. *Another cosmopolitanism*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1994. *Staats-Bürger. Deutschland und Frankreich im historischen Vergleich*. Hamburg: Junius.
- Clarke, John, Coll, Kathleen, Dagnino, Evelina, and Catherine Neveu. 2014. *Disputing Citizenship*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Connolly, William E. 1992. *Identity/Difference. Democratic negotiations of political paradox*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Dahl, Robert A., 1971. *Polyarchy. Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Delanty, Gerard. 2002. *Citizenship in a global age. Society, culture, politics*. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press. Original 2000.

- Fernández Sebastián, Javier, ed. 2011. *Political Concepts and Time. New Approaches to Conceptual History*. Santander: Cantabria University Press and McGraw-Hill.
- Gosewinkel, Dieter. 2001. *Einbürgern und Ausschließen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
- Hyvärinen, Matti, Kurunmäki, Jussi, Palonen, Kari, Pulkkinen, Tuija, and Henrik Stenius, ed. 2003. *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ihalainen, Pasi, Ilie, Cornelia, and Kari Palonen, ed. 2016. *Parliament and Parliamentarism. A Comparative history of a European Concept*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Isin, Engin, and Greg Nielsen, ed. 2008. *Acts of citizenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Isin, Engin, and Brian S. Turner, ed. 2002. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: Sage.
- Isin, Engin, and Patricia Wood. 1999. *Citizenship and Identity*. London: Sage.
- Joppke, Christian. 2010. *Citizenship and Immigration*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. 1967. "Richtlinien für das Lexikon politisch-sozialer Begriffe der Neuzeit." *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 11:81–99.
- . 1996. "A Response to a comment on Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe." In *The meaning of historical terms and concepts. New studies on Begriffsgeschichte*, edited by Hartmut Lehmann, and Melvin Richter, 59–70. Washington: German Historical Institute.
- . 2006. "Drei bürgerliche Welten. Zur vergleichenden Semantik der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft in Deutschland, Frankreich und England." In *Begriffsgeschichten: Studien zur Semantik und Pragmatik der politischen und sozialen Sprache*, 402–63. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp,
- Kostakopoulou, Theodora. 2002. "'Integrating' non-EU migrants in the European Union. Ambivalent legacies and mutating paradigms." *Columbia journal of European law* 8.

- Kraus, Peter. 2008. *Union of diversity: language, identity and polity building*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- European Conceptual History Project. 2012. "Mission Statement."  
[http://www.javierfsebastian.es/images/mission\\_statement\\_ECHP.pdf](http://www.javierfsebastian.es/images/mission_statement_ECHP.pdf). Accessed September 21, 2012.
- Kymlicka, Will. 2002. "Citizenship Theory." In *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, edited by Will Kymlicka, 284-326, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maas, Willem. 2008. "Migrants, states, and EU citizenship's unfulfilled promise." *Citizenship studies* 12(6):583–596.
- Magnette, Paul. 2005. *Citizenship: The history of an idea*. ECPR monographs. Colchester: ECPR.
- Marshall, T. H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class: And other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palonen, Kari. 1997. "An Application of Conceptual History to itself: From Method to Theory in Reinhart Koselleck's Begriffsgeschichte." *Redescriptions (Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought)* 1:39–69.
- . 2003a. "Four Times of Politics: Policy, Polity, Politicking, and Politicization." *Alternatives* 28:171–186.
- . 2003b. *Quentin Skinner: history, politics, rhetoric*. Oxford: Polity.
- . 2004. *Die Entzauberung der Begriffe. Das Umschreiben der politischen Begriffe bei Quentin Skinner und Reinhart Koselleck*. Münster: Lit.
- . 2005. "The Politics of Conceptual History." *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 1(1):37–50.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. [2000] 2006. *Rethinking multiculturalism. Cultural diversity and Political Theory*. Hampshire: Palgrave.

- . 2008. *A new politics of identity. Political principles for an interdependent world.* Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pocock, John. 1998. “The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times.” In *The citizenship debates: A reader*, edited by Gershon Shafir, 31–41. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Reichardt, Rolf, ed. 1985 - 1996. *Handbuch politisch-sozialer Grundbegriffe in Frankreich 1680 - 1820.* München: Oldenbourg.
- Richter, Melvin. 1995. *The history of political and social concepts: A critical introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rigo, Enrica. 2009. *Rajojen Eurooppa [Europa di confine : trasformazioni della cittadinanza nell'Unione allargata]*. Finnish translation Antti Paakkari, Taina Rajanti, Miika Saukkonen, and Eetu Viren. Helsinki: Like.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. “Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics.” *American Political Science Review* LXIV(4):1033–1053.
- Schmitter, Philipp. 2017. Politics as a Science, aka Politology.  
<http://www.eui.eu/Documents/DepartmentsCentres/SPS/Profiles/Schmitter/Politics-as-a-science.pdf>, Accessed July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2017
- Schulz, Heiner. 1979. “Begriffsgeschichte und Argumentationsgeschichte.“ In *Historische Semantik und Begriffsgeschichte*, edited by Reinhart Koselleck, 43–74. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1993. “Two Concepts of Citizenship.” *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 55: 403–19.
- . 1999. “Rhetoric and Conceptual Change.” *Redescriptions (Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought)* 60–73.
- . 2002a. “Retrospect: studying rhetoric and conceptual change.” In *Visions of Politics Vol. 1. Regarding method*, 175–87. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

- . 2002b. “Introduction: Seeing things their way.” In *Visions of Politics Vol. 1. Regarding method*, 1–7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002c. “Moral principles and social change.” In *Visions of Politics Vol. 1. Regarding method*, 145–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2009. “A Genealogy of the modern state: British Academy Lectures.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* (162): 325–70.
- Soysal, Yasemin Nuhogly. 1996. ”Changing citizenship in Europe.” In *Citizenship, nationality and migration in Europe*, edited by Mary Cesarani, and David Fulbrook. London: Routledge.
- Spanakos, Anthony Petros. 2015. “Conceptualising Comparative Politics: A framework.” In *Conceptualising Comparative Politics*, edited by Anthony Petros Spanakos and Francisco Panizza, 1-23. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, Charles. 1994.”The politics of recognition.” In *Multiculturalism. Examining the politics of recognition*, edited by Amy Gutmann, 25–74. Princeton, N.J.:Princeton University Press.
- Tully, James. 1995. *Strange multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an age of diversity: Freedom & belonging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilmans, Karin. 2012. “Applying Begriffsgeschichte to Dutch History: Progress report on the Dutch national conceptual history project.” <http://dare.uva.nl/document/43514> Accessed September 21, 2012.
- Turner, Bryan S. 1997. “Citizenship Studies: A General Theory.” *Citizenship Studies* 1:5-18.
- Weber, Eugene. 1979. *Peasants Into Frenchmen: Modernization of Rural France 1870-1914-1914*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Wiesner, Claudia. 2007. *Bürgerschaft und Demokratie in der EU*. Münster: LIT.

- . 2008. “Womens' partial citizenship.” In: *Ashgate Research Companion: Democratisation in Europe*, edited by Kari Palonen, Tuija Pulkkinen, and José Rosales, 235-250. London: Ashgate Publishing.
- Wiesner, Claudia, and Anna Björk. 2014. “Introduction: Citizenship in Europe after World War II.” *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 9(1):50–59.
- Vink, Maarten. 2005. *Limits of European citizenship. European integration and domestic immigration policies*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Young, Iris M. 1990. *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2003.” Citizenship, territoriality and the gendered construction of difference.” In *State/Space. A reader*, edited by Neil Brenner, Bob Jessop, Martin Jones, and Gordon Macleod, 309–325. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2011. *Power, intersectionality and the politics of belonging*. FREIA Working Paper Series. Working paper no. 75. FREIA – Feminist Research Center in Aalborg. Aalborg University, Denmark.
- Zvereva, Galina. 2014. “Shaping New Russian Identity: Discourses of ‘Inclusion/Exclusion in Europe’.” In *The Meanings of Europe*, edited by Claudia Wiesner, and Meike Schmidt-Gleim, 221–35. London: Routledge.