Citizenship 2.0. – changing aspects of citizenship in the age of digital media

Jakob Linaa Jensen, Ph.D., associate professor, Department of Information and Media Studies, University of Aarhus, Denmark
E-mail: linaa@imv.au.dk website: www.netdemocracy.dk project website: www.ong.au.dk

Conference paper – work in progress. Do not quote without explicit written permission

Citizenship is what Connolly (1974) has called an essentially contested concept. It is of utmost importance in relation to the relationship between the nation and the state as it defines belongings, identities and personal rights and in many countries it also defines the level of access to social benefits. However, the notion and understanding of citizenship has changed in recent years. Traditional notions of political citizenships are based on rights and the level of citizenship involvement is evaluated based upon formal political participation. However, scholars with a sociological perspective like Liesbet van Zoonen and Nick Couldry claim that the cultural and emotional aspects of citizenship are important as well. Besides, it becomes increasingly difficult to define the borders between the political and the non-political.

The media platforms of performing citizenship are changing as well. From mere passive media like TV and radio, the Internet has come to play an important role in the life of many people. The rise of social media like Facebook, Twitter and YouTube emphasizes that our notions of citizenship might have to change, a development already understood by several scholars. For instance, more than half of the Danes are involved in social networking, communities and forums for content sharing like YouTube and Flickr. Further, more and more turn to online debates and blogs. The social media do not only allow for retrieving information but also for user involvement and user-generated content. As everybody can now potentially publish everything, Andrew Keen (2007) has proposed the concept "the cult of the amateur" but from a citizenship perspective those tendencies might be less destructive than he proposes.

This paper discusses such changes from the perspective of digital, social media. Where more static media like TV and radio did not invite to high levels of interactivity and social involvement, the Internet, not at least social media have come to play an important role in the daily social life of many people. For instance, more than half of the Danes are involved in social networking, communities and forums for content sharing like YouTube and Flickr. The social media do not only allow for retrieving information but also for user involvement and user-generated content. One could argue that joining debates, uploading videos, sharing food recipes might be considered an important act of citizenry in a time where more formal acts of citizenship like voting and party membership seems to be in decline. In short, the citizenship might be transformed to both new ways of acting and new media for performing the acts.

As this has been discussed for years, there is a lack of investigations of the relationship between traditional and cultural acts of citizenship, not at least in relation to the convergence between old and new media. This paper aims to shed light on those changing practices from the perspective of

social media: what does for instance internet debates, Facebook petitions and online sharing of recipes and participation in lifestyle related groups mean for the citizens' understanding of belonging and for their ability to make a difference?

We start by discussing various concepts of citizenship, concluding that today one must include cultural as well as political dimensions in analyses of citizenship patterns. Next, we investigate citizens' experience of political efficacy, social capital and sense of belonging, three aspects often surveyed in similar projects on citizenship. This is followed by a discussion of various practices of performed citizenship, from cultural and political citizenship to patterns of consumption. In the last section we discuss how media use influence practices and performances of citizenship, demonstrating certain differences between users of old and new media.

This chapter is based on a quantitative survey questionnaire among 1710 Danish Internet users collected in May and June 2009. For a decade Denmark has been among the countries with highest internet penetration. Further, Denmark is among the front runners within the use of social media and thereby this country study might be a critical case for the development of citizenship in a new media age in general.

Data on internet use, political activity online and offline, social capital and trust and attitudes towards the state and other people are correlated in order to identify possible new citizen roles. One could argue that it might be those already competent, educated and politically active who are active citizens, politically and culturally, but is this really true? And are there new segments of citizens which traditional analyses do not account for?

The survey is part of a bigger research project "The changing borderlines of the public sphere in the 21st century" sponsored by The Danish National Research Council.

Citizenship: the classic views

As mentioned, citizenship must be regarded as an essentially contested concept. Besides academic disparities related to true, correct definitions, there are strong political and emotional attachments to the concept. Citizenship is not only formal rights, duties and benefits but essentially related to the question of belonging and membership of the national community. Some of the hardest games are fought exactly over the right to membership (Stone, 1997).

Marshall (1950) discusses in "Citizenship and Social Class" how concepts of citizenship have changed historically. During the age of enlightenment and the expanding bourgeoisie in the 18th century judicial reforms were initiated in order to secure the citizens' basic civil rights like freedom from oppression, freedom of speech etc. Thinkers like Hugo Grotius and John Locke had delivered the theoretical arguments behind such rights and the last absolute monarchs of Europe slowly but steadily adapted such principles. Marshall calls this set of rights for civil citizenship.

The 19th century is the period of democratic reforms throughout most of Europe. The absolute monarchs are replaced by democratically elected parliaments in a number of countries and the citizens are guaranteed certain political rights (which slowly during the first decades of the 20th

century are expanded to all groups in society). Marshall denotes this political citizenship.

In the 20th century civil and political rights are supplemented by social rights. By popular demand and in some case because of the ruling classes fear of a violent revolution, ordinary citizens, not at least the growing working class), are admitted various social rights like pensions, unemployment benefits and paid vacation, all together such social rights are called social citizenship.

As the (nation) state secures these social rights and also finances them through tax collection, the legislative process becomes a battle ground for achieving and maintaining social rights. Much debate and political initiatives in post-war Western democracies are centered on such battles as the state becomes a source of benefits of prosperity. Civil and political rights are now taken for granted and many struggles are fought over belonging to the nation state and thereby the rights to benefits. The hard debate about immigration must be seen in this light as it might be more a battle about resources than about cultural differences (although the latter is most often played as the main argument).

As Marshall summarizes three traditional views on citizenship which have been common among political scientists and in political thinking in general, one could add that traditionally there has been a correspondence between the sphere of the nation state and the sphere of citizenship. Thus, civil, political and social rights have been connected to membership of a nation state which defines it's citizen's rights as citizens and their duties, for instance as tax payers. It is striking that societies with extensive social rights are often relatively ethnically homogenous as well, for instance the Scandinavian countries. Here, the citizenship is not only connected to citizenship but also to ethnicity (Turner, 2001: 11). On the contrary, more multi-ethnic societies like the US or Australia are normally characterized by less extensive social rights.

Those traditional aspects of citizenship should be supplemented by a fourth, more cultural perspective, for instance emphasized from a sociological point of view. For instance Stevenson (2001), van Zoonen (2005) and Couldry (2006) stresses that cultural activity, consumption and lifestyle are also important aspects of citizenship as they contribute to one's notion of identity and belonging. They name it "cultural citizenship" – a sense of belonging and responsibility slightly different from the rights and duties of formal citizenship. Passionate as well as rational acts ought to be taken into account. Further, sense of belonging and responsibility as well as passions and emotions must be taken seriously. Political consumption is an example of an activity which fits into this broadened notion of citizenship. People feel they can make a difference by buying organic food or boycotting products from certain countries.

Understanding citizenship in such cultural terms is nothing new. Already German historian Herder focused on so-called primordial characteristics among various peoples. The Germans had certain characteristics, the English and the French others. While such an understanding today seems outdated (and politically incorrect) the focus on national culture (and identity) has been an important strategy in building and strengthening nation states up to our time. Army prescription, compulsory schooling and standardizations of written and spoken language were early strategies of ensuring a common national identity within the borders of the often quite arbitrarily constructed nation states. Later strategies were development of public service media like radio and TV which still today enjoy a favorable position even within the European free markets for reasons of national culture and identity and the ongoing fight against cultural domination, not at least Americanization.

Ideas of "civic virtue" or in the German-speaking world "bildung" goes hand in hand with strengthening national identities.

However, whatever a concept of citizenship one wants to emphasize, processes of globalization, immigration and the rapid spread of new, digital media all contribute to challenge the traditional link between citizenship and the nation state. Here I will sketch at least three sets of such important challenges:

1. The free flow of goods, capital and people (not at least within the EU and other free trade areas) challenges traditional formal civil and political rights. With increasing immigration, work and collaboration across countries many states face a substantial number of non-citizens within their borders. Which set of rights are to be granted to these groups? Strict segregation might cause social unrest whereas a laissez-faire policy might create strong resistance from existing citizens. The growing unrest in European countries about immigration is an example.

2. The global capital flows challenge the economical sovereignty of the nation state. For instance, the European union poses strict regulations on government spending and budgeting within the member states, and together with fierce competition from growing economies in Asia and South America the former so-called rich world might face increasing problems upholding social rights and welfare levels, not at least concerning an ageing population in most European countries

3. The increased global diversity and the global flow of symbols affect the cultural homogeneity of the nation states. Today most people can instantly get access to TV, radio and not at least Internet data from all over the world. The age where media supply was closely connected to the nation state (and in some instances broadcasting monopolies) is over. Some have shown fear of an Americanization or McDonaldization (Ritzer, 1995). Others like Appadurai (1996) have pointed out that the development is not uni-dimensional: local powers like Brazil, China and Indonesia might influence their surrounding areas more than the mighty America but the global flux symbols across countries is inevitable. Not at least the young generations tend to subscribe to globalised media products rather than national media.

Where the two first sets of challenges are related to the traditional aspects of citizenship, civil, political and social rights, the classical focus of political scientists like Marshall, the last set of challenges are related to the culture, identity and sense of belonging within the traditional nation states. In short, they are related to a more sociological or cultural understanding of citizenship which has been more dominant during recent decades. One could claim that the political scientists have emphasized a vertical dimension of citizenship, the citizens' relationship to the state, whereas sociologists have emphasized a horizontal perspective, focusing on the citizens' relationship to each other.

It is worth distinguishing between the classical dominant culture of the nation state inscribed in schooling, the military and the ideology of public service media. The struggle between the official "high" culture defined by cultural and political elites and the "low" culture, prevalent in folk traditions and ordinary life is documented in various important sociological works, for instance

Veblen (1899) and Bourdieu (1984). Often high culture has suppressed the low culture, not at least because the elites have controlled the means of cultural productions. For instance, in the first years of public service media like the BBC and Denmark's Radio they regarded themselves as defenders of "good taste" and took up the role as educators and enlighteners. When discussing and analyzing cultural habits related to citizenship it is important to take seriously all aspects of culture, high and low. The struggle between high and low culture is also a struggle about identity and belonging, within the borders of the nation state and in the relationship with other people. The so-called everyday culture (de Certeau, 1984) is just as important as the dominant high culture in order to grasp an understanding of cultural citizenship.

A certain aspect of cultural citizenship is the discussion whether political rights should be followed by cultural rights, for example protection and acknowledgement of minority cultural practices etc. As all civilized countries practice for instance freedom of religion more far-reaching aspects of cultural rights, for example in form of affirmative action towards ethnic and cultural minorities is more widely disputed, a discussion which is too long to consider further here. However, as political rights are linked to duties, one could also ask whether cultural rights should be linked to cultural duties (and how they should be defined) (Turner, 2001: 14).

It is clear by now that cultural citizenship cannot be defined in the formal, objective terms like certain political rights. It is more related to a subjective experience, sense of connection among the citizens, or like Annemarie Mol (2002) puts it: "a reality exists as shared decisions to understand and act in the world".

A certain fruitful definition of citizenship understood in such subjective terms is that of "Public connection" (Couldry, Markham & Livingstone, 2007). Such an understanding obviously focuses on the subjective, experienced factors of citizenship. But it is useful because it aims to grasp cultural as well as political aspects of citizenship. It emphasizes that we need to take seriously exactly the lived experience among the citizens, the daily practices and the experience sense of belonging, that each citizen plays several roles: as voters, consumers, viewers, producers etc. and that digital media play an increasing role in defining and negotiating such roles. In this analysis I will draw on such a perspective combined with encompassing various aspects of citizenship.

New media and citizenship

The rise and spread of digital media have created enormous expectations for a strengthening of citizenship and altogether a democratic renewal (Hoff, 1999; Linaa Jensen, 2006). To some extent the hype related to democratic promises and possibilities for ordinary citizens reminds of similar expectations at the rise of radio, TV and cable TV (Arterton, 1987; Linaa Jensen, 2006)

Such promises can also be found in discourses related to the concepts of post-industrialism and post-modernism. Where the first was believed to change economic conditions and traditional class structures, the latter was believed to profoundly affect existing patterns of knowledge and social roles. As well-known such expectations only partly came true.

From a perspective of political citizenship there have been expectations that the Internet might strengthen the possibilities of discussion among citizens and an enhanced connected between the voters and the politicians. Esther Dyson (1997) has argued that the Internet empower the citizens to participate and act. Douglas Schuler (1996) has imagined new community networks of interacting

and discussing citizens whereas Andrew Shapiro (1998) has pointed out that the Internet breaks down existing communicative and institutional barriers between citizens and politicians. Not at least the possibilities of realization of deliberative democratic ideals associated with Habermas (1989) and Gutman & Thompson (1996) have been widespread. Benjamin Barber (1998) has talked about the possibilities of "strong democracy" based on true, obliging participation rather than just the formal process of voting every fourth year.

From a cultural perspective the rise of digital media creates unprecedented possibilities for citizens to choose among all kinds of various media and to become producers rather than mere consumers (Bruns, 2008). Processes of media convergence further strengthens such possibilities as the media melt together and can be used more seamlessly in everyday practices. Here one ought to distinguish among technical media convergence where content, genres, forms and platforms merge (Kulturministeriet, 2001) and participatory convergence (Jenkins, 2006)

No matter what, the Internet facilitates new modes of production and consumption and a mix of roles for the citizens who now might become a produser, who produces as well as uses (Bruns, 2008). Certain scholars have focused on the so-called "Web 2.0" (O'Reilly, 2002) and others have focused on the cult of the amateur (Keen, 2007). Lundby (2009) discusses the concept of digital storytelling as an important aspect of this.

A sociological understanding: the experience of citizenship

This paper basically has a sociological understanding of citizenship. That means that we do not focus on formal political or social rights but rather on subjective factors like sense of belonging, experience of the citizens' capacities to act and to some extent their specific actions as citizens in a broad sense of the word. Thus, a quantitative survey was a natural method in order to get the first overview. Later, we followed up by more qualitative approaches broadening the understanding of several of the components of citizenship discussed in this chapter.

A first step in understanding changing patterns of citizenship in the globalized, digital age must be to ask how citizens' perceive and perform the possible changing roles. In short, we first focus on the experience of citizenship rather than objective factors which are well described elsewhere. In the next section I will address the practical performance of citizenship.

I was aware that it is impossible to cover all possible aspects of citizenship within a survey. I chose to focus on various dimensions related to the idea of the sense of public connection and which also are well described and surveyed in existing literature, combined with questions on political consumption which is not surveyed that often. Here we will first discuss aspects of political efficacy, social capital (trust), sense of belonging (connectedness) to various areas and institutions and political consumption.

Political efficacy

Besides formal political rights and possibilities of influence various scholars within the field of political culture and citizenship have focused on the importance of the citizens believing they can make a difference, in other words their subjective political self-confidence. Almond & Verba (1963: 217) has crowned the term "political competence" whereas Barnes & Kaase (1979: 488) has

suggested the term "political efficacy" which has gained widespread acceptance and will be employed here.

Here we distinguish among political interest and connectedness versus the belief that participating can make a difference. I have used a Likert-scale to survey the respondents' attitudes to a range of statements. The results are shown in table 1.

Table 1: Aspects of political efficacy among respondents. Level of agreement with the following statements. Percentages.

	Agree	Partly agree	Neutral	Partly disagree	Disagree	N
I follow politics	36	39	14	6	6	1676
I feel connected to a political ideology or certain political ideas	28	34	21	6	11	1603
I can influence politics on certain areas which interest me	6	23	36	16	19	1543
Ordinary people can share their opinion through media	43	38	11	5	3	1642
Denmark has a well working public sector	10	44	18	18	9	1660

It is shown that most respondents demonstrate an interest in politics. This is no surprise as the figures are the same as in similar surveys. Also, the respondents in general demonstrate a sense of connection to a certain political orientation. However, the belief in the personal ability to influence certain policy areas is more divided, only 29 percent in total agree where as 35 percent disagree. So where people feel competent they don't necessarily believe it makes a difference. Those are all aspects which can be defined as internal efficacy, belief in one's own capacity as citizen and political being.

The two last questions are related to the concept of external efficacy, the more general belief in the political system. Here a vast majority agree that ordinary people have access to media. However, combined with the figures above, many obviously question whether it has any effect. For the last question, a majority believe that Denmark has a well working public sector, even despite an intense media debate on public institutional failures within areas as child care and care for the elderly. In general, the respondents believe in themselves and the society.

Social capital

The concept of social capital has been widely discussed and analyzed for decades. Theoretically, it is heavily associated with Robert Putnam (2000) and his book "Bowling Alone". He claims a decline in civic culture in America in forms of trust, connectedness to neighbors and general belief in society. As the concept of social capital is what can be described as a latent attitude among respondents, difficult to approach directly, similar surveys like in the "Public connection" project, the Danish Democracy Project (Goul Andersen, 2000) and the Eurobarometer[1] operates with

---

[1] See http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm

indirect questions, trying to grasp the level of interpersonal trust and belief in society among respondents. This survey was inspired by some of such typical questions and the five questions shown in table 2 were asked to respondents.

Table 2: Aspects of social capital among respondents. Level of agreement with the following statements. Percentages.

	Agree	Partly agree	Neutral	Partly disagree	Disagree	N
You can generally trust in other people	21	53	16	7	3	1602
I feel safe where I am in everyday life	59	31	6	3	2	1604
In the end everybody has to take care of oneself	14	15	19	33	19	1678
I am afraid of getting ill or a bad health	13	24	24	17	22	1695
I often feel lonely	3	10	14	17	56	1700

We see that the respondents demonstrate a high level of trust concerning the first two questions. The overall majority agrees (74 and 90 percent) or partly agrees that you can trust other people and that they feel safe where they are in everyday life. The last three questions are reversed so disagreement represents high levels of trust. The attitudes here are more mixed, apart from the last question which reflects the level of trust and self-confidence from the first two questions: 73 percent disagree that they often feel lonely. The attitude to the somehow ideological statement that everybody has to take care on oneself is more evenly divided among agreement and disagreement. The same is true for the health issue as 37 percent agree or partly agree that they are afraid of getting ill. The mixed attitudes are no surprise as these questions are more facetted and complicated than the first two and maybe less clear cut issues of social capital.

Sense of belonging
The next question addressed was the sense of belonging to certain areas, a phenomenon which is definitely a core component of the concept of public connection but also often asked in surveys addressing citizenship.

Table 3: Sense of belonging among respondents to certain geographical or institutional entities.
   Percentages.

	Very strong	Strong	Some	Weak	None	N
My local area	25	38	24	10	3	1696
The Danish society	44	38	14	3	1	1687
Europe	10	29	33	16	10	1658
My workplace, school etc.	21	37	20	5	16	1583
My colleagues, fellow students etc.	15	37	24	8	15	1594
A fan group or a fan culture	3	8	10	15	64	1608

The first three questions address sense of geographical belonging. The overall majority indicate a strong sense of belonging to their local area and the Danish society in general. There is a vaguer but still considerate sense of belonging towards Europe, even despite the mixed Danish attitudes to the European Union demonstrated in several general referendums on the issue. Most respondents also demonstrate a strong sense of belonging towards their workplace or, for some, their school. This belonging is reflected in the fact that a majority feel strongly connected to their colleagues or fellow students, classmates etc. The sense of belonging, thus, is institutional as well as personal. Finally a more un-traditional question of connectedness to a fan group or culture was asked, in order to grasp a factor of identification which might be noticeable not at least young people. In general, only 11 percent feel a strong sense of belonging to a fan culture, but for the youngest group (18-24 years), the figure is three times higher, at 33 percent, confirming our initial suspicions.

Political statements through lifestyle and consumption

The final aspect of citizenship investigated in the survey was that of lifestyle and political consumption. As mentioned, this is an example that areas traditionally belonging to the free market, lifestyle and consumption, becomes politicized, illustrating the blurring of different spheres in contemporary society. Today, lifestyle and consumption is often a question of signaling who you are, as private person as well as citizen. A range of questions was asked, the percentages of answers are illustrated in table 4 below.

Table 4. Attitudes to various aspects of lifestyle and political consumption among respondents. Percentages.

	Agree	Partly agree	Neutral	Partly disagree	Disagree	N
I am aware of what I eat	34	45	17	3	2	1699
I am worried about chemicals in food	31	34	20	9	5	1690
It is important for me to buy organic food	15	27	26	11	22	1695
As a consumer I can influence producers	11	39	26	15	9	1658
I boycott products from certain countries	8	12	29	15	36	1616

The questions on lifestyle are closely related to food issues as investigation of food habits and attitudes connected to citizenship was another important aspect investigated in the survey. We see that a majority of respondents are aware of what they eat as well as worried about the level of chemicals in our food. When it comes to the more practical, daily behavior, a smaller share declares that they actually buy organic food. Even though the attitude towards healthy food is present, it does not necessarily materialize into lived practice. The last two questions relate to the more explicit role as political citizen. Exactly half of the respondents agree that they can influence the producers through their actions as consumers. A practical way of influencing producers is through boycotts, for instance of products from certain countries like Burma, Zimbabwe or Israel. However, when it comes to such a practical consumer action, only 20 percent agree that they do that. Again, one thing is attitude, another thing is practical action.

Dimensions of citizenship

Above, I have surveyed the experience of citizenship and public connection through asking four sets of questions, related to theoretical ideas. The next step was to test whether such a framework is correct or whether other (maybe cross-cutting) dimensions of citizenship appeared within the data. One common method for exploring hidden dimensions is explorative factor analysis. Here all 21 questions shown in the above tables were pooled together and analyzed for hidden coherences, factors, among certain sets of questions. The extraction method was principal axis factoring and the rotation method Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 5: Factor analysis for 21 questions on (experienced) citizenship

	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am worried about chemicals in food	,706	-,037	,070	,154	-,028	-,085
It is important for me to buy organic food	,705	,047	,153	-,085	,063	,107
I am aware of what I eat	,520	,015	,100	,128	,140	,020
I boycott products from certain countries	,458	-,035	,038	,013	-,092	,022
As a consumer I can influence producers	,346	,076	,213	,021	,259	-,040
Belonging to my colleagues, fellow students etc.	,037	,858	-,011	,118	,103	,112
Belonging to my workplace, school etc.	,004	,852	-,017	,157	,027	,111
Belonging to a fan group or a fan culture	,179	-,185	-,064	,105	,032	,068
I feel connected to a political ideology or certain political ideas	,145	,018	,706	,083	,110	,059
I follow politics	,123	-,079	,658	,135	,091	,116
I can influence politics on certain areas which interest me	,113	,093	,479	,108	,314	,035
Belonging to The Danish society	,035	,103	,147	,619	,194	-,019
Belonging to my local area	,081	,056	,075	,555	,099	,054
Belonging to Europe	,080	,110	,176	,327	,265	,017
Ordinary people can share their opinion through media	,073	-,050	,096	,211	,483	-,009
Denmark has a well working public sector	-,064	,028	,163	,075	,474	,035
You can generally trust in other people	,105	,138	,032	,163	,400	,387
In the end everybody has to take care of oneself	,124	,025	,217	,059	-,076	,398
I am afraid of getting ill or a bad health	-,096	,059	,024	-,099	,027	,396
I often feel lonely	,077	-,038	-,005	,334	,079	,384
I feel safe where I am in everyday life	,015	,053	-,018	,098	,353	,355

The factor analysis demonstrated six factors across the questions, roughly corresponding to initial theoretical expectations. The factors are marked by yellow in the table above.

The strongest factor (factor 1) fits exactly to our initial expectations that the five questions within the framework of lifestyle / political consumption are related. I call factor 1 Political Consumption.

Factor 2 and 4 are related to the question of belonging. Interestingly, there seems to be a distinction between institutional belonging (factor 2) and geographical belonging (sense of belonging to certain geographical entities (factor 4). Factor 3 is related to the concept of political efficacy as it encompasses the first three questions from the battery, those related to personal experience of political competence and capacity to act. Factor 5 on the other hand encompasses the issue of efficacy in the terms of belief in society (external efficacy). The social capital-related question of trust in other people is interestingly encompassed in this factor as well. The last factor (6) is the least significant of the factors and is related to the issue of social capital. 4 of the five questions from the battery are included, omitting the question of trust in other people as it is a part of factor 5. To a large extent, the factors generated through this exploratory method fit the initial expectations of citizenship dimensions which lay behind the survey. This is quite satisfying although we cannot overlook the risk that the framing of the questions in the same context might have affected the respondents' response patterns, making them think coherently about the issues. This is always a risk in survey analysis.

The performance of citizenship

In the section above I have focused on the experience of citizenship, explored mainly by Likert scale-styled questions. In this section I will address the actual performance of citizenship. Beyond a traditional focus on political participation I will also focus on cultural activity in order to encompass aspects of cultural citizenship. I will further distinguish among offline and online political and cultural activity. Finally, one of the issues from the previous section, political consumption, can also be defined as a kind of performed citizenship as the questions relate to willingness to perform specific actions. Thus, in the table below it is put in the category of performed rather than experienced citizenship.

In order to summarize how various forms of citizenship are related, a number of formative indexes were constructed. The measures of experienced citizenship are based on the questions from the previous section. I very much followed the outcome of the factor analysis. Thus, the questions of political efficacy were pooled together in one index; the same was true for the questions on social capital. Regarding sense of belonging, the factor analysis clearly showed two dimensions, that of geographical belonging and that institutional belonging.

Performed citizenship was analyzed by constructing additive indexes based on a number of political and cultural activities, and by a formative index on political consumption based on the relevant questions addressed in the previous section.

The index of political participation offline was constructed by adding the number of the following political activities in which the respondent had participated within the last year: membership of a political party, attending political meetings, contacted a politician or civil servant, participated in

town meetings etc., written letters to the editor, discussed politics with friends of colleagues, followed political debates on TV, joined a petition and "others".[2]

The index of online political participation was based on the number of the following activities: participated in online debates (in chat rooms, blogs, social network sites etc.), joined online petitions, contacted a politician or civil servant electronically, searched for information on parties and candidates, tested political opinions in tests or quizzes online, watched politicians' videos online, read politicians' blogs, joined online referendums, read politically related content on MySpace, Facebook, YouTube etc.

The index of cultural activity was based on the number of following activities: visited a historical museum, visited an art museum, participated in a sports event, visited a library, attended a theatre performance or a classical concert, attended a rhythmic concert, been at the cinema and visited a festival, market or a fair.

The index of online cultural activity was based on the following activities: Participated in online groups on literature, images or music, used websites related to literature, art, music or history, visited a Danish museum website and visited a foreign museum website.

All the indexes were standardized so as the possible scores ranged between 0 and 10. Table 6 shows a correlation matrix for all the 9 indexes, the 4 of experienced and the 5 of performed citizenship. Significant correlations at a 99 percent level are flagged with **.

---

[2] Of course one can argue against additive indexes in the sense that the number of activities tell us nothing about the level and intensity of involvement in the single activities. That is a problem which can only be solved by more qualitative measures which are employed in other parts of this research project.

Table 6: Correlation matrix for indexes of experienced and performed citizenship. Gamma values.

	Political "efficacy"	Social capital	Geographical belonging	Institutional belonging	Political consumption	Political participation	Online political participation	Cultural participation	Online cultural participation
Experienced citizenship									
Political "efficacy"	1	,243**	,351**	,073**	,243**	,407**	,284**	,264**	,181**
Social capital	,243**	1	,206**	,181**	,101**	,143**	,045	,222**	,111**
Geographical belonging	,351**	,206**	1	,207**	,165**	,233**	,099**	,150**	,115**
Institutional belonging	,073**	,181**	,207**	1	,030	,082**	,088**	,179**	,050*
Performed citizenship									
Political consumption	,243**	,101**	,165**	,030	1	,220**	,168**	,255**	,248**
Political participation	,407**	,143**	,233**	,082**	,220**	1	,542**	,362**	,299**
Online political participation	,284**	,045	,099**	,088**	,168**	,542**	1	,293**	,413**
Cultural participation	,264**	,222**	,150**	,179**	,255**	,362**	,293**	1	,460**
Online cultural participation	,181**	,111**	,115**	,050*	,248**	,299**	,413**	,460**	1

In general one should notice that gamma values greater than 0.3 indicate strong relationship and those close to 0.5 very strong relationships.

In general, there are significant correlations between most indexes, indicating that experienced and performed citizenship, political and cultural citizenship are all related.

There are particularly strong relationships between political efficacy and political participation. Those who believe in themselves and society tend to participate and engage more in civil and political activities or maybe they get their trust in themselves and society by participating. So far, this analysis tells us nothing about the direction of the relationship.

There are also strong correlations between social capital (trust) and efficacy and sense of belonging. Again, those who are self-confident and believe in others are the same as those who feel attached to a certain place or institution. This should be no surprise either.

When exploring the relationship between online and offline participation forms, it is a common claim that the Internet tends to supplement the "lived", "physical" world. Here we see that there might be a supplement rather than a substitution. There are strong correlations between political and cultural activity online and offline respectively. In other words: those culturally active offline are also active online. The same is true for political activity. The Internet reinforces rather than changes existing behavior patterns.

ICT and the performance of citizenship

Finally, there is reason to discuss how the use and the competence of using new media affect various aspects of citizenship. Whereas pessimists claim that digital media make people lazy and unengaged, a large number of scholars and theorists discussed earlier in this paper would claim that the use of new media strengthens the ability to perform and act as a citizen. In table 7 below I have constructed three further indexes, "ICT competence", "net consumption" and "net production". "ICT competence" is based on the respondents evaluations of their own ability to perform a range of operations online, form the very simple like checking e-mail to the complicated of setting up a website or a mail list. "Net consumption" is based upon the aggregate number of different (more passive) activities in which the respondents have taken part the last year. "Net production" is based upon the aggregate number of more active (Web 2.0) activities the last year, like participating in social network sites, building websites, updating blogs and uploading or sharing videos and images. Again all indexes are standardized to values between 0 and 10.

*Table 7. Correspondence between ICT competence, net consumption and net production. Gamma values. Significant relationships at 99 percent level flagged ***

	ICT competence	Net consumption	Net production	Political "efficacy"	Social capital	Belonging to areas	Belonging to work/school	Political consumption	Political participation	Online political participation	Cultural participation	Online cultural participation
ICT competence	1	,444 **	,420 **	,049	,093 **	,054 *	,221 **	,047	,077 **	,241 **	,156 **	,202 **
Net consumption	,444 **	1	,566 **	,015	,027	-,002	,172 **	,061 *	,166 **	,395 **	,288 **	,445 **
Net production	,420 **	,566 **	1	-,007	-,026	,026	,105 **	,080 **	,200 **	,421 **	,190 **	,296 **

Of course there are strong internal correlations between ICT competence, production and consumption. More interestingly, there are strong correlations between those competent and eager

ICT users and those politically and culturally engaged (offline as well as online). It seems as if the active and competent within the fields of ICT also are the most active citizens, online as well as offline. However, such relationship needs to be further analysed and elaborated in a later version of this paper, for instance by statistical control related to age and education. Further, cluster and correspondence analysis might reveal heterotopias and variations which are not visible here.

Preliminary conclusion

This paper has been a first draft of experiencing roles of citizenship in the age of digital media, using Denmark as a critical case study. For the data on attitudes to citizenship, there are no big surprises comparing to similar investigations in Denmark and abroad. However, when one related experienced and performed citizenship, there seems to be discrepancies between attitudes and the actual performed action. For instance, as many people are worried about chemistry in food, only 20 percent are eager to buy organic goods. And where half of the respondents think they might affect producers, much less are willing to take a specific action like for instance boycotts.
The last part of the paper address the role of new media related to citizenship. This is the part of the paper which might still need to be elaborated. The tendency is that new media tends to reinforce existing behavior patterns and attitudes: those engaged and resourceful get yet another media for performing citizenship. However, further analyses might reveal more hidden tendencies within that part of the material. Media are central to the experience of collective belonging. Thus there are reasons to correlate the dimensions of citizenship to media use and practices, to explore the relationship between media habits and citizenship but also to shed light on the relative importance of various media for various performed citizenship practices. Later in this project, it is the plan to attempt a correspondence analysis in order to grasp potential clusters and identify further differences between various forms of citizenship, ideally relate citizenship forms to various kinds of media use.

References (not yet complete):

Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba (1963). *The civic culture: political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Andersen, Johannes (2000). "Borgerne og det lokale styre", i Jørgen Goul Andersen, Lars Torpe & Johannes Andersen (red.). *Hvad folket magter – Demokrati, magt og afmagt*. København: Jurist & Økonomforbundets Forlag.

Appadurai, Arjan (1996). *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Arterton, Christopher (1987). *Teledemocracy - Can Technology Protect Democracy*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Barber, Benjamin (1998). *A Place For Us – How To Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Barnes, Samuel & Max Kaase (1979). *Political Action – Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Bruns, Axel (2008). Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life and Beyond. New York: Peter Lang

Connolly, W.E., (1974) "Essentially Contested Concepts in Politics", pp.10-44 in Connolly, W.E., *The Terms of Political Discourse*, Lexington: Heath

Couldry, Nick (2006). Culture and Citizenship: "The Missing Link?", *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3), pp. 321–339.

Couldry, Nick, Sonia Livingstone and Tim Markham (2007). *Media Consumption and Public Engagement: Beyond the Presumption of Attention*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

De Certeau, Michel (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Los Angeles: University of California Press

Dyson, Esther (1998). *Internettet og vores liv* [Release 2.0]. København: Munksgaard – Rosinante.

Greenacre, Michael (1994). *Correspondence analysis in the social sciences: recent developments and applications*. London: Academic Press

Goul Andersen, Jørgen (2000). "Magt og afmagt: Nyt perspektiv på politisk 'efficacy'", i Jørgen Goul Andersen, Lars Torpe & Johannes Andersen. *Hvad folket magter*. København: Jurist & Økonomforbundets Forlag.

Gutmann, Amy & Dennis Thompson (1996). *Democracy and disagreement*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hoff, Jens, Karl Löfgren & Sune Johansson (1999). *Internet og demokrati - Erfaringer fra kommunalvalget 1997*. København: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag.

Keen, Andrew (2007). The Cult of the Amateur: How Today's Internet is Killing Our Culture. New York: Random House

Lundby, Knut (2008). *Digital Storytelling, Mediated Stories*. New York: Peter Lang

Marshall, T.H. (1950). "Citizsenship and Social Class"; in: *Citizenship and Social Class*; T.H. Marshall/Tom Bottomore; London et altera: Pluto Press .

Mol, Annemarie (2002) *The body multiple. Ontology in medical practice*. Duke University press: Durham and London

Putnam, Robert (2000). Bowling Alone. New York: Touchstone Books

Ritzer, George (1995). *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press

Schuler, Douglas (1996). New Community Networks. Available at http://www.scn.org/commnet/ncn.htm

Turner, Bryan S. (2001). "Outline of a General Theory of Citizenship", pp. 11-32 in Nick Stevenson (ed.): *Culture & Citizenship*. London: Sage

van Zoonen, Liesbet (2005). *Entertaining the citizen: politics in the fan democracy*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.