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Abstract

The notion of good citizenship is a neglected concept within the theoretical literature and in empirical investigations. The field of citizenship studies is now vast and multidisciplinary yet there has not been a specific study aimed solely at uncovering what it means to be a good citizen. This research responds to this deficiency by undertaking a theoretical analysis of the components of good citizenship, combined with the creation of a consensus view of citizenship experts and a set of lay perspectives on good citizenship. The methodology is concerned with examining the characteristics of good citizenship from an expert point of view using a modified Delphi study. Two methods of data collection: semi-structured interviews and focus groups were used to research the lay perspectives on what it means to be a good citizen.

Much of the citizenship literature in Britain acknowledges the seminal work of T.H Marshall in shaping the way in which citizenship is perceived. His tripartite categorisation of citizenship is a device which adds clarity to the complex and contested discourses surrounding citizenship. Since then, creating models and observing types in the discourses that contribute to citizenship has further added clarity to the way in which the concept is understood, both theoretically and empirically. This study has distilled the complex discourses used to describe the good citizen to produce taxonomy of ideal types that can act as a starting point for discussion and further investigation into what it means to be a good citizen in contemporary Britain.

Most significant amongst the findings is the importance given to relational, interpersonal characteristics of good citizenship. The findings acknowledge a conception of good citizenship in which responsibilities are central. Individuals do not perceive their contribution toward the community in a narrow and political view, but a broad and interpersonal view in which good citizenship relates to all spheres of activity, from caring activities toward family and friends, to a concern with the well-being of future generations. This offers up a
challenge to recognise and incorporate more fully, the activities that have traditionally been considered to be of the private realm and therefore beyond the scope of citizenship. This also challenges us individually, to be inspired by the narratives of good citizens and to question our behaviour and our dispositions.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Background to the research

The notion of good citizenship is a neglected concept within the field of citizenship research. The notion of citizenship is being investigated with more rigour and scrutiny than ever before, yet only a small part of this literature deals with the notion of good citizenship. Normative conceptions of the correct or optimal citizenly behaviour are present throughout the theoretical traditions of thinking about citizenship yet the public understanding of the term is relatively poorly documented. Whilst there is a substantial amount of literature on the theoretical parameters of citizenship and the relationship between the individual and the political community, this study aims to redress the relative lack of empirical studies on the meaning of citizenship and in particular, the meanings of good citizenship.

This study began amidst a context in which 'citizenship' was an unfamiliar notion to the public. In 1990, the Commission on Citizenship reported on the lack of fluency on behalf of the British public with this term and the passing years and the exponential increase in the amount of theoretical literature on citizenship have not resolved this issue. In 1999 Dean with Melrose reported that close to a third of respondents in their study did not know ‘what being a citizen means’ (p.5). The question of good citizenship has been neglected in the theoretical literature although the lack of popular understanding has been referred to in the opening years of this century (Miller, 2000; Jones and Gaventa, 2002: Lister, 2003). The empirical studies that have addressed the meaning of citizenship have taken Conover et al’s seminal 1991 study as a starting point. Conover et al produced an incisive empirical study on the meaning of good citizenship in the United States and Great Britain. They identified a distinction in the public consciousness between an ‘ordinary’ and ‘extra good’ citizen, thus
commenting not only on the ways that citizenship is understood by the public but also on the notion that there is something above the level of a mere citizen, an ideal or a model that should be strived for. Subsequent empirical studies have also added to the debate around the meaning of citizenship. Sara MacKian (1998) outlined a set of findings on the meanings of the ‘active’ citizen based on a series of in-depth interviews with male respondents in a Welsh mining community. More recently, Dean with Melrose (1999) undertook empirical research into popular understandings of welfare citizenship and Lister et al (2003) have undertaken a longitudinal study on how young people in a British city perceive citizenship and their own transitions as citizens. Pattie et al (2004) have also undertaken a study into people’s civic attitudes and behaviour in The Citizen Audit conducted in 2000 and 2001.

This study is the first to focus solely on good citizenship and builds upon the theoretical literature to construct a landscape of the meanings of good citizenship. The empirical part of this research will explore how such conceptions of good citizenship are shared by a panel of experts and the general public.

**Methodological approach**

Throughout the project the researcher has attempted to apply the insights provided by grounded theory. Thus, at each stage of the study, grounded theory shapes the approach and informs the methodology of subsequent stages. In this way, the literature review provides the basis for a theoretical discussion of the characteristics of the good citizen which are in turn used to construct the methodology for a questionnaire study into the views of a panel of experts. Continuing in this vein, the expert study informed a schedule through which lay perspectives on good citizenship were examined, firstly through a series of in-depth qualitative interviews and secondly through a shorter series of focus group sessions.
Research questions

In order to proceed with this research a series of aims were articulated and translated into a number of objectives. These objectives generated a series of research questions which guided the methodologies that were adopted for the research.

Research aims

1. To analyse the concept of citizenship and associated notion of ‘good citizenship’.
2. To explore expert and lay perceptions of good citizenship

Research objectives

1. To reconstruct a theoretical framework of good citizenship.
2. To identify dimensions of good citizenship based on the theoretical literature.
3. To identify perceptions of good citizenship from a panel of citizenship experts.
4. To identify lay perceptions of good citizenship.
5. To compare good citizenship in the theoretical literature with expert and lay perceptions of good citizenship.

These objectives thus give rise to the following research questions:

- How does good citizenship feature in the theoretical and empirical citizenship literature?
- How do citizenship experts and lay people conceive of the characteristics of good citizenship?
- What is the relationship between theoretical conceptions of good citizenship and the lay person’s perceptions of being a good citizen?
Outline of contents

Following this introduction, the second chapter presents a review of the general meaning of citizenship in the theoretical literature on citizenship. The next chapter continues to explore the concept of good citizenship in the theoretical and empirical literature on citizenship. The first stage of the literature review looks at the theoretical issues underpinning citizenship and aims to clarify and generate a theoretical framework. With this in mind, initial studies explored the concept of citizenship more thoroughly in order to investigate the notions of a good citizen more specifically. This investigation led to a study of a diverse array of subject areas including ethical frameworks from which the notion of an 'ethic of care' emerges as an important theme.

Following on from this, a chapter on the methodology used in the empirical study considers three methods of data collection, beginning with the expert study and proceeds to look at in-depth interview and focus groups in turn. The theory and general use of each method of data collection are first examined before making reference to their particular application to the meanings of good citizenship. Data analysis was an integral part of the data collection process; the chapter proceeds to outline the types of analysis used and the cumulative way that analysis of one stage informed the data collection in the later stages. Chapter 4 concludes with a description of the recruitment and recording of the in-depth interviews and focus groups.

The main findings of the study are reported in a series of sections. The first section addresses the results of the expert study and considers four sets of findings. The first set presents a consensual view of the characteristics of good citizenship based upon a ranking of the expert results according to a series of counting procedures. The chapter then proceeds to report how the characteristics of good citizenship could be grouped into categories. The chapter then continues to look at the results according to gender before assessing the tensions and differences in opinion in the expert findings.
The results of the in-depth interviews and focus groups that constitute the lay perspectives on good citizenship are reported in the second part of the Findings chapter. The chapter continues to outline the processes through which lay respondents discuss good citizenship and then describes the essence of the lay perspectives on good citizenship. The next section continues to look at the findings from the counting procedures used in the lay study and then outlines the topics that were either not relevant or inimical to good citizenship. The chapter concludes by looking at the content of bad citizenship and the obstacles that make it hard to be a good citizen.

The penultimate chapter discusses the findings of both the expert and the lay studies and identifies similarities and differences between them. The discussion revolves around four ideal types of good citizen that emerge from a taxonomy of good citizenship that is developed in this chapter. After using the ideal types to draw out the similarities and differences between the two studies, this chapter concludes by comparing the findings and ideal types to the theoretical and empirical literature.

The final chapter presents the conclusions of the study, including reflections upon the methodology used and suggestions for further study.
Chapter 2
What does it mean to be a citizen?

Introduction

Contemporary political discourse uses the term 'citizenship' very loosely, often treating it as little more than an empty vessel into which speakers may pour their own social and political ideals. (Schuck, 2002: 131)

There are various ways of answering the question of what it means to be a citizen. In over-simplified terms, citizenship can be understood as either a legal status or a substantive practice and this dichotomy often provides a starting point for much of the theoretical discussion of citizenship (notable examples include Heater, 1990 and 2000; Lister, 1997; Oldfield, 1990; Turner, 1997 although most definitions of citizenship pay lip service to this distinction). In this way then the question of what it means to be a citizen is reducible to the two main theoretical traditions that enunciate the concept, liberalism and civic republicanism. It is also possible to view the meaning of citizenship as the product of a series of inter-related themes, as a legal status, as a substantive identity and as a philosophical guide (Faulks, 1998).

The tendency to conceptualise citizenship as either a status or a practice is a useful starting point for analysing the current position that citizenship occupies, however, the current debates surrounding citizenship do not easily map onto the status/practice distinction and this chapter will go beyond this dichotomy. Looking at the traditions of citizenship allows us to realise that citizenship pertains to a particular space and to a particular time, its boundaries are constantly shifting according to social and theoretical challenges. With this in mind, the chapter will proceed to examine the current context within which citizenship as a theoretical concept is discussed; the main
traditions of citizenship thought; citizenship rights and citizenship responsibilities; and finally, the boundaries of citizenship.

The context of the citizenship debates

Citizenship has been an enduring concept in the tradition of Western political philosophy for several decades, notably in Ancient Greece, in Roman civilisation, with the rise of the modern nation state, and in the twenty first century arguably developing into a post-cosmopolitan form (Dobson, 2003). According to Kymlicka and Norman the recent interest in citizenship over the past few decades is in part a function of the 'natural evolution in political discourse' (1994: 352). Over the last decade or more, there have been various ideologically-based challenges to the mainstream theory and practice of national citizenship from across the political spectrum, from the New Right to New Labour, from new social movements such as feminism, environmentalism and multi-culturalism. The challenge has not been just an academic one in the UK. First the New Right and then New Labour have contributed to the arenas in which the responsibilities agenda has been played out and can be seen in the emphasis on paid work and in the civil renewal agenda.

Firstly, the relevant aspects include the nature and role of citizens' responsibilities (e.g. Roche, 1992, 1995; Janoski, 1998). Secondly, in recent years new social and cultural movements have developed to promote interests and agendas in the fields of the politics of identity and recognition, of multi-culturalism and anti-racism, of sexuality and lifestyle, of consumption and communication. These movements have renewed interest in the politics of citizenship in general and also in the theoretical proposition that citizenship has a distinct and analysable cultural dimension (Isin and Wood 1999; Pakulski, 1997; Roche, 1992; Rosaldo, 1994; Stevenson, 2001; Turner, 1993). Arguably a cultural dimension was always present in the politics and development of modern citizenship in general since the nineteenth century, albeit in contestable national and mono-cultural versions. This is evident in the development of such cultural institutions as national education and media systems and citizens' rights in

1 See Reisenberg (1992) for the historical development of the idea of citizenship.
relation to them. However, the cultural dimension, whether it is envisaged in these national mono-cultural terms or in contemporary multicultural and pluralistic terms, was never adequately represented in the mainstream citizenship analysis. At the very least the new social and cultural movements and their politics can be said to reveal and address new levels of complexity in the status and implications of national citizenship. Thus additional contextualisation is required in the mainstream analysis of citizenship if the nature and prospects of social citizenship in the contemporary period are to be adequately grasped.

Thirdly, there is the question of whether the nation state and the national level of citizenship are any longer adequate units of analysis in the contemporary world in which globalisation, and particularly the creation of a global capitalist economy, is such a powerful long-term dynamic. In the Marshallian framework, citizenship and residence started and ended with the nation state. However, notions of cosmopolitan citizenship (Linklater, 1998, 2002), multiple citizenship (Heater, 1990, 2000) and post-national citizenship (Dobson, 2003) have added to the debates about citizenship and the nation state. Taking the transnational level seriously means adding further to the complexity of any understanding of the structures of contemporary citizenship, and also adding further to the societal contexts that need to be taken into account when analysing social rights.

The main traditions of citizenship

Current thinking on the concept of citizenship has been significantly influenced by the tendency to consider theories of citizenship according to two opposing themes; citizenship as status and citizenship as practice (Oldfield 1990; Marquand, 1991; Lister, 1997). Broadly speaking, this division is consistent with the split between the liberal tradition and the civic republican tradition respectively which arguably have the longest historical pedigree of contributing to the understanding of what it means to be a citizen. However, in recent decades a communitarian position on citizenship has emerged which also has an important bearing upon the way in which citizenship is understood. The first part of this subsection addresses the liberal tradition and considers its influence on the meaning of citizenship. The second part of this
subsection considers the communitarian challenge to liberalism and examines the communitarian view of citizenship. Following this part, the next section will address the older civic republican tradition and explore the image of a citizen that it constructs.

*Liberalism*

Presently, liberalism is held to be the central theoretical tradition in understanding the notion of citizenship. However, the discourse of liberalism is not unified, and contains a range of political positions and diverse expressions (Durish, 2002: 5). In spite of this, it is possible to identify several core concepts and also to identify particular strands of liberalism ranging from classical liberalism through to more recent social democratic forms that inform the liberal view of citizenship, or the liberal answer to what it means to be a member of a community.

Liberalism is commonly associated with a formal view of citizenship that prioritises legal status. The basis of liberalism that has a more prominent bearing upon citizenship can be traced back to the rise of the central bureaucratic state from the sixteenth century onwards. As the progenitors of modern liberalism, the core aspects of the contemporary liberal view of citizenship can be located in the works of John Locke and Thomas Hobbes (Locke, 1960; Hobbes, 1989, 1991, 1998).

In defending the civic body of citizens from the intrusive threat of central government, Hobbes and Locke sought to preserve the conditions of market exchange and helped to establish the enduring doctrine of individualism that prioritises the view of a citizen as an unencumbered individual, endowed with a set of inalienable rights. In other words, the liberal view asserts the moral primacy of the individual against the claims of any social collectivity' (Gray, 1995: 12). This view of the individual has come under considerable criticism as an unconvincing account of the individual, not least from feminist and communitarian critics who fundamentally challenge the liberal conception of personhood (Blum, 1988; Crowley, 1987; Etzioni, 1999; Gilligan, 1986; Pateman, 1988, 1990; Phillips, 1991; Sandel, 1982; Taylor, 1985, Tronto, 1987, 1995). Chapter 3 will consider the shortcomings of the liberal theory of citizenship and argue that a more rounded conception of good citizenship needs to build on the traditional
theoretical underpinnings by adding insights from feminist theory, in particular an 'ethic of care'.

The liberal tradition is often viewed as a 'contractual' theory (Dworkin, 1977; Gray, 1986; Gutman, 1985; Rawls, 1971) due to the fact that liberal theory regards individuals as autonomous actors bound together by the notion of a social contract, not so much by common tradition, practices and experiences (Rawls, 1971; Wolin, 1986). The liberal view of the citizen is also built upon the principle of equality. The notion of equality can be traced back to classical liberalism and is contained in Greek and Roman thoughts on citizenship although was still markedly restricted and only 'egalitarian, in as much as it confers on all men [sic] the same moral status and denies the relevance to legal or political order of differences in moral worth among human beings' (Gray, 1995: 12). The liberal view of a citizen is also universalist, in as much as liberal thinking affirms 'the moral unity of the human species' and can be seen as 'meliorist' because of its affirmation of the corrigeability and improvability of all social institutions and political arrangements (ibid).

The role of the state is another key feature in the liberal view of citizenship. John Stuart Mill (1951) is a key contributor to the liberal view of the relationship between individual and state, emphasising as he does, the notions of 'free choice' and the pursuit of one's personal interests, or interests that do not affect the interests of others. Therefore, through the prism of liberalism, a citizen is free to pursue their own projects, voice their opinions freely, and pursue their own business designs with limited interference or guidance from the state. However, it is challenged by alternative theoretical traditions, which fundamentally differ, particularly in the importance of the notion of community.

In the twentieth century, social liberalism has made a large impact on the way that citizenship is currently understood. Social liberalism rests on a view of the 'social self' who 'have and need a social milieu in which to develop their recognisable human qualities' (Twine, 1994: 9). As social beings, humans make themselves but not in conditions of their own choosing so the developmental potential of human being was dependent on institutional arrangements and provisions. Social liberalism was
concerned with protecting people against poverty, and it was thought that through the welfare state, everyone was able to be autonomous.

TH Marshall is a central theorist to the social liberal view of citizenship as it was he who applied such views to the emerging Keynes-Beveridge welfare state in the notion of social rights. Social rights came to be concerned with the welfare of people as citizens' including 'such things as work, education, health and quality of life' (Roche, 1992: 3). Until the new social movements such as feminist, anti-racist and environmental movements starting in the 1960's, and later neo-liberal critiques, the notion of social rights was part of the post-war orthodoxy and one of the three pillars upon which citizenship rested (Pierson, 1991: Ch. 3, Roche, 1992: 39-55). John Rawls (1971) is another exemplar of social liberalism who generates principles of justice from the social view of the self. His view of citizenship is minimalist in its attempt to apply universally and emphasises equality of rights, equality of opportunity and fair distribution of goods, services and jobs. Other social liberal theorists include the procedural social liberalism of Bruce Ackerman (1980) who sees dialogue as crucial to citizenship and focuses on the importance of reasonable public debate in the just distribution of resources.

Civic republicanism

It is often considered that the dominant liberal view of citizenship meets its sternest rival in the civic republican tradition and there is a tendency to view them as competing theoretical traditions. Whereas the liberal view of citizenship prioritised the inalienability of individual rights, the civic republican tradition is concerned primarily, with notions of 'responsibility'. Where the liberal tradition is accused of emphasising the legal and formal status of citizenship, civic republicanism emphasises the importance of actively contributing towards the common good, in particular through political participation.

The image of the citizen constructed in the civic republican tradition is rooted in the political thought of Aristotle, in which a citizen has the 'time, intellect and power to engage in public affairs' (Carey, 2001: 60). Running throughout the history of political
philosophy, civic republicanism has identified membership of society, citizenship, as the basis of the common good 'and hence as indispensable to any form of social morality or good society.' (Jordan, 1989: 67). In addition, the civic republican conception of citizenship is characterised by the importance it places on being publicly active. Aristotle, one of the most influential progenitors of the civic republican tradition termed this requirement, 'arete', meaning goodness or virtue. Furthermore, a civic republican views a community of common interests as the framework for a basis of social relations. 'Power in society must be directed towards ensuring that common interests are recognizable, and that people have opportunities to act upon them.' (Jordan, 1989: 77).

However, despite being the older of the two main theoretical traditions, classical civic republicanism seems to be lacking in contemporary relevance given its emphasis on military service. In recent years theorists such Adrian Oldfield (1990), David Marquand (1991), Richard Dagger (1997, 2000, 2002) and Mary Dietz (1987) have rearticulated civic republicanism in terms of active engagement, particularly political engagement as a fundamental duty to be expected of all citizens by virtue of their acceptance and enjoyment of the entitlements citizenship also grants.

The revitalising of civic republicanism has been seen as part of a 'current nostalgia over citizenship' which 'strives to recuperate the participatory involvement of the small community' (White and Hunt, 2000: 94 and see Burchell, 1995: 541 for a similar point). Along with the civic republican tradition, communitarianism is also seen to be part of the same trend.

**Communitarianism**

Citizenship is a 'crossroads' concept, which is to say that it is a notion in which different disciplines as well as theoretical traditions can converge. Considering citizenship with community leads to one such point where sociological theory and political theory meet. The notion of community has been a significant feature of both modern social and political thought, elements of which can be found in the functionalist, classical sociology of Tonnies (1957) and Durkheim (1960) but also
throughout the 1980's and beyond in the work of Taylor (1985, 1986, 1989), MacIntyre (1981), Walzer (1983) and in a more populist dimension in the work of Selznick (1992) and Etzioni (1995, 1997). Since the 1980's the communitarian label has been attached to an emerging socio-political position which was initially reacting against the liberal notion of the individual and personhood. Whereas, the individual has primacy in liberal thinking, in communitarianism one's responsibilities, attachments, friendships and commitments all flow from an appreciation and commitment to community. ‘Community is the anchor, it provides certainty, regularity and rhythm – in community people know their place, they know what is expected of them. Life is stable and predictable and it is the stability, durability and continuity which give people a sense of belonging, identity and citizenship’ (Bussemaker, 1999: 17).

Following the trend of its theoretical re-emergence in the last two decades, the communitarian citizen therefore, is one that is defined in contrast with the liberal citizen. Opposition to the market-oriented perspective of liberalism is a distinguishing feature. The ethic of competitive individualism can be identified as one of the corollaries of a market centred approach and it is against this that the communitarian citizen takes form; the communitarian citizen prioritises solidarity with others in the local community and those who share the collective memories and history of that group. Cooperation, mutual care and fairness are important values to the communitarian citizen (Heater, 2000: 78).

For communitarians the task at hand is to rectify the moral failings of excessive individualism and to counteract its corrosive effects on social relations. This aim expresses itself via a strong emphasis on the virtue of community and a re-assertion of communal morality. As Newman and Soysal write:

The movement deplores the decline of the family and of community life, it condemns isolation and the loss of a clear faith, while resolutely setting its face against the immorality that is blamed for the decline in public morale. (Newman & Soysal, 1999: 263)
Communitarianism considers 'community' to be a need of its inhabitants, and emphasis is placed on the special bonds and connections that exist between members of the same community. Reflecting a belief expressed by Hegel, and more recently by Charles Taylor (1985, 1992), community is intrinsically valuable and a moral good and citizenship is conceived in terms that promote and benefit a sense of community.

Together with civic republicanism, communitarianism can be said to comprise a community-centred 'vocabulary of citizenship' (Bussemaker and Voet, 1998: 278) yet this often occludes the differences between the civic republican and communitarian perspectives. Communitarianism frequently draws upon the civic republican tradition of thought and both share a concern with the priority of the good over the right, however, when applied to citizenship, each has a different emphasis. The civic republican perspective on citizenship stems from a belief that citizens have a duty to participate actively in public affairs. In contrast, the communitarian perspective on citizenship emphasises one's responsibility towards the family, the neighbourhood and the broader society.

The populist dimension gives understandings of citizenship a particularly moral character. The centrality of a community-focused morality can be seen by looking at Part I of Etzioni's 'The Spirit of Community' that is titled "Shoring Up Morality". This chapter of Etzioni's work is concerned with answering the question: 'What are the foundations that undergird morality? How can they be shored up? In providing an answer to the self-posed question Etzioni focuses on the 'Communitarian family'. The essential message is that more care must be dedicated to the care and education of children. A review of articles published in The Responsive Community since 1991 illustrates not only the central concern with morality, but also the desire to lay out a course of action that is intended to guide and strengthen moral reform. A few titles help to illustrate this point: "A Moral Reawakening Without Puritanism," (Etzioni, 1991), "Can You Not Teach Morality in the Public Schools?" (Wildavsky, 1991/92) "Bridging Psychotherapy and Moral Responsibility" (Doherty, 1994/95), "The Case for Moral Education" (Close, 1993/94), "The Decline and Fall [of American Morality]" (Patterson and Kim, 1993/94), "On Moral Education" (Summers et al., 1992), and "Let's Focus our Moral Outrage" (Etzioni, 1995b).
This section has illustrated very briefly, the contested nature of citizenship through the content of the dominant traditions of political thought which house the intertwined roots of the concept of citizenship. The next section will explore the notion of citizenship more thoroughly through an examination of rights and then proceed to consider the responsibilities that are variously said to comprise its make up.

Rights

This section will begin with a brief overview of the types of rights that are associated with the concept of citizenship.

Types of rights

T.H Marshall and citizenship rights

Much of the prominence of rights in the citizenship construct can be attributed to the emphasis laid on them in T.H Marshall's seminal account of citizenship. He constructed a developmental theory in which citizens' rights progressed over three centuries from civil, to political to social rights and three sets of institutions in modern societies (namely legal systems, democratic government systems, and welfare systems respectively) have developed to address and service them. Marshall (1964) identified citizenship as a matter of membership denoted by the possession of rights; the more full and equal one's membership the fuller the complement of rights one possesses.²

The 'civil' component of rights was seen by Marshall to have originated in the 1700's and comprised such elements as freedom of speech, the right to own property, the right to justice and the necessary conditions for individual freedom. Marshall's second category of rights were seen as ensuring effective participation in the political process and this category was constituted by 'the right to participate in the exercise of political power', the right to vote, to stand for political office, to free elections and to a secret ballot. (Marshall, 1964: 72). 'Social' rights developed in the first half of the twentieth century and are concerned with the individual's full inclusion and integration into society. Social rights arise out of an awareness that civil and political rights are not a guarantee of full equality and attempt to provide redress for social and economic inequalities. Not all welfare programmes can be classed as 'social rights' but welfare and social security do make up a large part of their content.

These are not the only terms in which rights can be discussed and Marshall's categories do not cover the extent to which rights are represented in the citizenship discourses. Global concerns about one's relationship with the environment have been

² The significant emphasis that Marshall placed on 'rights' and comparatively little on 'obligations' is perhaps a consequence of the socio-historical situation. Marshall was writing in the context of post-war Britain which had just seen a massive emphasis on responsibility, obligation and duty in the form of the recently concluded World War. The comparative lack of emphasis on obligations may be attributable to the fact that it was taken for granted that one had responsibility and concomitant obligations.
joined with cosmopolitan sentiments to complement civil, political and social rights with 'environmental' and 'cultural' rights. Furthermore, the very task of constructing a framework of rights is a contentious task as the utility of specific rights categories are contested and challenged. Marshall's structure may have been the orthodox view of rights for several decades although it was eventually challenged by a neoliberal perspective which brought into question the desirability of social rights and attempted to roll back the welfare state. Given that citizenship is a concept that is bounded to a particular cultural and historical context it seems germane to note that the structure of rights proposed by Marshall must be altered and arguably replaced if it is to remain relevant to the social changes and political movements that have characterised recent decades. There are several ways in which it is possible to alter the Marshallian structure, removing social rights from a theory of citizenship for example, or by adding rights to this list. The next part of this subsection will discuss new kinds of rights-claims in general, whilst pointing out the significance of human rights, environmental rights and cultural rights to the notion of citizenship.

In the 1960's, new social movements emerged that took a critical view of the dominant understandings of citizenship, criticising the social divisions institutionalised by the welfare state, that perpetuated the types of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' (Pierson, 1991: 83). Over the years, these movements have prompted a series of rights claims, challenging the universalist assumptions at the heart of modern liberalism and calling for the recognition of difference, of the cultural and environmental rights and criticising exclusion and discrimination.

Human rights

Human rights are not a subset of citizenship rights but rather they stand alongside citizenship rights and, since the Enlightenment, have formed one of two ways in which the individual can legally be defined, as human being or as a citizen (Delanty, 2000: 68). However, the relationship between human rights and citizenship rights has changed and is not as easily viewed as the separate definable positions they once were, but are becoming more blurred and ‘de-differentiated’ (ibid) and thus cannot be placed alongside civil, political and social rights of citizenship. Human rights can be
powerful weapons against repression and subjugation within nation states although they are still a matter of debate and discussion within the theoretical literature on citizenship: the definition and agreement of what constitutes human rights is ongoing and complex. For theorists such as Bryan Turner (2000), the concept of human rights has the potential to radically alter the content of citizenship rights.

Environmental rights

One example of the type of human rights that is also arguably impacting upon the complex of citizenship rights is that of environmental rights. The emergence of the concept of environmental and 'ecological' citizenship (Barry, 1999, 2002; Dean, 2001; Dobson, 2003; Smith, 1998) and of the environmental rights that ensue are a source of debate, as Andrew Dobson illustrates: 'it is commonly argued...that the environmental rights are a type of social right rather than something completely different' (2003, 84). Dobson further points out that environmental rights might comprise claims that may be considered also to be human rights (2003, 90). Drawing upon Dinah Shelton (1991), this is one type of environmental rights that Dobson highlights, also including the 'right to a liveable and sustainable environment' and a 'right to the environment' itself (Shelton, 1991, 105 cited in Dobson, 2003; 91).

Cultural rights

The notion of cultural rights, flows from a concern with citizenship as a question of identity and membership and theories of cultural citizenship such as that of Renato Rosaldo often arise out of 'difference' (1994). Toby Miller remarks that immigration is the 'enabling condition of existence' for claims that may be described as 'cultural rights' (2002; 231). Therefore, the demand for cultural rights is in part a demand for access into a community and to the benefits such as welfare protection, civil justice and representation that can be accrued. In addition, Jan Pakulski (1997) points out that cultural rights also include demands for recognition of language and religious identity and to a share in the cultural heritage of a community he observes that they have become central to the modern politics of identity.
Obligations

Whilst the complex of citizenship rights is potentially expanding and being debated in a variety of settings, the responsibilities of citizenship are also a prominent feature of recent theoretical debates. As remarked earlier, obligations and responsibilities are central features of the civic republican and communitarian theoretical traditions and therefore are present in much of the literature surrounding both theoretical viewpoints.

In the post-World War II orthodoxy, rights dominated the theoretical discussions and discussions over obligations received comparatively little treatment. This is not to say that Marshall's post-war dominance omitted obligations, however. Ruth Lister's account of the obligations of citizenship highlights Marshall's discussion of 'work obligations' (1997; 19). According to Marshall (1950), a citizen was expected to fulfil their duty of work by striving for excellence and taking pride in working hard at their paid job. Despite the changed social and political circumstances since Marshall's remarks, the need for individuals to find paid work and avoid dependency on the state, is a theme of neo-liberals such as Lawrence Mead (1986) and Michael Novak (1987) and in new right policy developments expressing work-fare policies (Lister, 1997; 19-20).

In the liberal tradition, responsibilities receive comparatively little attention beyond a minimal set of duties that incorporate the obligation to obey the law, to pay taxes and to vote, the responsibility to respect the rights of others to pursue their own life plan and pursuit of happiness and not to harm others. Going back to the roots of the civic republican tradition, responsibilities were principally military. Each citizen had a pressing responsibility to defend the polis and community from outside attack and it was this that comprised one of the chief citizenship responsibilities. In addition, civic republican thought on obligations revolved around the 'sharing of the government of the city' which was frequently defined as political participation but also includes a strong element of military service (Marquand, 1991: 338). In the liberal tradition the obligations of a citizen toward the polity is perhaps best described as a duty, carrying with it passive connotations rather than the active connotations of either 'obligation' or
‘responsibility’. In this tradition, individuals owe to each other the duty to respect each others’ rights and the duty to obey the law and pay taxes. Liberalism, it can be argued, places little emphasis on duties and, as David Marquand points out, ‘in some formulations there is even a slight suspicion of activity, on the grounds that it may encroach on the rights of others or disturb political or social peace’ (Marquand, 1991: 337).

However, there is a danger in simplifying the liberal tradition and assuming it is a more passive theoretical position than the reality bears out. Although it is true that rights discourse is at the heart of the liberal tradition there are a series of responsibilities in addition to the somewhat passive duties of obeying the law, paying taxes and respecting the rights of others. These stem from the emphasis that liberalism places on rights and entitlements and flow from the concept of agency inherent in the justification for social rights. David Marquand has drawn attention to what he observes as a paradox in liberal thought. This paradox depends on liberalism, as commonly understood, to require passivity on behalf of its citizenry, even declining involvement in some formulations. However, this interpretation clashes with social liberalism’s justification for social rights. If one agrees that social rights are indeed a necessary complement to political and civil rights, they require a degree of agency. Marquand sums up his position thus: ‘if resources are distributed in your favour, are you not under some obligation to make proper use of them?’ (1991: 339). Therefore, the citizen is obliged to behave in a more active way than merely obeying the law and respecting the rights of others.

This subsection has detailed the content of citizenship by referring to citizenship responsibilities. However, rights and responsibilities only flow from membership to a bounded political community, excluding non-members from the potential benefits of citizenship. The next subsection considers the boundaries of citizenship.
The boundaries of citizenship

The last section of this chapter considers the boundaries of citizenship. A large part of the theoretical literature on citizenship is concerned with the ways in which the notion of citizenship is challenged by forces of globalisation. As the quote below illustrates, much of this literature is concerned with conceiving forms of citizenship beyond the nation state.

In order to understand the relationship of people in general, and women in particular, to politics and society at the end of the second millennium, there is a need to separate analytically citizenship from the 'nation-state' (Yuval Davis, 1997: 120)

Citizenship cannot be properly construed in the current climate as a singular bilateral relationship (Heater, 2000: 115) and much of the literature in the field of citizenship studies has been devoted to illustrating the ways in which citizenship includes multiple identities, and is theorised in ways that go beyond the bilateral individual-state relationship. The boundaries of citizenship are being questioned from a variety of sources. Much of the citizenship literature is concerned with issues such as the need to re-think the theory and practice of state sovereignty (Camilleri and Falk, 1992); to rectify the perceived democratic deficit (Held, 1998: 14) and extend democracy beyond the borders of single states by asserting a global form of it (Archibugi, 2000: 144). Similarly, the concern with cosmopolitanism is focused on re-conceptualising the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, for example: extending what is perceived to be the evolutionary development of citizenship rights from individual to state and to parties beyond national borders (Beetham, 1999: 137).

This has resulted in a call for a more ‘flexible definition’ of what it means to be a citizen, as in the quote below:

Unless we accept the validity of a more capacious and flexible definition of citizenship, we shall be denying the
evidence of its history, constricting its theoretical investigation and inhibiting its practical development. (Heater, 2000: 115)

Citizenship is increasingly being acknowledged as a multilayered concept of which national citizenship resides alongside other forms such as European and even global citizenship. However, there is no unanimity about how cosmopolitanism can be understood (Tännsjö, 2003: 10). Its theoretical basis can be located in an enduring element of political philosophy that extends back to the ancient world and can be found in the writings of the Greek and Roman Stoic philosophers such as Marcus Aurelius (1961, cited in Heater, 1999: 135).

Gerard Delanty (2000: 51-67) has woven the theoretical literature on cosmopolitanism into four strands which provide an excellent interpretive exposition of the themes and subject positions. The first strand is labelled 'internationalism' which is primarily legal in its nature and based upon Kantian and Enlightenment universalism. It is concerned with the international politics of states and the rule of law at a global level. The second strand is primarily political and is concerned with governance and the political assertion of a global civil society comprised of non-state actors. This form of cosmopolitanism includes the concepts of ecological citizenship and the risk society. The third strand is cultural and is based upon post-colonial theory. It is 'transnational' and is concerned with the international movement of peoples. The final strand of cosmopolitanism is post-nationalism which is civic in nature and deals with the reflexive transformation of sovereignty to sub and supra national institutions.

It is also possible to divide citizenship beyond the level of the nation state into empirical and moral dimensions. Empirical claims for the extension of citizenship draw upon the changing global context, increasingly defined as the process or processes of globalisation that are creating new forms of association, loyalty and allegiance which threaten the relative sovereignty of the state. Moral arguments draw upon the theme

---

present in the ancient Stoic philosophy, amongst other sources, that emphasises the existence of common humanity, a global fraternity.

In empirical terms, there is a theme amongst the theoretical literature that draws attention to the possibility of multilayered citizenship in which the citizen-state complex is challenged by movements above and below the state and arises out of an understanding of rights and responsibilities. Broadly, the argument here is that if rights and responsibilities do not flow exclusively from the state then citizenship can not be exclusively tied to the state:

If citizenship, this 'full membership in a community', expresses itself in terms of rights and responsibilities, as Marshall and others have argued, then to the extent that those rights and responsibilities are not determined by the state but by other polities and collectivities, citizenship cannot be understood exclusively in terms of the 'nation-state'. (Yuval-Davis, 1997: 121)

The nation-state might be said to represent an old-fashioned form of self-governance that does not reflect contemporary realities:

Whether it is the organisation of formal status, the protection of rights, citizenship practices, or the experience of collective identities and solidarities, the nation state is not the exclusive site for their enactment. It remains by far the most important site, but the transformations in its exclusivity signal a possibly important new dynamic. (Sassen, 2002: 278)

Whatever one thinks about the possibility of transnational citizenship, it is certainly true that the relationship between the individual and the state is shifting. Saskia Sassen has termed the changed relationship between individual and state 'denationalising citizenship' (1996, 2002). This can be evidenced by legislative changes that 'allows national courts to use international instruments', shifts from
formal to effective nationality and shrinking welfare states (Sassen, 2002: 278). There is a growing literature on the conditions and the reasons for a change in the relationship between the state and citizenship. This has occurred both above and below the state. The claims of guestworkers in Germany, and of immigrants in other European countries, to rights and responsibilities can be seen as reconstituting the meaning of membership. Increasingly, the individual can be seen as the 'unit of action and the notion of personhood would be the dominating categories' (Delgado-Moreira, 2000: 20).

Extending citizenship beyond the level of the nation state often take the form of calls for 'global citizenship'. For instance, April Carter has defined the concept of a global citizen as 'embodying a moral and political commitment to cosmopolitan values, [which] has roots in early Western thought and [which] was articulated during the Enlightenment' (Carter, 1997: 67). However, whether the terms of reference are 'global citizen', 'transnational citizen', 'cosmopolitan citizen', it remains the case that the state is currently the main locus of a citizen's rights and responsibilities. It remains to be seen how this relationship will develop, whether or not the example of regional association provided by the EU is an indicator for future trends (Linklater, 1998) and how the human rights discourse will develop.

However, liberal, civic republican and communitarian traditions are based upon the assumption that citizenship is a bounded concept. In the liberal tradition, citizenship is very much bound to the state, whereas in civic republican traditions, citizenship is bound to the overarching political community. In Aristotelian and Machiavellian formulations citizenship was tied to a city state, and in more recent civic republican theory, citizenship is bound to the nation-state. Finally, in communitarianism, citizenship is connected with the cultural community and the nation rather than the state, but is limited by relations of historical and cultural attachments. The case for re-conceptualising the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, of creating a new form of democracy and considering forms of transnational harm has not be accepted unproblematically.

It is possible to argue against the possibility of transnational citizenship by drawing attention to the history of the notion of citizenship and concluding that the attempts to
extend citizenship beyond the level of the nation state does not take seriously the preconditions for citizenship. Foremost amongst the detractors of citizenship beyond the nation state are David Miller (1999) and Michael Walzer (1994), who argues from what might be called a communitarian point of view, which attests against the desirability of cosmopolitan sentiments and the utility of citizenship beyond the level of the nation state.4

It is possible to identify a critical response from each of the theoretical traditions of citizenship that cosmopolitanism threatens to supplant. The liberal critique of cosmopolitanism argues against attempts to go beyond the constitutional state as supranational organisations such as the European Union do not have the same democratic legitimacy as the institution of parliament for example. In addition, civic republicanism criticises the cosmopolitan dimension for its lack of a politics of participation. This is based upon the comparative lack of an international civil society. Briefly, the communitarian argument against transnational citizenship revolves around the thin sense of membership and obligation that presently obtains at the international level. Walzer (1994) recognises the need for moral duties to the rest of humanity but holds that transnational citizenship is dependent on the creation of a universal political association, the current likelihood of which foments pessimism in the present world situation. Cosmopolitan citizenship can also be criticised for a lack of a common culture and shared substantive identity. Such a view invokes themes central to a communitarian position. Finally, proponents of radical democracy argue that supranational organisations such as the European Union will lead to the creation of new kinds of exclusion.

But despite these criticisms, the notion of cosmopolitan citizenship remains desirable to a large number of theorists. For example, feminist literature is critical of focusing solely on national citizenship as it excludes certain groups who are not able to fully access forms of national citizenship and privileges 'the terms of inclusion of a particular group at the expense of the structural exclusion of others' (Squires, 2000). For this reason, human rights claims can be potentially powerful in overcoming exclusion (Lister, 1997, 2003; O'Neill, 2000, Yeatman, 1994, 2001). It is the opinion of

4 Statist responses have been eloquently expressed by Michael Walzer (1994) for example.
the researcher that conceptions of citizenship need to extend beyond national formulations in order to more adequately include marginalised groups and more adequately realise citizenship obligations to people beyond national borders. However, it is unlikely that the nation state will be dispensed with entirely in the imminent future, it retains a valuable role.

Whilst cosmopolitan citizenship attempts to remedy some of the drawbacks of national forms of citizenship it has been supplanted by Andrew Dobson's notion of post-cosmopolitan citizenship (2003). Dobson ably illustrates the weaknesses in which the social bond beyond the state has been perceived. Rather than a commitment to open dialogue or a series of duties based upon a shared humanity, Dobson's post-cosmopolitan citizenship conceives of obligations based on justice rather than compassion in which the individual is bound by 'relations of actual harm' (2003: 28) to compensate or actively avoid causing harm to other parties.

Summary

In this chapter I have attempted to show the theoretical contributions that come to bear upon our conception of what it means to be a citizen. Citizenship can be theorised in different ways and it is possible to identify a variety of different 'voices' or dialogues of citizenship. This is to say that different theoretical traditions employ the language of citizenship in diverse ways and use different vocabularies as they contribute to the multifarious debates in which issues concerning citizenship arise. T.H Marshall's use of citizenship to produce a developmental framework of rights can be seen as the beginning of a wealth of post-war literature on citizenship that has extensively dealt with the nature and scope of 'rights', 'obligation's, 'responsibilities', matters of inclusion and exclusion and such concepts as 'social justice'. Following Marshall's influential structure, arguably the most common way of discussing citizenship is in terms of a complex of rights and responsibilities. There are significant discourses on both of these issues and the precise balance between rights and responsibilities is a matter of ongoing debate.
In addition, the politics of difference and issues surrounding membership and identity play an important role in the current citizenship discourses. Membership is being debated at levels above and below the state and the rise of the European Union and the expansion of the concept of human rights is offering to change the way that citizenship is understood. In a sense this chapter has come full circle and ends where it began with the assertion that citizenship is a contested concept and will remain so for the foreseeable future. The same is true of the notion of 'good citizenship which is the subject of the next chapter.
Chapter 3

What does it mean to be a good citizen?

Introduction

The remainder of this chapter considers the theoretical and empirical literature on 'good citizenship'. The question of 'what it means to be a good citizen?' has preoccupied some of the most pre-eminent thinkers in the Western tradition of political philosophy. As Derek Heater has written 'so many philosophers and politicians over the past two and a half millennia have commended civic virtue or good citizenship and have accorded the term so many different meanings that it has become virtually impossible to know what any given advocate has in mind without knowing the context (1990; 193). The notion of good citizenship has been as contested as the concept of citizenship itself, differing in content according to the main theoretical traditions that inform one's perspective. Therefore, this part of the chapter will consider good citizenship in each of the main theoretical citizenship traditions: liberalism, civic republicanism and communitarianism. I will argue that a conception of good citizenship based on these three traditions is inadequate, and that a conception of good citizenship that is relevant to contemporary Britain must consider the input from feminism citizenship theory. This chapter will conclude by assessing the contributions to an understanding of good citizenship made by the empirical literature on citizenship.

Good citizenship and the main theoretical traditions

To begin an examination of good citizenship a working definition is in order. If, in its most basic formulation, citizenship is about membership of a political community, then good citizenship can be said to refer to an ethical or moral dimension of one's membership. Therefore, teasing out the ways in which this membership is viewed will
provide a basis for identifying characteristics of good citizenship. Furthermore, it is possible to pick out two broadly similar strands of thought amongst the main traditions, characterised by the primary object in each theoretical tradition. The first strand draws upon liberalism and is marked out by the primacy it accords the individual. The second strand is marked out by the primacy accorded to the community and comprises the communitarian and civic republican traditions of thought.

Good citizenship and Liberalism

It is possible to misread the liberal tradition's contribution to good citizenship based upon its perceived neutrality in relation to conceptions of the good life. However, if good citizenship is understood as a standard and a concept that describes the proper or optimal behaviour of a member of a community, then it is possible to identify liberal characteristics of good citizenship. The primacy accorded the individual in the political philosophy of Locke (1960) and John Stuart Mill (1951) has contributed to the fact that liberalism is very much concerned with the rights of an individual, and the first characteristic of good citizenship stems from a concern with respect for the rights of others, in particular the need to ensure that harm to others does not result from the pursuance of one's life goals. Furthermore, the process of looking at what respecting the rights of others entails can lead to other qualities that might be claimed as characteristics of the liberal view of good citizenship, such as tolerance. In liberal societies many individuals' rights are institutionalised and are upheld by law such as the right to own private property, the right to a certain amount of protection from harm through the presence of a police force and military organisations and so on. Therefore, in addition to respecting the rights of others, obeying the law might also be added as a characteristic of liberal good citizenship. Given that individuals are entitled to the right of freedom of speech and freedom to practice their own religion in a liberal society, respecting the rights of others may also include tolerance if there is a plurality of views or religions.

Obeying the law and respecting the rights of others are both linked by the notion of freedom which is the central motivating idea behind Stephen Macedo's liberal virtues (Heater, 1999: 32; Dobson, 2003: 56-57). According to Macedo, freedom is the
essence of liberalism and it requires certain moral qualities of the individual of which tolerance is one (1990: 2 cited in Heater, 1999: 32 and Dobson, 2003: 57). Macedo’s liberal virtues also include moderation, self-criticism and a ‘reasonable degree of participation in the activities of citizenship’ (ibid). As Heater observes, moderation is seen to be a corrective to the problems of extremism and fanaticism, out of which is bred intolerance. However, the last of Macedo’s liberal virtues points to another aspect of the liberal approach to good citizenship. Macedo sees monitoring and critical vigilance directed towards the state as a necessary liberal virtue so that it is incumbent on an individual to protest against government actions that are perceived to be misguided or unjust, ‘and are impervious to change through constitutional channels’ (Heater, 1999: 32). Monitoring the government in this way requires a substantial degree of effort directed at keeping track of government pronouncements and initiatives and also no small degree of skill and savvy.

Monitoring and if necessary protesting against the government may be said to describe formal involvement which leads to another characteristic of the liberal view of good citizenship: voting. Voting is one way in which an individual might fulfil Macedo’s ‘reasonable degree of engagement in the activities of citizenship’ and is therefore the final characteristic of good citizenship that may be observed from the liberal tradition.

Good citizenship in the civic republican tradition

In civic republicanism, the supreme civic virtue is to take part in the government of the city (Marquand, 1991: 340).

Morality is often viewed as a complex of responsibilities and if good citizenship is viewed as a citizen’s morality then it can be said that the civic republican tradition speaks more directly to the notion of the good citizen than liberalism due to the stronger emphasis on citizenship responsibilities. The principal virtue of classical republicanism was service to the state, defined by Aristotle as arête. Arête was directed towards the survival of the state and actions such as military service. A host of qualities such as leadership and courage were deemed to be important to this republican virtue although this virtue has lost currency somewhat over the years.
Marquand (1991) and Oldfield (1990) amongst others have repositioned the relevance of the civic republican tradition and highlighted the notion of giving towards the common good. Revival of interest in civic republicanism in the 20th century has generally returned to the ideal of Athens rather than Republican Rome and stressed political, rather than military, qualities and obligations, in particular, political participation and a sense of responsibility. Furthermore, it does resurrect the idea that citizens have duties as well as rights, because republicanism depends upon citizens who are socially responsible and willing to put the public good above private interest. In this respect, the work of Rousseau in *The Social Contract* (1762) is an important contribution to the civic republican perspective of the good citizen.

In the history of political philosophy, Rousseau has an important part to play in the way that citizenship can be understood, particularly in the way that the relationship between the citizen and the state is conceived. In *The Social Contract* (1762), Rousseau argued for a version of the social contract between individual and state that was at odds with the contemporary individualistic consensus. Rousseau envisaged a community in which citizens did not view themselves as individuals each pursuing their own self interest but as a collectivity with a responsibility to seek what was best for the community overall. Rousseau recognised that members of a community have potentially competing identities and contributes to the civic republican perspective of the good citizen as someone who chooses to prioritise their communal identity.

In their seminal study *The Civic Culture* (1991) Almond and Verba present an image of the good citizen very much in tune with the civic republican tradition. Acts of good citizenship pertain to virtues within the public realm, including active participation in the political process. Their interpretation of the acts of good citizenship stems from a tripartite conception of personhood that identifies three roles each individual occupies, spanning the whole range of both public and private interactions and held simultaneously. These are, the parochial role, a role as subject and a role as a citizen. Almond and Verba believe that each role has a set of virtues associated with it and each a concomitant set of rights and responsibilities. For example, the parochial role includes responsibilities towards the family unit.
Almond and Verba's test of good citizenship revolves around whether or not an individual's actions accord with the ideals established by normative democratic theory. Therefore, the level of one's citizenship and whether or not it is good is reflected by the extent of an individual's understanding and fulfilment of their role within society. Themes of declining civic virtue, passivity, indifference and apathy all stand out as an elaborate weave in the cloth of political debate over the last half a century and Almond and Verba's conception of good citizenship stands as an obvious response to this.

Almond and Verba conceptualise 'good citizenship' as a corrective to the problems faced by a democratic polity such as voter apathy and the evils of individualism. Consequently, the content of good citizenship is shaped by the perceived importance of active participation in political affairs. Therefore, citizenship is good for Almond and Verba in a technical sense because it involves being good at participating in the political process. However, there is a tension between the citizenship roles that they articulate in that being a good citizen can clash with being a good parent. Almond and Verba resolve that the demands of citizenship should be subordinate to familial obligations and are consequent upon the prior fulfilment of one's responsibility to be a good person.

Richard Dagger holds an interesting perspective on good citizenship in *Civic Virtues: Rights, Citizenship and Republican Liberalism* (1997). Dagger attempts to reconcile the traditions of liberalism and civic republicanism and so develops a concept of 'republican liberalism'. In doing so, he presents the notion of 'real citizenship' which takes as its starting point the civic republican tenets of promoting the common good. Dagger's concept of 'real citizenship' is heavily inspired by the doctrine of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Alexis de Tocqueville in requiring that the individual be active in public life not out of self-interest but out of concern for the common good. Dagger's good or 'real' citizen is also guided in their conduct by ethical principles, not just by feelings of fraternity and loyalty.

However, the civic republican view of good citizenship is not solely concerned with political participation. Adrian Oldfield in his book *Citizenship and Community* (1990) argues that civic republicanism depends primarily on moral beliefs and ways of behaving, or what de Tocqueville called 'habits of the heart'. Unless people feel and
think like citizens, opportunities for participation will not create a political community (Oldfield 1990: 172). Similarly, communitarianism is also concerned with the common good.

Communitarianism and good citizenship

Communitarianism is also concerned with the common good. However, whereas civic republicanism prioritised political participation, the communitarian view of good citizen is located in the central principle of the superiority of common endeavour over individualism for sustaining the community and including the concepts of fraternity, solidarity, civic pride, social obligation and tradition. Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936) is one of communitarianism’s intellectual progenitors who, whilst writing in the late 1800’s, closely analysed the effects upon traditional community of the emergence of the large and impersonal social relations brought about as a consequence of modernising forces and industrial society. He remarked that urbanising forces were fragmenting society and introduced the well known polarities ‘gesellschaft’ (the emerging society) and ‘gemeinshaft’ (the disappearing communal society). As Selznick explains, ‘gemeinshaft’ can simply be interpreted as ‘community’ although to be more specific; it refers to a kind of community, ‘one that fully realises values of historicity and mutuality, and does so even at considerable cost to personal mobility and autonomy’ (1992: 365). Moreover, the word also connotes moral unity, rootedness, intimacy and kinship. At the heart of ‘gemeinschaft’ is a state of being that includes a way of thinking, feeling and acting; Tönnies called it ‘wesenwille’ which can be translated as ‘natural will’. A community based upon ‘wesenwille’ is person-centred and, as Selznick remarks, it ‘prizes loyalty, commitment, self-acceptance- all the virtues and benefits of integrative participation in cohesive groups’ (ibid: 366). The influence of communitarianism in New Labour has been identified by several commentators such as Faulk (1998: 206-207); Jones (1996: Ch.7); Shaw (1996: 228-9) and these values have also been a feature of late Home Secretary David Blunketts speeches.

Communitarianism also places a strong emphasis on associational community groups in an effort to assert the community as an ethical base for political action (Etzioni, 1993, 1995). Therefore the good citizen may well engage with the intermediate
institutions that stand between the individual and the State such as the family, schools, trade unions, religious groups, neighbourhood and voluntary organisations.

Combinations of the three main traditions

Some contemporary attempts to define good citizenship contain influences from each of the three traditions discussed above. The civic republican notion of political participation as well as liberal virtues and communitarian concern with community for instance, are all present in Agnes Heller's writing on good citizenship (1990). Drawing upon Aristotle and ancient Greece she views good citizens as political actors motivated by the pursuit of justice (1990: 147-161). Her account starts with an assumption that modern men and women are citizens of a liberal-democratic state in which liberties provide the framework for socio-political contestation. She believes that men and women as citizens of a liberal-democratic state are either concerned or non-concerned persons. She calls the latter 'passive citizens' and goes on to make the point that a good citizen is concerned with matters of justice and injustice in the state and with participation in acts which aim to remedy injustice.

In Heller’s view part of being a ‘good citizen’ involves making the effort to interpret ones rights as responsibilities, ‘the responsibilities of citizenship have to be chosen’ and ‘adopted with resolve’ (Heller, 1990: 148). Heller is slightly inconsistent on the competency or proficiency required of a good citizen. On the one hand, the good citizen possesses the skills needed to monitor, identify and address acts of injustice, although there is no objective standard to which these skills are subjected to. In other words, the good citizen might not arrive at the best, or what Heller deems the 'right', opinion on matters; what distinguishes a good citizen is the fact that they have the courage to be involved, if they face considerable difficulties, and are committed to remedying injustices (ibid: 154). But on the other hand, she does apply standards to the behaviour of a good citizen when discussing the way in which a good citizen is expected to debate and be able to reach agreement with others. In this instance, a good citizen is required to be ‘a good listener’ to different views and opinions and is ‘never too tired to explain issues' (ibid: 159).
There is also a communitarian aspect in Heller’s conception of good citizenship. She views participation in actions where justice is at stake for those who cannot voice their own grievances as an act of solidarity, in other words showing solidarity with the victims of injustice is also a virtue of a good citizen. The notion of long term commitment is also central to her notion of good citizenship. Through her concept of ‘continuity’ she explains that good citizens have to be dedicated and that despite how well someone might perform in attempting to remedy injustice, too long a gap between actions results in that individual slipping off the radar of good citizenship. Heller is also very specific in her explanation of what motivates a good citizen and she points out that ‘a good citizen need not necessarily be a decent person. Performing all acts required by ‘good citizenship is perfectly possible without abiding by the general principles of moral orientation in matters of daily life’ (ibid, 149). For Heller, a good citizen embraces the cause of individuals (or groups) not out of care or concern for a particular individual, or group of individuals, but out of a commitment to justice.

The liberal virtues of tolerance and equality are also significant features of Heller’s conception of good citizenship. Through her notion of ‘radical tolerance’ she conveys the good citizen’s care not to impose standards on others, to seek co-operation between persons who participate in different ways of life and to recognise all forms of life equally, as well as the needs of all human groups.

Heller is also clear on the sphere of good citizenship, good citizens are ‘decent persons’ who have made a political commitment: ‘in so far as one takes responsibility for what happens in one’s closer environment, one is a concerned person but not a good citizen’ (1990: 153). Good citizenship makes a heavy demand of a person’s time, money, energy or interests and this may require a commitment to boring meetings or action in the public sphere. Heller adds depth to her conception of good citizenship by including ‘state pride’ as another defining characteristic. Good citizens feel responsible for their own state and everything that happens in it and want the state to have the best of constitutions, laws and social arrangements. Furthermore, the state should not be required to ‘take responsibility for all the past and present calamities of the world’ (1990: 154).
An illuminating interpretation of 'good citizenship' can be found in Citizenship: The Civic Ideal In World History, Politics and Education (1990) by Derek Heater who also incorporates virtues from across the theoretical traditions. Heater describes an inclusive view of good citizenship, in which he presents a range of moulds in which good citizenship can be cast, ranging from the international level to the local level. The first characteristic Heater identifies is loyalty. With echoes of the community-based approaches of civic republicanism and communitarianism, Heater describes loyalty as encompassing a moral bond, a sense of allegiance and fraternity with the object of one’s loyalty. He brings out the flexibility of the term by running through the various recipients of ‘loyalty’, mentioning the state and patriotism although also pointing out that it can apply to an emotional attachment to institution, land, group or person and in this way can include cosmopolitan sentiments and concerns for the good of humanity. Heater also points out a conflict between the individual-based (liberal) and the community-based traditions in which loyalty to the state clashes with the critical vigilance of Macedo’s liberal virtues.

Secondly, Heater mentions ‘responsibility’ as one of the characteristics of good citizenship. It comes across as something of an umbrella term which reveals a host of moral qualities once examined but broadly refers to a form of political participation or community participation such as neighbourliness and volunteering. Heater proposes that good citizens have a responsibility to take positive and supportive actions that are of benefit to the political community, although what is important is the motivation behind ones actions (Heater, 1990: 197). Anyone who performs legal duties, for example, primarily out of fear of what might befall them if they do not is not displaying conduct befitting a good citizen. Rather, Heater exhorts good citizens to act out of something broader than individual interest, such as the good of the community.

Continuing to sail along a civic republican tack, Heater’s notion of ‘responsibility’ includes good intentions and conscience but also that the good citizen displays the ‘participatory equipment’ to put one’s good intentions into practice (Heater, 1990: 198). Heater links good citizenship with competence so that certain skills, including political knowledge, judgement and initiative comprise the content of his ‘participatory equipment’. The common good becomes the referential object again here because the emphasis lies not just on good intentions but how the political community as a whole
gains from them. The emphasis on political participation, and on what may be called the formal characteristics of good citizenship, gives way to a note on the importance of neighbourliness, a form of volunteering that is consistent with the notion of the active citizen. At this point, Heater discusses the connection between good citizenship and justice and points out the role a good citizen would play in bringing pressure to bear for change on unjust practices, whether they be at local, national or international levels. Responsibility also encompasses social decency, where upholding the law and practising orderly behaviour in public places is prized.

Finally, Heater includes 'respect for political and social procedural values' (1990: 202) as vital components of good citizenship. Equating Bernard Crick's criteria for political literacy with the criteria for good citizenship Heater rounds off his model by including the values of freedom, toleration, fairness, respect for truth and respect for reasoning.

The components that Heater identifies help to put the concept of good citizenship into clearer focus although the image still has limitations. A more rounded conception of good citizenship must look outside of the main theoretical traditions of citizenship and also embrace the developments in feminist citizenship theory.

**Beyond traditional theories of good citizenship**

The traditions outlined above can be used as a starting point for an understanding of good citizenship but do not add up to a rounded whole. For this to be achieved, feminist theory must be recruited to address the gender imbalance inherent in tradition theoretical traditions of citizenship. The additional insights to be gained from this perspective help to create a more inclusionary and rounded notion of good citizenship.

Each of the theoretical traditions described above have their drawbacks. Communitarianism can be attacked because of its ill-defined notion of community and by those who refute its aim to transcend neo-liberalism (Faulks, 1998: 206). Liberalism can be criticised for promoting a 'passive' type of citizen, in particular social citizenship. This aspect has been criticised for presenting an even more passive form of citizenship than classical liberalism (Voet, 1998: 33) and has been criticised for
creating in individuals a dependency on experts to express judgements, so that people do not take responsibility for their own affairs (MacIntyre, 1985; Mead 1986; Roche 1992). The exclusionary nature of the civic republican tradition has been remarked on by feminist theorists such as Anne Phillips who comments: 'civic republicanism has been ominously dismissive of femininity and female concerns, tending to treat the distinction between public and private spheres as sacrosanct and to presume that women will occupy the latter' (1993: 76).

The most significant criticism of these theories, for the purpose of creating an understanding of good citizenship, is their exclusion of women. This has been a feature of feminist projects over recent decades in response to the failure of traditional theoretical traditions to adequately include women within conceptions of citizenship (such as Lister, 1997, 2003). Ursula Vogel makes the point that: 'the main traditions of European political thought (if we exempt feminist projects) do not offer any genuinely universal conceptions of citizenship' (in Vogel and Moran, 1991: 78).

Feminist citizenship theory has drawn attention to the fact that citizenship is 'broader' than the traditional focus on political or socio-economic concerns indicates; 'citizenship can also be expressed in ethical terms beyond the narrowly political or socio-economic spheres - through ethical association which is expressed as a social status' (Prokhovnik, 1998: 85). Recognising citizenship as a practice that includes activities from the private realm as well as the public realm expands the ways in which it is possible to view good citizenship. Good citizenship can be seen as any type of activity that contributes to the well-being of society, including small scale personal behaviour. Consider the New Labour rhetoric on the 'informed patient', in which the burden facing the NHS is potentially assuaged by encouraging individual awareness of potential health risks. Recognition that personal behaviour can be considered a site of good citizenship opens up the possibility of a host of virtues that may be added to an understanding of what it means to be a good citizen.

One set of virtues that may be included in a framework of good citizenship stems from the 'maternal' strand of feminist theory. As an antidote to the masculinity of the traditional theories, writers such as Jean Bethke Elshtain (1981, 1983) and Sara Ruddick (1983) have presented women's experience as mothers as an alternative
morality on which to base a civic virtue capable of combating the perceived selfish materialism of US society in the 1980's.

Another related strand of feminist theory that attempts to translate virtues that were traditionally associated with the private sphere into the public sphere is the literature surrounding an 'ethic of care'. The 'ethic of care' emerged through the work of Carol Gilligan's who's 1982 publication 'In a Different Voice' suggested that girls' moral judgements were determined by an alternative moral basis to the established view of justice and rights. The notion blossomed and many feminists took up the notion of 'woman's way of knowing and caring' (Nagel, 97: 307).

The 'ethic of care' can be seen as an approach to citizenship based on a morality that arises out of relationships between individuals rather than a contractual or consensual relationship between state and individual: 'specific moral claims on us arise from our contact or relationship with others whose interests are vulnerable to our actions and choices. We are obligated to respond to particular others when circumstance of ongoing relationship render them especially, conspicuously, or peculiarly dependent on us' (Walker, 1998: 107). It therefore describes a moral outlook based upon a response to the specific character and context of any given moral issue so that moral assessments and decisions take specific contexts and relationships as their guide (Smeyers, 1999: 243).

Based on Joan Tronto's four stages of an ethic of care (1995), the virtues that can be applied to good citizenship might include the skill of identifying those in need of care, knowing the best course of action to take in order to remedy or help the recipient of care, and being able to effectively deliver a course of action that helps that individual. These characteristics of good citizenship might appear vague but they are necessarily so given that the 'care' given is dependent on the context of any particular situation. What is clear though is that an ethic of care describes a deep concern with the welfare of others. In addition, in the willingness to help others, an ethic of care offers a moral outlook that might lead to other characteristics of good citizenship such as volunteer work for example, a staple of Marquand's re-interpretation of civic republicanism (1991).
Therefore, an understanding of the notion of good citizenship can benefit from the feminist literature on citizenship, in particular from the ‘ethic of care’. The main theoretical traditions of citizenship are predicated upon a contractual relationship between the individual and the state and lead to a series of characteristics of good citizenship. Feminist literature on an ‘ethic of care’ describes another moral outlook that is relational and associational and forms an approach to increasing the wellbeing of society by empowering individuals to make a difference at an informal and interpersonal level. The next part of this chapter considers how empirical studies on citizenship contribute to an understanding of what it means to be a good citizen.

**Empirical studies and good citizenship**

There are few empirical studies within the wealth of academic literature on citizenship and therefore few studies which contribute to an understanding of good citizenship. Perhaps the most influential study was published in 1991 by Conover et al who examined the way in which citizens in the United States and Great Britain conceived of citizenship rights, duties and civic identities. Good citizenship was amongst the topics that were discussed in a series of focus groups held in both countries and Conover et al reported a British view of good citizenship that was particularly conservative and formal in character.

Conover et al reported that ‘far and away the most commonly cited British duty was obedience to the law’ (1991: 813). In addition, the content of good citizenship was shaped by liberal, procedural characteristics such as serving on juries, voting and paying taxes. The emphasis on activism that is placed on good citizenship by the civic republican and communitarian theoretical traditions had less of an impact on the British participants’ perspectives on good citizenship, however. Therefore, the image held of the good citizen was one that strongly included a concern with liberal, procedural characteristics such as paying taxes, formal participation in the public realm such as jury service and a conservative concern with obeying the law and upholding community norms and civility.
Conover et al distinguished between these types of responsibilities, which were seen to be 'bottom-line duties', and characteristics that described an 'extra good' citizen such as political participation (Conover et al, 1991: 814). 'Bottom line' characteristics such as 'voting' and 'obeying the law' received strong support from the participants although beyond these topics there was less of a consensus and more hesitancy and differences in opinion.

Conover et al also reported that good citizenship could also be seen in a 'quietist way' (1991: ibid). In contrast to the public roles, constant activity or communal participation, good citizenship could be seen as 'looking after your own family, your own patch' (ibid). This introduces another way of viewing the characteristics of the good citizen, as upholding certain standards of behaviour, such as civility. Their study also showed that 'extra-good' characteristics were often problematic for the participants. It emerged that demanding activities such as active participation should not necessarily be regarded as a citizen's duty because these types of activity depend on individuals having sufficient resources and opportunities. Furthermore, the virtue behind active participation was questioned by respondents, indicating that the individuals who do actively participate in the local community, for example, are acting out of self-interest rather than virtue.

Another empirical study that bears upon an understanding of good citizenship is that by Dean and Melrose (1999). They conducted research which explored the meaning which people attach to the concept of citizenship through a series of interviews. It was conducted with 76 people of widely differing income levels and there were three types of response from the participants in answer to the question: 'What does it mean to be a good citizen?'. Analysing this research Dean constructed three types of good citizen, each taking its cue from the statements above. These findings differed from those of Conover et al and reflect more wide ranging theoretical underpinnings. Based upon his findings, Dean conceived of good citizens as either 'altruistic' (bound to look after others); motivated by feelings of solidarity (contributing to the community); or bound to a code of obedience, where good citizenship revolves around adherence to the law and paying taxes.
A more recent longitudinal empirical study undertaken by Lister et al (2003) studied the way in young people in Leicester perceived citizenship and their transitions as citizens. Amongst the discussion of rights and responsibilities an interesting conception of good citizenship emerged from the findings. The good citizen was seen by the participants in terms of active participation in the community, including neighbourliness as well as 'helping' and 'looking out for' were oft mentioned characteristics. In addition, a notion of 'respect' also emerged as a characteristic of good citizenship in which 'respect' indicated a concern for the physical environment and surroundings, as well as a form of interpersonal behaviour such as being polite (p. 245). In addition, the familiar image of the good citizen as someone who obeyed the law was also a prominent characteristic. The image of the good citizen that emerged from this study was more akin to the feminist and communitarian theoretical traditions in prizing relational and associational characteristics.

Good citizenship has also been researched by the Home Office, as a part of a biennial Citizenship Survey, designed to be part of the evidence base for the Home Office's community policy area. Their research consisted of a 10,000 strong nationally representative sample and a 5,000 strong booster sample of minority ethnic people. One of the major themes of this study was the reciprocal way in which a good citizen views their rights and responsibilities. The report notes that 'the formalisation of rights in the UK has been complemented with the idea that rights are accompanied by duties and responsibilities. Together, rights and responsibilities form the core elements of what it means to be a good citizen' (2001 Home Office Citizenship Survey: people, families and communities: 10). This assessment was based on ninety-seven per cent of respondents who 'agreed (definitely agreed/tended to agree) with the statement that if people treated others as they would want to be treated themselves, our society would be a better place' (ibid: xiii).

Most recently, a longitudinal study by Pattie, Seyd and Whitely (2004) investigated the attitudinal and behavioural foundations of citizenship in Britain. The account of good citizenship offered by these authors has a liberal emphasis in defining the 'good citizen' as someone who possesses an awareness of their rights but there is also a communitarian element also. In tandem with rights, a good citizen must be aware of their responsibilities to fellow citizens and to a wider society. In addition, the good
citizen is influenced by the civic republican concern with political participation and volunteering activities. Interestingly, Pattie et al (2004: 138-139) make a connection between the performance of the political system and good citizenship. In discussing what they term the 'cognitive engagement theory of citizenship' Pattie et al develop the aspect of good citizenship concerning political participation. They identify a knowledgeable and informed citizen who may feel compelled to participate in political life in unorthodox ways in order to protest against the perceived poor performance of the political system. According to Pattie et al: 'the performance of the political system is a key factor in explaining why some people are good citizens when others are not' (2004: 139).

Summary

A framework of good citizenship is based on the main theoretical traditions of citizenship. However, they present a flawed image of the good citizen that is exclusionary and narrow in its scope of the appropriate characteristics of good citizenship. This is because the wellbeing and flourishing of a contemporary society depends not just on participation in the public realm but also on the private and personal behaviour of individuals. A contemporary society would be well served if the personal behaviour of its citizens approximated the moral outlook contained in an ethic of care in which individuals are empowered to help others and contribute to the common good at a local level.

The empirical contributions to an understanding of the concept of good citizenship show a combination of theoretical influences. An earlier study by Conover et al (1991) indicates that good citizenship centres on basic duties such as obeying the law and community norms, together with paying taxes and voting. Later empirical studies such as those by Dean and Melrose (1999) and Lister et al (2003) show that the conception of good citizenship held by lay people is more aligned with relational and associational theories as well as elements of communitarianism. An important development in thinking of good citizenship appears to be the increased relevance of 'looking out for others' and helping people in the neighbourhood. However, prior to this study, there has not been a research project in the UK solely engineered to explore the meaning of
good citizenship. The next chapter is concerned with the methodology used in this project.
Chapter 4

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter explains the methodological approach that was employed for the empirical study. The methodology was under-girded by the aims of grounded theory which aims to generate theory from the data and attempts to remove any personal bias on behalf of the researcher. Building upon these tenets, the study aims to make sense of the existing literature on good citizenship and to test the possible characteristics of good citizenship against an expert perspective and then also a lay perspective. Therefore, the methodology consists of three aspects; the first aspect was concerned with examining the characteristics of good citizenship from an expert point of view using a Delphi study. The second and third dimensions explore lay perceptions of the good citizen using two methods of data collection; semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The key issues emerging from each stage were used to inform the following stage so that the Delphi study provided a framework for researching lay views on the good citizen that began with semi-structured interviews. After a preliminary analysis that was undertaken after completing the semi-structured interviews a framework for conducting focus groups emerged. The focus groups were used to explore, in greater depth, the key points which emerged from the first two stages.

Grounded theory

The research procedures used in this study were influenced by grounded theory. The approach was used to inform the design of the research rather than as a tool of analysis.
Grounded theory was a methodology developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) in the late 1960's that places an emphasis on discovery and theory development rather than logical deductive reasoning which relies on prior theoretical frameworks that are characteristic of many of the existing approaches to collecting qualitative data. Implicit within the method was a number of coding procedures designed to encourage researchers to interpret and disentangle the observed and narrative data.

At the heart of the grounded theory approach is the notion that theory is generated from data using inductive principles of analysis. By its very nature, and unlike theory testing, it requires flexibility on the part of the researcher; the structure of the research, the sample to be studied and methods to be used are worked out as the research proceeds. Glaser (1992) describes how the researcher 'moves into an area of interest with no problem. The grounded theorist keeps his mind open to the true problems of the area' (p.22). The process of data collection is guided by the emerging theory and the theorist consequently generates a number of hypotheses, which can subsequently be investigated using deductive procedures.

Rationale

The empirical study was approached within a framework that was gleaned from the literature review. The literature review served to highlight important possible characteristics of good citizenship and these formed the basis of the interview schedule at the start of the lay study. Within this structure, my study was able to benefit from two particular tenets of grounded theory: inductive reasoning and theoretical sensitivity. Inductive reasoning means that the researcher is expected to enter the area under study with no preconceptions, a priori theory or knowledge. This can create great difficulties for the analyst who was likely to have an interest and consequent prior knowledge of the proposed area of study; however, the approach does encourage researchers to compartmentalise personal influences and use theoretical sensitivity to try and minimise potential biases. This was a beneficial standpoint for the investigation into the meaning of good citizenship as it reinforced the need for the researcher to restrict personal preferences and biases from the study.
However, using the Grounded theory framework was complex and time consuming when followed verbatim and there was a lack of agreement not only amongst its originators, Glaser and Strauss, but also amongst its followers, on its exact nature, its objectives and how it should be applied. On the surface, grounded theory represents a logical approach to collecting and simultaneously analysing qualitative (and quantitative) data. Upon further reading however, the researcher realised the myriad of potential methodological difficulties in implementing the research, which include progression through many difficult and challenging coding procedures (especially if one adopts the Strauss and Corbin 1990 model). Moreover, the uncertainty surrounding the methodology's ontological and epistemological roots can create doubt in the researcher's mind, even to the extent of understanding their assumed role in the research process. Therefore, this study was not a direct application of grounded theory but only uses its suggestions and features to inform the data collection.

Grounded theory offered a framework that encouraged the researcher to make sense of interview and observational data obtained from subjects. Much of the literature surrounding grounded theory made a point to illustrate the fact that this theory was able to give respondents an opportunity to speak openly and free of interview or moderator bias. As Keddy et al have written, grounded theory 'allows for the voices of the participants to be heard as they tell their stories' (1996, p.450). Even though this study was not intended to focus on the personal histories and life stories, it was a significant advantage to include an approach that allowed participants to speak openly and freely. Grounded theory studies typically generate a rich, deep and well-integrated conceptual system, organised at various levels of theoretical abstraction, all of which in some way articulate with the data. As such, they engender great confidence in the researcher's theoretical account (Henwood and Pidgeon, 1993).

The Expert Perspective- Using the Delphi technique

The Delphi technique was used as the methodological model that guided the study into the expert perspectives on the meanings of good citizenship. The Delphi study had a history dating back to the early 1960's when it was used as a tool by the US
army. Since this time the Delphi study has been used in various fields. It was used principally as a forecasting tool and was used as a means of testing expert systems. The first stage of the data collection employed a method based upon the Delphi technique. The Delphi Technique was designed to sample a group of knowledgeable persons (the panel) in order to gain a consensus of opinion on a particular topic without bringing the group together (Dalkey, Rourke, Lewis, & Snyder, 1972; Uhl, 1983) and therefore provided a suitable methodological device for capturing the views of a series of experts in the field of citizenship.

Creation of the questionnaire

A thorough review of the theoretical literature on 'what it means to be a good citizen' produced a series of topics that might be considered characteristics of the good citizen. These topics were worked into a series of statements beginning with the phrase: 'The good citizen...' and followed by a particular topic. In order to ensure that a wide scope of opinions was included, the construction of the list was facilitated by creating a series of categories to represent the different ways it was possible to view the characteristics of the good citizen. Each category possessed a certain theme that related to the content of its particular viewpoint and then names were assigned to these categories. Categories ranged from 'Ecological' to 'Charity'. Creating a series of categories made it possible to see any omissions along the spectrum of possible perspectives and to ensure that a full scope of opinions was included in the list.

Within this guiding structure the list invited panellists to express their opinion on the characteristics of the good citizen by indicating their agreement or disagreement with a set of carefully worded statements derived from the categories. Panellists were asked to identify the key characteristics using a four point Likert scale to indicate the strength of their attachment to a particular statement. They were also given the opportunity to elaborate their opinion through a 'Comments' box that followed each statement. At the end of the questionnaire the panellists were presented with an 'Other' box in which they could describe any characteristics of good citizenship that had not already been mentioned. (See Appendix 1 for a copy of the questionnaire)
Selection of panellists

The panel for the Delphi study consisted of a number of people who had published prominently in the field of citizenship or who were from significant organisations with a special knowledge of citizenship. The Delphi technique required the candidates, who make up the panel, were well respected and of important stature in their field and so an important criterion of selection was their knowledge of citizenship, expressed through their publications or positions of responsibility. It was also important to choose candidates who reflected different theoretical viewpoints and thus the composition of the panel was intended to include candidates who had strongly represented a particular aspect of citizenship.

Perceptions of the meaning of citizenship and in particular of good citizenship vary widely across nationalities and it was decided to limit the potential panellists to British residents. The selection of the panel reflected the composition of the writers in the citizenship field so that just under one third of the panellists contacted were female.

Moderating and piloting

Before the list was sent to the panellists it was checked thoroughly by a moderating team consisting of three members. The list of statements that made up the list went through several revisions with particular attention being paid to the wording and length of the statements. The majority of the input was made by Professor Ruth Lister although Jill Vincent and Dr Jack Demaine moderated the list, offering particular advice on the content and style of presentation.

Once the list of statements had been finalised the form of the list was piloted with several colleagues who were asked to comment on the clarity of presentation and ease of use. Much care was taken over a series of further revisions to produce a clear and easily usable design.
Response Rate

25 people were originally contacted to make up the panel and three quarters of these agreed to participate in the study. Each of the respondents was subsequently sent a copy of the list with a covering letter explaining the requirements. Scripts were received from 14 participants, giving the study a 65% response rate. The panelists were comprised of 8 male respondents and 6 female respondents. Of these, 12 came from academic institutions and 2 were from organizations specializing in citizenship.

Analysis

The received scripts were analysed with the aim of establishing which statements were generally considered to be a condition of the good citizen and which were not. The low number of participants in the study meant that statistical analysis of the results was not appropriate. However, counting procedures were used to rank the statements according to their overall relevance to the notion of the good citizen. In addition many of the respondents had included comments on the statements and this helped to establish a categorical hierarchy.

Not all respondents added commentary to their selections on the likert scale but in the cases where comments were included the data were entered into a separate document for analysis. This document also contributed to an understanding of the characteristics of good citizenship by showing the extent of the support for any particular statement or by revealing the complexities and difficulties in applying certain topics to the notion of the good citizen.

Counting procedures

The results of the questionnaire were compiled by applying a specific counting procedure that produced a list indicating the precise number of times each option on
the likert scale had been checked so that every statement received a 'score'. Each option on the likert scale was also given a value according to the following system:

- Strongly Agree = 2 points
- Agree = 1 point
- Disagree = -1 point
- Strongly Disagree = -2 points

By multiplying each score along the likert scale by the relevant value it was possible to construct an 'overall score' for each statement. It was then possible to rank the statements according to these scores so that the highest score was deemed to have the most approval as a characteristic of the good citizen. The results of this calculation can be seen in Appendix 2.

Categorical analysis of the Delphi study

The responses of the Delphi study were grouped together to form a document containing all the qualitative data which was then analysed to see if any patterns and themes emerged. From this document it became apparent that the categories that were developed from the theoretical literature could be altered slightly and a new set of categories emerged. These categories were then subjected to the same counting procedures used to develop a hierarchy from the individual statements. An average score was then calculated for each category thus giving a hierarchy and illustrating which statements were more closely related to good citizenship.

Gender analysis

Using the results from the counting procedures and the results built up from the comments written by the panellists, it was also possible to analyse the perceptions of good citizenship along gender lines.

Stage 2 of the Delphi study
Analysis of the results soon showed that a further round of enquiry was needed. The results demanded clarification of the relevance of certain statements. The clarification was needed of those statements that received a negative score from the first round of analysis. The panellists were then sent a second list in which the offending statements were repeated. They were asked to distinguish between those statements they felt were either a condition of a 'bad citizen' or 'relevant', 'not relevant' or a 'condition' of being a 'good citizen'.

The response rate was lower than in the previous round as only five panellists responded to the second round of the Delphi study. Nevertheless, their input helped to clarify their opinions on the statements that were not considered to be very relevant to good citizenship.

Lay perspectives on good citizenship: Interviews and Focus Groups

Building upon the initial research into the theoretical literature and from the findings of the Delphi study, the second aspect of my empirical research was concerned with exploring lay perceptions of the meanings of the good citizen. This was completed using two methods of data collection: semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The next section of this chapter begins by addressing the methodological issues that are raised by using in-depth interviews and focus groups in social research. The remaining part considers how in-depth interviews and then focus groups were used in this research project.

Combining interviews and focus groups in social research

In qualitative research, investigations are often connected with methods such as in-depth interviewing, participant observation and the collection of relevant documents. Maykut & Morehouse (1994:46) state that:

The data of qualitative inquiry is most often people's words and actions, and thus requires methods that allow the researcher to capture language and behavior. The most
useful ways of gathering these forms of data are participant observation, in-depth interviews, group interviews, and the collection of relevant documents.

Focus groups and in-depth interviews are frequent tools in social research and are often used in conjunction with each other. Focus groups can help to explore or generate hypotheses (Powell & Single 1996) and develop questions or concepts for questionnaires and interview guides (Hoppe et al 1995; Lankshear 1993). The research of Michell (1999) into young people’s experiences of their social worlds was an example of the practice of using focus groups as an initial method of enquiry and using one on one interviews with the participants to follow up the research questions in more depth.

Such a methodology had the considerable advantage of using the one on one interviews to minimize the potentially harmful effects of group psychology which can emerge in focus groups and cause the sessions to be monopolised by one or more dominant personalities. In cases such as this, interviews ensure that all participants of the research had an equal say and facilitates the discovery of voices that may be marginalized or unspoken in focus groups.

Unlike methodologies of this type, the research methods used in this study reversed the practice of using one on one interviews to back-up focus groups. The exploration of the lay perspectives of good citizenship therefore began with in-depth interviews and proceeded to undertake a series of focus groups with a different set of participants. There was a potential problem in focus group research that the group dynamic can cause the participants to feel under pressure and inhibited and it was decided that the initial investigation of the lay perspectives should be in a setting that facilitated in-depth discussion of good citizenship free from any inhibiting group dynamics. It was decided that this particular methodology would allow a rich investigation into the characteristics of good citizenship by allowing the interviews to create in-depth personal accounts of the characteristics of good citizenship. These could then be used to give direction to the focus group discussions.
In-depth interviews as a qualitative method

Historically, interviewing has long been used as a technique for collecting data, for example Babbie (1992) details Egyptian use of interviews to conduct census enquiries. More recently, interviewing has been a familiar tool of sociological ethnography and the current use of interviews in social research is widespread, causing Foddy (1993: 1) to comment that 'there is no doubt that the use of verbal data has come to dominate the social sciences.'

The theoretical literature offers several definitions of 'interviewing', Seidman (1998: 3) described it as 'an interest in understanding the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience'. The crux of interviewing was trying to understand the opinions of others and it was an excellent way of gathering information about beliefs, values and attitudes and 'subjective variables that cannot be measured directly' (Foddy, ibid). As such it was an appropriate technique for exploring the lay perspectives on good citizenship.

Interviewing takes on a broad range of forms, of which the most common was face-face verbal interchange, although new technologies have made it possible for interviews to be conducted via telephones, email and the internet. It was decided to use face-face in-depth interviewing as the main method to collect data for my study since this method offers the best chance make the participants feel comfortable and to establish a rapport so that rich and thorough explanations of good citizenship could be captured. Within these parameters, interviews can follow one of several formats: structured, unstructured or semi-structured.

The Delphi study was clearly structured although the study of the lay perspectives did not use as structured a pattern. The level of structure within an interview or focus group was related to power so that the more structured the schedule the more power and control the interviewer was able to exercise in the interview. This had the advantage that by dictating both the content of questions and the order in which they were asked, the researcher could direct the respondent to very specific areas in which
the researcher was interested. In contrast, unstructured interviews afford respondents considerable scope in shaping the content of the discussion so as to reflect issues which they felt to be significant in relation to the general research topic. In this way, the 'interrogator-informant' relationship common to both structured and semi-structured approaches was largely avoided and the interviewee could be more relaxed when providing answers. Whilst these factors were considered carefully, it was decided that the interviews should be semi-structured and incorporate a combination of questions on specific topics that were significant in the Delphi study and in the theoretical literature whilst at the same time using open-ended questions that allowed the participants to express their personal opinions freely and in their own terms.

The interview schedule

The questions in the interview schedule were designed to enable the participants to discuss good citizenship in terms that were real and most germane to them (see Appendix 2). Cicourel (1964) comments that, 'many of the meanings which are clear to one will be relatively opaque to the other, even when the intention is genuine communication.' In addition, it was advised that to enhance their comprehensibility to the interviewees, questions should be easy to understand, short, and devoid of jargon (Kvale 1996:130). Therefore, all efforts were made to use words that made sense to the interviewees, words that were sensitive to the respondents' context and worldview.

The work of Cohen and Manion was important to the construction of an interview schedule. Cohen & Manion (1994:277) had written on the importance of the question 'sequence' in qualitative research. They refer to a special kind of questioning technique called 'Funnelling', which involved a process of asking questions going from general to specific and from broad to narrow. Although the interviews were semi-structured the design followed such a pattern, so that open-ended questions gave way to more structured questions on particular themes.

With this in mind, the in-depth interviews contained four stages. The first stage began by thanking the interviewee for their participation, introducing the name, role and background of the interviewer before asking some 'ice-breaker' questions that were
designed to put the participant at ease by allowing them to talk about their local neighborhood. This stage culminated in a short introduction to the rest of the interview, noting in particular that the good citizen was distinct from the good person.

This gave way to the second section of the interview which consisted of open-ended questions which were designed to allow the participant to express their initial thoughts on the content of good citizenship without any bias or leading on behalf of the interviewer. It was anticipated that the interviewee may still be insecure and shy about expressing an opinion on good citizenship at this early stage of the interview. Bearing this in mind the first question of this section invited the participant to think of someone whom they considered to be a good citizen. The characteristics making this person a good citizen were then thoroughly probed. This section invited the respondent to consider a good citizen at a local and then a national level and then to consider the content of bad citizenship. It was hoped that general questions would stimulate participants into constructing their own conception of the good citizen. The length varied according to the responses of the participant. It was intended that the discussion should progress organically and stem from the initial formulations of the participant. However, when these topics were satisfactorily and thoroughly probed, the interview moved on to the third section.

The third section contained a list of structured questions that were intended to flow from one topic to another so that the interview might be linked together and had a coherent logic to it. The purpose of this section was to explore the participants’ opinions on the topics generated by the Delphi study that were considered to be characteristics of the good citizen. These questions allowed participants to amplify particular aspects of their conception of the good citizen or to modify it in the light of different opinions. The end of the section allowed the participants the opportunity to sum up and reflect upon their views of good citizenship, bearing in mind their earlier comments.

The final section of the interview was comprised of two questionnaires (see Appendix 3). On the first questionnaire, the participants were invited to record their biographical and demographical details. The second questionnaire presented the participants with a range of statements which respondents could rank according to their relevance as a
characteristic of good citizenship. This questionnaire was designed from the results of the Delphi study which showed that there were some statements that received little support as characteristics of the good citizen and it was decided that pursuing them in the interview schedule would have been unproductive.

This format allowed the researcher to comment on the characteristics of the good citizen from a lay perspective and also to produce a set of results that can be compared against the expert opinion formulated in the Delphi study.

**Piloting and testing the interview schedule**

Once the interview schedule was finalised a series of pilot interviews was arranged. It was hoped that the pilots would help inform the structure, content, flow, sequence and style of questioning. The participants were selected to represent a cross-section of the population, with different levels of education, different income levels and different levels of responsibility in their personal lives and professional roles.

The participants involved in the pilot study were:

- A male school governor
- A male in part-time employment
- A female home-maker (the respondent filled out the questionnaire using this title)
- An unemployed male
- A female social worker

The pilot interviews were very helpful, and allowed the researcher to practice interviewing style, check the order and content of the interview schedule and develop an interview routine. After reviewing the recorded tapes several things were noticeable that were corrected and improved upon for the full interviews.

The chief value of the pilot interviews was that they gave an insight into the effectiveness of the interview schedule; whether or not the questions were
easy/difficult to understand; how the flow of the interview went; and if the sequence of questions worked well or not. In every case, participants replied positively when asked about their feelings on the schedule and there appeared to be no need to amend the content based upon their suggestions. However, certain questions affected the flow of the interview and did not provide particularly useful data. On subsequent deliberation it was decided to omit two of the questions and make up for their absence by changing the wording of one question.

One of the chief benefits of the piloting stage was the opportunity it presented to develop and test out a procedure for recording. The fourth interview was unfortunately not recorded due to a problem with the cassette recorder. A valuable lesson was learned - to have plenty of back-up cassettes and to test the recorder thoroughly before interviewing.

**Choosing a sample**

Strict random sampling techniques were inappropriate for the aims of this study and the methodology used might be described as a hybrid of quota sampling and stratified random sampling. Recruitment took account of two factors so that the semi-structured interviews were stratified according to gender and whether or not the participants were ostensibly an active contributor to the local community. Individuals were deemed to be an 'ostensibly active contributor' when they made an active commitment once a month or more (except in special circumstances, for example, where respondents make a significant contribution on a quarterly basis) and received no payment for their actions (except expenses). Individuals were not deemed to be an ostensibly active contributor when they were acting in personal interest or the intended recipients of their actions were family or friends. The neighbourhood, town, village, city and borough were all included within the definition of the 'local community'. The interviewees were recruited after an initial mapping exercise in which all the available literature on voluntary groups within Charnwood Borough was collected. This gave a basis for contacting ostensibly 'active' individuals together with the advice and recommendations of several community workers and knowledgeable persons within a local community centre. This process of mapping and consequent social networking revealed a number of potential participants and they were contacted and vetted according to the factors
above. The total number of interviews was 34 and interviews tended to last between 60 and 90 minutes.

**Focus groups as a method of social research**

This section attempts to outline the main features of focus group research, paying particular attention to the benefits of interaction and group dynamics which only this method can offer. Focus groups have been a common research tool in the social sciences since Robert Merton's seminal work lead to their development in the 1940's and 1950's (Krueger, 1988, Morgan, 1988, Stewart and Shamdasani, 1990).

There are many definitions of a focus group in the literature, but features like organised discussion (Kitzinger 1994), collective activity (Powell et al 1996), social events (Goss & Leinbach 1996) and interaction (Kitzinger 1995) identify the contribution that focus groups make to social research. Powell et al define a focus group as:

>a group of individuals selected and assembled by researchers to discuss and comment on, from personal experience, the topic that is the subject of the research. (1996: 499)

Merton and Kendall's (1946) influential article on the focused interview set the parameters for focus group development. This was in terms of ensuring that participants had a specific experience of or opinion about the topic under investigation; that an explicit interview guide was used; and that the subjective experiences of participants were explored in relation to predetermined research questions.

*Focus groups are a particularly distinctive form of group interviewing. Group interviewing involves interviewing a number of people at the same time, the emphasis being on questions and responses between the researcher and participants. Focus groups however rely on 'interaction within the group based on topics that are supplied by the researcher'. (Morgan 1997: 12). Hence the key characteristic which
distinguishes focus groups from other interviewing techniques was the insight and data produced by the interaction between participants.

**The role of focus groups**

Focus groups can be used at the preliminary or exploratory stages of a study (Krueger 1988); during a study, perhaps to evaluate or develop a particular programme of activities (Race et al. 1994); or after a programme had been completed, to assess its impact or to generate further avenues of research. They can be used either as a method in their own right or as a complement to other methods, especially for triangulation (Morgan 1988) and validity checking. In this study, focus groups were used as the third and concluding part of the data collection.

**Potential and limitations**

Kitzinger (1994, 1995) argued that interaction is the crucial feature of focus groups because the interaction between participants highlights their view of the world, the language they use about an issue and their values and beliefs about a situation. Interaction also enables participants to ask questions of each other, as well as to re-evaluate and reconsider their own understandings of their specific experiences.

Another significant benefit for the purpose of this study was that focus groups elicit information in a way which allows researchers to find out why an issue was salient, as well as what was salient about it (Morgan 1988). The focus groups allowed the moderator to see how the participants discussed the issues that were relevant to good citizenship and how the tensions and more problematic themes were dealt with. If multiple understandings and meanings are revealed by participants, the group setting was a convenient way of assessing how conflicting opinions mesh with each other and which characteristics of good citizenship emerged as the most relevant.

The opportunity to be involved in decision making processes (Race et al. 1994), to be valued as experts, and to be given the chance to work collaboratively with researchers (Goss & Leinbach 1996) can be empowering for many participants. If the focus groups
worked well, it was hoped that trust would develop and that the group would go on to explore solutions to a particular problem as a unit (Kitzinger 1995).

Although focus group research had many advantages, as with all research methods there are limitations. Some can be overcome by careful planning and moderating, but others were unavoidable and peculiar to this approach. The researcher, or moderator, for example, had less control over the data produced (Morgan 1988) than in either quantitative studies or one-to-one interviewing. The moderator had to allow participants to talk to each other, ask questions and express doubts and opinions, while having very little control over the interaction other than generally keeping participants focused on the topic. By its nature focus group research was open ended and cannot be entirely predetermined.

Focus groups may discourage certain people from participating, for example those who were not very articulate or confident, and those who had communication problems or special needs. The method of focus group discussion may also discourage some people from trusting others with sensitive or personal information. In such cases personal interviews or the use of workbooks alongside focus groups may be a more suitable approach. Finally, focus groups were not fully confidential or anonymous, because the material is shared with the others in the group.

**Piloting the focus groups**

Allowing for these difficulties and the new demands placed on the moderator, extra care was taken with the piloting section of the focus group research. This period was made deliberately longer and more rigorous than initial planning stages had anticipated in order to prepare the moderator for the coming sessions and to develop an approach and the necessary moderating skills to produce a high quality of data.

Conducting pilot focus groups played an important role in this research. It allowed the opportunity to refine the schedule and to adapt moderating techniques from the individual interviews. However, adapting to the new conditions offered in the focus groups presented a variety of problems ranging from logistics to group dynamics. Obtaining reliable audio recordings was a significant difficulty although the researcher
was able to resolve this problem with the helpful loan of a colleague's video camera. Using a combination of video camera and micro-cassette recorder the researcher was able to transcribe overlaps in the conversation and easily differentiate between speakers.

The effect of group dynamics on the data collection was an important consideration in the design of the focus groups and in the piloting stage. When researching attitudes and opinions, focus groups may be influenced by one or more dominant personalities and one of the pilot sessions revealed that when a group is not forthcoming with ideas and lacks confidence a tendency to agree with each other emerges. In this case, the group was reluctant to present alternative perspectives and to offer comments. This may have been a product of several factors: shyness, a lack of interest in the subject matter manifesting itself in meagre attempts to answer thoughtfully, lack of confidence, lack of information or clarity provided by the moderator or confusion caused by the difficulty of the subject matter.

In addition, the motivation of participants in a focus group of this nature may also be sensitive to the way in which their answers are perceived by others. Investigating good citizenship raises a number of topics with sharply different perspectives and respondents may feel the need to appear tolerant, accepting and liberal. As a result, respondents may not explore accurately their opinions. These problems could potentially allow mixed quality data to be collected although a number of strategies were designed to prevent these scenarios impacting upon the quality of the data in a negative way.

The design of the focus groups was intended to facilitate a diverse range of input on the subject of good citizenship. Participants were asked to write down three key words which they associated with good citizenship and these responses acted as cues and prompts for the ensuing focus group. It was hoped that the written ideas would not be influenced by other participants and these could be used to open up avenues of thought that had not previously been touched upon by the group and thus allow potentially competing views to be considered by the group.
In addition, the ability of the moderator to make participants feel at ease, to have confidence expressing their views even if they are contradictory to the consensus view, was seen as an important means of reducing harmful group dynamics. At the beginning of each focus group care was taken to emphasise the importance of expressing opinions as honestly and faithfully as possible. The introduction to the sessions pointed out that ‘there are no wrong or right answers’, and respondents were given confidence to explain their thoughts even if they did not agree with emerging views. Throughout the sessions, the participants were encouraged to offer their opinions, for example the probe: ‘Does anyone have a different point of view?’ was used where appropriate to consider alternative aspects of a particular topic.

**Recruiting for the focus groups**

It is widely acknowledged that focus groups can be time consuming and problematic to arrange. The logistics usually require more planning than other types of qualitative research methods as getting people to group gatherings can be difficult and setting up appropriate venues with adequate recording facilities requires a lot of time. Recruiting adequate numbers and appropriate individuals was an elusive task.

Recruitment of participants was time consuming, especially because the topic under consideration has no immediate benefits or attractions to participants. Many focus group studies, particularly consumer research, offer financial or other material rewards as incentives to boost attendance and recruit participants. This study was not able to offer such inducements, however, and the recruitment of suitable candidates was a significant problem. Burgess (1996) noted that people with specific interests are often recruited through word of mouth. Holbrook & Jackson (1996) stress the usefulness of poster campaigns and advertising although advertising using small posters placed in community centres and other key buildings did not have any noticeable benefit in the recruitment process.

Recruitment of participants for the semi-structured interviews and focus groups was reliant upon existing social networks. Local community centres such as John Storer House were able to supply individuals with contacts to diverse aspects of the local population. Further recruiting was done through community centres in the local area.
such as Shepshed and Birstall, Loughborough College and the Loughborough Job Centre and also with the help of local health authorities.

Whilst the in-depth interviews were stratified according to gender and whether or not individuals were ‘active within the local community’, the focus groups were stratified according to ethnicity, social class/education, older age and disability.

Ethnicity: The most prominent ethnic minority in Charnwood Borough was South Asian and there was a strong Bangladeshi community in South Charnwood, the district whose biggest urban community, Loughborough, was at the centre of the recruitment. Therefore, two focus groups were held with participants from the Bangladeshi community.

Social class/education: The contributors in the first stage of the lay data collection were all educated to a similar level, all having progressed successfully through the school system to the age of sixteen and the majority going on to further education. The two 'socially excluded' groups included individuals who had not shared the same educational benefits. Many of these contributors had spent time in Detention Centres and Young Offenders Institutes and had received little formal education post-sixteen.

Older age: Almost all respondents in the in-depth interviews were under 55 and two of the focus groups consisted of participants over this age so that the lay study was more evenly balanced in terms of age.

Disability: The final two focus groups were made up of people with a range of physical disabilities and were recruited through social networks in Charnwood Borough.

Ethical issues

Ethical considerations for focus groups are the same as for most other methods of social research (Homan 1991). For example, when selecting and involving participants, researchers must ensure that full information about the purpose and uses of participants' contributions is given. Being honest and keeping participants informed
about the expectations of the group and topic, and not pressurising participants to speak is good practice. A particular ethical issue considered in the case of focus groups was the handling of sensitive material and confidentiality given that there was always more than one participant in each of the groups. At the outset, care was taken to clarify that each participant’s contributions would be shared with the others in the group as well as with the moderator. Participants were reminded and encouraged to keep confidential what they hear during the meeting and that the moderator has the responsibility to anonymise data from the group.

The role of moderator

Once a meeting had been arranged, the role of moderator or group facilitator became critical, especially in terms of providing clear explanations of the purpose of the group, helping people feel at ease, and facilitating interaction between group members.

During the meeting moderators need to promote debate, perhaps by asking open questions. They may also need to challenge participants, especially to draw out people’s differences, and tease out a diverse range of meanings on the topic under discussion. Sometimes moderators will need to probe for details, or move things forward when the conversation is drifting or has reached a minor conclusion. Moderators also have to keep the session focused and so sometimes they may deliberately have to steer the conversation back on course. Moderators also have to ensure everyone participates and gets a chance to speak. At the same time moderators are encouraged not to show too much approval (Krueger 1988), so as to avoid favouring particular participants. They must avoid giving personal opinions so as not to influence participants towards any particular position or opinion.

Finally, the degree of control and direction imposed by moderators will depend upon the goals of the research as well as on their preferred style. If two or more moderators are involved in the facilitation of a focus group, agreement needs to be reached as to how much input or direction each will give. It is recommended that one moderator facilitates and the other takes notes and checks the recording equipment during the meeting. There also needs to be consistency across focus groups, so careful
preparation with regard to role and responsibilities is required. Recording devices were set up and checked prior to the sessions and were set up in such a way that they did not need to be continually adjusted and maintained. This left the moderator free to focus on making field notes and able to influence the direction of the conversation or to probe and further explore aspects of the discussion.

Focus group schedule

Building on the work of the previous stages of research, the structure of the focus group schedule gave participants the opportunity to speak generally about what it means to be a good citizen whilst also allowing participants to respond to questions on specific topics (see Appendix ). The intention of this combination was to stimulate participants into constructing their own conception of the good citizen and to give them the opportunity to amplify particular aspects of their conception or to modify it in the light of different opinions.

The basis for the focus group schedule was provided by the topics contained in the Delphi study and investigated further in the individual interviews. A line of reasoning was used to construct the focus group schedule that was consistent with that which informed the creation of the interview schedule, that the research should prioritise those statements shown by previous rounds to generate the most productive data. As with the Delphi study, preliminary analysis of the interviews showed that there were some statements that received little support as characteristics of the good citizen and it was decided therefore to exclude them from the focus group. These statements formed the basis of a short questionnaire that participants were invited to complete at the end of the session. As with the individual interviews, this questionnaire also provided an opportunity to record demographic information.

The conduct of the focus groups

The recommended number of people in a focus group is usually six to ten (MacIntosh 1993), although it is possible to extend this number up to fifteen (Goss & Leinbach
1996) or to reduce it to as few as four (Kitzinger 1995). Numbers of groups in a study vary, some studies use only one meeting with each of several focus groups (Burgess 1996), and others might meet the same group more than once. Focus group sessions usually last from one to two hours and the focus groups conducted in this study were no different. The longest focus group used in the study lasted for one hour and forty-eight minutes, whilst the shortest focus group used in the study lasted for one hour and six minutes. Similarly, the literature suggests that neutral locations may be useful to avoid negative or positive associations a particular site or building may have (Powell & Single 1996). In each focus group session the meeting was held at grounds that were familiar to the participants. This had the advantage of helping the participants to feel at ease and making it as easy as possible for participants to attend. The meetings were held in a variety of places, ranging from people's homes, in rented facilities, to where the participants held their regular meetings if they were a pre-existing group.

Summary

The methodology adopted for my study was based upon a review of the theoretical literature on good citizenship and was inspired by the tenets of grounded theory. The literature informed a preliminary set of characteristics of the good citizen which formed a basis upon which an investigation into the perspectives of an expert group of individuals in the field of citizenship was carried out. This study revolved around a questionnaire that was inspired by the techniques used in Delphi studies.

The results of the study into the expert perspectives on good citizenship were then used to inform a schedule that provided the basis for an investigation of lay perspectives on good citizenship in the Charnwood Borough area. The lay study began with a series of in-depth interviews that provided rich accounts of the characteristics of good citizenship that were then explored further through a series of focus groups. The findings from the expert and lay studies can be found in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

Findings

Introduction to the Findings

It is the purpose of this chapter to report the findings from all three stages of data collection: the Delphi study, in-depth interviews and focus groups. The first section of this chapter examines the findings from the Delphi study which is shorter and a smaller scale study than that of the lay perspectives. It stands as a study in its own right but its function was partly to frame the ensuing enquiry into lay perspectives on good citizenship. The Delphi section comprises four parts. The first part reports the results of the counting procedures that produced a ranking and a consensual view of the most popular statements on good citizenship. The second part complements the ranking procedures by exploring the qualitative data in the Delphi study before moving onto the third part in which the data is analysed according to gender. In the final part the possible statements of good citizenship are put into groups in order to look at patterns and themes.

The second and largest section of the 'Findings' examines the lay perspectives based on the results of both the in-depth interviews and the focus groups. The first part of this section examines the processes by which the respondents discussed and engaged with the meanings of good citizenship. The second, and longer part, reports the findings of the lay perspectives and examines the essence of good citizenship. This part considers what topics were and were not considered to be characteristics of the good citizen and also those areas in which opinion was divided. In the remaining sections, this chapter will consider the responses to two structured questions. The penultimate section looks at the content of bad citizenship and this is followed by an
assessment of the obstacles to good citizenship. The implications of all these findings are discussed in the following chapter.

The Expert Perspectives- The Delphi Study

Introduction

The Delphi study represented the first step of the empirical side of this project. A function of the study is to act as a bridge between the theory and the lay perspectives on good citizenship. In it, a group of experts in the field of citizenship offered their opinions on a range of topics generated from the theoretical literature. Traditionally, Delphi studies have employed a quantitative analysis of the results and produced a group perspective based on a consensus of the findings.

The analysis here uses a counting procedure to produce a hierarchy of statements, ranging from the most popular to the least popular. This is followed by an analysis of the data that grouped like statements together before applying the results of the counting procedure to these groups in order to establish which categories of good citizenship received most support. This section will be referred to as a ‘categorical analysis’ of the findings.

It is also possible, to a limited degree, to analyse the Delphi Study qualitatively as the participants were invited to add comments to explain or develop any of their opinions and to add any characteristics of good citizenship that they felt had been omitted from the original list. The penultimate part of this section is devoted to looking at the findings from the qualitative analysis.

In the main part the qualitative analysis serves to support the findings of the counting procedures and the ‘categorical analysis’ but it also points to differences in opinion. The final part addresses the gender differences in opinion on good citizenship.
The counting procedures described in Chapter 4 produced a set of results that picked out a hierarchy of good citizenship. The results can be seen in the following list that shows the consensus of opinion from the panel. The statement ‘Is a good parent’ marks the point at which the statements take on a negative score and from here on the subsequent statements in the hierarchy can be seen to be outside the perceived characteristics of the good citizen. Therefore, it is possible to split the hierarchy into two groups: statements that are considered to be a characteristic of the good citizen, and statements that are not considered to be characteristics of the good citizen.

A consensual hierarchy of the Delphi statements

1. Shows respect for others
2. Speaks out on behalf of minority/stigmatised groups
   = Knows their responsibilities as a citizen
4. Keeps abreast with/is aware of social issues and political groups
   = Votes in elections
   = Feels a responsibility to help others living beyond national boundaries
   = Challenges the law when they think it is wrong
8. Obeys the law
   = Considers the needs of others
10. Knows their rights as a citizen
    = Pays their taxes willingly
    = Is actively involved in the local community
13. Is a good neighbour
14. Is prepared to break the law for a cause in which they believe, e.g. burning GM crops.
15. Uses environmentally friendly products
16. Helps to reduce/prevent crime
17. Gives money to charity
    = Fulfils their responsibility to hold/find a job
19. Recycles used products
   = Gives time as a volunteer

The following statements are not considered to be characteristics of the good citizen

21. Is a good parent
22. Cares for elderly or infirm relatives
   = Cares for elderly or infirm friends
   = Demonstrates a strong sense of loyalty to their country of residence
24. Is an active member of a political party
25. Works hard at their job.

Emerging categories

After analysing the results from the counting procedures, the statements were then placed into similar groups in order to gauge whether the expert contributors associated any one category with good citizenship above others (For a more detailed description of this process (see Chapter 4).

The data can be ordered into the following categories:

Interpersonal Intimate and Interpersonal Universal

Many of the statements can be grouped together because they describe interpersonal relations. They can be divided into two categories, ‘Intimate’ and ‘Universal’. The interpersonal ‘intimate’ category of statements refers to interpersonal characteristics of good citizenship that apply to a private or intimate sphere of personal relations. They include the following statements:

Is a good parent
Cares for elderly or infirm friends
Cares for elderly or infirm relatives
The second 'universal' interpersonal category refers to characteristics of good citizenship that might be applied on a general level to both intimates and strangers:

- Considers the needs of others
- Shows respect for others

**Work**

Reflecting a New Labour theme within the citizenship literature (see Literature Review) with the addition of the Marshallian interpretation, this category consists of statements that explore the relationship between good citizenship and work:

- Fulfils their responsibility to hold/find a job
- Works hard at their job.

**Challenging the Law**

This dimension considers the appropriate behaviour of a good citizen in situations where an individual's personal beliefs and those of the government diverge. It explores whether or not it is important for good citizens to stick to their principles and personal beliefs even if they are in conflict with those of the government.

- Challenges the law when they think it is wrong
- Is prepared to break the law for a cause in which they believe, e.g. burning GM crops.

**Formal**

The Formal category consists of statements that describe the good citizen in legalistic or formal terms. It includes the following statements:
Knows their rights as a citizen
Knows their responsibilities as a citizen
Pays their taxes willingly
Obeys the law

Cosmopolitan

The Cosmopolitan category reflects the concern within the contemporary citizenship literature with trans-national citizenship. It consists of the following statement:

Feels a responsibility to help others living beyond national boundaries

Patriotism

Throughout the history of citizenship, a sense of loyalty has been a significant aspect. Some commentators have observed the impact of recent global and sociological trends in a way that questions the relevance of patriotic feelings and a sense of loyalty to the country of residence. This statement explores the contemporary relevance of these notions.

Demonstrates a strong sense of loyalty to their country of residence

Political engagement

Statements in this category were grouped together because of their relevance to the political process or because they described a form of political action. It therefore embraces both party politics and broader kinds of political action:
Keeps abreast with/is aware of social issues and political topics
Votes in elections
Is an active member of a political party
Speaks out on behalf of minority/stigmatised groups

Community Engagement

This category consists of four statements that describe different ways of engaging with the local community:

- Is a good neighbour
- Helps to reduce/prevent crime
- Is actively involved in the local community
- Gives time as a volunteer

Charity

One of the smaller groupings, this category was separated from volunteering because it does not require giving personal time:

- Gives money to charity

Environmental

The concerns of conserving the environment are a significant feature of the contemporary political landscape and some of the citizenship literature. Aside from political lobbying these concerns also manifest themselves in the belief that the environment is a moral responsibility. This category comprises environmental actions in the private sphere such as:
Recycles used products
Uses environmentally friendly products

The table below shows each of the categories with examples of good citizenship.

**Fig 5.1 showing the complete grouping of the categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interpersonal Universal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interpersonal Intimate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers the needs of others</td>
<td>Is a good parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows respect for others</td>
<td>Cares for elderly or infirm friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cares for elderly or infirm relatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Patriotism</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cosmopolitan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a strong sense of loyalty to their country of residence</td>
<td>Feels a responsibility to help others living beyond national boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Work</strong></th>
<th><strong>Formal</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulfils their responsibility to hold/find a job</td>
<td>Knows their rights as a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works hard at their job.</td>
<td>Knows their responsibilities as a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pays their taxes willingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obeys the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Environmental</strong></th>
<th><strong>Community Engagement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycles used products</td>
<td>Is a good neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses environmentally friendly products</td>
<td>Helps to reduce/prevent crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is actively involved in the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives time as a volunteer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Political engagement</strong></th>
<th><strong>Challenging the law</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeps abreast with/is aware of social issues and political topics</td>
<td>Challenges the law when they think it is wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes in elections</td>
<td>Is prepared to break the law for a cause in which they believe, e.g. burning GM crops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an active member of a political party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks out on behalf of minority/stigmatised groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Charity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives money to charity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of these categories was then given an average score based on the results of the ranking procedure described above. It was therefore possible to produce a hierarchy of categories and the results can be seen in the table below:

Fig 5.2 showing a hierarchy of good citizenship according to a categorical analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal Universal</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cosmopolitan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political engagement</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Challenging the law</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Engagement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environmental</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Charity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Work</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Patriotic</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Interpersonal Intimate</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible to observe four tiers in the hierarchy of categories, comprising the following statements:

Tier one, Strong Support: Categories 1-3
Tier Two, Medium Support: Categories 4-6
Tier Three, Weak Support: Categories 7-8
Tier Four, No Support: Categories 9-11

It is interesting to note that the Interpersonal categories are at opposite ends of the hierarchy and are split between the first tier and the last tier. Similarly,
cosmopolitanism and patriotism stand out in the top and bottom tiers. Although political engagement and community engagement are in the same tier of statements, they are at different ends with political engagement appearing to be the more important.

A qualitative view of the Delphi study

A second analysis of the Delphi study was carried out based on the qualitative input from the panellists. This was an additional method of data collection and had two functions: to add texture to the quantitative analysis and to point to any diverging opinions masked by consensual analysis. Underneath each of the statements contained in the Delphi study was positioned a 'Comments' box, which offered the respondents the chance to personalise their opinion or to qualify their choice on the likert scale.

The qualitative data gave substance to the emergent impressions made by the ranking procedures. Analysis showed that where the counting procedures scored statements highly the qualitative input backed up these choices. For example, these quotes on the importance of speaking out for minority groups support its high ranking in the hierarchy:

A public realm issue. Engagement in debates about rights and duties of all minorities – however defined – is a key element of citizen activity.

Self-evident from what I have said about the collective good. It is also difficult to see how anyone can claim to support the idea of citizenship while colluding with the denial of human rights to some sections of the community – provided the minority is not a group whose aim is to be despotic over others!

Defending the rights of others is a key responsibility of citizenship
The importance of political engagement and engagement in the public realm was echoed throughout the panellists' comments even in response to statements on other topics. For example, it was used to frame the participants' responses to statements such as 'pays their taxes willingly':

Broadly I agree – something that allows the 'good citizen' to engage in public debates is the fact that s/he provides resources for a particular community through taxation. This is not to say that engagement could not be exercised through a refusal to pay tax in certain circumstances – i.e. where public resources are being used to undermine minority rights or the rights of marginal groups. Of course, paying taxes hardly exhausts citizenly behaviour!

And also in this instance:

Not a key issue – and not one that defines the 'good citizen', but it could be considered a citizenly activity in so far as it speaks to a commitment to, and engagement in, the public realm.

At the opposite end of the scale, the statements that were not considered to be relevant to being a good citizen were borne out with negative comments. The qualitative input reflected the lack of support for 'being a member of a political party' that is indicated by the hierarchy. One panellist commented:

Formal political affiliation may be an area which relates to the exercise of citizenship – it is associated with the public sphere and clearly opens on to debates about the nature of rights, duties, etc. That said, party membership is neither a necessary, nor a sufficient condition of being a good citizen. The key point is engagement in one or more areas...
of the public realm, whether or not this involves party affiliation.

Interestingly, ‘working hard’ was not considered to be relevant to good citizenship. One commentator noted that ‘

Working hard may be counter-productive to other admirable but not relevant or relevant activities. Working sensibly, responsibly and honestly would be relevant to being a good citizen.

And also:

No doubt a very desirable attribute – but again, working hard does not relate per se to citizenship as a mixture of social belonging and social and political engagement.

Wanted to leave blank because what does it mean- not sure working hard has anything to do with good citizen

Similarly, about ‘caring for elderly or infirm friends’, panellists wrote:

Caring is not citizenship

This kind of function takes place in the private realm. While it is highly desirable that individuals take some responsibility for the care of older people and the infirm, I don’t regard this as a duty relating to the public realm – the ‘good citizen’ would work to ensure that conditions of care, etc, were good and resources sufficient to make public alternatives to private care a viable option. An individual may well care for elderly or infirm friends but I do not regard this as a particular function of citizenship. This is a private sphere activity.
The analysis showed that the statements that frequently scored poorly in the ranking procedures were dismissively labelled as 'private' and 'personal' issues. Further comments reinforced the view of the Delphi study that good citizenship was something that existed in the public realm. Commenting on good citizenship as 'being a good parent', panellists wrote:

The good citizen in my view is concerned with the public world primarily and with contributing to its improvement. So, paradoxical though it may seem, someone can be a good citizen and a lousy parent, unkind to the dog and so forth.

I put this in the social/familial/personal sphere rather than the public sphere.

As the quotes above indicate, this aspect of good citizenship appeared marginal and mainly provoked a negative response. Overall, the ranking procedures showed that 'personal' characteristics of an intimate nature were not considered to be strong features of good citizenship. According to a categorical analysis, 'interpersonal intimate' characteristics were the least relevant to good citizenship. However, this is not to say that interpersonal characteristics were derided entirely by the Delphi panellists. Interpersonal characteristics with a more universal application were highly important. The comment below indicated that interpersonal characteristics had more significance if they had a resonance within the public sphere, not the private sphere.

Citizenship I take to refer to rights and responsibilities relevant to the public sphere. Virtues which may exist in the private sphere I partly leave to one side when I say they are relevant to good citizenship but not synonymous with it. They are relevant in that as Burke and others said the family and the wider circle of associates provide the setting in which wider civic virtues develop.

On occasions, however, the qualitative view presented a different perspective to the ranking procedure. The qualitative input added texture to the choices made in the
likert scale, raising or reducing the importance of a particular statement above that indicated by the ranking procedure. Sometimes, the comments went against the grain of the consensus opinion and underlined the problems inherent in taking a consensual view of a panel of respondents: it did not give much indication of the tension and split in opinions.

'Knowing your rights as a citizen' is one such statement that divides opinion. Most of the respondents show some form of agreement that this statement is important to being a good citizen although the consensus does not support it as wholeheartedly as it does 'speaking out for stigmatised or marginalised groups' for example. However, this is not to say that it does not provoke contrasting opinions. The following quotes show this statement is held in both strong and contrastingly weak regard amongst the Delphi panellists. On the one hand this characteristic provoked strong support:

Absolutely! But also knowing one's rights entails knowing what rights actually are and how they relate to the social politics of the public realm. It is important that citizens engage with rights in this way.

However, it also provokes flippant responses and is dismissed and ranked poorly by some contributors. One respondent considers it to have such a poor relevance it is dismissed with a cursory:

Can't see the connection!

The qualitative analysis revealed that opinions sometimes clashed. For example, the results suggested that it was important for good citizens to obey the law, although results also suggested that good citizens might 'break the law for a cause in which they believe'. The qualitative analysis showed that there were mixed feelings when it came to obeying or breaking the law and that the relationship between a good citizen and the law was not clear cut. The quotes below illustrate some of the views on 'breaking the law for a cause':
I strongly agree in principle but there are, in my view, very few causes where the ends justify such means. Gandhi, the Civil Rights Movement, modern South Africa are among the very few.

[This is] not something to be taken lightly, but I believe that if citizenship is understood as 'engagement' then, yes, there will be times when individuals feel sufficiently strongly about an issue to regard law-breaking as the only means of furthering public debate.

In terms of diverse opinions, the data of the Delphi study are significant in the split that is evident along gender lines. It is to this topic that the next section will turn.

**Gender Differences**

Initially, the Delphi respondents were divided into groups according to their gender and the findings were subjected to the counting procedures outlined in the Methodology (see Chapter 4). When these findings were compared, the results showed that the findings were similar in many respects yet they differed significantly over one category in particular, the 'Interpersonal Intimate' category. It became clear that this category was viewed quite differently by the male and female respondents and at the root of this tension were the following statements:

The good citizen....

- Is a good parent
- Cares for elderly or infirm friends
- cares for elderly or infirm relatives

Each of these statements was poorly received by the male respondents, the majority of whom 'disagree' that these statements were characteristics of the good citizen. The female respondents had a much more positive response and the majority of respondents 'agree' that these statements were characteristics of the good citizen.
This had significant implications for the overall results of the Delphi study. In the ranking procedures used, the ‘Intimate’ statements did not make an impact as one of the more significant aspects of good citizenship. However, the difference in opinion along gender lines suggested that these characteristics could not be dismissed as easily as the ranking and categorical analyses indicate.

Summary

The Delphi study explored the consensus on good citizenship from a panel of experts on good citizenship. The primary characteristic of good citizenship emerged as ‘Shows respect for others’. In addition, the most strongly opposed characteristic of good citizenship was ‘works hard at their job’. Furthermore, a categorical view of the Delphi study showed that ‘Interpersonal Universal’ characteristics comprised the most important category of good citizenship. At the opposite end of the scale, ‘interpersonal intimate’ characteristics of good citizenship were held in the most poor regard although an analysis of the results according to gender showed that this category was a more prominent feature of good citizenship amongst female respondents than the consensual view indicated.
The Lay perspectives

Introduction

This section focuses on the findings that emerged from the study of lay respondents and are a product of two methods of data collection: in-depth interviews and focus groups. For the purposes of analysis these two methods have been combined (see Chapter 4 for more information on the methodology).

The first part of this section examines the responses of the lay participants and observes a series of characteristics that are common across the in-depth interviews and the focus groups and apply to the 'process' of discussing good citizenship. The second part of this section looks at the characteristics of good citizenship in order to construct the 'substance of good citizenship' from the perspective of the lay respondents. The following part of this section considers which statements are not 'considered to be characteristics of the good citizen' before a subsequent part looks at the statements that divided opinion most strongly. The lay perspectives on good citizenship will conclude by exploring the content of bad citizenship and the factors that get in the way of good citizenship.

The process of discussing good citizenship

Introduction

This part of the chapter has three sub-sections and initially deals with the processes by which the participants in the lay study frame their responses. It is a common trait in this research that the respondents react to and internalise the open-ended questions by using specific examples, contextual cases and hypothetical situations in order to articulate their views. The first sub-section details and explains these themes. The second sub-section addresses the particular responses that are common when participants had difficulties expressing their opinions. Often, the complexity of the
subject matter led to inconsistencies and contradictions in the respondents’ scripts and this created difficulties when it came to establishing clear messages and themes from the lay participants. To a certain extent, the nature of the data collection methods contributed to the tendency to reflect and revise opinions that was a source of these problems. However, it was possible to observe strategies that enabled the participants to give structure to their responses. The final sub-section will address these strategies.

The structure of lay responses

The lay sessions began with some concrete questions about the neighbourhood in which the participants lived and proceeded to a series of open-ended questions. These were aimed at putting the respondents at ease and extracting a set of information that would direct the discussion onto more specific areas before a reflection and summary. In almost every case the lay participants responded to open-ended questions by introducing specific cases, hypothetical situations and concrete examples. In several cases, the respondents referred to people they knew well to explain their thoughts on good citizenship. Jack, a member of the older age focus group, had no problems expressing his conception of good citizenship:

Moderator: What do you think is the most important characteristic of a good citizen?

Jack: To me, it’s like someone like Derek, this person I know who is a erm, Parish officer, or something, a Parish-person, don’t know what the best-way, the name for calling him. He’s such an important figure in the neighbourhood and well, I’m not sure...he can’t spread himself too thin, but the area around-about. If there’s bereavements he would be there for the family, doing all sorts of things, a really important role, really. Understated, I mean, he’s not getting paid for it but he’d always be there for you.

This theme was also evident in the other focus groups as Bryan, a respondent in his 30’s from one of the disability focus groups, provided a typical response:
To me, good citizenship is like what my friend does for Sileby, it's good citizenship to me because it's important, not everyone would do it and it's done well...he does things like writing letters to the council and getting involved in local affairs like traffic things and cars, traffic on the roads and that.

Over the course of the data collection, similar responses built up to form a set of anecdotal descriptions that hinged around a specific activity or a particular disposition that a good citizen would possess. In this instance, Bryan's understanding of citizenship centred around the notion of 'being involved in the local community' and tended to have a bent for local politics. The seed of this understanding was evident in the initial situation Bryan presented. In other instances, the respondents were less specific about naming the person whose characteristics they detailed as being those of a good citizen. Hazel, an inactive contributor in her 20's, began in this way:

I suppose a good citizen is someone who helps people out, they might go and deliver meals to elderly people in the mornings because they're on a shift work and they have got the time to fit it in and do good deeds like that. I suppose it's that way because they care, a caring person, they've got the time to do it and they can make a difference to all of those people...erm, the type of person like that I reckon.

As in the above quote, it was common for respondents to include biographical details in their account of good citizenship. Sometimes they were specific in naming a particular person and sometimes they constructed a hypothetical situation but almost all respondents placed the example in the context of other aspects of a person's life.

Context is something that played an important role in how lay participants expressed their opinions on good citizens. Often respondents were faced with issues that they did not have established or examined views on, and applying and modifying the context of their answers was one way in which they were able to discuss unfamiliar
issues whilst leaving room to revise or alter their opinions. Context became all-important, as Bryan, pointed out clearly:

You know, it depends on the context. You might be a good citizen if you volunteered but you might not be as well. You see it just depends on the context of that person's life. I'm not saying that everyone who volunteers is a good citizen or that people who volunteer aren't good citizens. It's just that you need to know the context, you need to know what else is going on in their lives.

Contextual explanations frequently accompanied cases where lay respondents stressed the importance of a person's 'disposition'. Their explanations were usually paired with an understanding of the things that made it hard to be a good citizen (see below). For example, many respondents thought that giving time and energy to a charity was indicative of a good citizen yet they also acknowledged that this was something that could not be achieved by everyone, especially for those with demanding family situations or pressured jobs. For the majority of the respondents each supportive statement connected with good citizenship was met with qualification and consideration of extenuating circumstances. Janet, an inactive contributor in her 40's, confessed:

'I'm not gonna be very good for this questionnaire Matthew because it depends on the circumstance that you're in doesn't it? You know, we've all heard of the person who picks the car up to save the old lady and they could maybe do that on that occasion for that person but on another occasion when somebody else might act they wouldn't even probably think about, you know, you know, probably I think that what makes a difference is when that's person compassion is at the forefront of a situation.'

Janet's comments highlighted the point that talking about a good citizen is often a very difficult task. In the face of this difficulty, many respondents were not able to make up
their mind and stayed neutral rather than attempting to explain an opinion or response to a particular question that they had not had reason to think about before. Consider Peter, an active respondent in his 50's:

Well, yes, I suppose a good citizen might be someone who voted but then again, they might not. I'm not entirely sure about that one, they might or they might not [vote in general elections]. I don't really know, er, either one I'd say, yeah...

This can also be seen in a quote from Damian, an inactive contributor in his 20's, who made a statement about volunteering that could be applied to numerous instances where the respondents were unable to make up their minds:

'Sometimes it is [being a good citizen] and sometimes it isn't. Sometimes you would be a good citizen if you did it and then again sometimes you might not be.'

Another feature of the lay responses was the reluctance the participants showed when invited to place the characteristics of good citizenship in a hierarchy. Towards the end of the structured section of the interview, the participants were shown a list containing all of the characteristics of good citizenship that had been discussed during the session. They were then invited to select the ones they felt were most important according to whether they were a 'condition' of good citizenship, 'relevant' or 'not relevant'. In the majority of cases, the participants were not able to select any characteristics as 'conditions' of good citizenship, and settled on marking everything as 'relevant'. Damian, an inactive contributor in his 20's explained his reasons:

I would say they were all relevant in some way, erm, yeah, they're all relevant, some people would see them as more relevant than others, and to some people they might be a little bit more relevant and if you was in a certain situation then you could say that some might be more relevant. But, I can't say anymore than that, I can see that they're all relevant in their own way, you know... it just depends on...
everyone's situation, I can't say which is more relevant than others, it's different for everyone.

The consensus of the lay respondents was that almost everything that had been discussed was in some way relevant, depending on the context of your standpoint.

To sum up this sub-section, the way of introducing characteristics of good citizenship through hypothetical situations and using context to qualify their views, was a defining feature of the lay study. Moreover, this process was significant not only as a defining feature of the lay studies but because it contributed to another feature of discussing good citizenship: inconsistencies.

**Inconsistencies and problems with discussing good citizenship**

When participants answered questions by using hypothetical situations to explain their points, they often avoided making definitive statements about the characteristics of the good citizen. On occasion, the lay respondents seemed to show a reluctance to commit to general statements such as 'The good citizen is someone who gives their time to charities' for example. Instead, a string of possibilities and hypothetical good citizens were suggested. This practice often led to inconsistencies and contradictions as the expressed opinions clashed with each other. Respondents often expressed a certain opinion in the open-ended beginning of the sessions, only to produce an incompatible opinion later on when discussing more particular aspects of good citizenship.

In one of the disability focus group sessions, Andrew, a man in his 40’s, decided upon the following way of describing a good citizen:

> I think that [being a good citizen] is about helping other people, when you help others you are being a good citizen, it's as simple as that, ok? I don't agree with Sarah, it's most important that you actually do things, ok? Things would just stay the same, just stay bad or even get worse if people
didn’t do things. Good citizens are the ones that you can see who are doing things that the world needs, ok?

Andrew’s description of the need to be seen to be doing things was a bold statement against some members of the focus group who believed that good citizenship was to be found in the ‘head, in the approach and the mental thinking’ of the individual rather than in any particular activities. In standing up for his opinions and going against the grain of the conversation Andrew appeared to be expressing a firm and considered belief. However, further on into the focus group Andrew contradicted his earlier assertions with a surprising volte-face:

‘well, ultimately, [being a good citizen has] got to be about what’s deep down hasn’t it? I mean anyone can do things that on the surface you would say ‘wow, that’s really like worthy and that’ and you would think that they do a lot to help people. But, you just don’t know why they do those things, is it because they can’t get a job or is the ‘hey, everyone look at me, aren’t I good factor’? You get a lot of busy bodies, so you can never tell whether someone is truly, you know, honestly a good citizen can you? It has to be on the deep down feelings that they have, and you know what? You can’t always see them. Just because you’re not Mother-bloody-Teresa, if you don’t do one single thing you might still be more of a good citizen than all these volunteers because you might be the most considerate person in the world…it’s about deep down, not show!’

In these excerpts from the focus group Andrew shifted from a position that placed emphasis on ‘doing’ to one that eschewed ostentatious examples of being a good citizen and emphasised the very thing that he denounced in a prior statement. The very nature of focus groups meant that it was common for views to shift and adapt in light of the contributions of others in the group. Sometimes, participants changed their mind when faced with a perspective that they had not considered or with a well presented point.
In the quotes above the inconsistencies occurred between views expressed in the open-ended section of the lay sessions, compared with the more structured section that followed it. In cases such as these the inconsistencies might have been a product of the demands each section placed on the respondent. In the open-ended section, the participant was required to create their own impression of good citizenship, whereas the structured section required the participants to respond to various topics and to judge their relevance to good citizenship. However, the inconsistencies in participants' scripts were not solely the product of the demands within individual sections placed on the participants. Inconsistencies could be observed throughout the sections of the lay sessions. In the following example, Nick, an older age focus group participant, offered two views of good citizenship in the more structured part of the session that were not consistent:

Hmmm, uh-uh, that's right, you can't give lots of money to help the Sudan when you haven't got enough money to deal with all the problems in this country, no. Give it to the hospitals over here, they're short staffed.

And then later on in the conversation:

It would be impossible to turn a blind eye to something like extreme squalor [in the Third World] if you see it on television and you watch a programme that tells you about it... It upsets you... Everyone can give a little bit of money can't they, you've got to give what you can, it all helps to them, every little bit.

In the cases where there were such problems, it could make it difficult to extract clear messages from an individual's interview or focus group script. In addition, many topics received a watering-down treatment in which the first opinion given by a particular participant was undermined or contradicted by further statements, adding an extra degree of difficulty to the task of picking out clear themes from the scripts. A lack of public fluency with theoretical issues was perhaps to be expected however,
particularly if respondents were being asked to construct a point of view on a topic that was foreign to them. The process of brainstorming by asking open-ended questions, tapping people's opinions on a range of topics and then shaping everything into a whole showed that it can be difficult and complicated for lay people to produce a rigorous and consistent formulation of the theoretical complexities of good citizenship.

By engaging with an unfamiliar concept people's views were liable to change, to make unexpected shifts in emphasis and to betray earlier thoughts that appeared to be firmly held and well considered. However, a product of discussing one's opinions of good citizenship included testing and occasionally rejecting particular positions. The interviews were not a simple question and answer session, but rather a process. By talking and responding to the topics raised, a process of mental distillation occurred and the respondents' scripts rarely formed fluid and consistent wholes. This reflected the fact that good citizenship proved to be an elusive concept for many of the lay respondents.

**An elusive concept**

The in-depth interview sessions were conducted with those who were considered to be 'active within the community' and those who were 'not active within the community'. Overall, the 'active' participants were able to talk more easily than those who were not considered to be active within the local community. In addition, across both the in-depth interviews and the focus groups, the socially excluded respondents and those with the least qualifications found it very difficult to think about the topic off-the-top-of-their-head.

It was often the case, throughout the interviews and focus groups, that people found it difficult to come up with a set of opinions that they could relate to good citizenship. This difficulty was most marked in the South Asian and socially excluded focus groups. This can be seen in the comments of George, a member of the socially excluded focus group in his 40's:

Well, I don't think we know, like, I don't think, hey look at 'im, you can tell he don't want to say nothing, hey? I don't
think that I really know... Well, I think that [good citizenship] is about being, erm, and this is just me like, about being kind and helpin’ others.

However, this problem was not exclusive to these two groupings and at one point or another all respondents found it hard to explain what good citizenship meant to them. Stewart, a male in his mid 30’s with a professed interest in local politics, made an awkward start to the interview:

I suppose there are a number of people who I would, erm, [to] name people, it’s a bit tricky isn’t it? I suppose it’s people I would feel go beyond, go beyond what might be expected of them in a paid position if they are being paid to do something...prepared to do something beyond the norm. so I suppose that (it’s a trick one isn’t it)...[medium pause]...with national people you tend to get a rather one dimensional view of them, or a two dimensional view, which is the matter of the media erm, I don’t know. I think there are people, I suppose there are people erm...

Thinking about the good citizen was a new task for the majority of respondents and there was a sense of anxiety and trepidation in forming views ‘off the cuff’ especially when they were being recorded at the same time. As this quote from Diane, an unemployed housewife and an active member of the community, showed, some of the respondents often felt a lack of familiarity with the subject combined with a feeling of insecurity in their views:

[Talking about good citizenship is] difficult because I tend to lead an insular little life to be honest with you, it’s very, I don’t have a lot to do with the outside world, does that sound silly? I live in my lovely home with a nice village, with nice people around me...my daughter says I live in a bubble...but it’s nice.
Confusion between the good citizen and the good person

A lack of familiarity with the concept of good citizenship led to some of the respondents using more familiar terms in order to construct their thoughts. The term 'good person' cropped up repeatedly in both the interviews and the focus groups where respondents used the term interchangeably with good citizen. Sheila, an active contributor to the local community in her 40's, found it difficult when asked to think of someone she considered to be a good citizen:

[T]here are people who seem to me to be good but I don’t really understand, probably, what....no, I can’t, it’s gonna take me a minute or two. I’ve got ideas that I think but it’s coming back to the good person sort of thing I suppose.

Sheila was not alone in thinking of the 'good person' when asked to think of a good citizen although Sheila recognised the confusion early on in the interview. Many respondents were not as conscious of the distinction between the two concepts and slipped into talking about the good person interchangeably with the good citizen without realising it. For instance, Damian, an inactive male in his 20's, commented:

Erm, good citizen, good citizen? I would say, someone who goes to church regularly... you think of those as a good person don’t you? People who join certain other organisations, people from the U3A [University of the Third Age]. Erm, people from the rotary club and the lions and the round table and all those sort of people, you think of those people as good people.

The confusion between the two terms can be traced throughout the course of the lay sessions and is one indicator of the problems that lay respondents encounter when dealing with theoretical concepts. In conflating the good citizen with the good person, the lay respondents were attempting to make a foreign term intelligible. In some
cases, good citizenship was seen as synonymous with being a good person, at other times it provided the basis of the good citizen, the foundation upon which a good citizen could build. In other cases, the good person acted as the 'other' against which a good citizen took form and the two concepts had starkly defined positions. By comparing it to something that they could relate to and were able to discuss, they could engage more with the topics being discussed. This process of constructing good citizenship against familiar notions and establishing it in relation to other terms that are understandable and recognisable to the participant is a clearly distinguishable strategy that was used in the lay sessions. Another strategy that facilitated discussion was to talk about bad citizenship.

**Bad citizenship: a bridge to good citizenship**

In the guide for the lay sessions a question on the content of bad citizenship rounded off the initial open-ended section. It was intended to kindle further discussion of good citizenship by inviting the respondents to look at their views from a slightly different angle and it proved to be a device that stimulated the participants and frequently produced rich data. The notion of bad citizenship also emerged organically from the participants' musings. Referring to bad citizenship proved to be a useful device and a large proportion of participants in the study were able to order their thoughts on good citizenship by first establishing what they thought of a bad citizen. The following exchange with John, a member of one of the older age focus groups in his 60's, was typical of these situations:

John: Well, my first thoughts are 'crikes, what actually is a good citizen?' and I'm not sure I've got it straight in my own head. Because I know there are certain things I admire in a person and things they do and I'd know a bad citizen because of crime but....I'm still searching for an answer I'm afraid.

It is evident in the quote above containing John's initial response, that his opinion on bad citizenship was more settled than his opinion on the content of good citizenship. When probed about the content of bad citizenship John replied:
Moderator: [Could you expand on what you understand of 'bad citizenship' please?]

John: Certainly...[medium pause] ... bad citizens are people who persistently offend, or commit crime. They are people that don’t have any regard for their community or the people that they are hurting...victimless crime? Rubbish! It’s just not realising the consequences of their actions, they don’t see or care about the effects of their actions. And I’m sorry but you can’t, that’s just not good enough in my view. It behoves us all to be responsible about the things we do and think of the consequences...

Joyce: Yes, a good citizen would.

John: Yes, quite. I suppose that’s something about a good citizen, about taking the responsibility to think of the consequences of your actions.

Thinking about bad citizenship sometimes acted as a cerebral bridge for participants to access and order their thoughts on good citizenship. It was rarely the case that the participants had no ideas about the content of good citizenship, but rather that they were uncertain how to order them or quite decide which were the most important. Thinking of bad citizenship often helped participants to structure their opinions and begin to express their thoughts on good citizenship.

A theme emerged in these instances and it was often the case that the respondents in both in-depth interviews and focus groups who visited good citizenship via their thoughts on bad citizenship proceeded to develop an interpersonal dimension of good citizenship. For example, Angela, an inactive participant in her 30’s, found open-ended questions about the concept of good citizenship difficult to talk about but was able to develop her opinions by discussing bad citizenship.

Yeah, I find it a bit hard to be honest with you Matthew. Isn’t it? I mean it’s not that easy talking about the big
things, about good and bad, well bad cit... erm [ahem], er bad is a bit easier, but it's, well it's not easy...
Interviewer: I'm sorry I'm not quite sure if I've understood, do you mean that bad citizenship is a bit easier to talk about?
Angela: Erm, yeah I can think of what bad citizenship is more easily...[pause]...like crime and anti-social behaviour and breaking the law and, did I already say that? And being selfish in what you want and not thinking that there are other people in the world too, you can't just do what you like and think it doesn't affect people. People are going to be harmed in some cases by the thoughtless things that bad citizens do...

Angela went on to expand her opinion of the bad citizen further and as she did so she began to uncover the bones of her conception of good citizenship. As the interview progressed Angela continued to talk about individual things that made up a good citizen, quite personal things such as being a good communicator, being approachable. At the end of the interview the way she talked about good citizenship put her very much amongst the people who emphasised the link between good citizenship and social decency:

Interviewer: So I wonder if you could finish off this sentence for me: A good citizen is someone who...?
Angela: A good citizen is someone who is polite and would help someone if they just needed a hand to do something...who you would feel you could talk to and would be friendly, who wouldn't litter and fly-tip and is within the law and I think that’s it.

Bad citizenship was not the only phrase that helped lay respondents to access their thoughts on bad citizenship. Using other phrases such as the 'ok citizen' was another strategy that the lay respondents used.
New phrases of good citizenship

In answering the open-ended questions, the respondents drew upon a variety of descriptions and topics in order to outline their conception of good citizenship. They also used a wide range of phrases to express their thoughts and occasionally substituted words such as ‘neutral’, ‘better’ or ‘ideal citizens’ instead of ‘good’. The next part of this section will address the main phrases that were used by the lay respondents.

The list below shows the variety of phrases that helped respondents to construct what they thought it meant to be a good citizen:

*Fig 5.3 Showing new phrases from the lay sessions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘active good’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘better’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘exemplary’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘extra-good’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘good enough’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘model’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘neutral’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘normal’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ok’ citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘responsible’ citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these phrases, the most common and main ones used, were ‘exemplary citizens’ or ‘extra-good citizens’. Many respondents considered good citizenship to be a tool for describing an exceptional individual who was more productive, effective or committed than the majority of their compatriots who were considered to be ‘normal citizens’.
Many respondents found they were able to tap their opinions on good citizenship by framing them in idealised terms, as Kevin, an active contributor in his 40's has done:

I know, I'm now thinking of Jim Davidson as my good citizen. He's like, he is ideal good citizen...because he's had a topsy-turvy background but does no end for the services...I mean just ideal what he does...What makes them a good citizen is because they want to help and because they have the money to help people who are less privileged than they are.

Until, this point, Kevin had not been able to see linkages in his thoughts, but thinking of the 'ideal good citizen' enabled him to talk more freely and in the quote above he was actually able to list some characteristics.

The term 'Active citizens' was also something that enabled respondents to explain their thoughts on good citizenship. Darius was one such participant, an inactive contributor in his 20's, he stated:

yeah, it can be, erm, active, it may well be in fact. I think an active good citizen's almost...is very likely to be engaged in some voluntary work... So you can't say that you define a good citizen purely by if they're engaged in voluntary work, they may not be. They may be making their contribution on a very personal level because that doesn't suit them or doesn't suit their particular contribution.

At this point in the interview, Darius had identified that volunteering was important to being a good citizen but then used the notion of being active to further shape his impression. He went on to set up the active good citizen in relation to the passive good citizen:

Darius: So I would have to say that active good citizen is better to be than someone who is a passive good citizen.
Interviewer: what might...what might a passive good citizen, what might it be/involve to be a passive good citizen?
Darius well, I suppose in that range they are in the bottom end of it, in terms of their contribution. But they are, I suppose, carrying out their life without an adverse impact on people around them even though they've not got a very positive one either. That may be all they're capable of doing.

Darius and many other participants were alike in the sense that their discussion of good citizenship revolved around and incorporated other phrases such as 'active' and 'ideal' that differentiated 'good citizens' from just 'citizens'.

Summary

The lay participants responded in a particular way to the demands of discussing what it means to be a good citizen. Their contributions were characterised by contextual and hypothetical answers. This could lead to problems for the lay respondents as many scripts were inconsistent and the process of adapting, changing and revising their views was evident. Over the course of the data collection, it became very clear that good citizenship is not a topic that comes readily to mind and is not something that is discussed or given much consideration.

Respondents encountered problems in conflating the good citizen with the good person. It is, though, possible to identify strategies or ways of overcoming the initial difficulties people had in expressing their opinions. Foremost amongst these was the process of establishing what it means to be a good citizen by first establishing what it is not. Thus, the good citizen was frequently outlined with reference to negative characteristics of the bad citizen. The lay respondents were also able to access their thoughts on good citizenship by referring to people they knew very well and was the final strategy used to overcome initial problems with discussing good citizenship.
The essence of good citizenship

Introduction

This section outlines the dimensions that were and were not considered to be characteristics of good citizenship before moving on to address the dimensions that divided opinion amongst the lay respondents. This section will present in turn, the findings from the qualitative material and the results of the questionnaires used in the lay sessions. A wide range of characteristics of the good citizen were discussed in the sessions, although this section addresses the themes that emerged most strongly and consistently. Analysis of the qualitative material showed that, overwhelmingly, the lay respondents connected good citizenship with the category of activities that can be termed ‘interpersonal’. This category consists of a series of dimensions that range from spontaneous actions between one person and another and more general characteristics that guide the way in which a person should conduct him/herself within the local community. The characteristics therefore covered a wide span and, following the Delphi categorisation, they were further sub-divided into intimate and universal interpersonal aspects.

Secondly, the notion of responsibility ran throughout the input of the lay respondents although it had several facets. It appeared as a responsibility to the local community, to the environment, to future generations, to work and to the family. The interpersonal dimension and the notion of responsibility were classes of characteristics that described an attitude or approach. Finally, the data from the lay perspectives indicated that the characteristics of the good citizen could also be understood as a skill or an ability of the individual.

The interpersonal dimension of good citizenship

The most striking dimension that the lay participants connected with good citizenship was the interpersonal. The open-ended questions at the beginning of the sessions presented the opportunity for respondents to talk freely about good citizenship. In
these instances in particular, the interpersonal dimension of good citizenship came out very strongly and two expressions were used repeatedly across the sessions and were returned to again and again: good citizenship as ‘helping others’ and good citizenship as ‘care’. As with the Delphi study, this aspect of good citizenship can be divided into a more intimate and a more universal form.

The ‘intimate’ aspect of the interpersonal dimension

The ‘intimate’ category of the interpersonal dimension referred to one-to-one, informal and small-scale actions or behaviour. The recipients were usually people the good citizen knew intimately such as relatives, friends and neighbours. Despite being conceived in a variety of different ways, these characteristics were all spontaneously raised by the lay respondents. This aspect of the interpersonal dimension revolved around a particular use of the notion of ‘caring’.

As discussed in Chapter 3, in the theoretical literature on an ethic of care Joan Tronto (1995) highlights a feeling of empathy between the person giving care and the person in need of care as a central act in ‘caring’. This understanding of care was reflected in the lay interpretations of good citizenship. It could be argued that the act of being a good citizen involved a process of reaching out and putting oneself in the position of the ‘care receiver’. A process of recognition, of recognising who is in need and of recognising the appropriate means of helping, was present in several accounts of good citizenship. ‘Listening’ and ‘understanding’ were two important parts of this process and the next two quotes illustrate that these terms were understood to be important aspects of good citizenship. Rachel, an inactive contributor in her 20’s, explained how listening was important to her understanding of good citizenship:

You might not realise that someone had a problem and if you don’t know about it you’re not gonna do anything. If you were a good listener then you might have heard someone saying that they’ve got something they need help with, I don’t mean talking to you over coffee, but if you’d hear someone saying something, like where they could just do
with some help because they aren’t managing then you might be able to help them by doing things and they might have more time or whatever.

A similar sentiment was present in discussions of the importance to good citizenship of ‘understanding’. Miriam, a member of the older age focus group, stated:

Understanding other people, you know? My sister is a good citizen because she understands what other people need and she is the most helpful person I know. It’s not just that she knows me because I’m her sister, everyone says it. She has this knack of getting it right and knowing how to help when there is a problem. Understanding is so important because she doesn’t judge people either, you know, she’s very open minded.

In some instances, good citizenship was imagined as compassion for others, or ‘when a person’s compassion was at the forefront of the situation’. In this case, the signifier of a good citizen was an emotion that is stirred in particular situations:

Good citizenship is about feeling in a good way towards the people you are close to...[good citizens experience an] explosion of emotion that you feel, you know, when you want to do a good deed or become compassionate towards somebody.

This quote came from Janet, an inactive contributor in her 40’s. Characteristic of this version of good citizenship was an immediate reaction, an impulse towards others. In other cases, the essence of good citizenship was expressed as something at the heart of an individual’s relationship with their family and close circle of friends. Susan, an active contributor in her 40’s, commented:

I think it starts, it’s most important how you are with your family, your loved ones an’ that, caring for them, looking
after ‘em and bringin’ ‘em up right, with care and love...loving and caring for your family is good citizens, erm what they would do I think.

The act of caring and its relationship with good citizenship was very often expressed in an intimate way. However, care was also used to describe a facet of the interpersonal dimension of good citizenship that was more universal.

**The universal aspect of the interpersonal dimension**

During the in-depth interviews and focus groups it became apparent that the respondents were also using the language of care to describe the behaviour of a good citizen that applied not only to an intimate circle of friends and family but to people in general. Furthermore, the language of care was also employed to describe a concern for the local community. In addition, respondents used terms and phrases, such as ‘helping others’, to account for the appropriate behaviour of a good citizen.

There was a sense in the lay perspectives in which a caring attitude led to a range of behaviours that would often spread to include activities that not only affected friends and relatives but strangers and all the people in the local community. Indeed, the interpersonal aspect of good citizenship was discussed most frequently in a universal sense. This quote from Hazel, an inactive contributor in her 20’s, was one example of the way in which ‘care’ was used to describe the behaviour of the good citizen:

> having a general sense of care for others I think is very important and to be a good citizen means to have, in my opinion, an awareness, without even knowing it, you impact on other people. And the way that you carry yourself in the world makes meaning for some people. And if you do that with some care and consideration it has some pebble in the pond ripple effect.
The end of this quote alluded to the fact that actions or behaviour, even at a small scale were important and may have much wider benefits. Much of the discussion of good citizenship among the lay participants also used the expression ‘care’ in a broad sense. For example, Damian, an inactive contributor in his 20’s, described good citizenship as an attitude towards others:

[A good citizen] cares about other people. So, they would do things like volunteer, help out in a shelter or even just decide to give money to charities because they care or to erm, make their views heard like, cos they care...They care that other people are ok in the world...so that is a part of it...because you care, you're get- erm, you're involved.

Damian used ‘care’ to account for the motivation that leads people to contribute to the local community. Peter, an active contributor in his 50’s, deployed the term in a similar way. Discussing people he considered to be a good citizen Peter remarked:

...And he cares. And my sister cares as well, and she cares about helping people and would do anything for me. And she cares and so she gets involved with schools and is involved in how they are run, don't ask me what she does mind. She gets involved in schools and she doesn't have to, she wants to do it.

In several cases, the language of care was used to describe what would at first appear to be an interpersonal ‘intimate’ characteristic, but was used to account for an attitude to the whole community, not just people that someone knew. Miriam, a contributor from one of the older age focus groups, centred her understanding of good citizenship on the notion of ‘caring for others’ and provided a good example:

A good citizen, for me, for me you understand, not for everyone, but for me...is someone who cares for others. I think someone who cares for you and supports you in
whatever you want to do...who knows when her family and friends need their support and is there for them.

In this quote, Miriam explained that part of her conception of good citizenship included being ‘supportive of others...positive towards their choices...considers their situation and their point of view’, not solely towards family and friends but to the people that ‘you would meet in general as you go about your life’. According, to Miriam, this type of attitude was associated strongly with good citizenship, and would indicate who ‘genuinely is a caring person’. Prakash, a contributor from one of the South Asian focus groups, also mentioned this sentiment as he continued to discuss his understanding of good citizenship:

and it's also about doing stuff for people. You know, you're there when they need you, something's going down, they need you, you're there...not too many people come through like that, it's easy not to see it, to miss it, your friends joke about, cover it up cos they might not want everyone to know. But you can see it if you're sharp and if you really care...

Prakash talked about being considerate towards others, spotting that they need help and being ‘there when they need you’. This was not solely a point concerned with family and friends but it was a way of behaving towards others in general, not only people within an intimate social circle.

‘Care’ was also used to describe an approach to the local environment as well as an approach to others. Ingrid expressed such a concern when she used ‘care’ to describe how good citizenship includes protecting the local environment:

Caring is also about stopping someone harming trees, a person should be embedded in the world around her, and take actions to prevent people doing things which harm the world like the dereliction of a public environment.
In other cases, the language of care complements other expressions such as ‘compassionate behaviour.’ Respondents in each of the focus groups mentioned situations in which good citizenship was conceived as a form of behaviour towards others that was marked out by care and compassion. In one of the South Asian focus groups Nita explained to the participants her definition of good citizenship as compassionate behaviour:

I have written ‘compassion’ down here and I think that it [good citizenship] is all about having compassion for other people. If you have this compassion for other people then it leads to nothing but good things. Compassion is caring that they are ok, doing and giving the best for them. More people should have that, you know, this would be a better place, I think. Wouldn’t it?

A similar theme was echoed throughout the lay sessions and was described as ‘thinking of others’, ‘being considerate towards others’ and ‘having a general concern for people’. This aspect of being a good citizen included an approach to others that one might label ‘social decency’. Fiona, from one of the older age focus groups, gave the following description of a good citizen:

Someone who puts the concerns of others above their own...it goes from simple things to world concerns basically...some you can affect directly or indirectly, some you can’t...[but] It goes from one extreme to the other, holding doors open for someone, concerns for the disabled...

Good citizenship was also interpreted as ‘having manners’, ‘general courtesy’ and ‘being polite’. Prakash, a contributor from one of the South Asian focus groups, explained his view of good citizenship in such terms:

I don’t just think of one thing when someone mentions good citizenship, there’s lots of things and I suppose there’s lots
[of] things to describe it. You know a good citizen because he's got manners, not rude... [is] generally someone that people say: 'Yeah, he's very polite, he's a good lad, treats all his friends and people he knows in a good way.'

David, an inactive contributor in his 20's, shared a similar view. He considered his grandmother to be a good citizen:

Interviewer: Why did you think of her?
David: ok, er, my grandma is very polite, she treats people well, she goes to church every Sunday, erm, she also gets involved erm in the community if you like. She goes to council meetings and all that, she's never erm, she's not selfish. Erm, that covers it I would say.

'Helping others' was another important aspect of the universal aspect of the interpersonal dimension of good citizenship. Nita, a female in her 40's from one of the South Asian focus groups, expanded her explanation of good citizenship as 'helping others':

'if something happens while I was out...for example, one day I found a bag and somebody had glasses and their purse and everything was in there, and so I went home and rang them up and sorted that out. So, you know, it's looking out for people outside of the house, it's not just to do with your friends and family but somebody might need me and just to be able to go out to them and help them... [Also] my friend was knocked down and I went around to help her because she was distressed, [good citizenship] is about being aware and helping on that level.

In addition to 'caring about' and 'helping others', being concerned for the local environment and municipality, an important dimension of the interpersonal aspect of good citizenship was concerned with a particular form of conduct, necessary given the
pluralism of contemporary communities. The next subsection considers the relationship between good citizenship and understanding difference.

**Understanding difference**

The lay respondents showed a concern with the demands that a multicultural society placed on the individual, and key aspects such as 'attempting to understand difference' and taking a stand against racist abuse featured significantly across both the in-depth interviews and focus groups. Taking a stand against racial abuse was an important theme and often accompanied a discussion of the importance of tolerating difference. Nita, a member of one of the South Asian focus groups gave toleration her strong support:

I think being tolerant is a large slice of what [good citizenship] is about you know. Where I live there are lots of different families and lots of different sorts of people and everyone makes an effort to get on and they do and everyone would support each other and would respect the wishes of the other people. You know, and sometimes, you don't understand or don't like the approach people take but you can't be funny about it. Everyone deserves the right to do their own things, we need to let people express themselves, sorry, I mean we need to be more tolerant of the way people express themselves and their nature you know.

Zoe, an active female in her 30's, described the importance to her understanding of good citizenship of an approach to others that understands difference:

[Understanding] I think, I mean for me, it's living in this multicultural society, I think that's the biggest issues that I'm aware of. And it's understanding where other people are coming from and for me, working here with young
parents it's...I've come from the background that I've got and I've come into this situation and being able to deal with that and not standing in judgement of them. It's that sort of understanding I think.'

This side of the good citizen was given further emphasis when she was talking about bad citizens:

Interviewer: what is 'stepping over the mark'?
Zoe: well you know, for example, like a racist attack or something like that where you, completely unacceptable outside of the law sort of behaviour. But if you say 'oh well, it's only a black guy' then you're part of that you know. So I think there are a lot of people in that respect because they don't, they don't challenge what's going on that's not...they tolerate things that they shouldn't.

The need to take a stand against racism was also referred to continually in spontaneous conversation and in the structured part of the lay sessions when discussing how a good citizen would respond when witnessing racial abuse. One of the structured questions introduced a hypothetical situation where the respondents were invited to describe how a good citizen would respond when witnessing racial abuse in the local community. The support given to the person who was the subject of abuse and the condemnation of the person issuing racial abuse were almost unanimous. Bob, an active contributor in his 50's, provided a typical response:

Out of the question, that's unacceptable behaviour. I have very short shrift. I would voice my opposition to anyone giving out racial abuse...and good citizens would be above that. They would respond just the same as I would there...providing it was not a very dangerous situation, mind...
Opposition to racism and understanding of difference could be interpreted as aspects of the need to 'respect' all individuals.

**Respect**

Respect was frequently discussed by the lay participants as a feature of good citizenship. The term was understood in various ways. In some cases it was presented as 'making people's lives more pleasant' or as a form of reciprocity. In other instances it was seen as 'giving people their own space'. Tony, a contributor from the disability focus group and in his 20's, offered the following view of respect:

Erm, I think that's an important thing, being a good citizen, that you have some sense of how you relate, erm, that you realise how you come across to other people. And, erm, I think the basic thing about all this is that, erm, it's a good test to tell good citizens, if you are making the lives of people around you more pleasant, would be a way of knowing who was a good citizen...because then that would involve lots of little things, like giving people respect on the streets erm, and helping people anyway that you can as long as it's not crazy, it has to be real, er realistic helping. But it doesn't have to involve lots of complicated things, it could just being nice to people you come along. You know, making other people's lives more pleasant, respecting them.

The importance to good citizenship of 'respecting others' often featured at a point when respondents were discussing their views on how the individual should act towards other people. Ingrid, an inactive contributor in her 30's, offered a conception of the good citizen that was heavily concerned with interpersonal relations and she spoke freely about the different aspects and situations in which people should respond to others:
'I have always thought that it's important how you treat other people and I would always want to treat other people with a degree of respect and with gentleness.'

Interviewer: is that how you think a good citizen should respond towards strangers?

Ingrid: yes, I think they should.

A significant dimension of 'respect' was expressed by Anthony, an active male in his 50's. He gave an account of good citizenship that placed special emphasis on 'giving other people space' and 'allowing everyone their own personal space.' In his view good citizens:

Are people who recognise that there are different ways of living and we've both got to live in the same place and try to do something about making it possible for these people with different ways to live in the same place.

It's something to do with respect, being a good citizen is, it's something to do with respect and respect is a very interesting word because we tend to think of it as getting close to people but actually I think it's not, I think it's about giving people space. If somebody puts a time-bomb in a room you give it great respect by giving it a big distance before it blows up in your face. Sometimes we actually have to respect people by giving them space to do what they want and being a good citizen means giving everybody that respect. And sometimes that's very difficult to do because the space you need to give is much bigger than you were aware of in the first place.

Interestingly, in Anthony's formulation, good citizenship appeared to be a concept that had most relevance when it was wedded to an urban community.
It's not the same as living in the countryside because there's usually a lot of space around you and so it's different from living in the town, which is where citizenship comes important, not because of the etymology of the word. You are forced to live in close contact and giving respect when you are in close contact is actually quite difficult because there's an immediate conflict, being close to each other, giving each other space is actually a difficult trick to achieve.

Respect emerged as something that a good citizen was obliged to give others, or even as some sort of responsibility of good citizenship. Responsibility was another significant feature of good citizenship in the lay sessions.

Responsibility

Responsibility was discussed in various forms but it is possible to argue that the notion of responsibility underpinned almost all the respondents' perspectives on good citizenship, as they all made reference to it in one of its forms. In addition, the statement 'knows your responsibilities as a good citizen' was well supported as a characteristic of good citizenship in the hierarchy derived from the questionnaires (see Fig. 5.4). Good citizens were seen to feel a sense of responsibility on an interpersonal level, to friends, relatives and people in need. Good citizenship was primarily discussed in terms of a responsibility to the local community and of preserving the shared public areas or preventing vandalism and harm. A responsibility to the wider community was a significant aspect of the lay respondents' perspective. For many respondents, this included a strong sense of environmental responsibility. It might be said that a concern for the environment included a sense of responsibility to future generations and this aspect was discussed later in terms of a 'vision for society' or a 'worldview'.
Interpersonal responsibility

It has already been shown that the interpersonal dimension was central to the lay respondents' view of good citizenship. Participants often framed their descriptions of good citizenship in terms of the responsibility to help members of the family and helping friends. In addition, the lay respondents talked of an interpersonal responsibility that also included neighbours.

Lewis, an active contributor in his 60's, explained that the good citizen feels a responsibility to family members that includes the following activities:

Making sure your kids don't get into trouble, helping them with their homework and that sort of stuff... but the best, erm, I mean, erm the biggest responsibility is to give them your support. You always support your family.

He was not alone in stressing the pastoral responsibilities of good citizenship. Keith, a member of one of the disability focus groups, explained his view of good citizenship by stressing the importance of responsibility towards one's family:

Helping other people is very important, but not just strangers and other people in the world, it starts with your family. Family is a big responsibility, and [a good citizen would] take that the most seriously...responsibility to your family's welfare is one of those things set down in stone.

In many of the lay sessions, participants felt that good citizens would help their neighbours, such as in the following quote by David, an inactive contributor in his 20's:

Part of it [being a good citizen] is being there for your neighbours, a good citizen would feel that he would have a responsibility to help his neighbours, his family or his friends in the little things of life...erm, whatever it means,
obviously, there are boundaries and you don’t interfere but you should help when you can with the things that a person just can’t do on their own.

Ingrid, an inactive contributor in her 30’s, also considered a responsibility to help neighbours to be an important aspect of good citizenship:

‘neighbourliness is a huge bonus in life, I like to be nice to my neighbours, I find it really disappointing that my neighbours are so disappointing, that my neighbours next door are so nasty...when the woman over the road was being beaten by her partner and we helped her and called the police and you know, we felt that it was part of our responsibility and I think that kind of thing is valuable in lots of ways.’

In addition to a responsibility to neighbours, friends and family, participants believed that the good citizen also felt a responsibility to those in need. The lay respondents displayed their feelings on this subject quite clearly in one of the hypothetical questions used in the lay sessions. The question invited the lay respondents to consider how a good citizen would respond to an individual who, appearing to be homeless and in a bad physical condition, asked for help. All of the respondents replied that a good citizen would feel a responsibility to help people in need. Bob, an active contributor in his 50’s, described his thoughts thus:

Yes, a good citizen has a responsibility to act like a good Samaritan in situations where he is in a position to help people less advantaged. So if a beggar was asking for some help, then the good citizen would help him...he might give him some money...he might contact the services to help him...he would not ignore the plight of someone needy like that.
It is clear from the lay respondents that, in their view, good citizens felt a responsibility to help their immediate familial and social circle, including neighbours and also would react helpfully towards people in need.

Community responsibility

The most frequently discussed aspect of responsibility and good citizenship, however, revolved around the local community. Having a ‘public spirit’ was one of the ways in which respondents expressed the view that good citizenship included a responsibility to look after the maintenance of public areas in the local community, such as parks and local amenities. Bill, a respondent from one of the disability focus groups, used a particular understanding of the notion of ‘care’ to refer to this type of responsibility and he went on to state that:

[good citizenship is about having] a sense that there is a public good and a sense of the shared possessions that we have, things like park spaces and that sort of things, a care for others...a feeling of responsibility to other people, being part of a shared responsibility, and it can express itself as a sensitivity toward public spaces and public buildings and a wish to preserve a built environment or a cultural environment. It's opposition to a 'me-first, survival of the fittest, that sort of view.'

For other respondents, the particular details of an individual’s concern were not as important as the fact that people acted directly on their responsibilities to ‘make a difference’ to the local community. Being involved was often discussed under the umbrella term of ‘volunteering’ and ‘helping others’. Diane, an active contributor in her 50’s, highlighted her impression of a good citizen by focusing on the ‘act of being involved’:

My friend Sheila, I think I would say she is a good citizen...well, because she is always involved in the local
community. She’s always involved in things where people need things to be done, like on important committees...like for the church an’ that....She takes on a lot of responsibilities within the village and people look up to her. I look up to her and I know that if she was on the case, as it were, then she would make a difference. And I think other people probably feel the same way about her.

Respondents often talked about ‘reacting to problems’ such as ‘picking up litter’ and ‘reporting damage to park benches’. Ben, an inactive contributor in his 20’s, offered the following view of good citizenship:

....ok, erm, I think it’s all about having a particular attitude to the community that you are living in, whatever that may be. It doesn’t matter where you are, you’ve got to make a difference though. Interviewer: could you say a bit more about what you mean when you say ‘making a difference’?

Ben: yeah, what I mean is...a good citizen is someone who is choosing to make a difference to the local or national community. I think that this is important, because everybody can moan about there not being enough police here or that taxes should be lower there...we can all probably think of the things that we don’t like about living in a place. I just think that good citizens are the ones who decide ‘I’m going to make a difference’. That’s all.

Although Ben was unable to expand further on what he meant by ‘make a difference’, many other respondents used the term to describe activities that involve public responsibilities, such as in this description by Bob, an active contributor in his 40’s:

‘So it might be in terms of voluntary work, it might be in terms of organising activities, it might be in terms of playing
an active part in politics. It could be through assuming some kind of role, such as school governor. Helping to organise youth activities, all that sort of activities would be part of my definition of a good citizen.’

The notion of commitment ran throughout these descriptions of good citizenship. All of the respondents were referring to a commitment on behalf of the good citizen to act on their sense of responsibility to the local (and sometimes national) community whether it was as an immediate reaction to problems or as a considered and thought-out approach to helping the community.

Environmental responsibility

Another aspect of good citizenship as responsibility frequently concerned the environment and most often the local environment. George, a member of the older age focus groups, made frequent references to the importance of looking after the local environment. Towards the beginning of the focus group session, George summed up his view of one of the central characteristics of good citizenship:

'yes, I think that good citizenship does start in the local community, yes, yes. Because, isn’t it important that we care for the parks and the natural environment that we are lucky to have around us, isn’t it important? Not enough people do, you know, but we should care for the local community, the public spaces that we all share, you know. It's important that we all contribute to their well being or else they would just go to ruin and we wouldn't get any enjoyment out of it. There are lots of places around, like scenic spots, like er, oh it escapes me does the name, umm. Oh well, I'll think of it. But there are lots of scenic spots around and we have to care for these places as we would care for our garden because these places would just disappear if we mistreated them. Good citizens are the
people that wouldn’t mistreat them and would care for the natural environment that we all share.

In this quote it was interesting that the language of ‘care’ was used although it was in a different context from the interpersonal dimension of good citizenship. Respondents also talked about the specific environmental responsibility of recycling. Ben was one such example:

And as well as doing things like voting there are the everyday things like putting waste in the right bin bags, you know? We’ve all got those green bins haven’t we? And if you have a can of something you should be expected to put it in a bag and take it to Tesco’s or you could always put it in one of those bins, erm the aluminium bins.

However, not all respondents considered recycling to be as important. Many respondents did not have access to ‘the right bin bag’s’ and it would seem that certain areas of Charnwood had more access to recycling than others. Nevertheless, in cases such as Ben’s, where recycling can be done relatively simply, the respondents felt that the good citizen should act on their responsibilities more.

Pareen, a member of one of the South Asian focus groups, explained this:

Yeah, I suppose that you would be a good citizen if you did go out of your way to recycle but you wouldn’t have to go out of your way to recycle, erm you could still be a good civilian [sic] if you didn’t do it. There are other more valuable ways that you could be a good citizen, like if you car-pooled instead. I think that’s more important than the odd few cans, but I’m not saying that recycling is useless.

Therefore good citizenship was seen to be concerned with safeguarding the environment and preserving it for future generations. It was a theme that was also
connected with another strand that ran throughout the lay sessions, a more general concern with the future well-being of society.

**Vision of society**

Many of the respondents in the lay studies considered the exercise of responsibility towards future generations to be a characteristic of the good citizen. Sandra described one such example. She felt it was important to 'give back to society and have a dream of leaving it as a better place'. Her vision for society was one where everyone had three aims:

Caring, in the sense of caring for relatives, for environmental aims and socially. I mean it's not exclusive as a vision for how I would want to see society, but a good citizen does think about improving the society and I think they would have some sort of things in mind. Maybe not exactly like mine, but something like...

The language of care recurred once more in Sandra’s account. As already observed, it was used by participants to describe good citizenship in quite a diverse array of contexts, from the interpersonal dimensions, through to the notion of environmental responsibility and above, when discussing the responsibility a good citizen felt to future generations.

Respondents such as Atish, a male member of the South Asian focus group, were less specific in their expression of the responsibility to future generations but no less enthusiastic:

I think that all that stuff about recycling is important and it's because I believe that we have, sorry I mean that I think good citizens should leave the world as they found it. It would be great if you could leave the world in a better state but there's so many things going on that you can't control and they're doing harm to the world and that's bad and it's
going to get worse. But I really do think that we should think about the future and the people who we are going to be leaving the world to. Good citizens would do that, It's so important, otherwise how will the world continue?

All respondents in the lay sessions made reference in some small or large way to 'being responsible' or having a particular responsibility as a good citizen. In most cases a good citizen was understood to feel a range of overlapping responsibilities and the types mentioned above occurred in various combinations across the in-depth interviews and focus groups.

Good citizenship and individual qualities

In addition to viewing good citizenship in interpersonal terms or as a particular responsibility, the lay participants also considered good citizens to be people who possessed a certain skill or ability. The qualities highlighted varied quite widely. In some situations, the qualities that people valued were general traits such as 'leadership' and 'integrity'. In others, the key to good citizenship became more specific, such as the ability to understand political issues and social topics.

Stefan, an inactive contributor in his 30's, explained how to spot good citizens by identifying features such as 'sound judgement':

Trying to define somebody who's got sound judgement so that if they are in a position of responsibility or if they are taken as a leader of a community they will have a good sound judgement as to what will take the community forward and what will damage it, ostensibly. I mean these issues are not simple, you know, what benefits the community locally, on a slightly larger scale, on a national scale on an international scale varies doesn't it and that's a bit of a balance.
Stefan pointed out that an individual quality such as 'sound judgment' was important because it enabled people to contribute to the local community or even the wider community more effectively. This was a common feature of the lay respondents who identified good citizens by pointing to particular skills; good citizenship was viewed as being 'good at' something.

Quite often, the skills that were valued as relevant to good citizenship were cerebral and often contributed to promoting the good of the local community. Pete, a member of the older age focus group gave the following description:

There's like two parts of it to me, the first of it is like contributing to society as they are able and then secondly, thinking through the consequences of their actions.

Good citizenship was also understood to be about the ability to process information and to understand issues. Good citizens were frequently identified as people who 'have to be able to examine and consider social and political issues'. If they could not do this because they had not got the time then this was something that would get in the way of them being a good citizen. Prakash, a member of the South Asian focus groups, explained his views on this:

It is not simply a question of volunteering because you have the time or can make time. It's also a question of being well very informed so you [are] able to recognise when injustices are being done or when there is a need for affirmative action so it's not just simply 'making a commitment' it's about reading and debating and discussing so you're aware of what's happening. So, in the case of war, you can weigh up whether an attack on a certain country or a certain person is, you can actually justify the circumstances... and in the same way you can think about local things as well.
Views such as these saw good citizenship as an exclusive label that was only applicable to a small percentage of the population. These views also narrowed the emphasis on good citizenship from contributing to a definable common good to the quality of one's contribution. The crux of good citizenship was not contributing but how well one contributed. Stefan for example, referred to good citizenship as being able to 'take the community forward' and his definition of a good citizen combined a vision for the future with having particular skills:

[I suppose I am] trying to define somebody who's got sound judgment so that if they are in a position of responsibility or if they are taken as a leader of a community they will have a good sound judgment as to what will take the community forward and what will damage it, ostensibly. I mean these issues are not simple, you know, what benefits the community locally, on a slightly larger scale, on a national scale on an international scale varies doesn't it and that's a bit of a balance...I suppose what I'm driving at there is that they've had sufficient experience of life to be able to work out what will ultimately benefit the group.

The attitude that good citizenship was something that was difficult to attain was most prevalent amongst the male respondents. A good example was Stephen, an inactive contributor in his 30's, who considered good citizenship to be a bundle of skills, of which 'leadership' was the most significant:

Interviewer: What do you understand by leadership?
Stephen: I think that, probably, it's something old fashioned. I think it's leading by example...say. I think it's being prepared to make hard decisions, erm. Those hard decisions are taken on the basis of what's of the benefit to the broader community, not to particular groups or individuals of that community.
In the majority of cases when good citizenship was seen as a skill, it was used to refer to a minority of people and as an exclusive notion. However, this was not always the case. On occasions, it was interpersonal skills that marked out a good citizen. For example, Kevin, an active contributor in his 40’s, mentioned a colleague as someone he considered to be a good citizen because he was able to make people feel at ease and was able to communicate effectively with war-wounded veterans:

My area manager is a good citizen, he’s great, he can talk to anyone and is always respected. He has got such an ability to talk with different levels of people, from high ranking officers to squaddies and he get’s miracles from them. He’s really good, and it’s a skill I would say.

Therefore, there were several aspects to the theme that associated good citizenship with possessing a particular skill or ability. Commonly, the most celebrated skills concerned individuals who took a leading role in contributing to the common good. Critical abilities were also well thought of, although interpersonal skills such as being good in social situations were also included.

Summary

The lay respondents identified three main aspects of good citizenship: the interpersonal dimension (both intimate and universal); as a series of ‘responsibilities’ be they interpersonal, community, environmental responsibility, or a responsibility to future generations; and finally as a particular skill or ability. The next part of this section will construct a hierarchy of good citizenship based on the characteristics of good citizenship that featured in the questionnaires completed in both in-depth interview and focus group sessions.
A hierarchy of good citizenship

At the end of the in-depth interviews and the focus groups all respondents completed a questionnaire in which they ranked the statements according to their relevance to good citizenship. The questionnaire was designed to add to the results of the qualitative in-depth interviews and focus groups (see Chapter 4 for further information on the creation of the questionnaire). The results can be seen below:

_Fig 5.4 showing the hierarchy of the counting procedures used in the lay sessions_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of counting procedures used in the focus groups and in-depth interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Considers the needs of others (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows respect for others (109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knows their responsibilities as a citizen (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obeys the law (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is a good parent (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cares for elderly or infirm relatives (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cares for elderly or infirm friends (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Knows their rights as a citizen (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Recycles used products (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Keeps abreast with/is aware of social issues and political topics (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pays their taxes willingly (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gives money to charity (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is an active member of a political party (-26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Legend:_
Numbers indicate the total score given to each statement from a highest possible score of 162.
The top of the hierarchy was dominated by statements comprising the interpersonal category of good citizenship, in particular the statement ‘considers the needs of others’ that scored 145 from a possible 162. This was followed further down the top half of the hierarchy by the other interpersonal dimensions of ‘shows respect for others’, ‘is a good parent’ and ‘cares for elderly or infirm relatives’. The third statement ranked in the hierarchy was the formal ‘knows their responsibilities as a citizen’. However, one of the other formal statements in the list, ‘knows their rights as a citizen’ was much further down the hierarchy, in 8th place.

After these statements there was another jump in the scores to the next ranked statement, ‘obeys the law’ in 4th place. One of the other formal statements in the hierarchy ‘pays their taxes willingly’ came much further down the ranking with just over half the votes of ‘obeys the law’. The more poorly ranked statement was also accompanied with another statement ‘gives money to charity’ in 12th, and it was interesting to note that the two statements concerned with money were seen to have little relevance to good citizenship in this hierarchy.

This table also showed that only one statement received a negative score, indicating that ‘being an active member of a political party’ was not considered to be a characteristic of the good citizen. The hierarchy showed that the statements that involved politics, such as keeping abreast with political issues, joining a political party, and knowing one’s rights were also seen to be of lesser relevance than statements that involved caring, considering others’ needs and being aware of one’s responsibilities as a citizen. Significantly, the former group of statements were predominantly statements that were located in the public realm, whereas the latter group of statements were predominantly located within the private realm or span the two.

In the Delphi study certain characteristics could be grouped together such as the formal statements, however, they were not grouped together in the lay sessions. In addition, the hierarchy suggested that formal statements related to money or to politics were seen as being of little relevance to good citizenship. The next section looks in more detail at dimensions that were considered to be of weak or no relevance to good citizenship in the qualitative analysis.
The salience of other dimensions of good citizenship

Introduction

There was comparatively little material on what the respondents thought was not relevant to good citizenship. Nevertheless, it was clear that certain characteristics were considered to be very weak characteristics, not relevant to good citizenship at all and some statements were considered to be positively inimical to good citizenship. One of the characteristics that was considered to be inimical to good citizenship was extreme patriotism, although when patriotism manifested itself as concern for the welfare of co-nationals this was considered to be a weak characteristic of good citizenship. The nature of the balance between family life and work commitments was another characteristic that was considered to be of no relevance to good citizenship. In addition, politicians were not seen to be good citizens and joining a political party was considered to have no relevance to being a good citizen either. However, involvement in politics was weakly connected with good citizenship. Furthermore, the lay sessions indicated that good citizens could be expected to protest against the government, however, a person ceased to be a good citizen when violence or harm to others entered into the equation.

Patriotism

With few exceptions, the respondents in the focus groups and in-depth interviews considered extreme patriotism to be something that was inimical to being a good citizen. Respondents often felt that patriotism was something that was an unnecessary sentiment. Damian, an inactive contributor in his 20's, gave one view of how patriotism was regarded:

I don't think patriotism is that important, I actually do feel proud to be from where I'm from and I feel, you know, I'm erm, I take pride in being English and that, but who needs it now, it's just something that bullies have...
Patriotism was often associated with violence. In these cases, it was not a characteristic of good citizenship. Greg, a member of the older age focus groups, provided such a view:

Thinking about your own country above others like France or Germany is an unsavoury thing, people taken up with ideas like that are often criminals, getting into fights abroad, destroying property under the name of patriotism is plainly wrong. I would not expect to find a good citizen among any of them...

A form of patriotism that did have currency in the lay sessions was a weak strain that could be expressed at sporting occasions. As Prakash, a respondent in his 20’s from the South Asian focus group, explained:

Patriotic? I am when England play but nothing else really. I don’t really know anyone who’s like that anymore, maybe old people...

Patriotism was occasionally seen as feeling a protective bond with co-nationals and this was seen as something that might also be good citizenship. David, an inactive contributor in his 20’s, provided one example:

Patriotic in the sense of sticking up for people from your country, of looking out for them and maybe er, I dunno. Erm, a good citizen might do that, I mean you’re a bit more receptive to helping English people if you’re abroad cos you understand what’s going on and you might help them if they were in trouble more than you’d help someone from say China or France. It’s not a big part of [good citizenship] though.
However, there was a clear consensus that extreme patriotism was something that was not felt by good citizens and was associated with bad citizenship, although on occasion, patriotism was thinly linked to good citizenship by a small minority of respondents who viewed it as extension of the interpersonal need to help others.

*Family work/balance*

Part of the structured section of the guide for the lay sessions included a question aimed at exploring the importance of staying at home and looking after children in comparison with working and holding down a job. The nature of the balance between looking after a family and holding a job was not something that was considered to be important to good citizenship. Very few respondents felt that either option was highly significant to being a good citizen. This in general reflected the contextual nature of the responses. As Hazel, an inactive contributor in her 20's, stated:

> Well, it would depend...it is just too dependent on, erm it just differs from person to person and I wouldn't like to say which is more important, because I think they are the same really. You would have to know the situation of every person, otherwise you just can't say.

Irrespective of gender, most of the respondents viewed each option as being of equal importance, and placed emphasis on knowing the situation of each individual before being able to give judgment. The topic was considered to be of low importance when it came to thinking of good citizenship. In the focus groups, discussion moved on quickly to other areas, as in this South Asian session:

Attish: Yeah, I dunno...can't say really, in what situation?  
Nita: I dunno, what are they like, can't really talk about it....  
Pretash: Huh? They're both the same, doesn't really matter, it's different for different people...
Attish: It's not really that important, you know...that's just about yourself, not others, [thinking about] others is more like it [good citizenship]...
Pretash: yeah, thinking for, I mean thinking about other people is more important to be a good citizen...

The comment above was from a focus group that provided particularly fertile and lucid responses and this topic was quickly dismissed.

*Politicians and joining a political party*

In the Delphi study the statement 'Is an active member of a political party' scored the most negatively, and there was a significantly large margin between it and the penultimately ranked statement (see Fig 5.4). In the lay study, political engagement had two dimensions, local and national. Neither entered into the top characteristics of good citizenship, but local political engagement was more relevant than national political engagement.

On the qualitative side of the lay sessions, the discussion spontaneously turned to the role of politicians and their relevance to good citizenship. It did so towards the beginning of the sessions, when participants were asked to think of people they considered to be a good citizen at a national level. In addition, it occurred at various points throughout the discussion and notably at the end of the sessions. In the first instance, when participants were discussing people they considered to be good citizens at a national level, politicians were given short shrift. They were considered to be of low importance to good citizenship and on a few occasions they were considered to act in ways that were inimical to good citizenship. Zoe, an active contributor in her 30's, confirmed her view that politicians are not good citizens by failing to think of a single one:

Zoe: that's a bit more difficult, erm, who would I put on my good citizen list? (medium pause). I'm trying to
think...I'm thinking politicians but I can't, I can't identify a politician that I particularly respect in that way. Somebody like the Princess Diana role where she actually took her job beyond, I mean I've a lot of respect for what she was doing. So somebody in that role, I can't think of anybody, that's bad isn't it?

Val, an active contributor in her 50's, gave a more direct expression of her views on the likelihood of politicians as good citizens:

I don't know if I can think of someone who is a good citizen at another level, not local. Not politicians, certainly not politicians. They're only out for what they can get, they're not honest, or don't act in our best interests, they're not what I would call good citizens.

Lewis, an active participant in his 60's, offered an explanation for the poor way in which political involvement is regarded:

I think people think politics is corrupt, people who are involved in politics are in it for their own gain. Most people wouldn't like to be called a 'politician' I don't think, I mean not people who actually are politicians, erm, you see I'm meaning that it's not something that people say fondly is it? The view is that politicians try and put one over on you, for their own gain.

The quotes above showed that politicians were not considered to be good citizens and in the same way, joining a political party was considered to be of little relevance to good citizenship. Bryan, a respondent in his 30's from one of the disability focus groups commented:

Being a good citizen and having to join a political party? Nah, I would have to say 'no' there. It's irrelevant.
Although being a national politician and joining a political party were not considered to have any relevance to good citizenship, not all aspects of the political were dismissed in this way. Knowledge of politics and keeping abreast with political issues were seen to have some relevance by a small number of participants. Being involved in politics at a more local level was also often seen to related to good citizenship when it was mentioned as a feature of being engaged within the local community. Bob, an active respondent in his 50's gave voice to his view of political involvement whilst discussing good citizenship and ‘getting involved’:

Getting involved in things is something that might take place on a variety of levels, I know people who enjoy local politics, they enjoy getting into that political side of things and I would say they provide a service to the community through their efforts.

He proceeded to talk about the relationship between keeping abreast with current affairs and good citizenship also:

I think you are able to give more to the community if you can link it to other things, if you're aware of what goes on, if you keep up to date with politics and things like that you are probably better able to contribute if you were involved in the local community.

However, in the lay sessions as a whole, involvement in politics did not emerge as significantly as factors such as those in the interpersonal dimensions.

Protest

Finally, it was strongly argued that violent protest was not a characteristic of being a good citizen. ‘Protesting against the government’ was a topic in the structured section of the lay sessions and was generally considered to be a characteristic of the good
citizen. However, once violence to the community was involved, protest was considered to be beyond the limits of good citizenship. When discussing the topic of challenging the law, the extent of good citizenship was often defined in terms of the boundaries of the law. For example, David, an active contributor in his 40's, explained his feelings on protesting against the government and good citizenship:

I think you've got to stay on the side of protest without violence or you should do... so, the limit is as defined by law. So if you remain within the law or you're not causing damage to [the] property of people then in my view it's ok.

On other occasions, protesting against the government ceased to be an activity associated with good citizenship when individuals were harmed. In this quote below Peter, an active respondent in his 50's, responded to an example of protest, included in the interview, centring on the validity of destroying GM crops as part of a campaign:

Peter: when they are harming other citizens and going beyond debate into erm, let's say damaging property. I know you could say crops are a property, I think the crops one is a bit marginal, I wouldn't like to go too much on that. So, I think on reflection, if I can revise, I would probably wish to condemn the burning of crops because I think that is damaging. It's breaking the law but it's more than that, it's erm, doing harm to other people.

Tape stopped

Interviewer: I'm sorry, you were saying about what you thought about the protestors.
Peter yes, I think the golden rule is not to damage other citizens. If you are rioting in such a way as to injure policemen then it is not acceptable. And I don't think that it is really democratic behaviour and don't think it's citizenship behaviour
Similarly, John, a member of one of the older age focus groups commented:

Good citizens would protest against the government if what they were doing, erm, they would do it if they thought that what the government was doing was wrong, but not if they were extremists and killed, or caused lots of injuries. You shouldn’t use violence to protest against the government, a good citizen wouldn’t erm, a good citizen doesn’t.

There were some characteristics that the participants from lay sessions viewed as of little relevance to good citizenship and some that were considered to be positively inimical to it. Despite the comparative lack of data on what was not relevant to good citizenship, two types of characteristics emerged: those such as patriotism as a protective feeling towards con-nationals or sporting allegiances, the family/work balance and politicians and political engagement; and those that were positively inimical to good citizenship such as extreme nationalism and violent protest.

Areas of disagreement

Throughout the focus groups there were some statements more than others that provoked lively debates between participants and resulted in a significant split in opinions. The topics that aroused the most differences of opinion and were most problematic to answer were cosmopolitanism and challenging the law.

Cosmopolitanism

A part of the guide used in the lay sessions drew the respondents' attention towards cosmopolitan issues, and invited them to discuss whether or not they thought it important for a good citizen to feel a responsibility for others, beyond national boundaries. There were mixed feelings among the respondents and the data from the
lay sessions showed that this was one of the topics where opinion was most divided. Many respondents spoke clearly about the connection between good citizenship and cosmopolitan sentiments. Peter, an inactive contributor in his 50's, commented:

Yes I would think that good citizens are concerned with the people in Bangladesh or in the favelas in Brazil and I think that is right. It is right for good citizens to be bothered about these sorts of things in other countries.

Other respondents took the opposite view and considered the national context to be more appropriate to the notion of good citizenship. Mark, an inactive contributor in his 30's, is one such example:

Well, no, I think you sort out your own before you look at people in other countries, to be fair, you should get your own house in order first, eh? There are people who need expensive operations and treatment and there aren't enough hospital beds and money for all that....we should take care of the problems in our own country before we start trying to save the world and solve all the other problems.

Challenging the law

Challenging the law, and in particular, the statement 'breaking the law for a cause' were both areas that aroused a split in opinion throughout the lay sessions. At the same time, obeying the law was given high priority as a characteristic of good citizenship. It scored well in the hierarchy derived from the questionnaire (see Fig. 5.4) and was frequently mentioned as good citizenship in the qualitative analysis. However, there were some respondents who considered that an individual could still break the law and be a good citizen.
John: You wouldn't be a good citizen if you broke the law...
Ian: Well, breaking the law, yes, but in certain situations it just doesn't really matter if you break the law, you're still a good citizen...there are many circumstances when it would be ok.... If you've not harmed someone else...by breaking the law then there's no problem, like the little things, such as speed in your car...we've all done things...had a drink when you're underage, little things, there's got to be a bit of leeway [between breaking the law and still being a good citizen].

Breaking the law, per se, did not signify the limit of good citizenship for the majority of the respondents. However, breaking certain laws was automatically considered to be beyond the pale of good citizenship. Violence and harm to others were two such cases (see above section on the limits of protest). Nevertheless, there were some situations in which violence was seen as acceptable provided the goals or ends of the good citizen’s actions justified it. In the example below, Val, an inactive contributor in her 50’s, discusses apartheid in South Africa:

you know, there are situations where I think it's ok for a good citizen to break the law and it's ok. If it's a big cause, you know, something that they feel very strongly about then that's a little different. Like apartheid, that's just wrong, if you did something that happened to harm others then it would be justified because you're trying to put an end to something that is causing so many other people suffering and that, you know.

This quote highlights a situation in which the behaviour of the good citizen is in direct opposition to the state and indicates a strand of good citizenship that can be considered to challenge the law.
Summary

The consensus opinion of the lay perspectives was that 'joining a political party' and the family/work balance was of very little relevance to good citizenship. In addition, extreme patriotism and violent protest were seen by the participants to be positively inimical to good citizenship. Between good citizenship and these outer limits were topics such as challenging the law and cosmopolitanism which sharply polarised opinion. In addition to producing a set of characteristics of good citizenship, the study of the lay perspectives also explored the content of bad citizenship and the barriers of good citizenship. The next two parts of this chapter will consider these themes in turn.

Bad citizenship

Introduction

It is the purpose of this section to consider how bad citizenship was discussed in the in-depth interviews and focus groups. This section draws attention to the most consistent ways in which the bad citizen was defined by the lay respondents and focuses on the themes that emerged most strongly and consistently. Bad citizenship featured frequently in the comments made by the lay respondents. It surfaced at various points throughout the in-depth interviews and focus groups. In some instances bad citizenship was introduced spontaneously by the lay respondents early on in the sessions as a device that enabled them to identify and frame their thoughts on what it means to be a good citizen (see 'The Process of Discussing the good citizen'). In addition, bad citizenship was introduced as a topic in its own right. The same themes cropped up in both instances, however, and in both the focus groups and the in-depth interviews, bad citizenship was consistently linked with selfishness, committing crime, drug abuse and anti-social behaviour.
The content of bad citizenship

Many expressions of bad citizenship were used in the lay sessions although only the strongest and most consistent have been included here. The chart below shows the range of thoughts on bad citizenship.

Fig 5.5 Showing the characteristics of the bad citizen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of the Bad citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abuses drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commits crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels they have no stake in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not faithful to the country they are living in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow minded and Intolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only interested in short term gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is striking that 'selfishness' occurs in the descriptions of bad citizenship from all of the lay respondents across both stages of data collection. The response given by Rachel, an inactive female in her 20's, is typical:
[I think a bad citizen is someone who is so self centred that they don’t even know there are other people around...and pursue their own agenda regardless of what other people say.

In other situations, the respondents give single word answers. ‘Selfishness’ or ‘being selfish’ were frequently offered as the archetype of bad citizenship. Attish, a respondent in one of the South Asian focus groups, did not wish to expand on the word:

Attish: [A bad citizen is] selfish... [pause]
Moderator: Could you expand on that for me please?
Attish: Someone who is selfish is a bad citizen... [pause]...everyone knows that don’t they? Bad citizenship, you know, you can say ‘selfish’. I don’t know what else you want me to say ‘cos that’s it really. They’re all people who are selfish.

In other situations, bad citizenship was seen as a lack of consideration and thought for others. Anthony, an active contributor in his 50’s, comments:

There’s another example that springs to mind from the work that I’m doing with St Peter’s in Loughborough and that is to do with...I suppose it’s the thoughtless end of the spectrum rather than the setting out to deliberately upset people. But we’ve got an area around there with a fairly massive student population and then against that we’ve got a static population which is typically old people in that area. There is poor citizenship going on there. I suppose on the students’ side there’s loads of rowdiness and behaviour which we associate with students, especially late at night and so on.
Thus bad citizenship was seen as behaviour that did not take into consideration the needs of others living in the same neighbourhood, although there was another part to Anthony's example that pinpointed a second aspect of bad citizenship:

Because they [the students] are a temporary population they are not particularly bothered about how they leave the area, so it tends to be left in a mess and then on the permanent residents' side we've got a degree of intolerance towards students so that all students are seen as the same basically... and unwillingness to engage with them as individuals and do this bridge building, getting to know and building up this mutual respect for each other and understanding so that's I suppose an example of a fairly thoughtless behaviour about what the other group is experiencing.

These quotes from Anthony offered two differing but related points about bad citizenship. The first quote highlighted a more commonplace example of bad citizenship, that of rowdy and unwelcome behaviour. However, the second indicated that intolerance was also a characteristic of bad citizenship. In each case, there was a perceived lack of consideration for the situation of the opposite group.

Bad citizenship was also viewed in more violent terms and some respondents pointed to acts of anti-social behaviour such as vandalism and fighting as examples of bad citizenship. Pareen, a respondent in one of the South Asian focus groups, was one example:

Some of the people round here go out every weekend and get into trouble and then talk about it all the time, to show how hard they are. They like getting into fights and that. You get people who are like that and I don't think they're the sort of people you want as good citizens, it's a bad thing that they go out an' that... they're bad citizens....
Similarly, Joan, an active contributor in her 60's, considered vandalism to be an act of bad citizenship:

Bad citizens are destructive and damage things, they spoil perfectly nice areas by spraying graffiti, smashing things up. Sometimes you see phone boxes or bus shelters that have just been smashed in, there seems to be no point in it other than to do damage and break things.

In another formulation, bad citizenship was linked with substance abuse. Drugs and alcohol were the two most common examples cited. Drug abuse on a very high scale, for example, was unequivocally linked with bad citizenship by many respondents. In a view that was echoed by the whole of one of the socially excluded focus groups, one of the members in his 30's, Barry, set out his view on bad citizenship:

Druggies. They are [bad citizens]. I think they’re the worst I can think of. Do anything they will. [I] seen ‘em rob places, erm, corner shops, mug people. They’re not them things, that word [good citizens]. They’re erm, bad uns, bad erm, that word...

In some cases, a combination of alcohol abuse and violence was cited. David, an inactive contributor in his 20's, made the following point:

Well, obviously, you’ve got people who go and get drunk, they drink too much and they get violent and you see them on the streets, causing trouble. You see ‘em, I mean you hear about ‘em on the news causing trouble with their families and at home, you know, beating up kids and that.

Similarly, crime was also seen as a badge of bad citizenship, as Hazel, an inactive contributor in her 20’s, explained:
Bad citizens were invariably described in terms that marked them out as people who did not act in a 'proper' way in their community. Bad citizens were also identified as people who 'feel no stake in society', who were 'apathetic' and 'they can't connect with other people'. There was a feeling amongst some of the lay respondents that bad citizens were somehow not a part of the community or society. For instance, a lack of sociability was also described as a characteristic of a bad citizen. One respondent in the in-depth interviews, Mark, an inactive contributor in his 30's, described a person he knew as a bad citizen because:

He's a miserable sod. He's dead unsociable, doesn't even say hello when he walks along and passes you in the garden. He's a misery, keeps the kids' balls if they go into his garden and that. He just doesn't get on with anyone. I don't think he talks or socialises with anyone in the neighbourhood.

By including notions such as 'unsociability' into the content of bad citizenship, the lay respondents broadened the understanding of bad citizenship away from simple 'selfishness' and 'being inconsiderate'.

In defining bad citizenship, much of the lay respondents' discussion centred on flaws in a person's character. However, environmental factors were also considered to contribute to bad citizenship. For example, when probed on the difference between good citizens and bad citizens, it became apparent that the politico/cultural climate was also partly held responsible for the phenomenon of bad citizenship. For example, Ingrid, an inactive female in her 30's, pointed towards the political regime of the 1980's for the existence of bad citizens:
Interviewer: what do you think makes a bad citizen?
Ingrid: I think it's a fundamental failure to acknowledge their affinity or their responsibility in respect of the wider community. So they, and you know, er, I'm you know, I'm not being party political here but I think the concept of Thatcherism (where people were fundamentally individuals) and when she said that there was no such thing as society I think she was meaning your first commitment is to yourself and your prosperity and your life and your happiness and then your family but nothing [was] said about the community in which you lived or you accrue your wealth from. I think that individualism has been an enemy to citizenship, individualism. And erm, that's how, that's where the battleground is I think, how far people are going to be individuals and how far people are going to recognise their relationship to a wider, within a wider setting.

Summary

There was a clear consensus that selfishness was the essence of bad citizenship. In addition, bad citizenship was also understood as anti-social and criminal behaviour, including substance abuse and the problems this could lead to. The next section examines the input from the in-depth interviews and focus groups on the obstacles to and 'things that get in the way of good citizenship.'

Obstacles to good citizenship

Introduction

Participants in both the in-depth interviews and focus groups were asked a question about whether they perceived any 'obstacles; or 'barriers' to good citizenship. Respondents suggested various obstacles that fitted into three categories: personal factors, material resources and contextual factors.
Many of the responses referred to factors that were personal in nature, they were often viewed as factors that set a person apart from the society or wider community and made them different.

In one of the South Asian focus groups, a long discussion ensued when the topic of barriers to good citizenship was raised. Communication was seen as an essential part of being a good citizen and lack of a common language with the majority of your compatriots was seen to prevent people from being a good citizen:

Nita: Yes, language is something that gets in the way and makes it hard to be a good citizen. Take someone who didn't speak the language very well and they would be someone who have problems wouldn't they. They would find it hard if they couldn't communicate...I think you're less likely to get involved in what is going on in the local area. You get some people that are so isolated because they only speak their own language, they wouldn't be able to help you now would they?

It could be argued that communicating with others was an essential aspect of being a good citizen and it was mentioned in several of the focus groups and in-depth interviews, not only the South Asian focus groups. It could be seen that a lack of communication could prevent someone from feeling a part of and taking an active part in the local community.

Almost all respondents mentioned disability as one of the things they considered to be an impediment to being a good citizen and the following exchange with an inactive respondent in his 20's, was a typical response:

Chris: Disability makes it hard I 'spose.
Interviewer: Could you expand on that?

Chris: Yeah, em. If you was not able-bodied you know like me and you then I think then that would be hard to be a good citizen. I see some people need help to look after themselves and I think it's hard for them to be good citizens in the same way that it is for someone who has full control and what's it over their body. They haven't like got the time or the energy.

In some cases, the things that made it hard to be a good citizen were seen as things that had permanently changed a person. Dora used the euphemism of 'an event' to describe how someone's life could be changed through an episode of abuse. In her example, Dora suggested that there were traumatic events in a person's life that might have prevented them from acting as a good citizen.

Interviewer: can you think of anything that would make it hard for someone to be a good citizen?

Dora: No, I can't. Well. Umm, maybe if they had been abused. Then that would make it difficult to be a good citizen. If you have been abused by your husband then I don't think you are as good a citizen, it leaves scars you know. Sometimes, it really harms you and you never get over it. You might go from someone who is really outgoing and always out and sociable and like being with people. And then there's this big event and you might not be ever be the same. I think it's difficult to be the same as you were if you've gone through a big event. You're different, for ever....yes I think it might change your priorities.

Dora was not alone in linking influences in a person's life to obstacles to good citizenship. More generally, an individual's background was seen as a possible obstacle to good citizenship. The phrase 'not having the right background' was occasionally described as something that got in the way of good citizenship. Laura, an active contributor in her 30's, was one respondent who associated an individual's
background as a factor that might have made it difficult to be a good citizen and her script echoed many of the respondents who discussed good citizenship as something that was learned:

Interviewer: You mentioned ‘background’ as something that would make it hard for someone to be a good citizen. Could you say a little more about this please?
Laura: it’s like, erm, how you’re brought up is important you know. I mean there’s all this about single parents and that and who is the best person to bring up the kid, mum or dad...I do think that your background does make a difference. I mean if you don’t know what’s right and wrong then you don’t always make the right choices and you might often be a bad citizen.

A lack of moral knowledge was only one type of knowledge mentioned by the participants as an obstacle to good citizenship. Respondents like Max, a member of one of the socially excluded focus groups, considered good citizenship in rather elitist terms, as something that required a level of knowledge and ability. These factors were important because the good citizen was seen as someone who had more knowledge than ‘regular’ people. Good citizenship was seen as a badge that denoted people who helped the local or wider community and for this to be effective it required certain abilities.

Max: this is umm, sounds bad if I don’t get this right, don’t give me a funny look or anything but you can’t be of use to society if you haven’t got the ability to discriminate and see the right choice of action. Look at Gandhi, he was a very clever person and he was definitely a good citizen, he knew how to go about things the right way to get change and he done it. But you get lots of other people who try to achieve similar things but they don’t succeed because they don’t get it right, you know, they’re not as smart.
In Max's view, the importance of knowledge also applied at a local level:

...And it applies at other levels too, if you're not very bright then you might not realise that it's the wrong thing to do to put metal stuff in the paper recycling bins. Actually, that's not really what I'm on about, but you can have a harmful influence if you are not aware of the situation and people do harm to society because they don't know any better.

The personal factors that made it hard to be a good citizen were concerned with attributes of an individual's personality and the experiences they had gone through that had shaped their lives. I shall now look at the material factors that make it hard to be a good citizen.

*Material factors*

The material factors that were seen to act as a barrier to good citizenship included the details of one's financial status and the life commitments that may have put a strain on a person's time and resources.

Money was viewed as something that had a strong bearing on being a good citizen. The less a person had, the more difficult it was to be a good citizen. Giving to charity was one of the things occasionally associated with being a good citizen and it was an aspect that many people had in mind when they were discussing the role that money played in being a good citizen. Vera, an inactive contributor in her 50's, was one such participant who thought in this way:

Financial reasons I suspect. Er, [I'm thinking now of] a family who are not well off, I'm thinking that they might not have much money and they couldn't give it to anyone else could they? They wouldn't be filling up those cancer envelopes you get through the door would they? They would need it for themselves?
It was argued that a complete lack of material resources would discourage people from a host of activities such as volunteering, being a good parent and contributing to the local community. In one of the socially excluded focus groups, Jack offered poverty as an obstacle to good citizenship:

Ok, ok, yes, I think I can think of a few things actually. Money would be one thing. If you didn't have any then I think that would make it very hard to be a good citizen. All these people in Loughborough that you see around the Town Hall, they've got nothing, or they seem to have nothing, and they're there always asking people for some money. Now are they good citizens? I would have to say 'no, they're not!' How can you be a good citizen if you haven't got anything or any money or a home or, yes? You know? Money is a big thing...

Commitments such as a demanding job and a demanding family situation were also seen as impinging on an individual's abilities to act as a good citizen. A member of one of the older age focus groups in her 50's, Alexa, pointed out the difficulties of a demanding job:

Moderator: And so I'd like to ask you if you can think of anything that would make it hard to be a good citizen?
Alexa: Your job. I know people who work really long hours and they just don't have the time to be a good citizen. Moderator: Could you say a bit more about that?
Alexa: They don't have the time to go and do something for the local community or get involved in local conservation efforts or marches because they work long hours what with the commuting and they spend time with their family when they're not, erm, when they're not going back and forth or stuck in the office. Or even doing lots of marking, you know teachers have a lot of marking and stuff,
and all that pressure. At the end of the day, you just want time for yourself don't you?

It could be observed from these accounts that good citizenship was dependent on having a degree of time and money to devote to carrying out the activities that people imagined a good citizen doing. The next part of this section examines the contextual factors.

**Contextual factors**

A significant proportion of respondents raised contextual factors as obstacles to good citizenship, including a lack of job opportunities in the locality, a lack of mobility and the problems associated with living in isolated communities as well as factors such as the political regime and the country that people live in.

For many people, the place that you live in can affect whether or not you are a good citizen. A respondent in one of the socially excluded focus groups pointed out that a lack of job opportunities in the area was significant in this respect:

Rob: If there ain't nothing going in the area, that could make it difficult....
Moderator: I'm not sure what you mean by 'nothing going in the area', could you say a bit more about that please?
Rob: it's like there's nothing for you, you can't raise yourself or earn you know. There might not be any jobs in the area, like you may be living somewhere and everyone is in council houses and squatters and that 'cos there's no jobs for people. If you were living in that area then you would be tempted to be, umm, not be a good citizen. Not if you like lived in a posh area and that.

It could be argued that the experiences gained from living in a bad area might influence an individual in such a way that they transgressed the perceived image of a
good citizen by breaking laws for example. Damian, an inactive contributor in his 20's, viewed the place that you live in as an obstacle to good citizenship but in another way:

Obviously, what I'm talking about is somewhere where, er, where it's not built up, villages or erm, hamlins [sic] and they're very small populations, like just a few people, a family even. And then the next lot are miles and miles away. I think that's very difficult to then be a good citizen if you are living like that, you just don't come into contact with people. There's no town or nothing, not really a community there is there. Farms, I suppose. Farms or things like that I suppose, with a little well, is what I've got in my mind, yeah?

As we have seen, many of the lay respondents argued that being a good citizen included standing up for one's beliefs and even protesting against the government or dissenting. It was also argued that good citizenship entailed abiding by the laws of the political community that you lived in. In such a situation, breaking laws or dissenting might be seen as something that a good citizen would not do. Prita, a woman in her 30's from the South Asian focus group, viewed a situation where good citizenship could be denied you by the country you live in:

Prita: The country you live in might make you a bad citizen...you might be seen as a bad citizen or you might not have any choice but to be, um, do things and you are seen as a bad citizen. You do have a choice, you always have a choice, but if you had these principles you wouldn't have a choice, it goes back to the Nazis again doesn't it?
Mina: and Africa, Nelson Mandela...
Prita: If you felt that, oh and apartheid is another one, anything like that. If you, er, you might be protesting against the government and they might see the things you do to be against their laws and so the country, like the Nazis might
think you were a bad citizen, but you were just standing up against things that you thought were wrong.

Ingrid, an active contributor in her 30's, viewed good citizenship as a particular attitude towards others, involving a non-judgmental and open-minded approach that she saw threatened by 'the overarching cultural philosophy' of a nation:

There are lots of things that get in the way of being a good citizen like the fact that we are encouraged to view ourselves as being individuals and that individual expression is sacrosanct makes it harder to express community spirit. In Japan, until quite recently, people have viewed themselves as part of a social organism and that being really important. They have this mesh, this network of people who care for you and are obligated to you in same way and that you are mutually supporting...The death of a sense of community is the biggest reason why people don't to it.

This was a theme that Ingrid observed right through society and she saw it as a source of worry that young people prioritised money and material goods:

I think the number of people coming out of university who want to be lawyers and accountants and who don't want to be say, teachers is a worrying trend. They're too concerned with consumption and with money over any sense of public work [. This ] is not a positive trend... [and] definitely militates against a sense of citizenship.

She was not alone in considering the effects wider social and political influences have on the capacity to be a good citizen. Anthony, an active contributor in his 50's, saw the abuse of positions of power as an obstacle to good citizenship:
one of the things that gets in the way of good citizenship is power and control. People who have a lot of power and control very often abuse that power and control and they need to be brought back to the general and sometimes the only way to do that is through petition and protest...I mean the ultimate protest is to go to war with someone and that is a very difficult one, I'm not sure. Because some people, when they have a lot of power, someone like Hitler, is not someone you could reason with, or apparently not.

It was argued that icons and figures in the media had an influence on the moral outlook of other individuals in society. Their influence was seen to instil views and opinions in other people that were contrary to those that should be held by a good citizen. For example, Iain, a member of one of the disability focus groups in his 30's, commented:

Well, you might be influenced by what you see in films, or on the radio, or what you read about in the papers. Sometimes, people who carry a lot of weight, like celebrities and famous people can give you a bad impression and be a poor role model for a young person. Sometimes, it's easy for people to get the wrong idea about how they should behave...that might affect someone growing up, might affect them being as good a citizen as possible.

Nothing gets in the way

Whilst most respondents mentioned one or more of these three sets of factors there were some respondents who did not accept the notion of obstacles to good citizenship. A popular view in one of the older age focus groups framed good citizenship as a certain way of dealing with others and it became apparent through the
course of this session that this was something that should not be compromised or
diluted:

Miriam: I don't think there's anything really. No, I'm sorry
I don't.
Claire: Ah yes, you just can't think anymore!
Miriam: No, no, no it's not because I can't think of
anything. It's just that I don't think there is anything really,
that should get in the way of being a good citizen. There's
no excuses, everyone can be it or could be it. I just, I just...I
just think that everyone can be caring and considerate to
other people, why shouldn't people be treated with the
same [pause] care and [pause], I just think that no-one
should harm others and do bad things or not think about
others, erm, the society rather.

The view that good citizenship incorporated a basic level of behaviour that should be
expected of everyone was also echoed by Derek, an active contributor in his 60's:

Even people who are disabled or with some big mental
issues, they're not bad citizens are they? Ok, maybe some
people can be more a good citizen than some others but
what really counts is that everyone is caring and treats
people they meet in the same way they would like to be
treated. And that should not be beyond anyone and I feel
quite strongly [about] that.

Summary

There were four different ways in which the lay participants viewed the obstacles to
good citizenship. The majority of the respondents suggested a combination of three
factors although in varying degrees. Material resources came most readily to mind
although respondents did discuss contextual factors most openly and in the most
depth. The personal factors were discussed slightly less and finally, there were some respondents who rejected the notion that there were barriers or obstacles to being a good citizen. Their definition of good citizenship was one that revolved around an interpersonal understanding of good citizenship.

Summary of the Findings

The findings contained in this chapter were drawn from the expert perspectives comprising the data, the Delphi study and the lay perspectives comprising the in-depth interviews and the focus groups. The Delphi study showed results from a series of counting procedures that placed 'shows respect for others' as the most important characteristic of good citizenship. Statements such as these represented what might be called an 'interpersonal universal' category and the expert participants considered this to be the most important aspect of good citizenship. In contrast, characteristics associated with the private realm were not generally deemed to be relevant to good citizenship, although there was a clear gender divide here.

Lay respondents often found it problematic to frame and articulate their views on good citizenship and they used similar strategies to help them, such as giving concrete examples. Phrases such as 'ideal citizens' and 'bad citizens' were both used to define the content of good citizenship.

The content of good citizenship that emerged from the lay sessions was dominated by the interpersonal dimension which comprised both a more intimate and a more universal aspect. In addition, the notion of responsibility, and an emphasis on individual abilities such as leadership emerged as important characteristics of good citizenship. The lay participants perceived extreme patriotism and violent behaviour in supporting a cause to be outside the content of good citizenship although they varied considerably in their opinions on the relevance of cosmopolitanism and challenging the law. Bad citizenship was seen as selfishness and committing crime. Personal, material and contextual factors were cited as possible obstacles to good citizenship. The implications of these findings are discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 6

Discussion

Introduction

This chapter reflects upon the findings from both the expert and the lay data collection and contains three parts. The first part presents four ideal type good citizens based upon the characteristics of good citizenship that have emerged from the theoretical literature, the Delphi study and both the in-depth interviews and the focus groups. A taxonomy is used to represent these ideal types and the first part details and explains the key characteristics of each type of good citizen. The second part of this chapter uses the taxonomy as a basis to assess the similarities and differences between the expert and the lay studies. Finally, a more general comparison of the expert and the lay studies is presented in relation to the theoretical literature and current political discussions.

Towards a Taxonomy of the good citizen

Introduction

The preceding chapter has discussed the different ways in which the expert and lay people’s understanding of good citizenship is constructed. It is the aim of this part to present a theoretical model to interpret the different voices and opinions that constitute the discourses through which good citizenship is defined and understood in the expert and the lay sessions.

The characteristics of the good citizen in both the expert and the lay perspectives can be plotted along two axes. One axis is concerned with the site of good citizenship and
describes the levels at which the characteristics of good citizenship can be placed. At one end of the axis, the characteristics of good citizenship can be located at the global level and national level. ‘Feeling a responsibility for others beyond national boundaries’ and ‘challenges the law when they think it is wrong’ may be found at this end of the axis. Characteristics such as these comprise the ‘macro’ dimension of the good citizen. In contrast, at the other end of the axis, good citizenship also includes characteristics that operate at a one to one, intimate level; an interpersonal level; and local community level. ‘Caring for infirm friends and relatives’ and ‘gives time as a volunteer’ can be found at this end of the axis. These types of characteristics comprise the ‘micro’ dimension of the good citizen.

The second axis describes the nature of the characteristics of the good citizen. A distinction between two forms of good citizenship emerged from the lay sessions when it was noticeable that good citizenship was understood either as a disposition involving values and principles, or as a range of actions that benefited other individuals directly or indirectly, regardless of an individual’s values and principles. This theme was then applied to the Delphi study and it was found that the majority of statements in the questionnaires and all of the qualitative data could also be characterised as either an action or a character trait or disposition.

These two axes can be combined to provide the basis for a taxonomy of good citizenship; this can be seen in figure 6.1 in which the locus of good citizenship is represented on the vertical axis and the nature of good citizenship is represented by the horizontal axis. Looking at good citizenship in terms of either an action or a disposition that operates at either a micro or a macro scale makes it possible to map the characteristics of good citizenship onto a grid of quadrants.
Fig. 6.1 Towards a taxonomy of good citizenship
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Whilst some aspects of good citizenship can be firmly attributed to a particular quadrant, others are more problematic, particularly when it comes to the nature of good citizenship on the action/disposition continuum. In locating the characteristics of good citizenship along this axis it becomes apparent that the level of effort required varies depending on the particular characteristic. Broadly speaking, it is possible to identify two types of characteristic of good citizenship that may be considered 'actions'. These two types hinge on the concept of what may be described as a 'domestic-work routine', which accounts for the experience of most adult individuals in this country and includes a balance between, on one hand, the family and home life, and on the other hand, some form of paid work. One type of 'action' includes characteristics of good citizenship that can be achieved with minimal deviation from one's domestic-work routine and that therefore require minimal extra effort on behalf of the individual. Buying environmentally friendly goods might be one such example. This characteristic can be carried out as a part of an individual's regular shopping habits and does not necessarily require a great deal of the individual's time. The other type of characteristic describes an activity that is pursued outside of an individual's interaction with home/family life or work, requiring additional effort, and might include some form of volunteering in the local community for example.

It is possible to place the characteristics of good citizenship from both the expert and the lay perspectives onto this figure.
Fig 6.2 showing the characteristics of good citizenship according to the Action/Disposition and Macro/Micro axes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is actively involved in the local community</td>
<td>Good listener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives time as a volunteer</td>
<td>Caring for the welfare of other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performs a certain type of job, Macmillan nurses for example.</td>
<td>Displays leadership qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares for elderly or infirm friends and relatives</td>
<td>Shows respect for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible within the local</td>
<td>Social decency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerates difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considers the needs of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obeys the law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pays their taxes <em>willingly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows your rights as a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows your responsibilities as a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels a responsibility to help others living beyond national boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges the law when they think it is wrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes in elections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible to future generations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chooses to make a difference to the national community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some statements which might appear to fit in more than one of these quadrants need some clarification. The statement ‘pays their taxes willingly’ implies an individual act, nevertheless, this characteristic is classed as a disposition because taxes are a legal requirement and the emphasis is on ‘willingly’.

The two environmental statements ‘uses environmentally friendly products’ and ‘recycles used products’ may be seen as activities that are carried out in the local community. However, the language used to describe responsibilities of these types referred to the Environment.

In addition, the statement ‘keeps abreast with social issues/political topics’ is considered to be an action because of the ongoing effort and commitment to reading, assessing and internalising social and political issues. A similar logic might be applied to the two statements ‘knows your rights’ and ‘knows your responsibilities as a citizen’ as both require that an individual actively learns and remembers what their rights/responsibilities are. However, there is no implication that the individual would act upon this knowledge or make a continued effort to monitor and keep abreast of how their rights and responsibilities change.

Each quadrant of the taxonomy contains a set of characteristics that comprise an ideal type of good citizenship, so that the Action/Micro quadrant may be labelled as the ‘Locally Active’ good citizen; the Action/Macro as the ‘Justice-oriented’ good citizen; the Disposition/Micro as the ‘Interpersonal’ good citizen and the Disposition/Macro as the ‘Dutiful’ good citizen.
There are two key aspects to the ‘interpersonal’ good citizen. The first aspect is comprised of characteristics that describe a one-one process such as caring for elderly or infirm friends or relatives. The second aspect describes a set of values or principles that are necessary for good citizenship such as being considerate of others’ needs, being a good listener and tolerating difference. This ideal type is found at the extreme micro end of the macro/micro axis. The ‘locally active’ good citizen differs from the interpersonal good citizen in that it is characterised by actions and is focussed on the neighbourhood and the local area. The ‘dutiful’ good citizen emphasises fulfilling basic duties of citizenship, it is a conservative ideal type that consists of characteristics that do not require the individual to put a lot of effort into the maintenance of the community, bar obedience and adherence to the laws and paying taxes appropriately. Finally, the ‘justice-oriented’ good citizen is defined by awareness of political and social issues and the effect not only of their actions, but the actions of domestic and foreign governments on issues concerning future generations, the environment, people living in other countries and people suffering injustices within their own county. Environmental characteristics are not always defined as justice-oriented although Dobson (2003) argues that justice is the first virtue of ecological citizenship.
This section has shown that it is possible to plot the features of good citizenship along two axes, according to the site and the nature of the characteristics. Out of this taxonomy, four ideal-types of good citizen can be extracted from the range of opinions comprising the discourses of good citizenship. The taxonomy and these ideal types can be used as a basis for analysing the similarities between the expert and the lay studies and this is the focus of the next section of this chapter.

A comparison of the expert and the lay perspectives

Introduction

The next part of this chapter compares the ways in which the participants in the expert and lay studies perceived the characteristics of good citizenship and how they relate to the taxonomy established above. This part of the chapter will begin by examining more closely the relationship between the expert and the lay perspectives with regard to the site of good citizenship. It will then proceed to discuss the similarities and differences between the expert and lay studies in relation to the ideal types.

Identifying levels of good citizenship

Each of the participants in the expert and lay studies was analysed and mapped onto a concentric circle diagram to show what level their conception of good citizenship could be located at. The results of this analysis can be seen in Figures 6.4 and 6.5:
Fig 6.4 Showing the primary influence of the Delphi respondents according to level.
Fig 6.5 Showing the primary influence of the lay respondents according to level
This analysis showed that there were distinctive differences between the expert and the lay studies. In particular, it is noticeable how much the interpersonal level was considered to be the primary locus of good citizenship amongst the lay respondents. In contrast, the Delphi panellists were more concerned with the national level. In both studies the local level received some interest, this was more pronounced in the lay study, in which it too emerged as a highly important locus of good citizenship, than in the expert study.

The mapping of each individual's conception of good citizenship according to its primary characteristics were then used in a further analysis in which these results were combined with the profile of each participant in both Delphi and lay studies. The results were then mapped onto the taxonomy grid according to whether their perspective of good citizenship emerged predominantly as an action or disposition and at what level, thereby getting an indication of which ideal-type of good citizenship was favoured most. Using crosses to mark each of the participants, the following scatter diagrams were produced. The location of the crosses on the scatter diagrams reflects the extent of each participant's opinions so that the further towards the outside edges of the quadrants, the more their opinions reflected that particular ideal-type of good citizen.
Fig 6.6 Grid to show the primary characteristics of the Delphi respondents' conceptions of good citizenship.
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Fig 6.7 Grid to show the primary characteristics of the lay respondents conceptions of good citizenship
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Research participants and the ideal-type good citizens

These two diagrams indicate that there was a fundamental difference between the Delphi and the lay studies according to the level they favoured most and the nature of the good citizen. Two dominant ideal types emerged from this analysis. In the expert study the Macro/Action ideal type was more closely linked with good citizenship whereas the lay study is more closely connected with the Micro side of the axis and has considerable support for both the Micro/Action and the Micro/Disposition quadrants but in particular the interpersonal ideal type good citizen.

In the Delphi study, there were only two respondents whose conception of good citizenship could be placed in the ‘interpersonal’ ideal type and these two respondents were the two candidates who were not classified as significant contributors to the academic literature on citizenship. They were included in the Delphi study by virtue of their position in important citizenship organisations (see Methodology chapter). It was interesting therefore, that the non-academic expert view of good citizenship differs from the academic view. In addition, it should be noted that these two respondents were female and the majority of respondents in the Delphi study were male. Furthermore, the Delphi respondents did not give substantial credence to the ‘dutiful’ ideal type good citizen, nor to the locally active good citizen. This is not to say that the local community did not emerge as a site of good citizenship but that it was not deemed to be as important as the national level.

In the lay sessions, there was rather a more equal spread, despite the dominance of the ‘interpersonal’ good citizen. The other ideal type on the micro side also received good support and it is significant that the two ideal types on the macro side received relatively little support, especially the ‘dutiful’ good citizen which contained the fewest participants. This was interesting when considering the scripts and the comments of the participants because certain features of this category, such as obeying the law, were considered to be significant aspects of good citizenship. Nevertheless, as the diagram shows, it was superseded in importance by the interpersonal and the locally active ideal type good citizens. Furthermore, it is noticeable that the diagram showing
the lay participants contains several clusters towards the centre of the taxonomy. This reflects the diverse range of opinions each respondent presented and the fact that they each discussed some element of each of the ideal-types. This resulted in a large proportion of statements being considered 'relevant' whereas comparatively few were deemed to be indispensable conditions of good citizenship. The next section in this part of the chapter will consider in further detail the similarities and differences between the expert and lay studies in relation to the ideal type good citizens.

Comparison of the contribution of the expert and the lay studies to the ideal-types

This section begins by discussing the expert and lay studies in relation to the two dominant ideal types which are the 'interpersonal' good citizen and the 'justice-oriented' good citizen. The section then continues with a discussion of the 'locally active' and the 'dutiful' good citizen ideal types.

The 'interpersonal' good citizen

The 'interpersonal' ideal type good citizen primarily includes characteristics from the lay perspectives, although one important element derives also from the theoretical literature and the Delphi study. There are two aspects to the characteristics of this ideal type: the 'universal' and the 'intimate'.

The intimate aspect of this ideal-type includes characteristics such as 'being a good listener', 'being trustworthy' and 'care' which was a very significant part of good citizenship. Care was a crucial feature of the findings, it was used to describe the one-to-one dynamic of caring for infirm individuals but also to describe the approach or attitude that a good citizen took towards the local environment or their approach to other people. Overall, the 'intimate' aspect of the interpersonal dimension did not feature as strongly as it did in the lay study and the two studies largely clashed in their view of what may be described as the 'intimate' interpersonal dimension but converged in their approval of the 'universal' interpersonal dimension.
In the expert perspectives, the non-academic and the female participants placed more emphasis on this aspect of good citizenship than the other participants did. However, the overall consensus of opinion dismissed the interpersonal as a locus of good citizenship. Commenting on 'cares for elderly or infirm relatives' one respondent expanded upon the negative mark given to this statement by connecting good citizenship with the public sphere:

I put this in the social/familial/personal sphere rather than the public sphere.

Among the lay participants who did regard the social/familial/personal sphere as a site of good citizenship this ideal type of good citizenship was viewed as an approach to other people, a way of treating others and a disposition or frame of mind. Derek, an active member of the local community in his 60's described a good citizen in such a way:

A good citizen is someone who is kind and welcoming and decent and all that kind of stuff, it's at a level of an individual...it's person to person. That's how you can tell a good citizen, obviously, it's in their dealings with people they come across.

Despite the dominance of the lay perspectives in the construction of the 'interpersonal' ideal-type good citizen, one of the most important features was a characteristic that was developed from the theoretical literature and emerged as the most highly considered characteristic of good citizenship in the Delphi study: 'Shows respect for others'. Although it came out top of the Delphi hierarchy, this was an anomaly because most of the other characteristics that the Delphi panellists supported did not fall into the interpersonal ideal-type (this is discussed further in the third and final part of this chapter). This characteristic also rose to prominence in the lay sessions; it was considered to be the second most important statement in the lay questionnaires and, more importantly, was a significant feature of the interviews and focus group discussion. The fact that this statement was highly supported across both the expert
and the lay sessions indicates that this emerged as one of the strongest perceived characteristics of good citizenship.

Some of the statements that comprise the 'interpersonal' good citizen were not included as statements in the design of the Delphi study nor did they emerge from the qualitative data as comments from the experts. Therefore, the two studies differed in that certain qualities such as 'Displays leadership qualities', 'social decency', 'is trustworthy' emerged as significant characteristics in the lay study but did not feature as significant characteristics in the expert study. For example, a new theme to the discussion of good citizenship that did not occur as a statement in the Delphi study was leadership. In the Delphi study, the skills of good citizenship related to participation in the public realm, and in this sense 'leadership' may have been a topic that would have been supported. However, the context was different in the lay study and 'displaying leadership qualities' encompassed situations that were not considered to be relevant to good citizenship in the Delphi study such as family situations.

Fig 6.8 Showing the level of agreement between the expert and lay studies in the interpersonal ideal-type good citizen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delphi and Lay</th>
<th>Lay only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerates difference</td>
<td>Good listener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows respect for others</td>
<td>Displays leadership qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social decency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considers the needs of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is respectful of others privacy/space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The justice-oriented good citizen

The justice-oriented good citizen was the other dominant characteristic of good citizenship. It straddled two levels, the national level and the international or global
level. The lay study contributed characteristics that were not mentioned in the expert study, such as being 'responsible to future generations' and 'chooses to make a difference to the national community'. However, this ideal-type was more closely associated with the expert study than with the lay.

One of the themes that ran throughout the expert and the lay studies was a concern with consequences, not only of individual but governmental actions. This might also be characterised as some form of critical conscience on behalf of the good citizen. In the Delphi study, an image of the good citizen emerges from the good ranking attributed to the statement 'keeps abreast of social issues and political topics' so that the good citizen has an element of the critical vigilance contained in Agnes Heller's (1990) conception of the good citizen (see Chapter 3). In the lay study, the notion of a critical conscience is expressed through a concern with the impact of actions that harm the environment or that might adversely affect future generations. Heller's critical vigilance is similar to the characteristic of 'awareness' that occurs in the lay studies. They both have a concern with rating and comparing government actions to a moral touchstone. However, the lay study is less concerned than the Delphi study with legal or formal actions to combat injustices and this is one respect in which the two studies differ in this ideal type. The responsibility to future generations and to the environment in the lay study is expressed as a concern for individuals.

Two of the characteristics in this ideal-type concern the environment although they were not well supported by the Delphi panellists. The environment was a strong theme in the lay studies however, and this is one of the chief differences between the two studies in this ideal type. In contrast, there was more of an emphasis on the transnational dimension of good citizenship in the expert study than in the lay. In the lay sessions, good citizenship at this level was usually discussed with mention of events such as 'famine' 'civil-war' and also the 'environment'. The respondents were often uncertain about the connection between being a good citizen and helping people beyond national boundaries. The majority of the discussion in the lay sessions switched to what was evidently considered to be more pressing concerns of the good citizen, such as 'helping other people'. Thus, this ideal type can be seen as more closely related to the expert perspectives on good citizenship.
Fig 6.9 showing the level of agreement between the expert and lay studies on a 'justice-oriented' good citizen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delphi only</th>
<th>Delphi and Lay</th>
<th>Lay only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feels a responsibility to help others living</td>
<td>Challenges the law when they think it is wrong</td>
<td>Responsible to future generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond national boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chooses to make a difference to the national</td>
<td>Uses environmentally friendly products and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td>recycles used products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keeps abreast with social issues/political topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Votes in elections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'locally active' good citizen

Whereas at the micro level, the 'interpersonal' good citizen operated at the level of interpersonal relations the site for the 'locally active' good citizen was the local community. In the lay sessions, this emerged most strongly when good citizenship was viewed as 'helping within the local community'.

The qualitative data on the locally active good citizen in the Delphi study were similar to the lay and contained a wide range of views on good citizenship and the local area. On the one hand, 'being actively involved in the local community' received the endorsement that:

Any form of local activity can be closely associated with 'good citizenship'.
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However, the local community was not the main emphasis of the Delphi study. Whilst the Delphi participants did give their overall support for statements such as 'being active in the local community' and 'gives time as a volunteer' both finished outside of the top five of the hierarchy; the former ranked joint tenth and the latter nineteenth. In contrast, the lay studies saw being active in the local community as a strong defining feature of good citizenship. The scripts show that the bulk of the discussion in the in-depth interviews and focus groups centred on activities within the local community so that the expert and lay studies differed in their view of this ideal type good citizen.

However, there is evidence to suggest that the hierarchy derived from the counting procedures in the Delphi study is misleading. The qualitative data from the Delphi study showed that the respondents marked 'being active within the local community' positively and when it came to 'volunteering' several respondents took care to point out that they did not want to contribute to the opinion that good citizenship was solely about volunteering. The implication being that volunteering was important but that it was only one of several other important points. Despite this possible contradiction in the data, it remains the case that being active in the local community was more closely connected with the lay perspectives than with the Delphi study.

This ideal-type of good citizen also contained characteristics that were not part of the questionnaire or qualitative data in the expert study. The lay sessions showed that there was a substantial amount of support for a link between performing certain kinds of job, such as being a Macmillan nurse, and being a good citizen. This was a new theme of good citizenship that did not have any precedents in the expert study.
**Fig 6.10 showing the level of agreement between the expert and lay studies on the 'locally active' good citizen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delphi and lay</th>
<th>Lay only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaks out on behalf of minority/stigmatised groups</td>
<td>Caring for the welfare of other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chooses to make a difference to the local community</td>
<td>Performs a certain type of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible within the local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives time as a volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is actively involved in the local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The 'dutiful' good citizen**

At the national level good citizenship can be seen as doing things for national organisations such as charities and includes statements such as ‘ensuring that we leave a good legacy for future generations’ which was one of the ways in which good citizenship was discussed in the lay sessions. However, not all the characteristics at this level required as much effort or commitment on behalf of the good citizen. The ‘dutiful’ good citizen is an ideal type that emerged from both studies as good citizenship was linked with a comparatively passive role in which the necessary conditions included obeying the law, paying taxes and also knowing one’s rights and responsibilities.

Many of the characteristics of the ‘dutiful’ good citizen are activities that may be carried out by an individual without veering away from his or her domestic/work life routine. The individual fulfils the formal responsibilities expected of a citizen and may
carry out acts such as giving to charity on an occasional basis but these are reactionary activities, not habitual practices.

**Fig 6.11 showing the level of agreement between the expert and lay studies on the ‘dutiful’ good citizen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delphi and Lay</th>
<th>Delphi only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obeys the law</td>
<td>Knows your rights as a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pays their taxes willingly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows your responsibilities as a citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The two studies emphasised different aspects of good citizenship. The expert study favoured the national level compared to the lay study which primarily associated good citizenship with the interpersonal and local community levels. These preferences also transferred into the ideal types where the expert study was most closely associated with the ‘justice-oriented’ good citizen and the lay sessions favoured the ‘interpersonal’ and the ‘locally active’ good citizens.

**Discussion of the findings, ideal-types and the theoretical literature**

**Introduction**

The construction of the ideal types of good citizen was the final part of the analysis of the expert and the lay studies. The creation of the subsequent taxonomy is an original
way of looking at the notion of good citizenship and the remaining part of this chapter will consider how the findings and the ideal types relate to the theoretical literature. The findings strongly suggest that the lay perceptions of the borders between the public and the private realms are shifting in favour of activities that have traditionally been associated with the private sphere. The most significant contribution to this observation is based upon the prominence of many features of the interpersonal dimension within the findings. The first part of this section considers how this dimension relates to the theoretical literature before moving on to consider the responsibilities of good citizenship. The penultimate part of this section considers degrees of good citizenship and explores good citizenship as one of two types, the 'ordinary' good citizen and the 'extra-ordinary' good citizen before finally considering the notion of learning good.

Interpersonal characteristics of good citizenship

The most highly supported characteristics of good citizenship in the findings were from the interpersonal dimension, which is a significant difference from the consensus in the theoretical literature in which good citizenship is related to public participation and political engagement. Although in some respects the findings chime with aspects of the theoretical literature, on the whole the findings suggest that the interpersonal dimension is undervalued in the citizenship literature.

In the traditional theoretical literature good citizenship operates according to a division between the public and the private spheres in which good citizenship is firmly a preserve of the polis/public realm (see Hannah Arendt, 1958 for more on the public/private distinction). However, the expert findings showed that the universal-interpersonal dimension was considered the most important aspect of good citizenship and the lay study showed that both interpersonal categories, universal and intimate, were extremely highly rated characteristics. In the citizenship literature as a whole, the interpersonal dimension is not given great emphasis. Consider the theorists mentioned in Chapter 3. Agnes Heller very clearly locates good citizenship as something that is to be carried out in the public realm, is concerned with formal activity and political participation that is geared towards remedying perceived injustices, she
believes good citizens are political actors motivated by the pursuit of justice (1990: 147-161). Almond and Verba (1991) conceive of good citizenship in terms of political participation, Richard Dagger (1997, 2002), Adrian Oldfield (1990) and David Marquand (1991) all conceive of good citizenship as a form of active engagement with the community, albeit with a political bent to it as well.

Of the two aspects to the ‘interpersonal’ dimension, the intimate and the universal, communitarianism bears a resemblance to the sense of ‘universal-interpersonal good citizenship’ that emerges from the findings due to the focus on contributing to the well-being of the community that emerges through informal means. However, the findings do not share the communitarian position on homogenising values and cultural practices. The existence, tolerance and even the celebration of diversity comes across in both expert and lay studies. In particular, this can be seen by looking at the content of the bad citizen in which intolerance and racism and extreme forms of nationalism are seen to constitute bad citizenship.

The interpersonal dimension in both its forms is strongly connected with feminist citizenship literature, in particular that of Sevenhuijjsen (1998) and Prokhovnik (1998). The ‘intimate-interpersonal’ dimension is inherently relational, is concerned with the well-being of others and connects with some of the characteristics the lay participants associated with good citizenship such as compassionate behaviour. This was one of the features Joan Tronto identified as defining the moral approach of an ‘ethic of care’ (1995). Furthermore, the language of ‘caring’ is used throughout the in-depth interviews and focus groups to describe the outlook that a good citizen has to family and friends, to fellow members of the local community, to municipal parks and to the environment more broadly. This suggests that ‘care’ as a moral outlook is far more pervasive than the consensus of the non-feminist theoretical literature on good citizenship currently allows. Feminist theorists have applied the works of Gilligan, Noddings, Tronto and others to the notion of citizenship (in particular see Bubeck, 1995; Bussemaker, 1998; Lister, 1997, 2003; Sevenhuijjsen, 1998; Voet, 1998; Williams, 2004) as well as non-feminist literature such as Dobson (2003).

Recently, Fiona Williams has called upon the government to reform its approach to citizenship to reflect the importance of an ethic of care (2004). One of the themes
emerging from Williams' research is the sense of commitment to others that is not explained by traditional assumptions of paid work. This sense of commitment to others is supported in the findings of this study in the often used language of care.

Putting the ethic of care into practice involves recognising the needs of others, which often entails the ability to listen. 'Listening' was an important characteristic of good citizenship because it was an essential component in 'understanding the needs of others' and was the first stage in being able to 'help other people'. The lay participants highlighted 'listening' as an important aspect of being able to help other people, especially those people in the family, in the neighbourhood and in the local community. In some of the theoretical literature 'listening' plays an important role in the negotiation of difference. Whilst the lay participants emphasised the role of listening in the more private interpersonal sphere, the importance of listening in the public realm has been commented on by Elisabeth Porter, Margaret Walker and Susan Bickford who have all produced interesting commentaries. As Porter (2000) writes, listening 'is part of the reciprocity of democratic dialogue' and it is 'an intrinsic dimension to deliberation and sound judgement' (2000: 159).

If some characteristics of the good citizen can be seen to have a 'dual purpose' in the sense that they are relevant to both public and private sphere activities, then the Delphi study and the lay perspectives can be seen to link more closely together. 'Listening' and the importance of effective communication for the resolution of differences in participatory democracies is similar to a characteristic emphasised by one of the expert panellists in the qualitative section of the Delphi study. Commenting on the importance of 'feeling a responsibility to help people living beyond national boundaries', one of the panellists agrees that this is a characteristic of good citizenship when 'we are talking about transversal citizenship'. The notion of 'transversal citizenship' is used to describe the process by which participants in a political dialogue articulate their views but also receive and attempt to understand the views of another party. It involves the very skills of listening and attempting to create dialogue across difference that is mentioned by Porter (2000, p161).
Therefore, the emphasis placed on listening as presented by the lay perspectives, has a wider application and a more resonant relevance to being a good citizen when it is seen as an essential part of the negotiation of difference in plural societies. This is not the only characteristic that is seen by the lay respondents in a private sense but can also be seen in a public sense. Many of the characteristics described in private terms in the lay study were considered in a public sense in the expert study and may be found discussed according to their relevance to the public sphere in the theoretical literature. However, respect was not discussed in a public sense by the lay participants. The themes inherent in the language of ‘respect’ in the theoretical literature, namely the recognition of difference were present in the lay study, although the language of respect was not used to discuss them.

In this study ‘respect’ and ‘toleration’ were two words often used to convey sentiments that acknowledge different viewpoints and recognise that they have equal worth and equal legitimacy. However, it is worth separating them out. According to Bernard Crick (2000: 157-159) respect for others is a part of the virtue of toleration for others, whereas Joseph Carens discusses how liberal democratic states constrain cultural differences under the banner of ‘toleration’ (2000: 140-160). In the critical citizenship literature respect for others is considered to go beyond mere toleration however, and respect is connected with a politics of recognition (Kymlicka, 1995; Phillips, 1995; Raz, 1994; Young, 1990). However, the meanings of these two words contain subtle differences in the findings of this study and are used in different ways from the theoretical literature.

The statement ‘shows respect for others’ was most highly ranked of all the characteristics in the expert study, was a part of the interpersonal accounts of good citizenship contained in the lay sessions and scored very highly in the lay hierarchy (see Chapter 5). However, in the academic literature (see Heller, 1990; Macedo, 1991, Glendon, 1990) the notion of respect carries a different meaning to the understanding that the lay perspectives have. In the theoretical literature, respect is discussed in terms of the recognition of difference and ‘respect for the other’. This notion of respect also pervades the Delphi study. In contrast, the lay perspectives speak far more of the moral aspect of respect and do not have a well developed understanding of ‘respect for difference’ in the way that the theoretical literature does.
The lay perspectives are closer to an understanding of respect offered by Tony Blair in a speech on anti-social behaviour on the 14th of October, 2003 at the QE11 centre, London:

> Respect is a simple idea. We know instinctively what it means. Respect for others- their opinions, values and way of life. Respect for neighbours. Respect for the community that means caring about others, Respect for property that means not tolerating mindless vandalism, theft and graffiti.

Crewe et al (1994) reported on the presence of tolerance as a virtue of citizenship in popular conceptions. It is contained in conceptions of liberal virtues and is present in Heater's (2000) evaluation of good citizenship (see Chapter 3); in David Blunkett's conception of the crucial tenets of citizenship (1999: 131); and Bernard Crick's presuppositions of citizenship education (2000: 157-159). The importance these theorists place on tolerance was reflected in the findings where it emerged as one of the characteristics that was always supported in the lay study, even if it was rarely mentioned as one of the most important characteristics of good citizenship. Issues of multicultural concern such as tolerance and respect for difference were as common amongst the South Asian focus groups as they were amongst other participants. Similarly, the female lay participants did not place more of an emphasis on caring activities than the male participants, thus rejecting the essentialist claim that the 'ethic of care' stems uniquely from female experiences.

In addition to tolerance, respect and the importance of 'listening', one of the ways in which the liberal tradition of thought considers good citizenship is as engagement with public reason, best exemplified in Rawls' political liberalism (1993). According to Meyer (2000), engaging with public reason is predicated on a host of qualities that comprise civility, notions that are based upon an interpersonal form of behaviour. Notions of civility and also of social decency comprised a significant proportion of the 'intimate' interpersonal dimension of good citizenship. The participants did not discuss the public importance of these actions, rather they were deemed to be important for their own sake.
In flagging the relevance of interpersonal skills that have an important role to play in the public and the private realms it might also be argued that they contribute to an alternative view of the characteristics of the good citizen. Instead of the good citizen as a predominantly public-minded construct, it is possible to re-orientate good citizenship around a set of characteristics that are important not only in the public realm but also in the more private sphere of personal and interpersonal relationships. 'Listening' is one such skill that can be said to transcend the boundaries between the public and private spheres in the sense that it has an important role to play in each.

The importance of the interpersonal realm has implications for the theoretical literature on citizenship in terms of the way in which the social condition is theorised according to the public/private divide. One of the most striking facts about the good citizen that emerges is how different it is from the traditional theoretical perspectives on good citizenship. This is to say that the meaning of good citizenship as it is understood by the Crick report, by the civic republican, liberalist and communitarian traditions, as well as the Home Office pronouncements through David Blunkett, is one that is rooted in terms of political participation and based upon a gendered division of the public and private realms. The perspective of good citizenship that emerges from the findings is one that is not confined to the private realm any more than it is confined to the public, it therefore cuts across the public/private divide.

The ideal types introduced earlier in the chapter suggest that conceptions of good citizenship are more diverse than traditional theories of citizenship recognise. This is chiefly due to the influence of activities that have traditionally been marginalised or were not included within the pantheon of citizenship behaviour let alone conceptions of good citizenship. Therefore, in relation to the theoretical literature on good citizenship, the findings have implications for the way that the public/private divide is perceived in the field of citizenship studies. They support what seems to be the increasing trend of redressing the balance between the private and the public sphere.

The ideal types of good citizen operate across interpersonal, local community, national and international levels; therefore suggesting that current conceptions of citizenship are entertaining different sites of citizenship behaviour not just the traditional sites of
the city or the nation state. The findings also challenge assumed conceptions of what is important to good citizenship. The political aspect of good citizenship that emerges from the theoretical literature is challenged by the importance given to the interpersonal dimension of good citizenship. The fact that politics and political engagement do not feature as the most significant characteristics of good citizenship amongst the lay participants is not a radical shock. Empirical studies have shown evidence of declining participation in political parties (Seyd and Whitely, 2002, Whiteley and Seyd, 2002), combined with declining trust in political leaders and institutions (Bromley, Curtice and Seyd, 2001). In addition, voter turnout has declined and citizens are increasingly less willing to involve themselves in formal politics (Dalton, 1996).

Responsibility

To a certain extent the responsibilities of the good citizen are problematic due to the number of different discourses used to discuss them. On one hand the responsibilities of the good citizen can be seen as charitable. They are reflect the same spontaneous extension towards others that is contained in charitable giving. They are also predicated on the availability of resources, the opportunity, they can be extended or denied according to the nature of the circumstances. On one hand, they are a weak basis for obligation because they can be easily withdrawn, giving the appropriate set of imposing or difficult circumstances.

The most dominant expression of good citizenship in this study involved responsibilities without mention of rights. The language of 'responsibility' was a strong feature of the perspectives of good citizenship in both expert and lay studies. The centrality of duties discourse is consistent with the theoretical literature in which good citizenship is predominantly a matter of what the individual contributes to the community (Dagger, 1997, 2000, 2002; Oldfield, 1990; Marquand, 1991). The citizenship literature is diverse when it comes to the notion of the responsibilities of a good citizen and there are discourses around each of the ways in which an individual's contribution to the community is framed, either in terms of an individual's duties (in a communitarian and civic republican sense, what they owe to the community), obligations (in terms of reciprocal and contractual terms between individual and state
and individual to individual) and also in terms of a moral responsibility (such as in an ethic of care). The findings in this study engage with all of these conceptions and are reflected in the different ideal types. For example, seen in a contractual, liberalist way, the findings can be seen to express a view of 'the dutiful good citizen', based on a minimal set of duties such as paying taxes willingly, voting and obeying the law. Similarly, 'the locally active good citizen' reflects the communitarian position that emphasises community-oriented behaviour.

Interpersonal responsibility

This subsection is concerned with the relevance of interpersonal responsibility. Much of the duties discourse in the theoretical literature is concerned with political obligations, such as political engagement (Dagger, 1997, 2002 and other examples of the civic republican tradition), as concern with institutional responsibilities (as in the concern with liberal virtues in the work of Galston, 1990 and Macedo, 1990); and with work obligations (such as in the 'third way' and communitarian positions of Giddens 1998.

The findings have an interesting relationship with political obligations. On the one hand, political obligations do emerge in the expert study as a strong responsibility to protect the rights of others and to stand up for marginalised, excluded groups. But, on the other hand they are not as important as other forms of responsibility. Features such as interpersonal responsibility, responsibility to the local community, to the environment and to future generations are seen as more important in the lay study.

The responsibility to work has been strongly supported by New Labour governments. This is highlighted by the notion of 'no rights without responsibilities', and the responsibility to work has been a central aspect of the New Deal strategy and an important pillar of the Third Way. Giddens (1994: 104) makes the point that the problem of dependency should be addressed by prioritising the primacy of duty before rights and in which the welfare benefits 'should carry the obligation to look actively for work' (ibid: 66). However, this does not carry over into the findings in which the responsibility to work was not seen as part of good citizenship. The emphasis is less on obligations in contractual terms, as either a corollary of rights or in equal...
conjunction with rights, but on one's responsibility as a good citizen because of one's association and connection with the well-being of others and the interpersonal relationships that sustain this.

The findings suggest an alternative conception of good citizenship responsibilities from the dominant understandings in the theoretical literature. Selma Sevenhuijsen has written that 'the moral subject in the discourse of individual rights looks at situations of moral dilemma from the stance of the 'highest principles' and takes rights and obligations as a means of establishing relationships, the moral subject in the discourse of care always already lives in a network of relationships... it is not 'duty' that has first and foremost to guide her/him through recurrent moral dilemmas, but rather situated questions of responsibility and agency such as, ‘How can I best express my caring responsibility?’ (Sevenhuijsen, 2000: 6). The predominant image of responsibility in the lay study, reflected in the frequent use of the language of care, is very similar to the moral repertoire of the ethic of care (Gilligan, 1987; Tronto, 1993; Griffith, 1995; Clement, 1996; Hirschmann and DiStefano, 1997; Sevenhuijsen, 1998).

However, whilst this accounts for many of the ways in which the lay participants viewed responsibilities, the moral repertoire of care did not have the same force amongst the expert participants. In these cases, caring responsibilities were viewed as significant amongst the female respondents but not amongst the male respondents. The pattern emerging from the experts is more closely associated with the contractual view of responsibilities.

The difference between the female and male participants in the expert study is just one of the possible differences between different types of participants (see Methodology for the ways in which the lay sessions identified different demographic groups). However, throughout the findings, these differences did not reveal significant variations in the ways that good citizenship were perceived.

Critics of social citizenship would welcome the emphasis on interpersonal responsibility in the findings. Social conservatives like David Selbourne (1994) may be pleased to discover how the lay participants discussed good citizenship in terms of interpersonal responsibility. Although the desire to avoid dependency on the state was
Responsibility and community-based approaches to good citizenship

The relationship between good citizenship and communitarianism is complex. On the one hand, community is often the anchor of many conceptions of good citizenship and provided the framework for many individuals to express their opinions. However, the motivations of Mary Ann Glendon has claimed that civil society is the 'seedbed of virtue' (1991: 109, cited in Kymlicka and Norman, 1994: 363) and much of the findings support the communitarian perspective of good citizenship, concerned with civic associations. However, there is an element of what Kymlicka and Norman (1994: 363) call the NIMBY principle ('not in my backyard') when the lay participants discussed the types of community action that a good citizen would become involved with. The NIMBY principle suggests that a proportion of civic activity is self-interested so that individuals are only active in the local community to further their self-interests.

The views of the lay respondents challenge the theoretical literature over the relationship between good citizenship and virtue. In the theoretical literature, good citizenship is predominantly discussed through the language of virtue, although the lay participants sometimes doubted that ostensible good citizens were always motivated by virtue. This view can be traced back to a similar point made by the participants in the research carried out by Conover et al (1991). Motivation is a thorny issue for the participants in both the expert and the Delphi studies and both display a similar concern to that expressed by Robert E. Goodin (1995) between actions motivated by civic virtue and those motivated by self interest.

The findings from both studies show that the good citizen's behaviour reflects two strands within the theoretical literature. The first and most dominant strand encompasses the majority of the theoretical literature which conceives of the good
citizen as a rational, instrumental individual in which the behaviour of the good citizen is directed towards the good of the community which then increases the good of the individual (self-interest properly understood, *a la* de Tocqueville, 1995: 109). This line of thinking is predominantly reflected in the justification for civic-action in the civic republican tradition of de Tocqueville and more recently of Oldfield (1990), Marquand (1991), Dietz (1995), Dagger (1997, 2000, 2002). The essence of the liberal concern with public spiritedness contained in Kymlicka and Norman (1994), Macedo (1990, 2002), Galston (1991) also contains this 'instrumental' view of civic action.

The second strand reflects an alternative motivation in which the driving force behind good citizenship is less on self interest properly understood but similar to the political philosophy of Montiesquieu (1985) in which virtuous behaviour involves a clash between private interest and public good. In this formulation, it is the sense of duty and desire to do the right thing not for any self-interested reason which predominates. This tradition underlies the communitarian perspectives on good citizenship, particularly in New Labour pronouncements on civil renewal stemming from David Blunkett, in the populist discourse from Amitai Etzioni (1991, 1993, 2001) and also the feminist theoretical approaches which emphasise the relational aspect of good citizenship. In the latter case, good citizenship consists of acts motivated by feelings such as compassion for others and including the language of care.

However, this discussion draws near to a psychological analysis of people's reasoning over good citizenship and this was not the intention of the research project. Further research may need to be carried out in order to gauge more accurately the motivations behind good citizenship. However, the thought that good citizenship does not follow in traditional collective action theories and can be a spontaneous reaction offers a new perspective on what it means to be a good citizen. The spontaneous 'responsibility' or sense of duty is not always related to firmly held beliefs or a particular outlook on life (although, good citizenship is often discussed that way in the lay study) but because of a sense that one person is a. in a position to help another b. has recognised this to be the case and c. is able to act upon this recognition. This is similar to the relational approach described in an ethic of care but Tronto (1993, 1995) and others and further indicates that the theme of 'helping others' observed in Dean
with Melrose (1999) and Lister et al (2002) is a significant and undervalued aspect of good citizenship.

A concern with family is evident in the sense of the intimate interpersonal conception of good citizenship and can be seen in the ‘interpersonal’ ideal type of good citizen, particularly through the notion of caring for others. This is largely a finding contributed by the lay study and is not shared by the expert participants, one of whom memorably pointed out that one ‘may be lousy in the home’ but still be a good citizen.

However, whilst responsibility was a very significant part of good citizenship, it was not seen to be a condition of good citizenship. This is to say that good citizenship was not universally predicated upon a conception of a particular responsibility. The content of good citizenship differed according to context. The qualitative data extracted from the comments and summaries provided by the expert panellists showed that the statement on volunteering provoked an interesting qualification on behalf of the Delphi respondents. They were cautious in ascribing the relevance of good citizenship to this statement. This is interesting given its importance in the theoretical literature and in the rhetoric of recent New Labour and Conservative governments. Furthermore, volunteering was ranked joint nineteenth out of 26 statements thus indicating that it was relevant to good citizenship but only relatively poorly, it was certainly not amongst the top characteristics. This is interesting because this result distances it from the civic republican and communitarian traditions and to a certain extent from the government emphasis placed on an active citizenry through recent citizenship education in the national curriculum and civil renewal initiatives. The comments point out that volunteering may be a feature of good citizenship but only one amongst many and not necessarily the most important one. This appears to be similar to the strand of thought in liberalism which emphasises choice over conceptions of the good. Volunteering is viewed very differently from the lay perspective where it was almost seen as an indicator of good citizenship, although a person was not viewed as a bad citizen if they did not volunteer. The importance given to volunteering in the lay sessions is similar to the importance given to volunteering in recent attempts to reinterpret the relevance of civic republican virtue to fit contemporary realities. In general, the civic republican perspective on good citizenship prizes ‘giving to the common good’ and in the case of Marquand (1991) and Dagger (1997) this is often
described in the form of volunteering. These two authors stress the necessity of good citizens fulfilling their duty to the state by becoming actively involved in the society they live in. This describes and accounts for many of the examples of activity within the local community that the lay respondents discussed in relation to good citizenship.

Communitarian thinking emphasises a feeling of fraternity, of a common bond between members of a community and prizes the linkages and practices that reinforce community spirit and actions that are in the common interest. Given, that British society is often historically described as linking more closely with community, as opposed to contractual, traditions of thought (Conover et al, 1991) one might have thought that ‘good neighbourliness’ is something that would have emerged as a relevant characteristic of good citizenship. Good neighbourliness was also one of the identifying features of good citizenship expressed by Derek Heater (1990). However, the findings in both the lay study and the Delphi study do not indicate that this was one of the more important characteristics of good citizenship. In fact, this was one aspect of what might be called the ‘interpersonal’ dimension of good citizenship that both the Delphi and the lay study are in broad agreement over, in giving it relatively low priority.

Environment

In addition, the findings deliver a mixed message to the citizenship literature concerned with the environment, in its many guises from ecological citizenship, green citizenship and environmental citizenship (Barry, 2003; Dean, 2001; Dobson, 2003; van Steenburgen, 1994; Smith, 1998). In the expert study, the environment was low in the hierarchy, and issues such as recycling received comments from the panellists such as ‘this equates good citizenship with a crank’. Yet, the environment is not quite so ‘cranky’ in the lay study. The environment forms one of the most significant aspects of the language of responsibility that is discussed in both the in-depth interviews and the focus groups. The environment emerged as an important theme regardless of the demographic of the participants, their ethnicity, social status or gender or whether or not they were ‘active’.
The implications of the expert view of the environment suggests the expert view of good citizenship is more focused but narrower than the lay perspectives. The Delphi panellists consider environmental responsibility to be outside of what should be expected of a good citizen because they believe it is a theme that should be addressed with the resources and expertise of national governments and/or appropriate NGO's. The lay study is more holistic in the way in which it perceives the responsibilities of a good citizen.

**Loyalty and patriotism**

A substantial part of the traditional citizenship literature relates the good citizen to the community through feelings of nationalism and patriotism. However, these aspects of good citizenship did not reflect in the findings of either the expert or the lay studies.

The issue of loyalty to one's country of residence and good citizenship is something that was generally dismissed as a relevant characteristic of good citizenship according to the lay participants. The important consideration in this decision was the pejorative association with xenophobia and intolerance. These feelings pervade much of the discussion throughout the in-depth interviews and the focus groups. Although it is difficult to compare the two studies exactly, the qualitative data from the Delphi study indicate that a similar concern contributes to the poor showing in the ranking of the statement 'demonstrates a strong sense of loyalty to their country of residence'. The legal, juridical view of citizenship connects citizenship with nationality, however, the lack of support for patriotism indicates that nationality is not a significant aspect of good citizenship. This could relate to the findings of Conover et al (1991) in which British people had difficulties discussing what it meant to be British and also in the more recent study by Lister et al (2003), in which the participants struggled when it came to discussion of nationality and national identity (2003: 240).

The expert panellists do show a concern with the inequalities of global power relationships and extend notions of world citizenship and the desirability of cosmopolitan concerns into the characteristics of good citizenship. However, there is no agreement over how the good citizen should act upon their concerns for others beyond national boundaries and in this respect the lack of consensual opinion reflects
the various subject positions in the theoretical literature. The theoretical literature ranges support for cosmopolitan projects against support for republican forms of citizenship and the impracticality of citizenship beyond the level of the state. However, the same range of opinions is not played out in the lay studies, although they do correspond with some of the subject positions on cosmopolitanism.

**Dissident citizenship**

Traditionally, there is a tension in the theoretical literature surrounding the notions of civil disobedience. The concept of the individual taking on a critical standpoint towards the actions of the state has endured throughout the traditions of political philosophy, in particular in the works of Locke and Thoreau and most recently in Sparks (1997). Whilst, in some cases, the findings do reflect the tension between legalistic concerns in which civil disobedience is not an option (Raz, 1979), and Aristotelian and communitarian conceptions in which one should support the rule of the polity, the overwhelming perspective is that good citizens do possess a sense in which the actions of the government require monitoring. This is in agreement with the consensus of the literature including Macedo (1990), Heller (1990), and more recently, in academic writings on radical democracy and on the perceived potential of the language of citizenship to mobilise and empower marginalised and minority groups (refs).

Dana Villa is one such theorist who seeks to re-assert the dissident aspect of good citizenship. In ‘Socratic Citizenship’ (2003) Villa argues that the critical and constantly evaluative aspect of citizenship that was personified by Socrates in ancient Greece is missing from contemporary theories of citizenship. In order to be a good citizen, Villa argues, one must act as a critical observer ‘constantly asking the question ‘why’?’ of states and governments and political communities (ibid: 58).

One of the questions in the lay studies invited the participants to consider the limits of acceptable protest against the government. In considering this question and what the good citizen should do with their critical vigilance, the consensus breaks down somewhat. In the Delphi study, the second most highly ranked statement is ‘speaking out for marginalised groups’ and it emerges that the good citizen would act formally,
through petition and lobbying but also on occasion be willing to ‘break the law for a cause that they believe in’. The consensus across both studies is not as clear-cut as to whether or not the good citizen should break the law for a cause they believe in. The consensus shows a conservative element in supporting not breaking the law, although there are often extreme cases which disprove the rule, these are dependent on complex sets of circumstances. This is perhaps a remnant of the British legacy of being a ‘subject’ rather than a citizen that Conover et al (1991) identify. It certainly fits in with the ideal-type of the dutiful citizen and with the conservative image of good citizenship that emerges from Conover et al’s study. Past this point, however, the findings are in definite agreement that an individual protesting against the government ceases to be a good citizen when violence and harm to other individuals, to the environment or to other’s possessions and property is concerned.

The next part of this section will consider the degrees in which good citizenship is experienced through the notions of ‘ordinary’ and ‘extra-ordinary’ good citizenship.

**Ordinary or extraordinary**

Citizenship has an ethical dimension, in short, because there are standards built into the concept of citizenship, just as there are standards built into the concepts of mayor, teacher, plumber, and physician. (Dagger, 2002: 149)

The quote above illustrates that citizenship is often seen as a skill or ability and therefore something that is acquired. The following section concerns different degrees of good citizenship so that one form may imply a more active or more demanding commitment than another. Some of the ideal types described in the taxonomy above are more exclusionary than others, so that the more difficult the actions, the more exclusionary the ideal-type of good citizenship is. In terms of their exclusionary potential, it is possible to describe good citizenship according to two forms. Firstly, good citizenship can be seen as an inclusive label and therefore something that can be expected of the ‘ordinary’ citizen. Secondly, good citizenship can be seen as a label that describes only the most virtuous behaviour, something that is to be strived for. In relation to the theoretical literature, this dimension of good citizenship bears
reference to the ‘thin’ and ‘thick’ binary with which predominantly liberal individualist and legal forms of citizenship (thin) are compared with community-based forms of citizenship that participate in duties-discourses (thick).

The notion that there are degrees of good citizenship is present both in the comparative study of Conover et al (1991) and also of Lister et al (2003). Both of these studies distinguish between a form of good citizenship and a form of ‘extra-good’ citizenship. Initially, Conover et al reported that the participants in their study introduced their own citizenship prefixes such as extra-good to differentiate between ‘bottom-line duties’ and the individuals who ‘do a little bit more’ and who actively participate in the local community for example (1991: 814-815). The participants in the in-depth interviews and focus groups used a similar device to frame their perspectives of good citizenship (see Processes section in Chapter 5). This way of thinking about good citizenship is evident in the taxonomy and the ideal-type good citizens.

Therefore, the ordinary good citizen may represent a ‘bottom-line’ set of characteristics or a common denominator. More often than not, the characteristics such as voting, paying taxes willingly, and obeying the law were considered to be relevant to good citizenship by both expert and lay studies, although they were not considered to be among the most relevant characteristics. However, the ‘dutiful’ good citizen and the findings reported by Conover et al can be said to represent a version of good citizenship that everyone could potentially aspire to and become, providing of course the individual is eligible to vote, able to pay taxes and so on. A similar conception of the ‘dutiful’ citizen is presented by Maurice Mullard (1999) who uses the term ‘independent’ citizen to label a similar type of citizen. Mullard was attempting to outline ways in which the different meanings and definitions of citizenship could be separated into five discourses. His ‘independent’ citizen was a model of an individual who possessed no vision of the good society and who made no attempt to moralise about what the good society is. It stems from the classic market liberalism discourses in the citizenship literature and is a close analogue to the ‘dutiful’ citizen.

The ‘interpersonal’ good citizen can almost be seen as something of a common denominator in the sense that it too does not involve the effort to engage in volunteering or community activism which was connected with being extra good in
Conover et al. (1991). However, the characteristics contained in this ideal type were very strong in the lay study but overall, were not as fully endorsed as the ones in the 'dutiful' citizen. The consensus view of the Delphi study did not consider the intimate interpersonal dimension to be important and this reduced the overall importance of the interpersonal dimension.

Two other sets of findings support the view of the dutiful good citizen as a common denominator of good citizenship. The first is the 2001 Home Office Citizenship Survey: people, families and communities, which found that 'obeying and respecting the law' was the most important responsibility of good citizenship (2001: 12). In addition a MORI survey conducted for the Institute of Citizenship found that 'obeying the law' was one of the top three characteristics of good citizenship (1999).

However, as the quote that began this section indicates, in the theoretical literature good citizenship is predominantly something that is considered to be very difficult to achieve. Consider the historical background of citizenship. In antiquity, ethics was something that was practised by a few; those who had the access and opportunity to indulge in deliberation and the public realm. This concern with ethics in general also translates to the ethical view of traditional civic republican theory in which good citizenship was something that was practised by a few, thereby limiting the field of potential good citizens. This continues in modern re-articulations of civic republicanism, particularly in the re-interpretations offered by Oldfield (1990) and Marquand (1991) where good citizenship is something that has to be arduously worked for and learned. In terms of the theoretical contributions to good citizenship, civic republicanism can be seen to constitute the more demanding conception of citizenship in the sense that it requires a greater contribution from the individual towards the community. Civic republican citizenship is 'a hard school of thought' and 'citizens are called to stern and important tasks which have to do with the very sustaining of their identity' (Oldfield, 1990: 5). Therefore, the difficulties associated with public participation highlight good citizenship as an 'extra-ordinary' label. However, it is not the only tradition that conceives of good citizenship in difficult terms.

Agnes Heller's conception of citizenship contains a similarly demanding conception of good citizenship in which the main activity of good citizenship - working to remedy
injustices - requires effective lobbying, a comprehension of the issues involved and deliberating skills (see Chapter 3). This is also true of the view of good citizenship inherent in the national curriculum and in the meshing of communitarianism and neoliberalism that David Blunkett proclaimed. The view of good citizenship in schools across the country is based upon Bernard Crick’s examination of citizenship which prizes amongst other things, political literacy (1998). According to Crick’s view of good citizenship, it is something that has to be acquired and strived for. Similarly, David Blunkett’s emphasis on civil renewal and active citizenship can be seen in one sense as an extension of the Hurdian citizenship ideal, as a way of taking pressure from local services and institutions, but also as a form of communitarianism in its prizing of the values of community and associational linkages.

In the lay study, good citizens were sometimes viewed as extraordinary in the sense that there were very few people who carried out the highly demanding actions required of a good citizen. Bob Geldof and Gandhi were frequently mentioned in this respect. The Delphi study viewed good citizens as somewhere between the ordinary and extraordinary. The demands of good citizenship required that a person ‘engaged with the public’ realm and therefore assumed that the individual has the necessary skill to do so and the time and the prior inclination. Seeing the characteristics of good citizenship as a skill was also a significant feature of the lay perspectives. Good citizens were often marked out from other individuals by possessing a certain skill or ability such as ‘leadership’ and were seen to be above the norm or ‘extra ordinary’. However, these opinions were balanced by an equally significant view from the participants. Rather than seeing a public skill or ability as the defining aspect of good citizenship, many respondents felt that good citizens were distinguished by possessing a particular attitude towards other people marked by such things as consideration, respect and toleration. It was felt that these were traits that could be adopted by all members of society and rather than being above the norm, good citizens were likely to be ordinary members of the community.

According to an ‘ordinary/extra-ordinary’ distinction, people may only be good citizens in degrees, or in part, and this challenges the way in which good citizenship as an identity is understood. Seen from a legal point of view, citizenship is an automatic status, the individuals in this study are citizens, no question. However, these findings
suggest that good citizenship is rarely wholly possessed and people's experiences of citizenship contribute to the view that one may only be a good citizen at certain times of life, given the time, resources and motivation to be one. The theoretical literature recognises that citizenship is an ideal and distinguishes between different forms of experiencing citizenship. Derek Heater for example, brings this out by discussing a citizenship ladder featuring full-active, full-passive, second-class citizens, an underclass and denizens (1999: 87).

The notion that one is only a good citizen in the right environment and in the right setting pervades another theme of the findings: whether or not good citizenship is seen as something that is learned formally or informally.

Learning and good citizenship

Currently, the citizenship is being taught in schools according to a definition produced by Bernard Crick that requires students to learn a set of principles and values and to engage and participate in citizenship activities (1998, 2000). Therefore, citizenship is being studied in a formal way and pays considerable attention to political issues and political engagement. The view of good citizenship that is contained in the findings of this study suggests that some of the main features of good citizenship are not sufficiently included in the national curriculum, however, political engagement was not well ranked as a characteristic of good citizenship. In addition, the consensus opinion of the lay sessions was that good citizenship is learned from parents, passed down to them from relatives and learned in social situations. There is a clash between the way in which citizenship ideals are presented in and taught in the national curriculum and the way in which many of them are acquired in real life. The implications of this are that the aim of citizenship education, to instil good citizenship practices, is only partially being met.

There is also an aspect of the rational actor about students' engagement in citizenship education. Students may only be engaging with the local community out of an instrumental motivation in which they hope to build an impressive CV or achieve an
academic grade. Given the fluidity of good citizenship as an identity, citizenship education may not necessarily be succeeding in its aim of producing good citizens.

Summary

This study contributes a significant set of findings to the contemporary understanding of good citizenship. In recent years the notion of the good citizen has been largely ignored by the theoretical literature and also by empirical investigations. However, this study adds clarity to questions over the content of good citizenship and presents a framework for viewing the concept. In addition, it illustrates the ways in which good citizenship is currently conceived from a popular point of view which suggests that the way the public understand good citizenship is different from the consensus view of the theoretical literature.

Good citizenship contains aspects from myriad sources and reflects the dimensions of the findings of each of the significant empirical studies in Britain that contribute to an understanding of the concept. It contains liberal elements in its concern with tolerance, respect and standing up for the rights of marginalised groups. It contains communitarian and civic republican concerns with the importance of contributing to the well-being of the local community and it includes a feminist view in the value it attributes to relationships of ‘care’ and emphasis on the interpersonal ‘intimate’ dimension. It is divided on its views of the extent of responsibilities to people living beyond national boundaries, but clear that the environment is an important concern. There is tension between the views of good citizenship as an ordinary person or an extraordinary example to the community.

The way in which good citizenship has been viewed in the past is not applicable to the contemporary way in which it is understood. It is not attributable to a unique moral repertoire or theoretical tradition, and there is a progression from a thin conception of good citizenship as in Conover et al (1991) in which good citizenship is predominantly viewed conservatively, to a much thicker conception of good citizenship in which responsibilities are central. In addition, individuals do not perceive their contribution towards the community in a narrow and political view, but a broad and interpersonal
view in which good citizenship relates to all spheres of activity, from caring activities towards family and friends, to a concern with the well-being of future generations.

Conover et al (1991) reported that the British perspective of citizenship was a product of its background in community-oriented theories and tradition. In essence, this analysis is still applicable to good citizenship in a twenty-first century, New Labour Britain, although it stands alongside a strong relational and interpersonal dimension.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that the characteristics of good citizenship can be mapped onto a taxonomy grid according to the site at which they are most relevant and the nature of the characteristics. By situating each participant on this grid it was possible to see the differences between the expert and the lay studies. The expert study favoured the macro/action quadrant whereas the lay study favoured the micro/disposition and the micro/action quadrants. The discussion also built upon an analysis of the respondents in each stage of data collection which identified the participants' opinion on the primary site of good citizenship. The expert study identified most closely with the national level whereas the lay studies associated most strongly with the interpersonal and local community levels.

Continuing the analysis, four ideal types of good citizen were identified in the taxonomy which reflected the different discourses of good citizenship in the expert and the lay studies. Of these, the 'interpersonal' good citizen and the 'locally active' good citizen emerged with very strong support, whereas the 'dutiful' good citizen could be seen as something of a lowest common denominator. The characteristics of the dutiful good citizen were not always amongst the most popular characteristic but they were most regularly seen as 'relevant' by the participants.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

The study has been a learning experience in which the researches to make s
significant contribution to the literature on citizenship. In addition, significant research
skills have been acquired and enabled the researcher to look back on the study and
assess the methods used and steps taken to achieve a thorough examination of good
citizenship. The first section of this conclusion summarises the contribution that this
research has made to the literature on citizenship. This is followed by reflections upon
the research objectives and the methods used in the investigation. In the final section, suggestions are made as to future research.

Contribution to the research literature

This study makes an important contribution to the field of citizenship studies by systematically exploring the meanings of good citizenship. The field of citizenship studies is now vast and multidisciplinary yet there has not been a specific study aimed solely at uncovering what it means to be a good citizen. This research acts as a remedy to this deficiency by undertaking a theoretical analysis of the components of good citizenship, combined with the creation of a consensus view of citizenship experts and a set of lay perspectives on good citizenship.

Much of the citizenship literature in Britain acknowledges the seminal work of T.H Marshall in shaping the way in which citizenship is perceived. His tripartite categorisation of citizenship is a device which adds clarity to the complex and contested discourses surrounding citizenship. Since then, creating models and observing types in the discourses that contribute to citizenship has further added clarity to the way in which the concept is understood, both theoretically and
empirically. The taxonomy created in Chapter 6 presents a unique distillation of the complex discourses used to describe the good citizen and acts as a starting point for discussion and further investigation into what it means to be a good citizen in contemporary Britain.

Most significant amongst the findings is the importance given to relational, interpersonal characteristics of good citizenship. This offers up a challenge to recognise and incorporate more fully, the activities that have traditionally been considered to be of the private realm and therefore beyond the scope of citizenship. This also challenges us individually to be inspired by the anecdotes of good citizens and to question our behaviour and our dispositions and to aspire towards the thicker ideal-type good citizens.

Reflections on the aims and objectives and research questions

The first research aim was to analyse the concept of citizenship and associated notion of good citizenship. This aim contributed to two research objectives, the first of which was to construct a theoretical framework of good citizenship. This was achieved in the literature review of this study, contained in Chapters 2 and 3. The second objective was to identify dimensions of good citizenship. Whilst the concept is largely ignored in the citizenship literature it is possible to pick out starting points of a framework of good citizenship which are broadly connected with the main theoretical traditions on citizenship, liberalism, civic republicanism and communitarianism. In these cases, good citizenship is related to conceptions of virtue and responsibility and emerges most clearly when theorists opine upon the necessary conditions for the flourishing and health of a liberal democratic society. However, these traditions do not make up a complete picture of good citizenship. Feminist theory contributes to a rounder understanding of good citizenship through their emphasis on a relational approach to others leading to an ethic of care.

In addition, good citizenship has not previously been the explicit subject of empirical research in Britain although there have been studies in recent years that contribute to an understanding of what it means to be a good citizen. Given the complex nature of
the notion of good citizenship and the lack of theoretical and empirical literature, this study aimed to present a perspective on good citizenship from both an expert and a lay perspective to fulfil my second research aim.

The second research aim was to explore expert and lay perspectives on good citizenship. This was associated with the third and fourth research objectives which were also successfully achieved. The third research objective was to identity conceptions of good citizenship from a panel of citizenship experts. This was achieved through the use of a questionnaire survey based upon the Delphi technique. The expert panellists in the modified Delphi study expressed a view of good citizenship that most strongly emphasised the 'interpersonal universal' dimension, including such characteristics as 'shows respect for others'. In contrast, characteristics associated with the private realm were not generally deemed to be relevant to good citizenship, although there was a clear gender divide.

The fourth objective was to identify lay perceptions of good citizenship and this was achieved through a series of in-depth interviews and focus groups. The perceptions of the lay participants were dominated by the interpersonal aspect of good citizenship which has two forms, universal and intimate. This was also a highly significant feature of the findings. The interpersonal dimension has been undervalued as aspects of good citizenship in the theoretical literature except in the feminist citizenship literature and in the notion of post-cosmopolitan' citizenship introduced by Andrew Dobson.

On top of this, the language of responsibility was frequently used to describe good citizenship in connection with the local community, the environment and to future generations. This is consistent with the theoretical literature in which good citizenship has mainly featured in theoretical traditions that are engaged in duties discourses. However, the diverse range of types of responsibility further suggests that a conception of citizenship responsibilities that centres on the political is narrow and does not reflect popular perspectives. Traditionally, the environment for example, has not been seen as the subject of responsibility, yet the lay participants were frequently of the mind that the good citizen has a firm environmental responsibility.
Good citizenship was also conceived as a skill or ability and this contributed to the impression that good citizenship can be an exclusive label. Good citizenship could be viewed as having the skills necessary to engage in politics although 'leadership' and 'awareness' were also discussed as skills that define the good citizen. These characteristics were as likely to have a bearing upon a good citizen's contribution to the local community or to helping others as it did to political activities. This reflected the way in which good citizenship is discussed in the theoretical literature, particularly from the civic republican perspective in which citizenship virtues must be strived towards.

The fifth research objective was achieved by comparing the ideal types of good citizenship with the theoretical literature and an original way of conceptualising good citizenship was produced based upon two themes, which divided each characteristic of good citizenship. Perceptions of good citizenship in the findings were diverse and expressed in terms that are not adequately recognised by the traditional theoretical literature. It was possible to map the characteristics of good citizenship onto a taxonomy grid which showed four ideal-type good citizens according to the primary level at which good citizenship occurred and the nature of good citizenship behaviour. The characteristics could be placed on a taxonomy grid showing ideal types of good citizenship according to whether they were primarily a characteristic of the micro or the macro realm and according to whether they were actions or dispositions. These ideal types condensed the different versions of good citizenship in the findings and they are presented here as the first systematic taxonomy of good citizenship in Britain.

Reflections on methods

In the act of reflecting back on the processes and procedures of this research it is important to identify key lessons that can be learned to inform the course of future research. This process provides the opportunity to highlight key features in the research and to reflect on how they could have been improved or enhanced.

The methodology used in this study was influenced by grounded theory which generates theory from the data through a series of in-depth rounds of investigation.
However, my study did not follow a strict grounded theory methodology, particularly in the fact that multiple rounds of enquiry with the subjects were not undertaken. Given the fact that the lay studies were characterised by a certain amount of discrepancy and contradiction and that it was often difficult to extract clear themes, the accusation may be levelled that further rounds of enquiry might have lead to richer data. However, more rounds of enquiry would not necessarily have contributed to clearer findings and fewer contradictions. The complex nature of the subject under investigation together with the fact that citizenship was not well understood at a popular level at the time of the data collection, combined to produce the particular responses from the lay study. Further rounds of enquiry might have revealed even more discrepancies as respondents tried to unravel their thoughts and perspectives and articulate their individual views. It is likely that such a process would add further layers of complexity and even more contradictions would emerge. Further interviews, even with perceptive questioning, may have led the respondents to articulating the views of others rather than their own immediate understandings.

The lay study was relatively small in its scope, less than 100 people contributed to the findings, and no clear conclusions emerged associated with the predefined categories of ‘male and female’, ‘active and inactive’, and according to disability, ethnicity or social exclusion beyond certain general conclusions. The female participants and the socially excluded referred to the interpersonal dimension more than the other groups did. In addition, there was a connection between the types of activity that was associated with good citizenship and the way in which the participants in the in-depth interviews were ‘actively involved’ in the local community. It remains to be seen if demographic differences would have emerged more clearly if the size of the sample were to be increased. However, a larger quantitative sample might have made it easier to see patterns across different groups of participants but wouldn’t have unearthed the lay understandings in the same way.

There was a tendency amongst some of the lay participants to openly conflate the good citizen with the good person and there was a suspicion that the lay participants may sometimes have been confused between the two terms. This leads to the concern that the two concepts were not adequately defined at the outset of the interviews so that some people saw little difference in the two concepts. The
difference between the two concepts was clearly stated and it was impressed upon the participants that this research was concerned with good citizenship, although more attention could have been paid to devices that impose clear boundaries between 'good person' and 'good citizen'. However, the problem in this approach is that the more specific the delineation, the more heavily the interviewer or moderator leads the participants.

Part of the design of the methodology highlighted low socio-economic groups. However, there was a feeling amongst many of these participants that the subject was complex, out of their conceptual reach and difficult to put into words and express in a formal setting. Despite some of these participants obtaining formal qualification of GCSE standard or above it did not provide a good basis for their engagement in the process of articulating their views and perspectives on good citizenship. There is a need to explore techniques to overcome this obstacle and obtain a more complete understanding of their perspectives. There is richness about the lay perspective that has not yet been adequately researched, in-depth and with a wide spectrum.

Suggestions for future research

In the course of this research a number of possibilities for future investigation were considered. Throughout the expert study and especially the lay studies, the researcher was left pondering the motivation behind characteristics of good citizenship. An ideal of citizenship is currently taught across the key-stage levels in the national curriculum based upon participating and 'doing' in addition to teaching particular values and principles. However, this study showed that good citizenship is often viewed in ways that are not significant features of the national curriculum.

Furthermore, the respondents in the lay studies frequently expressed the opinion that good citizenship was learned in informal settings from parents and families. Future research may build upon the suggestions of these findings and address issues surrounding the motivation behind good citizenship behaviour and whether the national curriculum is succeeding in inculcating habitual characteristics of good citizenship. The ideal types of good citizen contained in this study may provide a
starting point against which adults who have experienced citizenship in the national curriculum can be compared with those who have not had any citizenship education.

The study undertaken by Conover et al (1991) is a landmark in recent empirical literature on citizenship. Future research may adapt the research methods used in this study and investigate a comparative study of good citizenship. The European Union is site of much research into citizenship already although not into the notion of good citizenship and given that good citizenship is a product of both time and place, researchers may thereby explore how conceptions vary across members of the European Union. The modified Delphi study used here is one way in which such a project might proceed or with sufficient resources a research team might complete a series of focus groups in various countries in the European Union.
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Appendices
Appendix 1

A copy of the Delphi questionnaire.
Dear Delphi Study,

Please find attached the questionnaire relating to the above study in which you so kindly agreed to participate.

The document requires participants to express their agreement/disagreement with the statements and to add comments should they wish. Completion of the comments section would be particularly useful to the study and would be much appreciated.

Please return the completed questionnaire by email or post to:

Matthew Almond
Room U.1.26
Dept of Social Sciences
Brockington Building
Loughborough University
Leicestershire
LE11 3TU

matthew_almond@hotmail.com

Should you wish to receive further information on the results of this survey I would be very happy to send you additional information and concluding results.

Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Almond
The good citizen...

Delphi Study

Please complete this form by placing a 'x' in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares for elderly or infirm relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is actively involved in the local community, e.g. by campaigning for a road crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an active member of a political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges the law when they think it is wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Considers the needs of others**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**Comment:**

---

7. **Fulfils their responsibility to hold/find a job**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**Comment:**

---

8. **Speaks out on behalf of minority/stigmatised groups**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**Comment:**

---

9. **Obeys the law**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**Comment:**

---

10. **Uses environmentally friendly products**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**Comment:**

---

11. **Knows their responsibilities as a citizen**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**Comment:**
The good citizen...

12. **Cares for elderly or infirm friends**
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   Comment:

13. **Works hard at their job**
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   Comment:

14. **Gives time as a volunteer**
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   Comment:

15. **Knows their rights as a citizen**
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   Comment:

16. **Demonstrates a strong sense of loyalty to their country of residence**
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   Comment:

17. **Pays their taxes willingly**
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   Comment:
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Recycles used products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Gives money to charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Feels a responsibility to help others living beyond national boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Shows respect for others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Keeps abreast with/is aware of social issues and political topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Helps to reduce/ prevent crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td><strong>Is a good parent</strong></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td><strong>Votes in elections</strong></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td><strong>Is prepared to break the law for a cause in which they believe, e.g. burning GM crops</strong></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Interview schedule for the lay study and Guide
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Part 1:

Introduce the session, give details of my study, putting interviewee at ease, guaranteeing confidentiality, ensuring consent for recording and mentioning questionnaire at end of study and feedback on the questions.

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to participate today. My name is Matthew Almond and I am studying for a PhD at Loughborough University. The work that I am doing involves examining how and what people think about the ‘good citizen’.

Some of the questions might seem a little odd or difficult to answer, the reason being that questions that are appropriate for one person are not always appropriate for another. Since there are no right or wrong answers there is no need to worry about these and I am most interested in hearing your opinions and personal experiences. Please feel perfectly free to interrupt or to ask for clarification at any time during the interview. I would like to make a record of this interview so I can be sure not to miss anything. May I have your permission to tape our discussion? At the end of the interview there will be a very short questionnaire and any of the questions in this interview seem to be a little unclear, awkward or anything like that then please say so. Your feedback would be very welcome and much appreciated.

Part 2:

Icebreaker questions, perhaps eliciting some information that might prove to be useful when addressing later topics. The question on community spirit is optional, depending on whether or not it is mentioned in the first question.

I’d like to begin today’s session by asking you to describe the area you live in.

[optional:]

Would you say there is a community spirit in your neighbourhood?

Part 3
[Open-ended questions, inviting the interviewee to talk about the 'good citizen' and the 'bad citizen'.]

When it comes to the good citizen there is such a wide scope of meanings. However, thinking of the good citizen is different from thinking about the good person. Where a good person might be thought of as kind or generous, the good citizen relates to something different and has wider implications for society. So, with this in mind...

Is there anyone you can think of who you would consider to be a good citizen?

What makes them a good citizen? Is it the person they are or what they do that makes them a good citizen?

[depending on the answer above, the next question explores the local/national]

Is there anyone you actually know who you would consider to be a 'good citizen'?

Can you think of anyone at a national or international level who you think of as a 'good citizen'?

Let's look at this from the other way around: what do you think makes a bad citizen?

Optional [depending on previous answers]

[incorporating part of their last answer into this question...]

If someone is the opposite, does this make them a good citizen?

Part 4

This marks the beginning of the section of the interview that addresses specific topics. The Preamble is aimed at setting the scene and explaining the format to the interviewee.

During my study I have read lots of authors on citizenship and now I'm very keen on discovering how people who don't write books, people in everyday life, think about citizenship. So can I raise with you topics these authors have written about?
Part 5

The order of this section progresses from the interpersonal through volunteering, paid work, breaking the law, protest, cosmopolitan and then environmental questions.

Topic: 'interpersonal', including good neighbour, good parent, care.

We have talked about the area that you live in, some authors say that good citizenship starts in the local community, what do you think?

[Invite the interviewee to elaborate on their answer: ]

If yes:

In what ways do you think good citizenship starts in the local community?

If no:

Could you say a bit more about your reasons for saying that?

Do you think someone who is a good neighbour is a good citizen?

We have a particular relationship with the people in our local community, but what about strangers?

I’d like you to consider a situation where a homeless person who is in a bad way and having difficulty standing up asks a passer to help him (to stand up). It might be that he is very drunk or he might just be in bad physical shape, it’s not clear. How would the good citizen respond?

Can we take another hypothetical situation? Let’s say that an Asian shopkeeper was being harassed by another member of the community. How would the good citizen respond?

Ok, let’s move onto some different topics now...

[to get at work, volunteering]

The government goes on about the responsibility to work, do you think the good citizen takes seriously their responsibility to work.
there are different types of work other than just paid work, such as volunteering. This is another thing that the government connects with good citizenship. Do you think volunteering is a mark of the good citizen?

[If yes:]

If you don’t volunteer are you not a good citizen?

And what about people with children, for example: lone mothers? Some people say that to be a good citizen they have to go out and work. Other people say that they should stay at home and look after their kids. What do you think?

[breaking the law, protest, cosmopolitan and environmental questions]

I think we’ve covered that area well, let’s move away from that now and look at a new area What about breaking the law...

Are there some situations where the good citizen could deliberately break the law?

[then use GM crops as an example]

if the answer to the question above was ‘No’:

Would breaking the law make someone a bad citizen?

You might remember that protestors in Genoa hit the headlines in July with the way they reacted to the world summit meeting. Do you think there were good citizens involved there? Is protesting against the government something a good citizen would do?

If Yes:

When does a protestor cease to be a good citizen? Probe on damage to property and violence to the person.

Genoa was convened to discuss problems affecting the whole world. Would you agree that the good citizen is someone who is concerned with world problems,
such as global poverty, or should we worry about people in our own country first?

A big global issue these days is the environment and some people link good citizenship with the environment. What do you think?

Eg of using environmental products

[to get at patriotism]

Global poverty and the environment are issues that affect the whole world and I’d like to change tack slightly now and concentrate for a little on our country. Let’s talk about British citizenship...

What does it mean to you to be a British citizen?

Does a ‘good British citizen’ feel loyalty to Britain?

Can we talk about voting now? Earlier this year there was much talk about the low number of people who voted in the General Election and some people would say that the good citizen is someone who uses their vote. What do you think about that?

[constraints:]

We’ve talked about things people can do or be that make them good citizens. [perhaps give some examples from the interviewee’s responses at this point]

Can we talk about things that get in the way of being a good citizen?

What do you think might get in the way or make it difficult to be a good citizen eg it could be something to do with a person’s situation or who they are?

Part 6

[using a sheet containing each of the topic areas that have been covered:]

During our conversation this afternoon, you’ve said that being a good citizen is about

(insert examples)

X
Given that it can be difficult sometimes to be a good citizen, do you think that any of these things can be seen as a condition of being a good citizen? In other words, do you think that unless you do 'x' you can't be a good citizen? Or do you think that while these things are relevant to being a good citizen even though they don't meet that particular condition?

[encouragements to interviewee to comment on each item mentioned in the list above, 'x'-z]

Part 7

Bringing the study to a close, asking the interviewee to sum up and give their opinion on what the good citizen is.

At this point of the interview I'd like us to imagine the good citizen and think what makes up the good citizen. Perhaps you could complete this sentence:

The good citizen is someone who...

This brings us to the end of the interview section and we've only the questionnaire to go. But before we conclude I'd like to give you the opportunity to reflect on any of the topics that we have discussed today. Is there anything that you would like to add, do you feel that any of your opinions have altered at all? I think our discussion has been productive and I'd like to thank you for your effort.
List to be used in conjunction with Part 6 of the Interview schedule

Local community

Good neighbour

Help to strangers

Paid work

Work

Volunteering

Looking after children

Breaking the law for a cause

Protest

World problems

Environment

Loyal to Britain

Voting
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Demographic information and questionnaire from the lay sessions.
Questionnaire:

(Please circle the relevant option)

Age: 20 or below, 20-39, 30-39, 41-50, 51-60, 61+

Marital status:

Single  Married  Separated  Divorced  Widowed

Children  Grown-up children  No children

Employment status:

Full time employment  Part time employment  Retired  Unemployed  Student  Looking after children/carer

Other: (Please specify)

My current occupation is .................................................................................................................................

My previous occupation was ..............................................................................................................................
How do the following statements relate to the notion of the 'good citizen'?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not relevant to being a 'good citizen'</th>
<th>Relevant but not a condition of being a 'good citizen'</th>
<th>A condition of being a good citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cares for elderly or infirm relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an active member of a political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives money to charity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares for elderly or infirm friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers the needs of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows respect for others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycles used products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pays their taxes willingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps abreast with/is aware of social issues and political topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows their rights as a citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows their responsibilities as a citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obeys the law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

List of contributors in the Delphi and lay studies.
List of contributors

Contributors to the Delphi study wished to remain anonymous:

The final sample contained 14 leading experts on citizenship from the UK.

List of contributors to the in-depth interviews

Active participants

1. Joan Smith
2. Peter Gilbert
3. Damian Jones
4. Chris Smith
5. Zoe Welsh
6. Lewis Gordon
7. John Brown
8. Jo Wright
9. Ann Coxe
10. Arthur Lean
11. Chris Overton
12. David Crosby
13. Anna Jefferson
14. David O’Neil
15. Becky Streets
16. Lawrence York
In-active participants

1. Chris Goude
2. Derek Jamison
3. Gary Norman
4. Simon Slepham
5. Stephen Gorman
6. Stefan Artist
7. Gavin Grimes
8. Peter France
9. Sandra Clarke
10. Elia Jenkins
11. Lara Flitt
12. Sarah Yale
13. Chrissy Misson
14. Victoria Norris
15. Fiona Short
16. Charlotte James
17. r

List of contributors to the focus groups

South Asian focus groups

1. Deepak Patel
2. Attish Kalam
3. Vikram Bharwani
4. Nita Nandwani
5. Tarluchan Vaswani
6. Reka Kirpalani
7. Raki Chatlani
8. Pareen Daswani
9. Hitesh Mohnani
10. Danesh Balani
11. Serena Tarachandani.

Social class/education

1. Kevin Wilson
2. John Frazer
3. Elliot Grahame
4. Frank Dourne
5. Charles Francis
6. Chris Smith
7. Sarah Essen
8. Claire Johns
9. Hannah Brown
10. Fiona Bellion
11. Rebecca Noon

Disability

1. Ian Bates,
2. John Thames
3. Frank Bell
4. George Fiddler
5. Gavin Ball
6. Allison Dowd
7. Elizabeth Knox
8. Catherine Eels
9. Lizzie Sampson
10. Caroline Heart
11. Sharon Goodman

Older Age

1. Phyllis Whittake

241
2. Eleanor Pike
3. Mary Lewis
4. Carmen Smith
5. Fran Jones
6. Lisa Fletcher
7. Elaine Taylor
8. Alfie North
9. Harold Crossham
10. Ephraim Davis
11. George Heston
12. Owen Best
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Transcript materials from the data collection.
Interview

In this document the prefix 'M' indicates that interviewer Matthew Almond is speaking. The view of the participant are prefixed by 'P'.

In-depth interview:

M I'd like to start today by asking you a simple question and asking you to describe the area that you live in.

P: The area that I live in?

M yeah

P Ok, erm, the, erm, I live in the, Nanpantan, the Outwoods area of Loughborough. Which is out towards the forest side of town, close to valley road and nanpantan road leading up to the forest part of the town. It's a fairly, I suppose, affluent part of the town. It's within easy walking distance of the town centre. Erm, that's probably it.

M would you say there is a community spirit in the area you live in?

P not particularly, I wouldn't have said so. I think in terms of neighbours, certainly take an interest in what other neighbours are doing and will help out and provide support. And by that I mean that by that I mean that probably, the people living either side of you, or perhaps one or two houses either side of you or opposite you, but beyond that, you don't tend to know other people living perhaps near you in your street. Erm, it hasn't got any community services as such; there's no community hall, there are a couple of pubs, but no other meeting places because they tend to be in the town centre or in adjacent areas. So, there's that mucking in helping out sort of approach from immediate people but a more general community spirit, I think, is more difficult to define.

M Thinking of the good citizen, there are lots of possible interpretations, lots of meanings although thinking of the good citizen is different from thinking about the good person. And whereas the good person might be thought of being kind or generous, thinking of the good citizen tends to have wider implications for society and with that in mind, can you think of anyone you would consider to be a good citizen?

P well yes, several people I suppose. Particularly working for the council, then I think councillors you have to regard, as people who, in very broad terms are good citizens. I mean you get good and bad people in all walks of life and you get some councillors who are obviously better than others. But generally speaking, by virtue of the fact that they are being councillors and are being active in their community, not on a paid per hour basis, I think does indicate that they have a feeling of public service and recognise that there is a need to contribute to society on some sort of voluntary basis.

M Do you think these councillors, who you consider to be good citizens, is it the person they are or the things they do that makes you think of them as good citizens?

P well, I think it's probably a combination of the two things, I think that some of it is about their personal qualities and about the values I suppose that they appear to adopt when they are carrying out their roles and those that I
regard as good citizens don't just apply those values to their councillor role but perhaps apply it perhaps in other areas of their lives as well. So, certainly, that's the thing about values and standards that mark out those councillors I think of as good citizens beyond just the fact that they are councillors. So there are some people that I would not think of as such good citizens because they don't have the same values or standards.

M what might those values and standards be? Do any come to mind?
P Well, I think they are things about integrity, there are things about not looking beyond the self and regarding what the broader issues are in society. They are not party political issues they are issues about how people feel about society and how we find that should behave and that will operate and I think they will recognise that society will operate effectively if it's got the support of the broader community. I think they see the need to contribute to that. And also to take the values of integrity, equality... leadership, I think as well. [need to double check the wording has been recorded verbatim here]

M What do you understand by leadership?
P I think that, probably, its something old fashioned. I think it's leading by example...say. I think it's being prepared to make hard decisions, erm. Those hard decisions are taken on the basis of what's of the benefit to the broader community, not to particular groups or individuals of that community. And that can create some very hard situations for councillors to deal with and I think that is often not recognised probably, not reflected probably, certainly by the public and the media I don't think recognise it either and I suppose it applies to national politicians in the same way. Clearly some people are in for what they can get out of it, but there are a number of other people involved in public service in a non-paid capacity, or even a paid capacity, who are, who recognise that there is a public service ethos that they can contribute towards.

M a point that you made earlier was that these councillors who are good citizens it's a combination of who they are and the things they do. What type of things do they do?
P well, I think, that one is going back to the discussion of making hard decisions, being prepared to stand up. They are prepared to stand up in the community and take the flak, and take the plaudits, for actions that they voted for. I think that that is something to be admired. A lot of people don't feel these things are a concern of them these days. And that is reflected by the difficulties with political parties and recruiting people to support the party yet alone stand for office. So it's being prepared to stand for the actions they've supported. I think it's also being prepared to listen to the people they represent and take a view on what they feel is the best cause of action for the general populous.

M can you think of anyone who you would consider to be a good citizen on a national level?
P I suppose there are a number of people who I would, erm, name people, it's a bit tricky isn't it? I suppose it's people I would feel go beyond, go beyond what might be expected of them in a paid position if they are being paid to do something...prepared to do something beyond the norm. so I suppose that (it's a trick one isn't it) medium pause...with national people you tend to get a rather one dimensional view of them, or a two dimensional view, which is the matter of the media [check this part of the tape, it is not
clear what is being said] erm, medium pause, I don't know. I think there are people. I suppose there are people like Tony Benn, with a national profile, wouldn't necessary agree with his political stance on things. But the fact that he is prepared to stand up on a lot of issues, and be laughed at possibly, but yet he has been prepared to put a point of view across. So I think that sort of figure I think, is someone I would regard, has got some of the elements of the good citizen in it. I think that those people who are perhaps in the media, the sort of theatrical, cinema type world that perhaps got involved in things that, in causes or activities that are going beyond their immediate professional area and being prepared to spend time on activities in those areas. And I suppose there are always those religious, sort of things as well who... are... standing up for particular values, attitudes that come from their particular faiths. Yeah, so...

M No that's very good. Ok, looking at it from another way around. What do you think makes a bad citizen

P I think someone who takes a very individualist view of life. Erm And by that I eman someone who appears to be selfish and self centred. I don't mean people are, I think there is clearly a lot of individualism in society and you wouldn't want to stop that but I think that you can be an individual and have a very indivual approach to life and still be a good citizen. On the other hand there are those people who take a very narrow view of life, this sort of 'what in it for me, I'm not interested in anything anyone else does!' that very sort of narrow view who are not interested in adding anything back to the broader good but are just very focussed on themselves, maybe their immediate family and that's it. So, it think that starts to mark out people who would not be good citizens.

M blurb
If it's ok with you...
Well starting off talking about the local area, some people would say that good citizenship starts with the local area. What do you think?

P well, it can do...but it's not exclusive. There are layers of good citizenship really and there are some people who you would consider as good citizens who operate on a national level erm, who don't perhaps, because they don't have the time or whatever, don't contribute anything to the locality, their role is different, by the nature of their socialstanding or whatever. Other people are very focussed on the locality, the connect very well with local people and are perhaps recognised by local people as spokespersons for erm, movers or shakers or whatever, in the a very localised area. They are prepared to put time in to get things done in the locality. They might not have the connections to get things done on wider level. So I think the people who work and maybe seen as good citizens on their street but not in a wider neighbourhood, and so on and so forth. Different people operate at different levels, I think you have to look at it as a network of connections.

M do you see this network of connections, of this layering, is it? Have I understood it correctly to sat that it is about different sites of citizenship or is it about a hierarchy?

P No. I wasn't particularly thinking of it as a hierarchy. I think people who are good citizens in their community are just as valuable, sometimes maybe more valuable as those people who are good citizens on a broader basis. It's
not a hierarchy of goodness of about good citizenship, it’s about people’s effectiveness and where people feel comfortable operating. And it’s about the values they apply in carrying out that role, in the network, in the area, that they are working. It’s not a hierarchy. I think people can work in different areas in this network in different stages of their life or different stages in their careers or whatever. You might move into a regional good citizen at one stage but for whatever reason that might change, they might change, they might then move to a national, they might move down to a much more local level. I think it’s more fluid than that.

M do you think a good neighbour is someone who is a good citizen?
P not necessarily no, because they...its goes back to this narrow view I suppose. A good neighbour might feel they can help out their immediate neighbour in doing something but wouldn’t want to get involved in something like an activity in the street, they might not want to get involved in a neighbourhood watch scheme, they may not be interested in getting involved in that at all, they might be prepared to help their immediate neighbour so I think there is a difference there.

M how does the good citizen act towards strangers?
P I don’t know that you can be, I don’t know that you can generalise on that, but I suppose I will do (laughs). I think the that if a good citizen was approached by someone they didn’t know who appeared to need some help that they would feel they ought to provide some assistance, they might be signposting that person to help they need. They might not want to get very involved in the immediate problem but would perhaps want to help that person find a solution through, as I say, signposting them to where they might get the help they need. And it depends where it happens I think as well. If it’s , this kind of layering of activities where you meet this stranger and the circumstances you meet them in. if it’s someone moving into a new area. I would thought a good citizen would be someone who is prepared to approach that stranger and tries to involve them in some way in what is going on in the locality. And similarly, if it’s someone who is working at a national level then again they approached someone they didn’t know they would try to involve them again, nationally.

M can we take a hypothetical situation? If you imagine there is an asian shopkeeper that is being harassed by another member of the community, how do you think a good citizen would respond in that situation?
P well, ideally, I think that they would, if in the shop while this was happening, they would say something to the person who was acting inappropriately and support the shopkeeper. Erm, that is more difficult I think in practice, I think that is quite a difficult thing in practice. That would be the ideal. I think in some instance the peer pressure would be difficult to resist, it might be something that even though the person might be a good citizen in other respects, they’d be seen as that by the community if there’s some racism in that community that is seen as the norm then a good citizen might find it very difficult to resist that. So they might still be seen as a good citizen by the rest of the community but they wouldn’t perhaps be, from an external view, be fulfilling the ideal of the good citizen [check this bit because it is very hard to tell what is being said]. So I think it’s very complex. I would hope that I would be able to step in in that sort of, to say something in that situation to try
and support the shopkeeper but I think it is very easy to walk away from that situation.
M yeah, moving on to a different topic, they area that we've covered so far has been superb. I'd like to ask you what you think about something that the government connects with good citizenship and this is the responsibility to work. Do you think the good citizen takes seriously the responsibility to work?
P I think it depends on what you regard as work... I think that it's not... I think they take seriously contributing to society in a broad way and that is contributing in a way that they feel they can best do that. Some people feel they can do that through paid work, other people can perhaps contribute through volunteering or erm, informal activity in their community and be a good citizen in that way. It doesn't have to be paid work.
M what type of things are 'informal activity'?
P it may be erm, well I suppose, things like being involved in a neighbourhood... neighbourhood watch, I regard that as being an informal activity. It might be something like perhaps running a social, or being part of some sort of social group that meets in the area, that doesn't have any particular constitution but it meets to play pool, or to do something with senior citizens, it might be driving a community bus on a volunteer basis. It might be driving people to hospital, or those sort of activities. It might be being involved I suppose in a political party as an on the ground worker, erm being involved in a community association. It might be just looking at the problems in the area and reporting those through to the council or to some other organisation.
M you've mentioned volunteering, is that a mark of the good citizen?
P it, erm, yeah, it can be, it can be. It's not the only thing but it does show a willingness to do something, where there isn't a paid reward or maybe some other sort of reward that he person finds beneficial [again check precise wording here]. erm, but yes, it think it does, but it's not essential. You don't have to volunteer to be a good citizen but it's a route by which people can be a good citizen.
M what about people with children, say lone mothers for an example. Some people would say for them to be good citizens they would have to go out and work, other people would say they would have to stay at home to look after their children to be good citizens. What do you think about this?
P that's very difficult and I think that has, to some extent, there's an element of individual choice there and you can't take a hard and fast view about that. Some people feel they are not contributing to society because they don't go out and work but they might not be a good citizen by doing that, they might just go and work but might have a very selfish view a non, not have a broader view of what they are contributing to everyone else. Other people might decide they are not going to work, they are going to look after their children, they might also then, have a very narrow view, they might just focus on their children and not do anything else. Yet again, there could be people in both groups who, work or stay at home but also stay at home but also contribute in some way to the broader society. So I think it is very easy to pigeon hole people, and say you're not a good citizen because you don't go out and work in a recognised way, but that person still might be contributing and be a good citizen. they might still be contributing, be a good citizen, in a variety of ways that is not immediately apparent to other people.
M: what about breaking the law, do you think a good citizen could deliberately break the law?
P: yeah, I think they can. I think it has to be in quite, in an extreme situation, but I can see that looking back over histories of protest where people feel that the conquered is not being served by a particular activity of the government or an agency of the government or another organisation. And, the only way of dealing with that is some form of direct action and that may lead to the law being broken. Erm, I wouldn't condone any violent activities but sit down protests in the street can lead to a criminal conviction and so the person could be breaking the law in that way. They may be seen as not being good citizen but with hindsight then they are then seen as contributors to what might be seen as the broader well being, the view about the way society should develop and they are prepared to stand up and put that view. Even though that has been contrary to, erm, at that time, the pervading view of the particular issue.

M: What about people who burn GM crops, are they acting as good citizens? There are some people who would say they are and there are some people who would take a different view and say that they're not. Where do you fit in on this?
P: pause, sigh. On GM crops... medium pause. I don't... long pause. I think people have a right to protest about their concerns about issues such as GM crops. Whether, I think that destroying the crops that are seen as havin an adverse environmental affect, I would probably not, I think that would be going beyond the good citizenship role. But I must admit that I find that a very fine line, I find that quite difficult to make a judgement between those, because er, you know, I support their right to have a protest. Destroying crops is a very high profile way of signalling their protest and it doesn't immeditately cause suffering to another human being so I'd say it's on the margins of acceptability I think. Although I think it's very difficult...

M: do you remember in july at the world summit meeting in genoa, there were a lot of protestors , protesting there. Do you think there were good citizens involved in the protests?
P: I think, there was probably a mixture of good citizens and people who had taken their view of citizenship too far, that they'd erm, yeah, I think peaceful protest is fine but when it goes beyond that to violent protest then I think that that starts to, the thinking there is starting to unravel abit.

M: genoa was one example of countries and governments coming together to discuss problems that affect the whole world. Some people would say that the good citizen was someone who was concerned with problems affecting the globe, such as global poverty. Other people would say that the good citizen think about their own contry first,

Interruption, changing over of tape:

M: some people would say that being a good citizen is being concerned with problems that affect the whole world, such as global poverty. Other people would say that being a good citizen is about thinking about the problems in your own country first of all. What do you think about that?
P: I don't think that they are mutually exclusive, I think that... I think you can be a good citizen if you're primary interest is your own country but that
you can still maybe be a good citizen if you have a broader view of the world as well and I don't see that's a... that one rules out the other.

M how is they linked? How is the good citizen concerned with their own country and the good citizen concerned with world problems, er, is there a link there? How can they be good citizens at the same time? What are the common features there, if there are any?

P well, probably the values that people are applying to the different global and national issues in the way they address those, so, they're looking at different levels but they are applying similar sorts of values to the issues in those areas.

M and are they the same sort of values that you mentioned towards the beginning of our interview?

P yeah, they would be around equality and fairness and those sorts of things.

M are these, are the showbiz people and the media people and the religious people and also the people like tony benn that you mentioned at the beginning. Are these people linked in the same way through certain values that they share or is there something else which marks them out as good citizens despite the fact that they are good citizens at different levels?

Pause

Is it that they are sharing similar features or characteristics or are they perhaps, united by the fact that...by some of the things they do, some of the actions that they take?

P I think it's probably a combination of the two, I think it's, you know, they don't, although they share the same values, that doesn't end up with them sharing the same view on a particular issue. They come at it from their own angle, based on their own experiences and their own knowledge and all those sorts of things that certainly come into it. I think it's about applying those values to the situation and making the most of that and that determines the sort of action they feel they can take. And that's probably about being prepared to take a particular stance on a particular issue, publicly, erm. That may be the common characteristics that applies to those people nationally but also to those who are good citizen locally as well.

M something that has been mentioned previously, is something that is very frequently linked with being a good citizen and this is thinking of the environment, perhaps being ecologically aware. Is that a connection you would make with being a good citizen, do you think they are ecologically aware, or perhaps not?

P erm, yeah I think they will have an awareness of environmental issues but they may not regard that as being the key concern of that they are interested in because it depends on where they're operating and who they're operating with. So for instance, environmental awareness in a broad sense is, tends to be less of a concern to people who are less well off. So, if you're a good citizen and you are generally dealing with people who are less well off they've got much more immediate concerns, you know: their standard of living, whether or not they are in work, problems with benefits, those sort of issues. And the environment is maybe not such an immediate concern, so they might have an awareness of it but it's not at the forefront of their thinking. Other people may be seeing the environment as a much more holistic issue
and see lots of connections with lots of things in the world. Erm, and they can read the environmental impact and the sustainability impact into lots of issues and will be able to convey that in the work they do or in the view they bring to a particular issue. So, it's people coming, I think the environmental element will have different weight depending on the issues and the individuals dealing with these issues. So I think it's quite complex, citizenship itself is very complex, erm, and it's not sort of black and white on that and some people have a different view on how the environment impacts on a particular issue. Obviously, the genoa incident is one view of that. [check this part because it is hard to tell what is being said in the last sentence]

M  erm, changing tack slightly and moving away from things that affect the whole world to things that affect Britain more now. Do you think that someone who is a good citizen is someone who shows a strong sense of loyalty to their country of residence?

P  erm, yeah. Loyalty from...

M  well, perhaps I can give you an example: perhaps if you were in a foreign country and someone made disparaging remarks about Britain, would you stand up for Britain, would a good citizen stand up for Britain, how would a good citizen respond in that situation?

P  umm, it's like all my answers, I say: 'well not necessarily'!! (laughs) because the good citizen might recognise that actually Britain isn't the be all and end of all of a good society. A good citizen may feel that there are inequalities that Britain itself might need to deal with and might not deal with them as well as other countries. That would depend on the individual, whether... I suppose if you were a good citizen and you were very focused on the national profile of Britain then you might be more inclined to take a defensive approach to erm, adverse comments about your country if you were somewhere else than a good citizen who has a more global view of Britain. But I would have thought that in general terms the good citizen would recognise that there are issues in Britain that Britain needs to deal with but on the other hand the good citizen would want to say to someone making disparaging comments, they would probably want to come back to them, probably not in an adversarial way, but in a way that says 'have you thought about this aspect of Britain: we do this and that, and point out the good things that happen. So it would be done in that way rather than in a jingoistic, Britain's best approach, it's more, erm... responding, saying 'yes well ok, we're not the best thing since sliced bread but you're being a little unfair in terms of this aspect or that aspect.

M  ok... voting. There was a lot of talk around the general election about the low number of people who turned out to vote and a lot of people say that being a good citizen is about using your vote. What do you think, would you support people who say that?

P  I think broadly speaking it is about using your vote, it's the one way that people have some sort of say, and there are all sorts of problems with it, in the way in which the country is run and I think the general feeling is that people should exercise their... that... right to vote as part of a good citizenship approach. On the other hand there is an obligation on part of the government, global and national to connect policy in a way that is meaningful to the public so they can understand why activities, why things are going on, so they can explain things better. Why things are being done and for what
reason and perhaps to look at other ways in which the public can be involved and influencing what public agencies do. So it's not...it's all, erm, it's a sort of contractual, perhaps contractual is a bit strong...but it's a two way process. The system has a right and to some extent perhaps a duty to exercise their vote but on the other hand the government has got to show that actually doing that is meaningful.

M  ok, so far we've been talking about things that people can do or things that people can be that makes them good citizens. Now I'd like to turn to things that might get in the way of being a good citizen. Can you think of any things that would make it difficult to be a good citizen?

P  I think we've touched upon issues about peer pressure. Also there may be issues around family...I suppose the family view of life; is there a history of being involved in what one might regard in public life, in very broad terms. If there's not a history of doing that then perhaps someone would be less likely to be involved. Opportunities for people to see where they can make a contribution are not clear to lots of people, erm.... Short pause

M  is it a lack of clarity about how they can be a good citizen? Or... is that what makes it difficult?

P  it's a combination of these things, you know. It's a combination of ... you know...how can I be a good citizen...what will people think about me if I stand up and be counted on this particular issue, do I want the hassle that I think will go with it? I think there's a public perception about people being involved in things for their own benefit rather than for the greater benefit which is very...sort of...pervasive really, that can be reinforced in the media. And by the actions of people who...some of them...have certainly been in it for themselves so you know there's that public perception. Erm, time. Life pressures I suppose generally although people who are busy, have busy lives are quite oftenthose people who are good citizen so there's something around that. It's the way people choose to spend their time and there are a great variety of things these days that people choose to spend their time on and some of those are very isolatin, insular activities and perhaps society demands less individual involvement in public activities than it used to.

M  by 'life pressures' do you...what is it that you mean by life pressures?

P  I think things...well, it's things around, expectations of earning,... lifestyle expectations, getting a nice car, getting a dvd player, it's those sort of things around. Having...the importance that appears to be laid on and having physical things to show your position in society as opposed to invisible things that people might contribute as good citizens. I think...the weighting seemsto have gone to investment in physical things as being more important...it's a generalisation but, more important perhaps thanwhat you contribute in some other way.

M  during out conversation...a list of things we've covered, can be seen...just there. Looking at that list and bearing in mind that it can sometimes be difficult to be a good citizen do you think that there are any of those things that we could say, sorry, you could say 'this is a condition of being a good citizen' or in other words, 'unless you do this, x say, you can't be a good citizen...or do you think that those things are perhaps relevant to being a good citizen and not necessarily a condition...

P  yeah, I think the latter actually. I think that you...people who are good citizens do...may be involved or do some of these things but don't do all of
them and it's like a bit of a menu and I don't think you can define a good citizen by saying that you have to do all of these things but I think probably that if you do one or a combination of these things, that might mark you out as a good citizen.

M well, by way of summing up... can you think of what it means to be a good citizen in your head and perhaps finish off the sentence for me...the good citizen is someone who...
P  hahahah
M  not necessarily in a treatise but in a bullet point or TWO... things that just come to mind.
P  pause... allright. A good citizen is someone who is prepared to contribute in some way to a broader social.. the broader wellbeing of their community and whatever they define by their community and that would be self-selective but...erm...so there's an element of...so they've chosen for whatever reason, to do something beyond what they necessarily need to do as an individual in society because they can see a broader benefit in doing that....

M  closing comments. I'd like to give you the opportunity to reflect on anything today, maybe there was something you'd like to add to any of the point or things that have been mentioned and you'd like the opportunity to add a point you wanted to make?...Perhaps there was something that was unclear, something was ambiguous....?
P  no, I don't think so, I think actually, it's been very helpful in having the questions in the...the way that you've asked those questions has been very useful. It's not,, as you said at the beginning, you don't think about citizenship as a everyday activity and I found it very thought provoking to go through the process. I don't think there is anything I'd particularly want to add, I'd be interested to perhaps come back to it at some stage and to see what your conclusions are.
M  certainly yeah, I can keep you informed [dif to hear]

Questionnaire section:

No comments