

Citizenship:

Review from Feminist Perspectives

Rima Vien Permata Hartanto¹, Siany Indria Liestyasari², Atik Catur Budi³

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Sebelas Maret University
Surakarta, Indonesia

¹rimavien@staff.uns.ac.id, ²sianyindria@staff.uns.ac.id, ³atikcaturbudiati@staff.uns.ac.id

Abstract—The term citizenship has been traditionally been understood in relation to the rights and responsibilities of citizens within a given nation state. This classic model of citizenship is associated with the work of T.H. Marshall who defined citizenship in terms of three stages of sets of rights: civil or legal rights, political rights and social rights. Since the 1990s debates over the inadequacies of traditional models have led to the development of new ideas about citizenship like citizenship from feminist. This article discusses citizenship from feminist perspectives. This study is theoretical using literature review method based on literature and combined with bibliographic research that focuses on the ideas contained in the theory. This study concludes that a series of dichotomies still exist in traditional citizenship and the divide of the public-private spheres is the most fundamental. The traditional citizenship is strictly limited to rational public sphere, while the private sphere is based on family life. Citizenship operates simultaneously as force for both inclusion and exclusion. Women have been denied the full and effective title of citizen for much history, ancient and modern. Feminist offers three models of citizenship as solution to inequalities that have been established and maintained. First model is gender neutral citizenship, second is gender differentiated and the third model is gender pluralist citizenship.

Keywords—*citizenship; feminist perspectives*

I. INTRODUCTION

The terms of citizenship are traditionally or classically understood in relation to the rights and responsibilities of citizens in certain countries [1]. This model of classical or traditional citizenship is associated with the work of T.H. Marshall; a British sociologist who defines citizenship in three stages sets rights: civil or legal rights, political rights and social rights.

Since the 1990s, the debate over the inability of the classical / traditional model has resulted in the development of new ideas of citizenship such as feminist citizenship.

Ruth Lister said that ... feminist theory and research have transformed the theorization of citizenship. And, in challenging the false universalism of the "malestream", it has contributed to more a differentiated analysis of the can to research into gender and citizenship in a multicultural context [2]. Pateman said that, historically citizenship has been built in the 'image of men' [3, 4] the literature on gender and citizenship contributes to citizenship studies because it has made a broader

field of civic study of criticism of the masculinity of traditional approaches to citizenship. Walby also said that, traditional citizenship mainly represent men's discourses [5].

This article discusses citizenship from a feminist perspective that offers several models of citizenship as a solution to established inequality and nurture.

II. METHOD

This study is theoretical using literature review method based on literature and combined with bibliographic research that focuses on the ideas contained in the theory.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

T.H. Marshall has defined citizenship as a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community [6]. According to Marshall, the key elements of citizenship are membership in a community, equality, equality of the members of that community and rights and obligations that result from membership. This definition of citizenship is gender neutral because it does not specify or distinguish rights or duties as belonging to either sex. Therefore, traditional citizenship still represents men's discourses.

Many scholars such as those are Marshall, Mann and Turner have made lots of researches on citizenship but the absence of gender from writings on citizenship, causes problems for the understanding of citizenship. Debates as how gender can be integrated into citizenship highlight major divergences in feminist theory over the relationship between the public and the private. Citizenship cannot be understood without a dynamic theory of gender relations.

A series of dichotomies exist in traditional citizenship both of liberal and republican citizenship, and the most fundamental is the divide of the public-private spheres. The public sphere is mainly for men, while women are mainly constrained within the private sphere. Table 1 below indicates the dichotomies in detail.

TABLE I. THE DICHOTOMIES EXIST IN TRADITIONAL CITIZENSHIP [4]

the public sphere; men; citizen	the private sphere; women; non-citizen
abstract; unrealistic; thoughtful	particular; realistic; natural
rational; useful	emotional; irrational; obedient
unbiased standards of justice and ideals	desire and passion; cannot use standards of justice
just; care common interest	prejudice; busy with private affairs and family affairs
independent; positive; heroic; strong	dependent; passive; weak
in favor of freedom and human kingdom	maintain the realm of necessity and natural kingdom

Table 1 indicates that the substantive characteristics of citizens in the public sphere are rational, independent, and active, while women are considered as irrational, dependent and passive. The role of career is disproportionately taken by women [7-11]. Yet this role as career places women at a disadvantage in access to income [9] and more broadly in relation to political and social citizenship [12, 13]. Women's long-standing exclusion from the theory and practice of citizenship is far from accidental and only partially rectified by their formal incorporation in virtually all societies in the twentieth century. Traditional citizenship has particular discrimination implications for women, who are disadvantaged by the sexual division of time. The narrow conception of the 'political' of traditional citizenship built on a generally, rigid separation of the public-private spheres [14]. According to Lister, the strict distinction between the public and the private leads to discrimination against women [4].

To challenge the traditional liberal and republican citizenship, feminist discourses of citizenship raise many questions about how citizenship has been framed within gendered thinking and constructions. Feminist citizenship discourses are currently "challenging the lions that guard the canonical literature on citizenship" [15]. Although "citizenship has existed for nearly three millennia, with very minor exceptions, women have had some share in civic rights in the most liberal states for [only] about a century" [16]. Feminist citizenship discourses have questioned and shifted the "meanings of such concepts as rights, needs, dependency, entitlements and democratic participation. Key reference point in this discourse is the public/private divide that pervades much political thinking in the Western world [17]. "Beginning with Aristotle, influential political theorists argued that women's reproductive function destined them for the private sphere," while their male counterparts participated in public life [18].

Feminist discourses question whether democratic citizenship is itself such a gendered, patriarchal concept as to require a complete transformation to live up to its inclusive ideals [19].

Analyzing the critiques to traditional citizenship, we can conclude that the traditional citizenship is strictly limited to rational public sphere, while the private sphere is based on family life. Citizenship as both a theory and practice operates simultaneously as a force for both inclusion and exclusion. Women have been denied the full and effective title of citizen for much of history, ancient and modern.

By criticizing the false universalism of traditional citizenship, there exist three models of citizenship that have emerged from the feminist's to re-gender the concept of citizenship aiming to deconstruction of power relations and attacking the concept of citizenship as being quintessentially male. The first model, which is centered on the allocation and exercise of rights and obligations, corresponds to the gender citizen, therefore making the gender of the citizenship irrelevant. The second model of the feminist attempts to re-gender the concept of citizenship is gender-differentiated citizenship, which appeals to "difference" rather than "equally" and puts great emphasis on women's experiences. The difference in women exercise according to this model is motherhood; therefore political motherhood is used as basis for promoting women's claims as social and political citizens [20]. This model of gendering citizenship, as Pateman points out, has been historically promoted through materialist arguments in order to equate motherhood to the male civic republicanism, which is rooted in active political participation and the ability to bear arms [20].

Gender-pluralist citizenship, the third model, that is founded on group differentiated citizenship was first proposed by Mouffe and criticized by Young and others [21]. The gender pluralist approach to the regendering of citizenship allows for the accommodation of social divisions such as sexuality, class, race, religion and age, which all intersect with gender to shape men's or women citizenship. They also help the diffusion of the gender binary at the center of the equality versus difference dichotomy [22].

In order to avoid women's exile as a group from full citizenship, we need to locate a gendered analysis within the wider framework of difference and the divisions and exclusionary inequalities. This represents a conception of citizenship based on a notion of 'differentiated universalism' which tries to reconcile the universalism that stands at the heart of citizenship with the demands of a politics of difference. At the same time, with the reconstruction of the public-private dichotomies, these ideas are offered as possible bases in the construction of a feminist theory of citizenship, which draws on principles of synthesis rather than dichotomy (2003). Three ways are adopted to construct a woman-friendly citizenship. Firstly, the formal politics should be more open to the informal politics. Secondly, women's equal status must be emphasized in the decision-making institution. Lastly, the relationship between the formal politics and informal politics must be considered seriously. The establishment of woman's citizenship needs to open up formal political arenas to women, and formal politics should be more accountable to informal [4].

IV. CONCLUSION

Traditional citizenship still represents men's discourses because the divide of the public-private spheres exists in traditional citizenship. In order to resolve the gender discrimination problems against women, some scholars criticize the traditional citizenship. There exist three models of citizenship that have emerged from the feminist's to re-gender the concept of citizenship aiming to deconstruction of power relations and attacking the concept of citizenship as being quintessentially male : First model is gender neutral

citizenship, second is gender differentiated and the third model is gender pluralist citizenship.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Richardson and S. Monro, *Sexuality, Equality and Diversity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.
- [2] R. Lister, "From the Intimate to the Global: Reflections on Gendered Citizenship," in E.H. Oleksy, J. Hearn, and D. Golanska (eds) *The Limits of Gendered Citizenship: Contexts and Complexities*. New York, London: Routledge, 2011.
- [3] C. Pateman, *The Sexual Contract*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- [4] R. Lister, *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*, 2nd edn. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- [5] S. Walby, 'Is Citizenship Gendered?' *Sociology*, 1994.
- [6] T.H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950.
- [7] E. Abel and M. Nelson, *Circles of Care: Work and Identity in Women's Lives*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1990.
- [8] J. Finch and D. Groves, *A Labour of Love: Women, Work and Caring*. London: Routledge, 1983.
- [9] C. Glendinning, "Dependency and interdependency: the incomes of informal carers and the impact of social security," *Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 19, no. 4, 1990.
- [10] B. Mayall, "The division of labour in early child care-mothers and others," *Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 19, no. 4, 1990.
- [11] L. Morris, *The Working of the Household: A US-UK Comparison*. Cambridge: Polity, 1990.
- [12] R. Lister, "Women, economic dependency and citizenship," *Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 19, no. 4, 1990.
- [13] B. Nelson, "Women's Poverty and Women's Citizenship: Some Political Consequences of Economic Marginality," *Signs*, vol. 21, no. 10, 1984.
- [14] R. Lister, "Citizenship: Towards a Feminist Synthesis," *Feminist Review*, vol. 57 (Autumn), 1997.
- [15] K.B. Jones, *Citizenship in a woman-friendly polity*, in G. Shafir (Ed.), *The citizenship debates: A reader* "Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- [16] D. Heater, *A history of education for citizenship*. London: Routledge Falmer, 2004.
- [17] J.B. Elshtain, *Public man, private woman: Women in social and political thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- [18] C.L. Smith, *Is citizenship a gendered concept?* in A.C. Cairns, J.C. Courtney, P. MacKinnon, H.J. Michelmann and D.E. Smith(Eds.), *Citizenship, diversity, and pluralism: Canadian and comparative perspectives*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.
- [19] A. Assiter, *Citizenship revisited*, in N. Yuval-Davis and P. Werbner (Eds.), *Women, citizenship and difference*. New York: Zed Books, 1999.
- [20] C. Pateman, *The Disorder of Women*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.
- [21] C. Mouffe, *Feminism, citizenship, and radical democratic politics*, In J. Butler and J.W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- [22] B. Hobson and R. Lister, "Citizenship", in *Contested Concepts in Gender and Social Politics*, Barbara Hubson et al. Eds. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2002.