

# Social Citizenship Discourses: Fusing Obligations with Rights in European Welfare States

Felicity Atieno Okoth  
School of Communication Studies, Moi University, P.O box 3900, Eldoret, Kenya

## Abstract

Social citizenship as conceptualized by T.H Marshall has been at the core of discussions that focus on social rights in Europe. These rights are enshrined in the welfare structures of most states as seen in the provision of health services, education, and housing, and in some cases allowances to citizens. Rising waves of immigration over the years has consequently seen the extension of these rights to immigrants. The current rising popularity of new right ideologies has however resulted in a shift of public discourse with the identification of certain immigrant groups as disproportionately favored by social provision. This has led to pressure from the public to restrict immigration. On a scholarly level, Marshall's social citizenship model has been criticized for ignoring responsibilities that constitute active citizenship. This has resulted in new right models that stress on obligations at the expense of social rights. Through a theoretical discussion of Marshall's social citizenship; Mead's new right model and drawing from examples from different immigrant groups and welfare states in Europe, I argue that it is possible to fuse labor market participation to social citizenship without infringing on the rights this kind of citizenship purposes to uphold. I further argue that there is need to open up the labor and narrow down obligations to the immediate community as a national community is too large and remote to command reciprocity. I conclude that respect, recognition and positive selectivism combined with guaranteed social rights could be a step towards balanced model of social citizenship.

**Keywords:** Social Citizenship, Immigration, Welfare States

## 1. Introduction

The conceptualization of citizenship has evolved in the contemporary world of migration broadening the applications and meanings attached to it. Scholars like Joppke (2010), have posited that the reintegration of immigration into the discussion of citizenship needs an approach that categorizes citizenship as status, rights and identity for better understanding. This categorization places T.H Marshall's conceptualization of citizenship under rights; which will be the focus of this paper.

Marshall's arguments of citizenship as rights is referred to as '*social citizenship*' in most scholarly works and will be discussed in this paper with immigrants in mind. Specifically, those who have legal residence and consequently access to rights similar to citizens of the country they reside. Nash (2009) refers to these kinds of immigrants as '*quasi-citizens*' and it is term that will be used throughout this paper in discussing rights and obligations in social citizenship.

This positive step of extending rights to 'non-citizens' has been a result of rapid globalization which has caused increased migration and consequently ardent calls by international human rights groups to extend rights to immigrants regardless of their formal citizenship status. This has delimited state bound citizenship creating rights attached to personhood rather than membership in a polity Soysal in (Bauböck 2010: 851).

Some states have heeded to this call however unevenly with the most generous being OECD countries with stable welfare regimes. Social rights as enshrined in welfare states and applied in varying quantities entail "*right to work; equal opportunity in education and labor market; entitlement to health services and welfare benefits and social services in the event of unemployment or inability to work; an entitlement to a certain standard of education*" (Castles and Davidson, 2000: 110).

It is important to highlight the interplay between, immigration, welfare states and social rights as its the policies enshrined in this welfare regimes that determine the amount of social rights guaranteed to quasi-citizens (Sainsbury 2006:29). These rights have however have been argued to be '*stratified rights*' as they are dependent on state immigration policies and inherently fused with states control and interests as seen in some states refusal to renew residence permits for immigrants dependent on welfare or the restriction of social rights to contribution in the labor market (Waldröon and King, 1998; Valenta and Bunar, 2010).

Basically social rights granted to quasi-citizens are not guaranteed and are more and more becoming contingent on 'economic benefit' (Joppke, 2010: 83-90). This has seen the rise of popularity of new right ideologies which champion for obligations to be tied to rights with arguments that individuals within a polity enjoying the rights within that society should be active in exercising citizenship responsibilities and virtues. These include among other things economic self reliance through labor market participation (Mead, 1986; Kymlicka and Norman, 1994).

These sentiments have spilled over to public discourse with immigrants seen as taking out more than they are putting back into the system. Negative attitudes towards immigration with regards to economic factors

are trampling over cultural concerns according to public surveys carried in different welfare states in Europe (Crepaz, 2008). On the extreme side is the identification of certain groups as disproportionately favored by social provision? This has led to pressure to restrict entitlement to high profile migrant groups and marginalize them in the welfare system (Taylor, 2009:29).

Retrenchment of these rights has pervaded elite discourse and gained prominence in political party campaigns. For example, recently in the second reading of the Bill of the house of Lords in the UK, West a member of the house stated that "*we want to encourage those with the right values to become citizens with rights come responsibility and those responsibilities must first be demonstrated ensuring (sic) that the benefits of citizenships are earned*" (Koskakopoulou, 2010: 835).

The alternative theme for withdrawal of social rights has been the public discourse of the need to reduce spending for fiscal reasons and has been accentuated by the economic crisis that recently hit most countries in Europe. This has led to more pressure on governments to cut down the spending on welfare and contain borrowing so as to keep the currency stable in the international competitive money market (Erickson and Mathews, 2005: 376; Taylor, 2009:30).

It is this context of debates that has changed the paradigm of social citizenship to go beyond rights to obligations in terms of labor market participation. This has seen the adoption of policies that are angled more on individual obligations as opposed to rights in most welfare states. The changes vary from country to country as illustrated by Germany policy of renewing residence permits to immigrants only active in the labor market (Lofstrom and Hansen 2011: 412), Norway's obligatory participation in a three year introduction program as a precondition for social welfare entitlement (Valenta and Bunar, 2010) and the introduction of workfare programs in USA and where social benefits are in return for obligatory reintegration into the labor market (Joppke, 2010: 79).

These kind of imposed obligations despite managing to make quasi-citizens socio-economically integrated in the host society, can be seen as a revival of assimilation; undermining individual liberty and as going against democracy in the larger sense because individuals should be able to choose whether to work or not without their rights being threatened (Valenta and Bunar, 2010: 473). Further, restricting social rights so as to push people to get into the labor market is likely to increase poverty for those not successful eventually excluding rather than including them (Andersen, Larsen and Moller, 2009:281).

This poses a dilemma for social citizenship since demanding for active citizenship through labor market participation risks the withdrawal of social rights or infringement of personal liberty. This paper aims to 'rescue' social citizenship from this dilemma and consequently reassert its value by arguing out the possibility of obliging quasi-citizens to participate in the labor market without necessarily withdrawing their social rights. This will be done by fusing tenets of two models of social citizenship. One that stresses rights and the other obligations to come up with

This paper will take the form of a theoretical discussion on T.H. Marshall's model of social citizenship and new right theory. The discussion will be at the backdrop of welfare states and examples will be drawn from the same.

The methodological approach will be the review of existing literature that touches on social citizenship, immigration and welfare states. All material will therefore be from secondary sources, mostly journals, text books and a few reports from Malmö University's online and official library.

The arguments in this paper will be presented in three parts. The first part will be a theoretical presentation of the concept of social citizenship with the two models by T.H Marshall and new right theorists presented and critiqued. The second part will fuse specific tenets picked from the two models in a bid to strike a balance between rights and obligations and discuss additional factors that can be incorporated to make this viable. The final part will be a conclusion that will include some personal reflections.

## **2. The Concept of Social Citizenship; Two Opposing Models**

Citizenship has evolved in the contemporary world of migration with different conceptualization of the term as seen with T.H Marshalls social citizenship, Brubakers national citizenship, Soysal's post national citizenship, Benhabis's cosmopolitan citizenship, Kymlicka's multicultural citizenship and recent works on gender and citizenship (Joppke, 2010 ). To draw away from this array and based on the aim of this paper I will focus on social citizenship as argued by T.H Marshall and a variation to it presented by the new right model of social citizenship.

### **2.1 T.H. Marshall's Social Citizenship**

Marshallian's conceptualization of citizenship stresses the interdependence of civil, political and social rights and sees them as having developed in different periods of history. Civil rights are seen to have roots in the 18th century between the First Revolution and the First Reform Act. Political rights otherwise referred to as democratic rights developed in the 19th century with social rights having developed in the 20th century during

and after the World Wars. Citizenship hence is to ensure that everyone is treated equally in the society by guaranteeing their political, civil and social rights. Every member of the society is to feel like a full member by being able to enjoy the common life prevailing in the society (Marshall, 1950).

Marshall defines social citizenship as "*..the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society*" Marshall (quoted in Heckmann, 2011: 433).

For Marshall, citizenship and the rights inherent in it is about equality not in its absolute form as in wealth but in status. It is " a general enrichment of the concrete substance of civilized life, a general reduction of risk and insecurity, an equalization between the more and the less fortunate at all levels" It is further argued that "equality of status is more important than equality of income" Marshall (quoted in Waldron and King, 1998:423) .

Social rights should not be seen as not based on helping the disadvantaged in the society cope with hardships but rather should be an attribute of citizenship (Waldron and King 1998:418). Rights and benefits are automatically granted to the person qua citizen so that social rights imply an absolute right to a certain standard of civilization. Equality talked about in this context of social citizenship is the enrichment of people's chances in life (ibid).

True citizenship in this sense is class abatement where 'skyscrapers' in capitalistic societies would be remodeled to 'bungalows' to create greater equality. In other words, real income provided by welfare state would render irrelevant money incomes provided by capital markets (Marshall, 1950). This is interpreted by Esping-Anderson as de-commodification where "citizens can freely and without potential loss of job, income, or general welfare opt out of work when they themselves consider it necessary" Andersen (quoted in Joppke, 2010: 13). According to Marshall, the liberal democratic welfare states are the fullest expression of citizenship as they ensure not only the political and civil rights but the social rights of all individuals in the community (Marshall, 1950).

Marshall's social citizenship was based on class inequality but currently has been broadened by scholars to include inequality that is faced by certain groups that are not necessarily class based. Social citizenship in this case focuses on social rights that are aimed at the distribution of opportunities and resources to everyone in the society (Erickson and Mathews 2005:375).

Although less stressed in literature on social citizenship, Marshall advocates for some sort of responsibility with the rights and sees "the possibility of combining on one system the two principles of social justice and market price" (Marshall, 1950. 29). In his later works he acknowledges the changing dynamics of the market and calls for some form of contribution to the welfare state by individuals (Marshall, 1981).

### **2.2.1 Strengths and Limitations**

Marshall's social citizenship strength lies in its aim to ensure equality through guaranteeing rights to people in the society regardless of their legal status and contribution to the society. This takes into consideration immigrants who may not have the same opportunities in the labor market as natives due to low human capital, local labor market conditions and individual characteristics unobservable by econometrics with others have cited as discrimination (Lofstrom and Hansen, 2011: Arai and Vilhelmsson, 2001).

By upholding the vision of Marshall's citizenship, welfare states have acted in such a way as to counter market processes through the provision of basic standards of social services like health and education to all legal residents. Also included is social assistance that covers maintenance allowance, housing allowance, child allowance, and unemployment compensation and cash benefits to cover food, basic clothing, leisure, health, newspapers and TV fees. However, these benefits are provided with varying limitations depending on states as seen in the liberal market oriented approach of UK , universal social citizenship of Nordic countries with the highest spending , corporist welfare in middle European countries like Germany and the lower spending and more divided welfare countries of the Mediterranean like Portugal (Taylor, 2009:22-37) .

These social rights are enshrined in welfare states so that the disadvantaged in the society can share in the general modicum prevailing in the society as Marshall's envisioned for social citizenship (Waldron and King, 1998:421; Lofstrom and Hansen 2011: 417).

The limitation to this kind of social citizenship however, is that the social rights inherent in it have been minimalized to social benefits missing the broader picture which should be equal opportunity to all in social and economic spheres of the community. The public mind is prone to equating social rights with welfare and thus limits its priority to social services instead of political action socialization of the economy or better put the reconstruction of the social and economic system of the society particularly the labor market so that it favours all members of the society (Bottomore, 1992: 60).

Further, Marshall's conceptualization of citizenship was based on the Roman tradition where individuals derived rights and benefits from the state. This kind of citizenship according to Brubaker (1992) is 'internally inclusive' with no migration in question and therefore ignores the fact that citizenship requires something outside itself such as ethnic homogeneity. By focusing on rights and giving less attention to national

community belonging, it is seen to cause a '*progressive dilemma*' between ethnic diversity and welfare. This is what has put social citizenship to test (Joppke, 2010; 11)

### **2.3 An alternative to Marshall's Social Citizenship? The New Right Model**

New Right ideologies rose up in the changed politics and economic conditions of 1970's and manifested itself in different forms both intellectually in terms of scholarly work and politically through public rhetoric and policies. The term 'new right' has been homogenized in contemporary range of political discourse but in real sense the term is diverse and contradictory encompassing a wide range of ideologies (Harris, 1997).

This paper focuses on the new right model of social citizenship whose main tenets argue for obligations and individual responsibility as a path to equality, social inclusion and in the larger picture social citizenship. This school proposes the opening up of the market so that everybody participates in it. States are encouraged to provide conducive labor market conditions that will offer incentives to individuals to participate (Mead, 1986).

Social citizenship in the marshallian sense is seen to foster a 'culture of dependency' rendering the recipients of welfare second-class citizens and not equal to the majority population. The guarantee of social rights is seen to erode employment incentives in that a guaranteed source of income makes people lack the motivation to work more so in the lower scale of the job market (Mead, 1986 ; Waldron and King, 1998:416).

Whereas the traditional marshallian model posits that social rights ensures equality and enables the disadvantaged to share in the social modicum prevailing in the society, this school argues that the provision of social rights has promoted passivity among minorities and the disadvantaged in the society without improving their life chances (ibid).

New right theorists argue that being responsible and fulfilling obligations is a precondition for being accepted in the society. Equality according to this school is not only sharing in the modicum prevailing in the society but everyone being obligated to the society. It is suggested that to ensure social and economic inclusion, recipients of welfare should go beyond entitlement and focus on responsibility (Norman and Kymlicka, 1994: 356; Mead, 1986: 12-3).

New right theorists like Mead assert that making demands on the state without putting anything back is not the true definition of citizenship as active citizenship entails fulfilling ones obligation to the community as a whole by having a job, paying taxes and obeying the laws. Mead claims that; "*failure to fulfil common obligations is as much an obstacle to full membership as the lack of equal rights*" Mead (quoted in Norman and Kymlicka, 1994:356 )

The model puts more stress on the individual rather than the society and stress that social citizenship entails the state equipping individuals with relevant skills and opportunities and in return the individual should take responsibility for exploiting the opportunities opened to them. Social inclusion is to be fostered by the state coming up with programs that have strong links to entry into paid work, opportunities in childhood and employment rather than reception of benefits ( Hill and Stewart 2005:139).

#### **2.3.1 Strengths and Limitations**

The greatest strength of new right model is that it advocates for the state's involvement in opening up of the labor market so as to absorb even the lowest skills workers as this can act as an incentive for individuals to participate. Some of the welfare states indeed adopted this ideology with the most prominent being the U.K. During the Thatcher era, the country pushed for a more market oriented social welfare that included the mobilization the workforce to make it suitable for particular segments of the labor market, offering incentives for employers to recruit more workers, helping groups with low entries into the labor market through labor market reform, enhancing flexibility and improving the quality of jobs and the lower end of the job market (Taylor, 2009).

Over the years, more welfare countries have embraced this ideology. Wage support in different forms and job creation represented 29% of total labor market spending in Germany, 35% in Spain, 40% in Italy, 36% in France and 72% consecutively in the UK (OECD 2007e, Table J; Taylor, 2009:38). These reforms indicate an active, individualistic and market oriented approaches to social citizenship with the justifications that redistribution with regards to tax achieves much more when all able bodied individuals in the society are complacent and willing to contribute (Crepaz, 2008).

The downside of this model however is the assumption that all factors are constant with regards to the 'equal opportunities' the state offers to citizens and quasi-citizens. The model ignores the fact that there are usually inequalities of outcome because when everyone starts with similar chances as those advantaged by their skills or background progress more. There is a difference between being given equal rights and opportunity and the equal capacity to exercise them Parkeh (in Taylor, 2009:169).

Early childhood and education have strongest influence on employment from most longitudinal cohort studies. This gives natives better chances than immigrants in the access of labor market opportunities. This is further acerbated by the fact that qualifications from abroad however much refined in the country of immigration are usually overlooked when it comes to employment more so with immigrants from developing countries

(Borjas, 1994; Bevelander, 2000).

The stress on obligation has also seen the adoption of policies by particular countries to cut down on direct benefits. Some countries have changed policies so that the provision of social rights is preconditioned by participation in the labor market in a carrot-stick manner. USA's workfare program and Denmark's decision to cut back on family allowance as a means of motivating quasi-citizens to look for jobs are a manifestation of this (Andersen, Larsen and Moller 2009:281).

The scraping off of established rights to passive social benefits is further seen in the amalgamation of various insurance programs for example in Germany where claimers are to prove that they are actively seeking employment as a condition for benefit; France where benefits have a limited time frame and reduce in value over time and case management in the UK where case officers are assigned to individuals to monitor how active they are job hunting (Taylor, 2009:40).

Despite the fact that this shift in policy is aimed at providing incentives for individuals to look for work, access to the job market for quasi-citizens is low and their position of disadvantage continues to grow stronger in countries that have adopted new right policies. This poses a challenge to social citizenship not only on the basis of reciprocity within the population in the society but in terms of less opportunity for inclusion of the most vulnerable in the society (Goldthorpe 2004; Taylor, 2009: 174). This is evidenced by Britain's moving back towards level of inequality in poverty and wealth last seen 40 yrs ago according to one long term study carried in 2006 and Denmark's increased immigrant poverty after the welfare cuts (Andersen, Larsen and Moller, 2009; Dorling et. al, 2007).

The new right concept of 'dependency of culture' and the dominance of this ideology in some welfare state policies has undermined social rights through the withdrawal of guaranteed social assistance thus rendering the recipients second class citizens. This is a situation which Marshall's social citizenship vouches against in his arguments against the *poor law* of the nineteenth century which treated the claims of the poor not as integral part of the rights of the citizens but as an alternative to them (Marshall, 1950: 15; Bottomore, 1992: 70).

Another shortcoming of new right ideology has been the infringement of personal liberty by stressing on obligations as a prerequisite for full membership in the society. This is seen for example in Norway's obligatory participation in a three year introduction program as a precondition for social welfare entitlement (Valenta and Bunar, 2010) and the introduction of workfare programs in USA and where social benefits are in return for obligatory reintegration into the labor market (Joppke, 2010: 79).

All the above pointed shortcomings of the new right tenets highlight the fact that equality and the enjoyment of rights is not only dependent on legal entitlement but social and economic structures in the state. It is possible for quasi-citizens to have full citizenship rights but not enjoy the benefits of this status because of 'stratified rights' that are having conditions to them (Nash, 2009:1069). According to Parkeh (in Taylor, 2009: 169), policies may be put in place to accord rights and equality to both citizens and quasi-citizens but there might not be equal capacity to exercise these rights. Fraser (1998) reiterates this by positing that social justice should not only limited to the formal and rule bound way whereby everyone is treated equal but should be concerned with treating the individual in ways appropriate to his or her needs as not everyone has equal capacity in the society (Andersen, Larsen and Moller, 2009).

Obligations stressed by new right model and as seen in the above discussion have opened up the labor market to the disadvantaged in welfare states through adoption of market oriented social policies but at the same time fostered inequality, limited social rights and personal liberty. Left this way, the new right model fosters obligation but infringes on social rights. Transformation of social citizenship from status to contract where social benefits are given as a return to obligatory participation in the labor market rather than rights attached to the citizenship status have reversed social citizenship's triumph over market inequalities (Joppke, 2010: 79).

In this section I have discussed the concept of social citizenship and analyzed two models that attach varying meanings to the concept. One that stresses rights and another that stresses obligations. I have also highlighted the strengths and limitations of both. In this section I will discuss and analyze particular points from both models that I consider viable for the balance of obligations and social rights.

### **3.0 Striking a balance between obligations and rights**

#### **3.1 The Guarantee of Social Rights**

My point of departure in this section will be Marshall's conceptualization of citizenship as status where rights and benefits are automatically granted to the person qua citizen so that social rights imply an absolute right to a certain standard of civilization. Despite the need for individuals to be responsible, social rights should be automatically guaranteed without a precondition of labor market participation (Joppke, 2010:13).

However to guarantee rights in this manner and still vouch for responsibility, there is need to visualize social citizenship as forwarded by (Taylor, 2010) in his book '*Reframing Social Citizenship*'. He attaches three assumed societal values of reciprocity, inclusion and trust to social citizenship. Reciprocity includes the willingness of members of a community to horizontally redistribute resources among the mass of population.

Inclusion aims to share the security of an advantaged mass with disadvantaged minorities by transferring between those with access to relatively stable and well paid employment through taxation to those without with the aim of promoting social inclusion. The third component which is the most important according to Taylor is trust as it legitimizes the whole aspect of social citizenship as it involves the confidence that the state will guarantee the rights and provide for all residents when called for and that other citizens will maintain their commitment to horizontal redistribution (Taylor, 2009: 6-8).

Put this way, obligation does not stress individualism and economic self reliance rather the willingness to participate in communal redistribution for the good of all in the society. Further, states are to be trusted to guarantee social rights. Universal welfare states illustrate this kind of social citizenship, however, Sweden offers the best example as it guarantees rights to both citizens and quasi- citizens without any preconditions apart from legal residence. The country further offers training to immigrants to improve their language and culture skills, has a positive action and a diversity embracement management philosophy with equal opportunity policies (Valenta and Bunar 2010: 28). I see this as the best way of upholding social rights and will thus move to discuss ways of fusing obligations to this kind of universal social citizenship.

### **3.2 Advancing Obligations to Social Citizenship**

In fusing obligations to universal social citizenship, I depart from Taylor's (2009), assumed societal value of reciprocity and inclusion which focuses on the willingness of members of the community to horizontally redistribute resources among the mass of population from the 'well off ' to the disadvantaged in the society through taxation.

The notion of 'helping the disadvantaged' is a moral value that cuts across cultures and religion and can be used to encourage people to participate in the labor market. Sissela Bok argues that there are a set of basic 'universal values' that cut across ethnic, national, racial among other boundaries by which moral obligations could be build in an ethnically diverse society. These values according to her revolve around "some form of positive duties regarding mutual support, loyalty and reciprocity (Bok, 2003-13-16).

For this kind of mutual support, loyalty and reciprocity to effectively work, there is need to narrow down obligation to the immediate community wherein an individual is situated. This is because the national community is too large and remote in command to make it a continuous driving force for individual moral obligation. Obligations should hence be devolved to basic units say the local community and particularly for the working group as this might supply the vigor that social citizenship generally lacks (McCluskey, 2003). Further there is the argument by Taylor, (2009: 28) that "people are reluctant to support benefits for groups they see as different and with whom they find it difficult to identify". It is in the context of the immediate local community that reciprocity and mutual support can be fostered.

It is key that individuals out of employment be encouraged to participate in finding ways out of their predicament. In as much as welfare states have adopted new right ideologies and implemented policies that open up the labor market to quasi-citizens there is still lower participation as compared to natives (Lofstrom and Hansen 2011: 413). Forcing a process by adopting state programs that impose responsibility can have a recoil effect and further push people away from participation (Koskakopoulou, 2010: 838). In the same line Andersen et. al (2007) argue for transformative empowerment that goes beyond political will to macro-determinant opportunity structure which set the conditions and framework over time for active participatory programs at the local level can foster obligations. When individuals are part of a process they feel a sense of ownership to it hence are more likely to actively seek solutions for it in this case participation in the labor market (ibid).

Koskakopoulou (2010) terms this a 'letting be' approach in that it opens up space for dialogue among the various actors on ways of participating in the labor market and in turn fostering respectful symbiosis. This approach does not need for people to prove that they deserve to earn rights but rather encourages them to take part in common socio-economic activities with the community in mind. It shifts away the focus from the national arena towards participation in practice or rather social engagement at the local level (Koskakopoulou, 2010: 839-840).

A step to fostering obligations in social citizenship through the above mentioned ways could be through '*social innovation*' defined as "*the ability to organize bottom linked collective action/empowerment as a bid to reach sustainable social and democratic development*" Moulaert and Nussbaumer quoted in (Andersen et.al, 2009:283). Social innovation has to be region specific between the agents' in this case quasi citizens dependent on welfare and the social welfare institutions (Moulaert et al, 2009:12). The reinvention of street level community workers acting as facilitators of the articulations of the quasi-citizens and bottom up designed social action empowerment programs can act as a step to pushing people into the labor market. This is because these actions create the space for developing long term inclusion programs that encompasses the unemployed individuals, politicians, welfare and education institutions for positive outcomes (Andersen et.al, 2009:283).

There is also need for specific socio-cultural and socio-economic opportunities for quasi- citizens (Andersen, Larsen and Moller, 2009:283-4). Fraser (1998) affirms this by arguing for a social justice that

defends different cultures in combination with the politics of equality (Andersen et al 2009:276). Simply opening up equal opportunities to all individuals in the society as proposed by new right is not the solution to encouraging people to participate in the labor market. There is need for social justice or otherwise referred to as *positive selectivism* which offers opportunities depending on the needs of the recipients. This is because quasi citizens are usually disadvantaged when seeking for employment compared to natives (Moroney and Krysik, 1998).

Positive selectivism has been applied in Norway by adopting a pilot project where immigrants qualification if matching with the best qualified from the native population are preferred for certain positions in the labor market (ECRI, 2009:7). This consequently saw a rise in the number of immigrants participate in the labor market (ibid; Valenta and Bunar, 2010: 474). This can be seen to go against social universalism but if applied to the disadvantaged in the society can result to more social inclusion as seen in the Norwegian case.

#### 4.0 Conclusion

From the above discussion it can be seen that obligations in the form of participation in the labor market can be tied to social citizenship through transformative empowerment where quasi-citizens are involved in the process of opening up of the labor market at the local level. This coupled with universal social citizenship, positive selectivism and social justice pertaining to different groups makes it viable to tie obligations to social citizenship without infringing on the social rights that this kind of citizenship purposes to uphold. This however needs public goodwill as public opinion serves as a milestone to implementation of policies. At the micro-level, quasi-citizens reliant on welfare need not be made feel like they are a burden. This is reiterated by Koskakopoulou (2010: 843) who states that "*Developing a sense of 'belonging' and reciprocity to a polity is correlated with respect and recognition received from host country and opportunity to fully participates in the society*".

The points I have highlighted in this discussion could be refined and better developed to come up with a model of social citizenship that combines rights and obligations without infringing on personal liberty and social rights inherent in this kind of citizenship.

#### References

- Andersen, J. Larsen, J.E. and Moller, I.H (2009) "The Exclusion and Marginalization of Immigrants in the Danish Welfare Society: Dilemmas and Challenges", *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Vol.29, No, 5/6, pp. 274-286.
- Bauböck, R. (2010) "Studying Citizenship Constellations", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol.36, No. 5, pp.847-859.
- Benhabib, S. (2011) *Dignity in Adversity: Human Rights in Troubled Times*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Benhabib, S. (2004) *The Right of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens*, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Bevelander, P. (2000) *Immigrant Employment Integration and Structural Change in Sweden, 1970-1995*, Lund: KFS.
- Bok, S. (2002) *Common Values*, London: University of Missouri Press
- Bommes, M. and Geddes, A.( eds.) (2000) *Immigration and Welfare; Challenging the Borders of the Welfare State*, London: Routledge.
- Borjas, G. T. (1994). 'The Economics of Immigration', *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 32, No 4, (December), pp. 1667- 1717.
- Castles, S. and Davidson, A. (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*, New York: Routledge.
- Crepaz, M. L. (2008) *Trust beyond Borders: Immigration, the Welfare State and Identity In Modern Societies*, USA: University of Michigan Press.
- ECRI (2009) Report on Norway, Council of Europe
- ECRI (2004) Third Report on Sweden, Council of Europe
- Fraser, N. (1998) : Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, participation, Discussion paper // Wissenschaftszentrum Berlinfür Sozialforschung, Forschungsschwerpunkt Arbeitsmarkt und Beschäftigung, AbteilungOrganisation und Beschäftigung, No. FS I 98-108
- Goldthorpe, J. (2004) "Trends in International Mobility in Britain", in R. Breen (ed.) *Social Mobility in Europe*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hansen, J. and Lofström . M. (2011) "Immigrant- Native Difference in Welfare Participation: The Role of Entry and Exit Rates", *Industrial Relations*, Vol.50, No.3, (July), pp. 412- 424.
- Harris, J. M. (1997). The Subversion of Citizenship: New Right conception of Citizenship, Thatcherism and the 'New Politics'. Ph .D. University of Sheffield.
- Heckmann, L.Y. 2011 "Introduction: Claiming Social Citizenship" *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3-4, pp. 433-439.
- Hills, J.(2005). *Inequality and State*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. and Stewart, K.( eds) (2005) *A more*

- Equal Society? New Labor, Poverty, Inequality and Exclusion*, Policy Press: Bristol.
- Howard, M. M. (2010), "The Impact of the Far Right on Citizenship Policy in Europe. Explaining Continuity Change", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol.36, No. 5, pp. 735-757.
- Joppke, C. (2010) *Citizenship and Immigration*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kostakopoulou , D. (2010) "Matters of Control: Integration Tests, Naturalization, Reform and Probationary Citizenship in the UK" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol.36, No. 5, pp. 829-846.
- Kymlicka, W. and Norman, W (1994) "Return of the Citizen: A survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory", *Ethics*, Vol. 104, No.2 January, p.352-381
- Marshall, T.H. (1950) and Bottomore, T. (1992) *Citizenship and Social Class*, London: Pluto Classics
- Marshall, T.H. (1965) *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*, New York: Anchor
- McCluskey, M.T (2003) "Efficiency and Social Citizenship: Challenging The Neoliberal attack on the Welfare State", *Indiana Law Journal*
- Mead, L. (1986) *Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship*, New York: Free Press
- Moulaert , F. et.al (2009) *Social Innovation and Territorial Development*, England: Ashgate.
- Nash, K. (2009), "Between Citizenship and Human Rights", *Sociology*, Vol 43, No. 6 December, pp.1067-1083.
- OECD (2007e) *Employment Outlook*, OECD Paris.
- Peisker , V. C. and Tilbury, F. (2006) "Employment Niches of Recent Refugees: Segmented Labor Market in Twenty-first Century Australia", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, vol.19, No 2.
- Sainsbury, D. (2006) "Immigrants' Social Rights in Comparative Perspective: Welfare Regimes, Forms in Immigration and Immigrant Policy Regimes", *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 16, No. 3, (July), pp. 229-244.
- Taylor, G.B. (2010) *Reframing Social Citizenship*, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Valenta, M. and Bunar, N (2010) "State Assisted Integration, Refugee Integration Policies in Scandinavia Welfare States: The Swedish and Norwegian Experience", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol.23. No.4 , ( September), pp. 464-475.
- Waldron, J and King, S.D. (1998) "Citizenship, Social Citizenship and the Defense of Welfare Provision", *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 18, No.4, (October), pp.415-445.