

Maria Theiss

*Institute of Social Policy
University of Warsaw*

***Unraveling universal social citizenship:
the role of local social policy¹***

Summary

The paper is aimed at outlining the concept of local social citizenship within the theory of social policy. The paradox of social citizenship concept is that it may serve to both identify and disguise inequalities in access to welfare state benefits and services. Thus, those aspects of local social citizenship construct thanks to which it may serve the former objective are discussed in the paper. In the first section of the paper, the importance of entitlements in the concept of local social citizenship is considered, proving that viewing them from formal and legal angles exclusively is too restrictive in regard to social policy. The second section contains considerations on differences between understanding them in the liberal manner and the one proposed within local social citizenship. In the last section, hypotheses concerning the more significant transformations of local social citizenship in Poland are outlined. It is argued that entitlements at the local level are becoming stronger related to certain obligations of the citizens.

Key words: local social policy, social citizenship, local community, local citizenship

¹ This paper has been prepared within a research project “Local social citizenship in social policy: the example of care services for children under 5”, funded within the National Centre of Science (NCN) SONATA grant, contract no.: 2011/03/D/HS5/02498.

Introduction

In the contemporary research on local social policy, the perspective focused on institutional efficiency is particularly often employed. The *governance* approach which focuses on identifying coordination mechanisms, as well as a large portion of research on local activity and participation, aims to identify the factors which result in a larger number of services and a higher quality of local social policy. These approaches fall within the Putnam's perspective in its broad sense (Putnam 1995). They assume that a civic and cooperating local community contributes to the formation of a responsive, efficient and innovative local government which will be effective in implementing highly valued local social policy. Neither questioning the topicality nor relevance of the mentioned streams of literature, in this paper an alternative view on local social policy is proposed. The discussed here perspective of social citizenship, including the concept concentrated on its local dimension differs from the technical approaches oriented towards efficiency.

While there are various definitions of social citizenship, as is noted by its researchers – an attempt to accurately and precisely define it seems pointless since its essence lies in that it is a subject for definition disputes, including the political ones. From the Marshallian perspective “*social citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of the community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed*” (Marshall 1950, p. 87, Turner 2009, p. 66, Heywood 2008, p. 125). Thus, social citizenship is an empirical object – it is an institution; however, in the study of social policy, it is primarily a theoretical and research perspective. Using it means research on social policy (including local social policy) directed at identifying various aspects of individuals' exercising their rights. It constitutes a broad strand of literature, even as some argue, an unlimited one, since every question in political philosophy may be expressed in the categories of rights and duties (Kymlicka & Norman 1994, p. 353). Within this strand, there are specific approaches already functioning (for example, Nancy Fraser's perspective of redistribution and recognition, or Amartya Sen's *capabilities / opportunities* approach), various 'types' of citizenship are identified (for example multicultural, cultural, post-national, and many other) and several research areas are particularly investigated (issues of migration, cultural policy, citizen education, etc.). The dynamics of this perspective seem to prove that it is still relevant in regard to investigating the current transformations in social policy.

This paper is aimed at outlining the concept of local social citizenship within the theory of social policy. This notion, as well as the notion of local dimension of social citizenship or the related ones, has occurred in the citizenship literature (eg. Sassen 2002, Yuval-Davis 1997, Marinetto 2003). However, they are viewed in quite a varied and imprecise manner. They are often used to describe local policies and practices of immigrant integration in large cities. The aim of the paper is to propose another 'theoretical localisation' of local social citizenship. It will be shown that local social

citizenship may serve as a category to investigate inequalities and differences in access to social transfers, and most of all – to social services provided by the welfare state. However, the paradox of the citizenship concept is that – as has been shown primarily by feminist criticism – it may serve to both identify and disguise social inequalities. Thus, those aspects of local social citizenship construct thanks to which it may serve the former objective are highlighted in the paper. In the first section of the paper, the importance of entitlements in the concept of local social citizenship is considered, proving that viewing them from formal and legal angles exclusively is too restrictive in regard to social policy. The second section contains considerations on differences between understanding them in the liberal manner and the one proposed within local social citizenship. In the last section, hypotheses concerning the more significant transformations of local social citizenship in Poland are outlined.

Entitlements as the Foundation of Social Citizenship

In various streams of theorising on citizenship, the notion of ‘the status of the individual, manifested in the entitlements’, which is key to the concept of citizenship, implies different sets of specific meanings. Their extensive reconstruction in this paper is neither the author’s intention, nor it is possible; however, three conventions of viewing them are worth consideration. Firstly, in the legal approach, this status is a primarily formal relation binding the individual with the state (Raciborski 2011, p. 57, Bodnar 2008, p. 4). The research within this very citizenship perspective often takes form of comparative studies and focuses mainly on the regulations on acquiring the citizenship of a country and on the legal consequences of possessing one. In this area, for the last dozen or so years, the questions considered have included, among others, the relations between the citizen’s rights and human rights, the rights of migrating people, national and ethnic minorities, or changes resulting from the increasing role of supra-national structures (in this context, for example, the notion of the multi-level citizenship in the European Union is concerned; Bodnar 2008, Duszczyk & Stawicka 2003).

Secondly, in the political philosophy approach, the analysis of the individual’s status, expressed in the language of entitlements, poses primarily the questions about obligations and citizen virtues connected with executing political rights (such as freedom of association, voting rights and rights to other types of political participation, etc.). This approach focuses on the active and not the passive aspect of citizenship (Turner 2009), which means a concern about citizen participation and not the guarantees of social security. The classic controversy refers here to the meaning of political rights – whether they are to be perceived as manifestations of an individual’s freedom (liberal tradition of citizenship), citizen duties and virtues (republican tradition), or connections with the community, including the local one, and with social solidarity (communitarian tradition). In recent years, in this stream of literature, the considerations on balancing the citizens’ rights and duties have been particularly

frequent, and the researchers typically concluded that what is observed is the erosion of citizenship in the classic sense, as it is ousted by 'the citizenship of social rights'. The measures aimed at reversing this trend include the political discourse which postulates *active citizenship* which is achieved thanks to the welfare state institutions urging the citizens not only to be active on the labour market (active welfare state), but also to get involved in the political decision making process for the benefit of the local community (Brannan et al. 2006, Marinetto 2003).

The third area of considerations, referred to as 'sociology of citizenship' (Turner 2009, p. 66) focuses on the role of the factors which promote the actual execution of the citizens' formal entitlements. In particular, it is stressed here that regardless of the formal equality, factors such as class affiliation or social and economic status, gender or cultural and ethnic background may determine the line of division of citizens into first-class and second-class. Furthermore, the feminist criticism argues that the universal, formal status of the citizen is a facade for disguising social inequalities (Kwiatkowska 2010, Yuval-Davis 1997); however, numerous constructive propositions of solving this issue have also been articulated (diversified citizenship, multi-cultural citizenship, etc.).

As a research perspective, *social* citizenship assumes an analysis of both the mentioned formal, informal and normative aspects of female and male citizens' status; however, it concentrates on the sub-set of rights. Whereas the approaches of political science, especially the legal ones, consider the issues of the status as resulting from *civil* and *political* rights, when *social* citizenship is concerned, the focus of attention is moved onto the area which Thomas Marshall labelled the "social element of citizenship". What was meant by the notion then (that is in 1950) was "*the whole range from the right to a modicum of 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*" (ibid., p. 74), thus, they are the broadly viewed social rights.

In this proposed notion of local social citizenship, using social citizenship as a research category in local social policy entails a further restriction of the scope of the researched entitlements. The analysis of local social citizenship covers the entitlements which are granted and exercised at the level of the local political community (in the case of Poland – the smallest administrative unit: *gmina*). Thus, its scope does not include the entitlements whose execution is determined by supra-local entities and only deconcentrated in provision. This pertains to, among other things, the social insurance benefits, health services financed by the Polish National Health Fund, obligatory social assistance or family benefits. Therefore, the study of local social citizenship shall focus on the inhabitants' rights which are autonomically executed (as the *gmina's* own tasks) at the level of the local community; namely, those in the case of which it is the local community (local authority) that decides how certain services are to be provided or even, in case of some services, who is a person entitled to them. In Poland, in practice, it covers, among other things: education at the level of kindergarten and elementary school, some social assistance benefits, local programs of public

health care and family support, housing and culture. What determines the specificity of the local social citizenship category is, among other things, the focus on those social entitlements which are manifested in form of social services provided by *gminas*. As shall be discussed in detail further on, this fact brings significant theoretical and methodological consequences resulting from, among other things, the fundamental role of local practices, including the informal ones, in executing citizen entitlements. This aspect has been overlooked in research on social citizenship at the central level, sometimes operationalised as the right to certain social transfers (it was the case of, for example, the *Social Citizenship Indicators Programme*; (Korpi 2010, Kvist 2008).

Although there is a legal category in the centre of the social citizenship concept, it has to be stressed that if ‘the execution of entitlements’, including especially the local community level, as referred to, this notion has a broader meaning than is usually assumed in legal sciences. Also, while in this discipline, the expression “X is entitled to A” may mean various situations, what is meant by it in the legal approaches to citizenship is the subjective right which enables X to lay claims to A. However, in the case of many welfare services and benefits, the inhabitants of Poland fail to have rights understood in this way. As has been argued by constitutional experts, part of social rights included in the Constitution is a description of the state’s policy rules, or, basically, the formulation of the legislator’s intentions and not the source of subjective rights (Garlicki 2009, p.93)². Therefore, the range of subjective rights on the basis of the specific acts of law is narrower than in the view of the concept of social citizenship. For example, it cannot be argued that “the citizen has the right to have her child’s admission to a kindergarten ensured” (except for compulsory kindergarten for 5(6)-year-olds) or “the citizen’s right to use the public library”.

However, what may be considered in this context is the broadly viewed entitlements, in legal sciences referred to as “the reflexes of the subjective right” which mean “*providing citizens with benefits by the state through the authority’s general commitment to execute acts of law (...) which in a specific context are advantageous for the individual (...) [however] they do not only fail to allow individuals to lay individualised claims, but even fail to ensure that the authorised body shall adjudicate*” (Jakimowicz 2002, p.125, cf. also Garlicki 2009, p. 98). R. Piszko explains what the connection between the expression “X is entitled to” and the legal reflex is, by stating that the ‘one’s entitlement’ expression is also used to identify “a situation which is generally advantageous for an entity, and which is a reflex of imposing some duties on other entities by a norm” (Piszko 2006, p. 16), and such a meaning, as has been mentioned, may be assigned to the entitlements contained in the concept of social citizenship.

² This also refers to kindergarten education. In the Judgement of the Constitutional Tribunal of 18 Dec. 2008, it was stated that in the Constitution “there is no regulation which would explicitly ensure or even imply among the objectives of public authorities activities the managing of kindergartens, nor all the more any subjective right to pre-school education (...), kindergartens are not institutions which would participate in exercising the constitutional right to education, regulated by Art. 70” (OTK [Judgements of the CT] no 10/A/ 2008, item 182).

The second element which locates entitlements within the concept of local social citizenship, and which, as opposed to the first one, reaches beyond the legal categories, are (in this case local) practices promoting the actual access to benefits and services, pertaining to, among other things, capitals, including the cultural one, necessary to benefit from the functioning of institutions, to granting access to information, or to the manner of addressing male/female citizens by institutions.

Local Social Citizenship: A Response to the Unfair Universalism of Citizenship

Recently, the category of local citizenship, including local social citizenship, has usually appeared in the literature in the context of reflections on the decline in the importance of the role of the state as ‘the level of localising’ citizenship and, more frankly – transformations of ‘the geography of the welfare state’ (Sassen 2002, Abrahamson 2005, Shinkel 2010, Yuval-Davies 1997). Whether statehood is still an essential feature for citizenship, as was perceived by the cited classic of the field, Thomas Marshall, has been a question for disputes for a certain time. On one hand, researchers indicate that even if we consider various ‘mutations’ of citizenship, understood as new concepts and new practices typical of the times of globalisation, statehood and the state equipped with the possibilities of making and executing law are the basic point of reference for the concept. On the other hand, the advocates of the so-called thesis on citizenship disaggregation (Benhabib 2002, Raciborski 2011, p. 45) argue that elements such as: membership in political community, citizens’ rights and identities, once closely connected, are beginning to function separately, and the territory is no longer their keystone, which most of all results from the processes of globalisation. Leading researchers in this field suggest that in this context one should consider the post-national or denationalized citizenship (Soysal 1994, Sassen 2002).

Undoubtedly, the spatial aspect of citizenship has undergone significant transformations in recent decades, and it provides an important context for analysing local social citizenship. However, it is not the reflection on space that is the basic point of reference in the discussion on local social citizenship in social policy science. Instead, it is contributing to the deconstruction of the classic liberal, and thus up to a point, Marshall’s model of formal and state citizenship. It was stressed by Thomas Marshall that citizenship is a form of equality in the world characterised by inequalities – independent of, for example, income, the votes of citizens counted in the same way and their entitlement to identical services in the public health care system. However, one reservation needs to be made here: Marshall was aware of the fact that for actual possibilities to use civil or political rights, social rights are necessary (Marshall 1950, cf. Zamorska 2010, p. 95) – it is only for the person who has, for example, access to free learning in how to read and write that the possibility to participate in the political process is not purely illusory. Marshall’s model of citizenship failed to equate the formal status with the real chances to use one’s entitlements, and in this sense, was

not liberal in the extreme. However, the majority of criticism, directed at Marshall's concept, among others, by feminists, pertained to that it was only the social class that was the dimension of inequalities where some 'tensions' with citizenship appeared. It disregarded categories such as gender, age or ethnicity.

Therefore, the deconstructing nature of local social citizenship is important not as an element of abstract theoretical dispute, but due to the fact that in social policy, the concept of citizenship may serve two basically different objectives – either the building of the illusion of equality or some spheres of equality (and thus discrediting the issues of, for example, exclusion), or the better identification of social inequalities as well as mechanisms which cause them. While the legal and formal approaches, the so-called liberal ones, entail such a risk of narrowing the perspective, the concept of local social citizenship may serve the latter, cognitive and emancipational objectives. Thus, the “deconstructing power” of local social citizenship is based on its three aspects – arguments against equating citizenship with formal status identical for all citizens of a country. The triad consists of: differences in local resources, local communities' subjectivity and local practices in favouring access to benefits and services.

Demonstrating the role of differences in local resources is consistent with feminist criticism of the universalistic (liberal) model of citizenship. As mentioned, the criticism by feminist researchers consists of, in short, proving that the claim on citizens' equality based on equal rights, such as, for example, the right to vote, right to work or freedom of speech is gender blind. They argue: what point is there in women having the right to be elected as a council member, especially in traditional social systems, since it is the men who are offered the first places in electoral lists; what point is there in having the right to work if the necessity to look after the dependent members of the family is more urgent; what is the point of freedom of speech if their voice is not seriously considered? As stressed by Yuval-Davis, among others, this type of perception is, first of all, standardising the pattern of the citizen according to the male example, and secondly – sanctioning exclusion under the slogans of formal equality (Yuval-Davis 1997).

An analogous argumentation may refer to diversifying the real possibilities of citizens' access to benefits and services with regard to the place of residence³. Also, it is not the very place but the local resources that make citizen entitlements in various local environments have a formal character of exclusivity. The rights to housing or to support the family in regard to caring services fail to improve the citizens' situation if there is no community/social housing available in a *gmina*, or if there are no funds to employ, for example, community support workers. This question arises not

³ Obviously, a full analogy is not possible here. Gender, similarly to ethnicity or religion, is a more stable feature of the individual than their place of residence. Moreover, even the very enterprising citizen-oriented local communities do not form large social movements which would formulate group postulates of recognition or redistribution, as it is the case of the gender or ethnic movements. Another difference pertains to that the gender is more strongly constitutive for a person's status and identity than the relatively easily changed place of residence.

only in the works by feminists. As Greer and Matzke point out, in reference to the British context: “*if money, resources and laws are what makes social citizenship rights real, and devolution shapes the allocation and use of money, resources and laws, then devolution will change the nature of citizenship rights (...) the material content of social citizenship and some of the rhetoric (...) are now shaped by the politics on levels other than UK*” (Greer, Matzke 2009: 3).

The concept of local social citizenship deconstructs Marshall’s model also as to its second, ‘positive’ meaning. The concept is based on the subjectivity of local communities and the possibility of adjusting local services and provisions to the inhabitants’ priorities and needs. Both the social objectives of the *gmina*’s activities, and the way of providing services, which are the *gmina*’s own tasks, may allow for specific problems, traditions and cultural specificity of the local community. Interestingly, while citizenship theorists frequently argue that granting entitlements to various cultural groups, immigrants and national minorities is a way of ‘casting off the yoke’ of universalism (Young 1989, Kymlicka & Norman 1994), in regard to social citizenship, the issue of decentralisation and the actual passing of the ability of self-determination onto local communities by the state is a rather ignored one. However, there are examples of Polish *gminas* where programs which do not exist at the central level are accepted, for example the program of co-financing in-vitro fertilisation (Częstochowa) or the complex policy of supporting multi-children families (Wołomin), and they prove that it is possible to grant specific entitlements to members of local communities thanks to the right of self-government.

The third element of local social citizenship which ‘disassembles’ Marshall’s model are local, including informal practices guaranteeing certain groups of inhabitants priority of access to services (and thus, also – excluding others from accessing them). For example, in spite of the central directives in this matter, local regulations and customs connected with recruitment to kindergartens may favour inhabitants in regard to their place of residence closer to this institution, their affluence, parent’s occupations, number of children, but also social or cultural capital, etc. This element has been purposively included in the triad by the author. In the theory of citizenship, there are argumentations that granting group entitlements within the institution of citizenship (for example, to groups which differ from the majority in their ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation) is not a solution to the problem of real inequalities in exercising rights by the members of the empowered group (Yegen 2008). Therefore, for example, the right to education in a different language than the national language fails to eliminate the issue that children from certain minority families have a more restricted access to education than other. Highlighting self-determination of *gminas* in a considerable area of social policy ought to be accompanied by a reservation that this means neither the fact that self-governing communities are constituted by similar, integrated inhabitants, nor that they can always accurately identify their inner social diversifications and are prepared to address them in their social policy measures.

Local social citizenship may be therefore perceived as an area of relations between the elements of the outlined triad. In these dimensions, it is also the area shaped by the policy of the central level. This is visible even in the recent obligation imposed on *gminas* to provide all 5-year-old children with a place in institutions of kindergarten education, which had been preceded by reducing the taxation income of local governments. In many *gminas*, the result was the ‘pushing out’ of the younger children from the kindergarten system. In the outlined proposition, as the author has attempted to show, local social citizenship is most of all a concept of non-liberal perception of entitlements in social policy. It is to provide a context for the formulation of research questions primarily about two dimensions of citizen diversification – differences in access to local provisions and services among the inhabitants of various *gminas* and within *gminas*. However, it needs to be stressed here that it has not been assumed that it would be either achievable or fair that entitlements and possibilities of using them be identical for all. Instead, what is proposed is the ‘project’ of an in-depth research on the mechanisms of social stratification caused by formal and informal activities within local social policy.

Towards a Program of Research on Local Social Citizenship in Poland – Research Questions, Hypotheses, Operationalisation

The range of issues of research on local social citizenship may be wide – it serves more as an inspiration than firm theory. Therefore, in this part of the text, only four exemplary areas, relevant from the angle of local social policy in Poland, are indicated – the potential spheres of local social citizenship transformations. The first of them shall be questions about local patterns of social services provision, and further – of social policy, selected due to the stratifying character of activities. It is the question whether it is possible, to some extent by analogy to typologies of Esping-Andersen’s regimes of welfare state and their impact on the social structure, to consider ‘local regimes’ which are, for example, relatively more egalitarising or stratifying the citizens. What does it look like in the case of all *gmina’s* activities, and in the case of particular types of services? For kindergarten education, this would mean the question whether there are *gminas* (and what their characteristics are) where there is an average percentage of children attending kindergartens and using kindergarten education is relatively equally distributed within particular social layers (as opposed to what usually happens – that there is an overrepresentation of children from families of higher social and economic status)? Most important of all, the question whether there is and what the influence of local policy on such a situation would be significant here.

The author has attempted to answer similar questions in one of the exploratory studies on the *gmina* budget expenditures. Expenditure on the *gmina’s* own tasks, compared with the budget, have been arranged according to activities addressed, based on income tests (*gmina’s* social grants, *gmina’s* one-time maternity benefit, optional provisions of social assistance, etc.) and activities based on the universalis-

tic principle (public health care programs, expenses on school equipment in primary schools, etc.). The results of the research are described in detail in another work (Theiss 2012); however, the general conclusion is not alternativeness but a strong tendency to correlate (the number of inhabitants being controlled) to the scales of expenditure, which is explicated not only by the level of *gmina's* income. This may suggest that in Poland, at least in using the quantitative measures, local social citizenship is more a function of *gmina's* authorities' interest in standard and quality of life than a manifestation of the systemic concept of whom to support and in accordance with what regulations.

The second area of questions and hypotheses pertains to political, in their broad sense, conditionings of various potential patterns of favouring particular groups of social services recipients. Are there any connections between the hypothetical egalitarian access to kindergarten services and the 'political colours' of authorities or the character of political activity and mobilisation of the inhabitants? The mentioned cases of unique entitlements for *gminas'* inhabitants (co-financing of fertility treatment in Częstochowa, governed by a left-wing party coalition) raise hypotheses on the existence of political (also in the sense of the traditional 'party politics') conditioning of decisions on local services. In the mentioned research (Theiss 2012), the relation between 'generous' local social citizenship (high expenditure per capita on different *gmina's* own tasks) and the social capital in the *gminas* (density of non-governmental organisations, turnout at elections, use of instruments of local participation) has been observed; however, it pertained to rural *gminas* exclusively. In the urban ones, the context which was relatively more advantageous for generous citizenship had resulted from a good economic situation.

Another sphere of investigation on local social policy from the perspective of social citizenship has been determined by issues of formal and informal boundaries of a local community – the range of people who have access to the benefits of services of a *gmina* and the mechanisms of exclusion from this access. A hypothesis both on migrations and alleged migrations in search of better social services, and on mechanisms of the *gmina's* authorities guaranteeing 'their'⁴ inhabitants priority, can be raised here. In the current research carried by the author into the conditioning of local social citizenship in the *gminas* around Warsaw, there have been inhabitants' statements on giving fictitious addresses of residence by the inhabitants of neighbouring *gminas* in order to have greater chances of their child being admitted to kindergarten. Similarly, the initiatives were introduced (in some *gminas* such systems are already functioning) of a 'resident card' which will be distributed among *the actual* inhabitants and guarantee that "*those from the housing estate built out of the limits of the gmina, to whom the developer lied that they would live within it (...) will not apply to our kindergartens*" (council member in P, text underlined by MT).

⁴ That is, residing in the area of the *gmina*. It is significant in the light of lack of regional division in providing social services.

The issue closely linked with the subject of facilitating the access to *gmina*'s services and exclusion from it pertains to the associating of entitlements to services, or facilitations in access to services with specific obligations or responsibilities of citizens at the local level. It has been observed that recently in Poland, especially in the suburban *gminas*, the logics of associating the right to services with the responsibility or even the obligation to pay taxes at the local level has been more and more common. Apparently, the problem pertains to those inhabitants who migrate, among other things, to places where it is easier to find a job or where house prices are lower, and who still pay taxes in their 'old' places of permanent residence, which they do not wish to officially give up. In the local discourses, there are voices of unlawful (although fully legal!) right to kindergarten admission in the case of such families, as it is not based on the contribution of the interested party in the form of paying taxes. The reaction to that, for example in Warsaw, has been accepted that parents who apply for a place in a kindergarten receive additional points for documenting paying taxes locally. In other *gminas* (Lesznowola near Warsaw), there have been different charges for classes at the local culture centre, depending on the ability to present the proper certificate from the tax office. Another *gmina* near Warsaw (Wolomin) is holding a lottery in which the participants who have submitted their tax office location update forms may win a luxurious car. During one of the sittings of the town council, the mayor of this town stressed that this competition is aimed at those new inhabitants who want to manifest "*their local patriotism*".

One of the main criteria of methodological correctness of investigating into local social citizenship in the outlined approach is the application of such techniques which enable one to identify, in the first place, in the case of which *gminas* access to services is evenly distributed among various categories of citizens. Secondly, for which categories of citizens the formal entitlements remain only formal, and in the case of whom they allow the actual access to services. Thus, a useful quantitative approach would be to use multilevel data – on individual inhabitants by *gminas*. Databases prepared in this way are rather rare, though. Nevertheless, the outlined concept of research provides primarily arguments for multi-technique research, including analysis of acts of law, analysis of quantitative and qualitative data on rules of using services, and, as it is more and more often highlighted – analysis of public discourse. It still remains a methodological challenge to develop such approaches that would allow aggregation of knowledge on local social citizenship, and which would assumedly crystallise in relation to particular types of locally provided social services. The pioneer works in this field pertain to services in the domains of kindergarten education or activation of the unemployed.

Concluding Remarks

The presented concept of local social citizenship is an attempt to perceive local social policy as a system of social stratification. However, the potentially stratifying role of social policy is viewed here in its broad sense, in such a way that allows cov-

ering many, and new, dimensions of social diversification. The specificity of such an approach also relies upon the assumption that there is political, in its broad sense, conditioning of local social citizenship. Decisions on allocating funds of the *gmina*'s budget that result for the inhabitants in, for example, better access to certain services are (often ad hoc and random, though) political decisions. Thus, this is a rather different perspective than in some approaches in the national social geography, in which the differences in using social services are explained mainly as strict institutional patterns. Obviously, institutions inherent to local social citizenship may be *longue duree* structures; however, the construction of the concept may foster the explanation of a change more than the mentioned approaches.

According to the classical notion of citizenship a relation linking the citizen to the state should be a stable one and also a basis of her or his identity. Traditionally this was the case of a national citizenship. Such a stability could be easily regarded as obsolete in contemporary times. Since spatial mobility of people is growing, to what extent is it worth speaking of citizenship in terms suggesting individuals' strong attachment to a certain place? It should be noted that in here proposed understanding of local social citizenship neither the ideal of traditional local community, nor the assumption of lacking territorial mobility is taken into account. Rather, the here discussed category might be regarded as a tool to investigate the processes of citizenship disaggregation.

References

- Abrahamson P. (2005), *A new significance of space and place regarding social citizenship: the case of the European Union*. Paper prepared for the ISA RC 19 Conference at North Western University, Chicago, September 8-10, 2005.
- Benhabib S. (2002), *The transformations of Citizenship: the Case of Contemporary Europe*, "Government and Opposition", vo. 37, no 4, pp. 439-465.
- Bodnar A. (2008) *Obywatelstwo wielopoziomowe. Status jednostki w europejskiej przestrzeni konstytucyjnej*. Wyd. Sejmowe, Warszawa.
- Brannan T., John P., Stoker G. (2006), *Active Citizenship and Effective Public Services and Programmes: How Can We Know what really works?* "Urban Studies", vol 43, nos 5/6, pp. 993-1008.
- Duszczuk M., Stawicka K. (2003), *Obywatelstwo europejskie. Pytania i odpowiedzi*. Wyd. Fund. im S. Batorego, Warszawa.
- Garlicki, L (2009), *Polskie prawo konstytucyjne. Zarys wykładu*. PWN, Warszawa.
- Greer S., Matzke M (2009), *Introduction: devolution and citizenship rights*. In: *Devolution and social citizenship*, S. L Greer (ed.), The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Heywood A. (2008), *Klucz do politologii*, Warszawa PWN.
- Jakimowicz, W. (2002), *Publiczne prawa podmiotowe*, Zakamycze, Warszawa.
- Korpi W. (2010), *Class and Gender inequalities in different types of welfare states: The Social Citizenship Indicator Program (SCIP)*, "International Journal of Social Welfare" no 19/2010.

- Kwiatkowska (2010), *Koncepcja obywatelstwa w teorii feministycznej*. In: *Praktyki obywatelskie Polaków*, J. Raciborski (ed.). IFiS PAN, Warszawa.
- Kvist J. (2008) *Measuring welfare states: problems and possibilities in cross-national studies*. Conference paper for: 'The Future of Social Citizenship: Politics, Institutions and Outcomes', Stockholm 2008.
- Kymlicka W., Norman W. (1994), *Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory*. "Ethics", vol. 104, no 2, pp. 352-381.
- Marinetti M. (2003), *Who Wants to be an Active Citizen?: The Politics and Practice of Community Involvement*, "Sociology" vol 37 (1), pp. 103-120.
- Marshall T. H. (1950) *Citizenship and Social Class and other essays*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Piszko R. (2006), *Pojęcie prawa podmiotowego*. In: *Prawa podmiotowe. Pojmowanie w naukach prawnych*. J. Ciapały, K. Flaga-Gieruszyńska (ed.), USz i WWSH-E in Jarocin, Szczecin.
- Putnam R. (1995), *Demokracja w działaniu: tradycje obywatelskie we współczesnych Włoszech*. Fund. im. S. Batorego, Warszawa.
- Raciborski, J. (2011) *Obywatelstwo w perspektywie socjologicznej*. Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Sassen S. (2002), *Towards Post-National Citizenship*. In: E. Isin, B. Turner, *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, Sage London.
- Shinkel W. (2010), *The Virtualization of Citizenship*, "Critical Sociology" no 36 (2)/2010, pp 265-283.
- Soysal N. (1994), *Limits of Citizenship*, University of Chicago Press.
- Supińska J. (1991) *Dylematy polityki społecznej*. IPS UW Warszawa.
- Theiss M. (2012), *Różne światy lokalnego obywatelstwa społecznego? O zróżnicowaniach gminnej polityki społecznej w Polsce*, „Studia Polityczne” no 30, pp. 287-322
- Turner B. S. (2009) *Thinking Citizenship Series*. T.H. Marshall, *Social rights and English national identity*. "Citizenship Studies", vol. 13, pp. 65-73.
- Yegen M. (2008), *The dialectic and the tragedy of citizenship*, "European Political Science" no 7, pp. 98-112.
- Young I. M. (1989), *Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship*, "Ethics" no 99, no 2, pp. 250-274.
- Yuval-Davis N. (1997), *Women, Citizenship and Difference*, "Feminist Review" no 57, pp. 4-27.
- Zamorska K. (2010), *Prawa społeczne jako program przebudowy polityki społecznej*, WUWr, Wrocław.

Streszczenie

Celem artykułu jest próba zarysowania w teorii polityki społecznej autorskiej koncepcji lokalnego obywatelstwa społecznego. Paradoks koncepcji obywatelstwa społecznego polega na tym, że może ono służyć zarówno rozpoznawaniu, jak i skrywaniu

nierówności w dostępie do świadczeń i usług oferowanych przez państwo opiekuńcze. W artykule przeanalizowane są te aspekty konstrukcji lokalnego obywatelstwa społecznego, dzięki którym może ono służyć temu pierwszemu celowi. W pierwszej części tekstu omówione jest znaczenie uprawnień w koncepcji lokalnego obywatelstwa społecznego – ukazane jest, że wyłącznie formalno-prawne ich rozumienie jest w polityce społecznej zbyt zawężające. W drugiej części przedstawione są różnice między liberalnym ich rozumieniem a proponowanym w ramach lokalnego obywatelstwa społecznego. W części ostatniej zaproponowane są hipotezy dotyczące ważniejszych przemian lokalnego obywatelstwa społecznego w Polsce – m.in. wskazane jest, że do czynienia mamy z silniejszym powiązaniem uprawnień z realizacją określonych obowiązków na poziomie lokalnym.

Słowa kluczowe: lokalna polityka społeczna, obywatelstwo społeczne, społeczność lokalna, lokalne obywatelstwo