

---

## Monitorial Citizenship: a Case of Lithuania

Jūratė Imbrasaitė

---

**Edição electrónica**

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/cp/989>

DOI: 10.4000/cp.989

ISSN: 2183-2269

**Editora**

Escola Superior de Comunicação Social

**Refêrencia eletrónica**

Jūratė Imbrasaitė, « Monitorial Citizenship: a Case of Lithuania », *Comunicação Pública* [Online], vol.10 n° 18 | 2015, posto online no dia 15 outubro 2015, consultado o 02 maio 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/cp/989> ; DOI : 10.4000/cp.989

---

Este documento foi criado de forma automática no dia 2 May 2019.



Comunicação Pública Este trabalho está licenciado com uma Licença Creative Commons - Atribuição-NãoComercial 4.0 Internacional.

---

# Monitorial Citizenship: a Case of Lithuania

Jūratė Imbrasaitė

---

NOTA DO EDITOR

Received: June 23, 2013

Accepted: September 17, 2014

## 1. Introduction

- 1 Citizenship has become a fashionable concept over recent decades and the literature on this subject is enormous (Schudson, 1998; Norris, 1999; Hooghe and Dejaeghere, 2007). Most scholars argue that the nation state is in decline and there is a need to do some hard thinking about what these changes mean for the emergence of a new concept of citizenship. Traditionally, citizenship has been conceived in statist terms and the form of citizenship participation has defined the nature of the subject in modern politics (Turner, 1998). From the perspective of traditional citizenship, support for democratic institutions and citizen participation is an essential condition for the functioning and stability of democracy. However, the relationship between the young generations and traditional political institutions in advanced democracies may be characterized as problematic. Pessimistic authors assert that widespread decline of civic participation weakens representative democracies. People are getting alienated from the political process (Putnam, 1993, 2000; Putnam & Goss, 2002).
- 2 On the other hand, proponents of the postmodern citizenship are more optimistic regarding the decline of trust in government, voting, and membership in political parties. They indicate that the decline of traditional forms of citizen participation and rising political cynicism among publics may be explained as the shift from traditional to new forms of citizenship (Dalton & Wattenberg, 2001; Inglehart, 1997; Inglehart & Welzer,

2005; Norris, 1999). Most authors agree that participation in protests acts as long as it is related to self-expression is not dangerous to the stability of democracy (Inglehart, 1997; Norris, 1999). Despite the fact that younger people have become more critical, they are more attached to democratic principles in comparison with the older generations (Norris, 1999).

- 3 Transitions to democracy in postcommunist countries were facilitated by mass mobilizations of elite-challenging activities. Notwithstanding, the interest in politics, voter turnout, participation in protest acts have been declining, there has been a slight increase in membership in political parties and membership in trade unions (Degutis, 2002; Degutis, 2004; Inglehart & Catterberg, 2002; Riekašius, 2003; Žiliukaitė, Ramonaitė, 2006; Žiliukaitė, 2006). Most scholars argue that there are no socioeconomic and cultural conditions for the development of postmodern citizenship in postcommunist countries (Mishler & Rose, 1998; Inglehart & Catterberg, 2002; Inglehart & Welzer, 2005; Savicka, 2004). They indicate that the current decline of elite-challenging activities in the new democracies is temporary.
- 4 This article focuses on the emergence of postmodern citizenship in Lithuania. Does postmodern citizenship actually occur in Lithuania? What may be explanations for the differences between forms of postmodern citizenship and other types of citizenship?
- 5 The method of the study is an analysis of the data of the survey sample. The article consists of four parts. In the first section, definitions of citizenship are introduced. In the second section, postmodern citizenship and its characteristics are described. In the third section, the results of the descriptive analysis and linear regression are presented. In the fourth section, the occurrence of monitorial citizenship and its conformance to theoretical expectations are discussed.

## 2. Definitions of citizenship

- 6 A number of definitions of citizenship focus on the distribution of political and social rights and duties, institutional infrastructures of participation and engagement, issues of integration. Most social scientists have been analysed the concept of citizenship in terms of the legal, political and social entitlements which define rights and privileges of the citizen. Marshall's (1964) concern with citizenship was related to a specific problem of social theory: how to reconcile the formal democracy with the social consequences of capitalism. Marshall argued that the negative impact of class differences on individual life-chances may be limited by the help of the welfare state. Marshall (1964) divided citizenship into three dimensions, which included the civil, political and social aspects. There were civil, political and social rights that were not equally significant. Marshall's theory leads to the question whether there is a single version of citizenship, or whether there may be different formulations of the citizenship in different social and cultural traditions.
- 7 A number of other definitions of citizenship focus on "being a good citizen", which consists of knowing citizenship rights and tending to volunteer for activities (Roelofs, 1957). Somers (1993, p. 589) rejects the definition of citizenship as being a status of a category of persons, and indicates that citizenship may be defined as an "instituted process", which is a "set of institutionally embedded practices" that are "contingent upon and constituted by networks of relationships and political idioms that stress membership

and universal rights and duties in a national community". Somers' (1993) definition is related to dynamics of social construction of citizenship during particular historical conditions. The notion of social practice refers to the sociological idea of citizenship, which is distinct from a juridical notion of citizenship.

- 8 Turner (1993:2) indicated that citizenship refers a set of political, economic, juridical and cultural practices that "define a person as a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups". The flow of resources is related to "differences in the individual life-cycle in relationship to the enjoyment of citizenship privileges" (Turner 1993:4). In other words, citizenship is not merely collection of rights and duties, but a process or a set of practices, which depends on historical context and is related to unequal distribution of resources in society (Turner, 1993). Citizenship refers to the content and types of social rights and duties, social forces that produce practices and social arrangements that are used to distribute privileges and benefits within society (Turner 1993). Type of citizenship refers to whether citizenship is passive or active and the form of citizenship participation defines the nature of the subject in modern politics (Turner, 1993). Some social scientists insist that understanding of citizenship as "a passive status and active form of participation may solve some of objections, but there are problems in including all processes leading to citizenship in the basic definition of the concept" (Janoski 1998). Turner (1993:3) indicates that his "definition of citizenship places the concept squarely in the debate about inequality, power differences and social class, because citizenship is inevitably and necessarily bound up with the problem of unequal distribution of resources in society". Various theories of citizenship are appropriate, because they depend on political and social circumstances in contemporary societies.

### 3. Monitorial citizenship

- 9 Inglehart (1977:317-321) predicted declining rates of elite-directed political mobilization and rising rates of elite-challenging political behavior among citizens in advanced industrial societies. Citizen participation is shifting from bureaucratized and elite directed forms of participation such as voting, membership in political parties and trade unions to more spontaneous, issue-specific, and elite-challenging actions such as petitions, demonstrations and boycotts (Inglehart 1977; 1997). If issues have broad symbolical relevance, citizens are mostly ready to express their preferences on specific issues directly. Citizens are inclined to participate in self-organizing and self-expressive forms of actions and they participate, even if they think their actions are not able to change official decisions. "Political self-expression becomes a value in itself and not just a way to attain specific goal" (Inglehart & Welzer 2005:119). The traditional elite-centered democracy are getting more people-centered and the source of this change is an intergenerational shift from materialist to postmaterialist or from survival to self-expression values (Inglehart 1977, Inglehart 1997, Inglehart & Welzer 2005).
- 10 The shift towards self-expression values is going together with cognitive mobilization (Inglehart, 1997; Inglehart & Welzer, 2005). Because of the rising levels of skills, citizens prefer to shape specific decisions rather than entrust them to more skilled representatives (Inglehart & Catterberg, 2002). The younger, better-educated, and more oriented to self-expression citizens replace older ones in the adult population. Inglehart and Welzer (2005) argue that the increase of intrinsically motivated, expressive, and elite-

challenging forms of participation in postindustrial societies reflects the changing nature of social capital. Elite-challenging activities are mostly not related to permanent membership lists and usually emerge from loosely knit and civic networks (Inglehart & Welzer 2005). This indicates the shift from externally imposed ties based on social control mechanisms to autonomously chosen ties, which people create themselves. Inglehart and Welzer (2005) contends that the Church membership and trade-union membership usually are determined by one's religious heritage or social class, however, participation in an environmentalist group or a civil rights group reflects an autonomous choice. "The public of postindustrial societies are becoming more critical of institutionalized authority in general, and political authority in particular, and less likely to become members of bureaucratized organizations" (Inglehart & Welzer, 2005:117).

11 Postindustrial democracies are characterized by large age-related differences, while the young citizens emphasize self-expression values much more than the old ones (Inglehart, 1997; Inglehart & Welzer, 2005). The generational differences reflect long-term improvements in the living conditions that shaped the formative years of the respective generations, and these improvements were not experienced in all societies (Inglehart & Welzer, 2005). According to Inglehart (1997; 2005), socioeconomic development, self-expression values, and democratic institutions work together. The shift in forms of citizen participation interacts with economic, social and political developments in the given society (Inglehart & Welzer 2005).

12 Making an historical overview of the development of the citizenship in the United States, Schudson (1998, 1999) insists that a form of citizenship depends on a particular phase of the political system. The traditional model of citizenship in the eighteenth century was based on trust, confidence and participation. Globalization and individualization implies that traditional and party - oriented participation has been declining in recent decades. Nowadays citizens may be monitorial rather than informed (Schudson, 1998: 8):

A monitorial citizen scans (rather than reads) the informational environment in a way so that he or she may be alerted on a very wide variety of issues for a very wide variety of ends and may be mobilized around those issues in a large variety of ways. (...) The monitorial citizen engages in environmental surveillance more than information - gathering. Picture parents watching small children at the community pool. They are not gathering information; they are keeping an eye on the scene. They look inactive, but they are poised for action if action is required. The monitorial citizen is a watchful one, even while he or she is doing something else. In this world, monitoring is a plausible model of citizenship.

13 Politics constantly presents in citizens lives in recent decades. "Citizenship now is a year-round and day-long activity, as it was only rarely in the past" (Schudson, 1998: 311). According to Schudson (1998), monitorial citizen is not a passive one, but he or she acts whether he or she feels it is necessary to act. Consequently, the monitorial citizen scans persons, issues, values as well as politics every day. The maintenance of the citizenship through monitoring is facilitated by technological means:

(...) the democracy of partisanship and the democracy of rights both call attention to two concepts that are far too often omitted in discussions of digital democracy: expertise and institutions. We are not going to have democracy without expertise, nor should we want to. We are going to have a democracy without a variety of institutions that mediate between private individuals and public governing bodies, nor should we. But we do and will have continuing discussions about wired nations as if every citizen could be and should be his or her own expert and could and

should communicate directly with political representatives without benefit of mediating institutions (Schudson, 1998: 310).

- 14 Hooghe and Dejaeghere considered Schudson’s description of the monitorial citizen as an ideal type, which “corresponds to someone who is politically interested, enjoys efficacy and participates in a non-traditional manner” (2007:261). They argue that the monitorial citizen may be identified by four defining characteristics: political interest, high level of internal political efficacy, certain degree of political activity, and participation outside the realm of institutionalized politics (Hooghe & Dejaeghere, 2007). Hooghe and Dejaeghere suggested measurement of the defining characteristics of the monitorial citizen. The first criterion, political interest may be measured by asking respondents whether they are interested in politics.<sup>1</sup> The second criterion, internal political efficacy may consist of two items: the first question is the Likert statement that politics is so complicated that one can no longer understand it, the second question asks whether the respondents find it difficult to make up their mind about political affairs. It is assumed that the monitorial citizens will have a feeling that they can understand politics and that they find it relatively easy to form an opinion on politics.<sup>2</sup> The third criterion, political participation is measured by seven items (contacting a politician or a government official, working in a political party or action group, working in another organization, displaying a sticker or a badge for a campaign, signing a petition, taking part in a legal demonstration, and boycotting goods for political or ethical reasons)<sup>3</sup>.
- 15 Hooghe and Dejaeghere (2007) applied three criteria (interest, efficacy and participation) in a logical manner and deducted eight groups (see table 1). The fourth criterion is participation in institutionalized politics.<sup>4</sup>
- 16 The group of citizens, who is interested in politics, feels politically efficacious and participates in activities of political parties and trade unions, was identified as the active traditional. Hooghe and Dejaeghere (2007) assumed that the group, which is interested in politics, feels politically efficacious and participate in some political acts, but refrain from institutionalized politics, comes closest to the ideal type of a monitorial citizen.

**Table 1. Hooghe’s and Dejaeghere’s an ideal type-based approach to citizenship**

	Interest in politics	Political efficacy	Participation
Active traditional	interested	efficacious	active
Active monitorial	interested	efficacious	active
Burnt out citizen	interested	efficacious	not active
Modest citizen	interested	not efficacious	active
Timid citizen	interested	not efficacious	not active
Opportunistic citizen	not interested	efficacious	active
Bold citizen	not interested	efficacious	not active
Instrumental citizen	not interested	not efficacious	active

Passive	not interested	not efficacious	not active
---------	----------------	-----------------	------------

- 17 The findings of Hooghe’s and Dejaeghere’s (2007) research reveal that the group of citizens (18.1 percent of the population) that mostly corresponds to the notion of postmodern citizen identified by various authors belongs to political parties and trade unions in Scandinavian countries.

## 4. Research methodology

- 18 The measurement of political participation in the questionnaires corresponds to questions that are used in classical studies of political participation (Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993; Verba, Nie & Kim, 1978; Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995). Political participation is measured by 14 questions that include modes of political participation such as voting, contacting, working in a political party or/and in an election campaign and protest actions.<sup>5</sup>
- 19 The instrument of the survey was a questionnaire, which includes closed questions concerning political participation modes, membership in organizations, characteristics of networks of discussion about politics, individual and collective values and attitudes.
- 20 The empirical analysis of the types of participators is based on quantitative data. The method of the study is survey sample data. The survey was conducted by the Market and Opinion Research Center “Vilmorus” in June, 2006. The sample of the survey was a stratified multi-stage sample, which represents the total number of the inhabitants of Lithuania at the age 18-75 and includes 1050 respondents.
- 21 This study employs various methods and techniques of statistical analysis in order to measure relations between types of citizenship and age, education, income as well as to investigate the differences among the types of the citizenship.

## 5. Forms of citizenship in Lithuania: the results of an empirical investigation

- 22 There is a statistically significant relation between types of citizenship and age (see table 2). The active traditional citizens mostly include respondents at the age from 36 to 55 years (42.5 percent of all active traditional citizens), but there are a number of respondents among traditional citizens at the age from 18 to 35 years. Contrary to theoretical expectations, the active monitorial group is older than the active traditional group - 37.7 percent of respondents of the active monitorial group are in the age over 55 years and 35.2 percent of the respondents of this group are in the age between 36 and 55 years.
- 23 The highest percentage of respondents in the age between 18 and 35 years are among the opportunistic (47.2 percent) and the bold citizens (53.3 percent).

**Table 2. Types of citizenship by age**

	18-35 years, %	36-55 years,%	over 55,%	Total, %
--	----------------	---------------	-----------	----------

Active traditional	30.0	42.5	27.5	100 (40)
Monitorial	27.0	35.2	37.7	100 (122)
Burnt out citizen	15.2	27.4	57.3	100 (164)
Modest citizen	17.4	26.1	56.5	100 (23)
Timid citizen	8.8	31.9	59.3	100 (91)
Opportunistic citizen	47.2	29.2	23.6	100 (72)
Bold citizen	53.3	26.9	19.8	100 (167)
Instrumental citizen	29.3	46.3	24.4	100 (41)
Passive	29.4	25.8	44.8	100 (163)

Note: N=883; Cramer's V =0.373, p=0.000.

- 24 There is a statistically significant relation between types of citizenship and education (see table 3). More than half of the traditional citizens (55.0 percent) have pursued higher education. The highest percentage of high educated respondents is in the group of the traditional citizens. As could be expected, the lowest education level is among the passive. The data in table 3 contradicts theoretical expectations that the monitorial citizens are mostly educated - 34.4 percent of the monitorial have pursued higher education and it is a lower level in comparison with the traditional group.

**Table 3. Types of citizenship by education**

	Incomplete secondary, %	Secondary, %	Secondary professional, %	High, %	Total, %
Active traditional	5.0	10.0	30.0	55.0	100 (40)
Monitorial	9.0	25.0	31.1	34.4	100 (122)
Burnt out citizen	21.3	24.4	32.3	22.0	100 (164)
Modest citizen	17.4	21.7	30.4	30.4	100 (23)
Timid citizen	30.8	33.0	28.6	7.7	100 (91)
Opportunistic citizen	23.7	20.8	31.9	23.6	100 (72)
Bold citizen	31.2	37.7	18.6	12.6	100 (167)



Instrumental citizen	21.9	36.6	26.8	14.6	100 (41)
Passive	42.3	34.4	16.0	7.4	100 (163)

Note: N=883; Cramer's V =0.205, p=0.000.

- 25 There is a statistically significant relation between types of citizenship and self-realization (see table 4). The traditional citizens are characterized by high self-realization - 94.9 percent of all traditional citizens are characterized by high level of self-realization. Contrary to theoretical expectations, the monitorial citizens are characterized by a lower level of self-realization in comparison with the traditional citizens and opportunistic citizens - 87.3 percent of the opportunistic citizens and 82.8 percent of the active monitorial are characterized by high levels of self-realization.

**Table 4. Types of citizenship by self-realization**

	Low self-realization, %	Middle self-realization, %	High self-realization, %	Total, %
Active traditional	-	5.1	94.9	100 (39)
Monitorial	5.7	11.5	82.8	100 (122)
Burnt out citizen	10.6	19.9	69.6	100 (161)
Modest citizen	13.0	8.7	78.3	100 (23)
Timid citizen	17.2	34.5	48.3	100 (87)
Opportunistic citizen	4.2	8.5	87.3	100 (71)
Bold citizen	7.9	12.7	79.4	100 (165)
Instrumental citizen	7.5	17.5	75.0	100 (40)
Passive	25.9	28.4	45.7	100 (162)

Note: N=870; Cramer's V =0.253, p=0.000.

- 26 There is a statistically significant relation between types of citizenship and generalized trust (see table 5). The active monitorial citizens are characterized by higher levels of generalized trust in comparison with other groups. The group of the active monitorial

citizens includes 32.0 percent of respondents whose levels of generalized trust is low, 38.5 percent – levels of generalized trust is average and 29.5 percent – levels of generalized trust is high.

**Table 5. Types of citizenship by generalized trust**

	Low trust, %	Middle trust, %	High trust, %	Total, %
Active traditional	35.0	40.0	25.0	100 (40)
Monitorial	32.0	38.5	29.5	100 (122)
Burnt out citizen	41.1	44.2	14.7	100 (163)
Modest citizen	56.5	43.5	-	100 (23)
Timid citizen	57.8	31.1	11.1	100 (90)
Opportunistic citizen	36.1	40.3	23.6	100 (72)
Bold citizen	44.0	39.8	16.3	100 (166)
Instrumental citizen	43.9	48.8	7.3	100 (41)
Passive	69.4	24.4	6.3	100 (160)

Note: N=877; Cramer's V =0.212, p=0.000.

- 27 There is a statistically significant relation between types of citizenship and membership in sport club, membership in cultural club, membership in local community organization, membership in political party, membership in trade unions (see table 6). The highest percentage of members of sport clubs and culture clubs is among the active monitorial citizens. The monitorial citizens and the bold citizens refrain from membership in a local community organization. The higher percentage of members of sport clubs (15.6 percent) and members of cultural clubs (22.5 percent) is among the opportunistic citizens in comparison to the active traditional ones (adequately 13.3 percent and 12.5 percent). The highest percentage of members of local community organizations (51.6 percent), political parties (66.7 percent) and trade unions (61.9 percent) is among active traditional citizens.

**Table 6. Types of citizenship by membership in organizations**

	Sport club		Cultural club		Local community organization		Political party		Trade union	
	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	
Active traditional	13.3 86.7	12.5 87.5	51.6 48.4	66.7 35.3	61.9 38.1					
Monitorial	22.2 71.8	27.5 72.5	- 100	- 100	- 100					
Burnt out citizen	13.3 86.7	10.0 90.0	- 100	- 100	- 100					
Modest citizen	4.4 95.6	- 100	- 100	- 100	- 100					
Timid citizen	2.2 97.8	- 100	9.7 90.3	4.2 95.8	9.5 80.5					
Opportunistic citizen	15.6 84.4	22.5 77.5	6.5 93.5	8.3 91.7	- 100					
Bold citizen	13.3 86.7	7.5 92.5	- 100	- 100	- 100					
Instrumental citizen	11.1 88.9	7.5 92.5	22.6 77.4	20.8 79.2	19.0 81.0					
Passive	4.4 95.6	12.5 87.5	9.7 90.3	- 100	9.5 90.5					
Cramer's V	0.179***	0.195***	0.474***	0.525***	0.452***					

Note: \*\*\*p=0.000, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05.

- 28 There is a statistically significant relation between types of citizenship and different modes of political participation (see table 7). The highest percentage of respondents, who have participated in protest actions are among the monitorial citizens. 22.1 percent of the monitorial citizens participated in the protest actions.
- 29 The highest percentage of respondents, who signed a petition or/and contacted mass media are among the traditional citizens. 60 percent of the traditional citizens signed a petition or/and contacted mass media. The second group, which includes a number of respondents, who signed a petition or/and contacted mass media, is the monitorial citizens. 44.3 percent of the monitorial citizens signed a petition or/and contacted mass media.

**Table 7. Types of citizenship by participation in political acts**

	Voting		Contacting		Working in a party/an organization		Signing a petition/contacting mass media		Protesting	
	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	Yes,% No,%	
Active traditional	97.3 2.7	50.0 50.0	92.5 7.5	60.0 40.0	15.0 85.0					
Monitorial	91.5 8.5	54.1 45.9	37.7 62.3	44.3 55.7	22.1 77.9					
Burnt out citizen	92.7 7.3	- 100	- 100	- 100	- 100					

Modest citizen	100 -	69.6 30.4	3.0 97.0	26.1 73.9	13.0 87.0
Timid citizen	93.6 6.4	- 100	- 100	- 100	- 100
Opportunistic citizen	80.6 19.4	58.3 41.7	94.9 5.1	31.9 68.1	16.7 83.3
Bold citizen	67.1 22.9	- 100	77.6 22.4	- 100	- 100
Instrumental citizen	85.7 14.3	51.5 48.8	97.0 3.0	34.1 65.9	7.3 92.7
Passive	71.0 29.0	- 100	- 100	- 100	- 100
Cramer'sV	0.211***	0.402***	0.331***	0.417***	0.197***

NOTE: \*\*\*p=0.000, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05.

30 Table 8 presents the profile of types of citizenship. The highest number of respondents belongs to the group of the monitorial citizens (17.4 percent of population) in comparison to the traditional citizens (4.5 percent of all population). It has to be noted that the group of the monitorial citizens does not fulfil all theoretical expectations. This group is not extremely young – their age average is 48.0 years, we tend to find the youngest age groups in the lower categories, these claim they are not interested in politics, namely the opportunistic citizens – their average of age is 40.5 years - and the bold citizens – their average of age is 38.4 years. The highest percentage of highly educated respondents is in the group of the active traditional citizens. There are less respondents among the monitorial citizens, who pursued higher education in comparison with the active traditional citizens. There are less respondents among the monitorial citizens, who pursued higher education in comparison with other groups. The lowest level of education can be found among the group that is completely passive (no interest, no efficacy, no activity) – the passive citizens. There is no statistically significant relationship between types of citizenship and trust in political institutions.

Table 8. Profile of types of citizenship

	Frequency, % (N)	Average age	High education %	Average income	Self-realization	Generalized trust	Average number of acts
Active traditional	4.5 (40)	45.7	55.0	819.0	9.4	4.6	3.58
Monitorial	17.4 (155)	48.0	34.4	584.6	8.4	4.8	2.23
Burnt out	19.1 (170)	55.8	22.0	558.2	7.5	4.2	0
Modest	2.9 (26)	56.0	30.4	510.9	7.7	2.8	1.74
Timid	9.6 (85)	59.0	7.7	456.7	6.4	3.3	0

Opportunistic	9.2 (82)	40.5	23.6	553.5	8.8	4.6	1.98
Bold	19.3 (172)	38.4	12.6	507.8	8.0	4.0	0
Instrumental	3.5 (31)	45.1	14.6	482.1	7.6	3.7	2.0
Passive	18.1 (161)	49.1	7.4	445.6	6.0	2.9	0
Total, (N)	100 (889)	48.3 (889)	100 (889)	527.4 (889)	7.5 (889)	3.9 (889)	1.77 (883)

- 31 A multilevel analysis of the relationship between the types of citizenship and self-realization and the types of citizenship and generalized trust are presented in table 9. Since the types of citizenship differ with regard to age, education and income, these characteristics are included as control variables. It has to be noted that the aim of multilevel analysis is to develop a test including controls for the bivariate observation that monitorial citizens do not seem to be exceptional with regard to self-realization and levels of generalized trust.
- 32 The results of multivariate level analysis confirm that age (negatively), education (positively) and the type of citizenship (positively) has impact on self-realization. Age has the highest impact on self-realization in comparison with education, income and type of citizenship.
- 33 Education, income and type of citizenship has impact on generalized trust levels, but even taking into account these control variables there is a significant relationship between types of citizenship and levels of generalized trust. Education has higher impact on self-realization in comparison to the type of citizenship.

**Table 9. The impact of citizenship types on self-realization and generalized trust**

	B	SE	Beta	B	SE	Beta
Intercept	7.104***	0.366		2.083***	0.358	
Age	-1.266	0.102	-0.379***	-0.123	0.100	-0.044
Education	0.526	0.073	0.231***	0.367	0.071	0.192***
Income	0.001	0.000	0.078*	0.001	0.000	0.099**
Active traditional	2.011	0.425	0.152***	0.690	0.415	0.061
Monitorial	1.171	0.248	0.160***	0.670	0.242	0.108**
Burnt out citizen	1.196	0.255	0.170***	0.699	0.248	0.118**
Modest citizen	1.029	0.477	0.065	-0.696	0.466	-0.052
Timid citizen	0.360	0.313	0.038	0.024	0.302	0.003
Opportunistic citizen	1.499	0.306	0.157***	0.959	0.299	0.119**
Bold citizen	0.965	0.253	0.137***	0.661	0.248	0.110**
Instrumental citizen	0.417	0.445	0.028	0.146	0.429	0.012
R -square	0.58			0.34		

**NOTE: \*\*\*p=0.000, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05.**

- 34 Entries are results from an OLS-regression. Types of citizenship are dummy variables. The group of the passive citizens is omitted. Self-realization is a dependent variable in the first model, generalized trust is a dependent variable in the second one.
- 35 The monitorial citizens significantly differ from the traditional ones according to their levels of self-realization, but those groups do not significantly differ according to their age, in comparison with the traditional citizens (see table 10). The monitorial citizens have the lowest income per family person in comparison with traditional ones. The monitorial citizens differ from the traditional citizens according to their perceptions of effectiveness of civil disobedience in the decision - making process and trust to political parties. The monitorial citizens have higher levels of perceptions of effectiveness of civil disobedience and lower levels of trust in political parties in comparison to the traditional ones. The monitorial citizens have higher levels of perceptions that a good citizen has to show solidarity with other people, on the other hand, they have less developed “open” leisure networks in comparison to the traditional citizens.

**Table 10. Differences between the monitorial citizen and the traditional citizen**

	Monitorial	Active traditional	t
Income	584.6	819.0	-3.154**
Effectiveness of civil disobedience in the decision-making process	5.27	4.18	2.005*
Socializing with people one does not know	1.98	1.53	2.821**
Socializing with people who have different lifestyle	2.17	1.68	2.661**
Socializing with people who are not born in Lithuania	2.26	1.68	2.698**
Good citizen has to show solidarity with other people	8.04	6.85	2.824**
Trust to political parties	2.64	3.58	-2.162*
Self-realization	8.39	9.44	-2.807**

Note: \*\*\*p=0.000, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05.

**Table 11. Differences between the monitorial citizen and the opportunistic citizen**

	Monitorial	Opportunistic	t
Age	48.9	45.7	2.751**
Frequency of talking about politics	1.98	2.97	-6.455***
Easiness of expression of a deviant opinion	8.25	6.61	4.397***
Able to write a letter against decision	1.29	1.56	-3.832***
Good citizen has to serve in the Army	8.47	7.18	3.027**

**NOTE: \*\*\*p=0.000, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05.**

- 36 The monitorial citizens significantly do not differ from the opportunistic ones by levels of self-realization, but they differ by age (see table 11). The monitorial citizens significantly differ from the opportunistic citizens by frequency of talking about political and social matters, self-assessment of easiness of expression of a deviant opinion, self-assessment of own abilities to write a letter against the decision of a government institution and perceptions of a good citizen. The monitorial citizens talk about political and social matters more frequently, their self-assessment of easiness of expression of a deviant opinion and their self-assessment levels of ability to write a letter against the decision of a government institution is higher in comparison with the opportunistic ones. The monitorial citizens have higher levels of perceptions that a good citizen has to serve in the Army in comparison with the traditional ones.
- 37 The monitorial citizens do not differ significantly from the opportunistic citizens by levels of self-realization, but they differ by age (see table 12). The monitorial citizens differ significantly from the opportunistic ones by their characteristics of political communication, perceptions of effectiveness of various forms of participation in decision-making process, perceptions of a good citizen, generalized trust, trust in the Army and importance of social justice. The monitorial citizens' levels of these dimensions are

higher in comparison with the bold citizens with the exception of perceptions that a good citizen has not to wait the State to solve his/her problems. The monitorial citizens' levels of perceptions that a good citizen has not to wait as long as the State start solving his or her problems, are lower in comparison with the bold ones.

**Table 12. Differences between the monitorial citizen and the bold citizen**

	Monitorial	Bold	t
Age	45.7	38.4	4.377***
Frequency of talking about politics	1.98	3.38	-10.688***
Number of people whom discuss politics	4.0	2.87	3.383**
Effectiveness of civic disobedience in the decision-making process	5.27	4.19	3.145**
Effectiveness of a petition in the decision-making process	5.44	4.34	3.135**
Good citizen has to show solidarity with other people	8.04	7.38	2.436*
Good citizen has to vote in elections	8.61	7.90	2.367*
Good citizen has to serve in the Army	8.47	7.10	4.040***
Good citizen has to learn state language	9.74	9.36	2.778**
Good citizen has to be informed	9.28	8.39	4.714***
Good citizen has not to wait the State to solve his/her problems	7.74	8.33	-2.046*
Good citizen has to not treat the minorities as worse	8.88	8.32	2.079*
Trust to people	4.75	4.02	2.479*
Trust to the Army	6.78	6.17	2.001*
Social justice	9.48	8.42	3.553***
Evaluation of present economic situation of the country	6.59	6.16	2.020*

Note: \*\*\*p=0.000, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05.

- 38 The opportunistic citizens significantly differ from the bold ones by levels of self-realization, but there is no difference between those groups by age (see table 13). The opportunistic citizens significantly differ from the bold ones by characteristics of political communication and values such as self-realization, self-discipline and social justice. The opportunistic citizens are characterized by higher levels of characteristics of political communication and values such as self-realization, self-discipline and social justice in comparison to the bold ones.



Table 13. Differences between the opportunistic citizen and the bold citizen

	Opportunistic	Bold	t
Number of people talk about politics	3.63	2.87	2.452*
Frequency of talking about politics	2.97	3.38	-2.408*
Self-realization	8.76	7.99	2.320*
Self-discipline	9.15	8.58	2.428*
Social justice	9.53	8.92	3.125**

Note: \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05.

## 6. Discussion

- 39 The focus of this article was the occurrence of monitorial citizenship in Lithuania. There are 17.4 percent of the citizens who are interested in politics, feel effective and participate, but refrain from traditional organizations such as political parties, trade unions and local community organizations and might be called monitorial citizens. However, from the theoretical perspective of postmodern citizenship, the characteristics of a “monitorial citizen” in Lithuania do not confirm theoretical hypotheses. Despite abstention from membership in political parties, trade union and local community organizations, monitorial citizens have a high percentage of participation in elections (91.5 percent of all monitorial citizens) which is a traditional form of citizen participation.
- 40 Even if the percentage of participation in protest actions among the monitorial citizens is the highest, it is the least in comparison to other modes of political participation. Only 22.1 percent of all monitorial citizens participated in protest actions, 37.7 percent - worked in a party or/and an organization, 44.3 percent - signed a petition or/and contacted mass media, 69.6 percent - contacted a politician or/and a government official or/and organization. This allows for an assumption that enthusiasm of elite-challenging actions of the transition period gave way to a more passive behaviour and the decline of protest actions. On the other hand, even if the monitorial citizens are characterized by the highest levels of generalized trust in comparison with the other groups (see table 5 and table 8), they are inclined to participate in individual political actions such as voting, contacting, signing a petition and it may be explained as a result of derogation of social capital under the Soviet regime or/and a shift towards individualistic values after the collapse of communism.
- 41 The levels of generalized trust and the percentage of membership in sports clubs and cultural clubs and participation in protest actions among the monitorial citizens are the highest. The highest generalized trust and membership in leisure organizations is related to the highest level of social capital, which enhances participation in different modes of collective actions, including participation in protest acts. On the other hand, it is possible to assume that the highest generalized trust and membership only in leisure

organizations causes higher evaluation of effectiveness of civil disobedience acts in decision-making process and perceptions that a good citizen has to show solidarity to other people in comparison with the traditional citizens.

- 42 The levels of self-realization among monitorial citizens are lower in comparison with the traditional citizens and the opportunistic citizens - the group, which is younger than the monitorial citizens and includes lower percentage of respondents who pursued high education than the monitorial citizens.
- 43 The monitorial citizens do not significantly differ from the traditional ones by age. The monitorial citizens and traditional ones differ from the opportunistic citizens and the bold ones by age.
- 44 The data in the table 3 contradicts to theoretical expectations that the monitorial citizens are mostly educated - 34.4 percent of the monitorial have pursued high education and it is lower level in comparison with the traditional group.
- 45 The monitorial citizens do not seem to be exceptionally young and educated, nor are exceptionally oriented to self-realization values. From the theoretical perspective of postmodern citizenship the characteristics of the monitorial citizens are mixed.
- 46 Citizens with high levels of self-realization are driven by intrinsic motivations, are critical concerning hierarchically organized institutions and prefer to engage in elite-challenging forms of participation according to Inglehart and Welzer (2005). But it is not the case for traditional citizens in Lithuania. The traditional citizens in Lithuania are members of political parties and trade unions and almost all are inclined to participate in elections (97.3 percent of all traditional citizens). On the other hand the two types of citizens, who are most young - the opportunistic and the bold citizens - are not interested in politics, and the percentage of their participation in elections (80.6 percent of all the opportunistic and 67.1 percent of all the bold citizens) is the least in comparison to other groups. Contrarily, the percentage of participation of the opportunistic citizen in protest actions is almost the same as among other groups and even higher than the traditional citizens.
- 47 The group of citizens in Lithuania that mostly corresponds to the notion of postmodern citizen identified by various authors is the traditional citizens. To some extent, this might be due to instrumental motivations and the results of derogation of social capital under the Soviet regime. But the number of the traditional citizens is exceptionally low (4.5 percent of all population) in comparison to other groups and this might be related to the lack of external pressure in some economic sectors to become a member of a trade union and the mistrust shown to political organizations in general that might be the result of the Soviet legacy.
- 48 Young citizens are becoming more highly educated, individualized and oriented towards self-expression values in postindustrial societies according to Inglehart and Welzer (2005). This process of postmodernization leads to a problematic and hostile relationship between postmodern citizens and political parties and trade unions. This does not seem to be the case in Lithuania; the group of citizens that most closely corresponds to the notion of postmodern citizen, which were identified by various authors, belongs to political parties and trade unions.

## Conclusions

- 49 Postmodern citizenship occurs in Lithuania, but it does not confirm theoretical expectations. From the theoretical perspective of the postmodern citizenship, the characteristics of identified groups (the traditional citizens, the monitorial citizens, the opportunistic citizens and the bold citizens) are mixed, because of socioeconomic and cultural conditions in Lithuania.
- 50 The traditional citizens that most closely correspond to the notion of postmodern citizen identified by various authors belong to political parties and trade unions, but their number is exceptionally low in comparison to other groups and this might be related to the lack of external pressure in some economic sectors to become a member of a trade union and the mistrust in relation to political organizations in general that might be the result of the Soviet legacy.
- 51 The monitorial citizens exist in Lithuania and this group includes a substantial number of respondents. However, the characteristics of a “monitorial citizen” in Lithuania do not confirm theoretical hypotheses. Despite abstention from membership in political parties, trade union and local community organizations, the monitorial citizens have a high percentage of participation in elections which is a traditional form of citizen participation. The highest generalized trust and membership in leisure organizations is related to the highest level of social capital, which enhances participation in different modes of collective actions, including participation in protest acts. The monitorial citizens do not seem to be exceptionally young and educated, neither are they exceptionally oriented to self-realization values.
- 52 The groups, which consist of a high percentage of young people at the age between 18 and 35 years, are the opportunistic citizens and the bold ones. Both groups are not interested in politics, but they feel politically efficacious. The percentage of the opportunistic citizens and the bold ones, who participate in elections, is less in comparison to other groups. On the other hand, the percentage of participation of the opportunistic citizen in protest actions is almost the same as among other groups and even higher than the traditional citizens.
- 

## BIBLIOGRAFIJA

Dalton, R. & Wattenberg, M. (2001) *Parties without Partisans*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Degutis, M. (2002) *Rinkiminio elgesio dinamika 1992-2001m.* Vilniaus universitetas. Doktoro disertacija: socialiniai mokslai, politikos mokslai.

Degutis, M. (2004) Politinė kultūra. In Lukošaitis, A. & Krupavičius, A. eds. *Lietuvos politinė sistema. Sąžanga ir raida*. Kaunas: Poligrafija ir informatika, pp.83-104.

- Hooghe, M. & DeJaeghere, Y. (2007) Does the “monitorial citizen” exist? An empirical investigation into the occurrence of postmodern forms of citizenship in the Nordic countries. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30(2): 249-271.
- Inglehart, R. (1977) *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1979) Political Action: The Impact of Values, Cognitive Level, and Social Background. In Barnes, S. H., Kaase, M. & Allerbeck, K.L., Farah, B.G., Heunks, F., Inglehart, R., Jennings, M.K., Klingemann, H.D., Marsh, A., Rosenmayr, L. *Political Action. Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills, London: SAGE Publications, pp.343-381.
- Inglehart, R. (1997) *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. & Catterberg, G. (2002) Trends in Political Action: The Developmental Trend and the Post-Honeymoon Decline, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 43: 300-316.
- Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. (2005) *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy. The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janoski, Th. (1998) *Citizenship and Civil Society. A Framework of Rights and Obligations in Liberal, Traditional, and Social Democratic Regimes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, T.H. (1964) *Class, Citizenship and Social development*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mishler, W. & Rose, R. (1998) *Democracy and Its Alternatives: Understanding Post-Communist Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Norris, P. (1999) The Growth of Critical Citizens? In Norris, P. ed., *Critical Citizens. Global Support for Democratic Government*. Oxford University Press, pp.1-31.
- Putnam, R. (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2002) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, R. & Goss, K. A. (2002) The Influence of Socioeconomic Factors on Economic Growth. In, R. Putnam ed. *Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ramonaitė, A. (2006) Kodėl rinkėjai ne(be)balsuoja?. In Žiliukaitė, R., Ramonaitė, A, L., Nevinskaitė, Beresnevičiūtė, V., Vinogradnaitė, I., *Neatrasta galia. Lietuvos pilietinės visuomenės žemėlapis. Pilietinės visuomenės institutas: Versus Aureus*, pp. 91-113.
- Riekašius, R. (2001) Rinkimai ir protesto politika. In *Lietuva po Seimo rinkimų 2000*. Vilnius Kaunas: Naujasis lankas, 34-40.
- Riekašius, R. (2003) Konvencinio dalyvavimo krizė. *Politologija* 3(31): 38-58.
- Riekašius, R. (2004) Politinis dalyvavimas. In Krupavičius, A. & Lukošaitis, A. eds., *Lietuvos politinė sistema. Sąranga ir raida*. Kaunas: Poligrafija ir informatika, pp.213-242.
- Roelofs, H. M. (1957) *The Tension of Citizenship*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rosenstone, S. J. & Hansen, J.M. (1993). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Rueschemeyer, D., M. Rueschemeyer & B.Wittrock. (1998) *Participation and Democracy, East and West: Comparisons and Interpretations*. Armonk: M.E.Sharpe.

- Savicka, A. (2004) *Postmaterialism and Globalization: the Specificity of Value Change in the Post-Communist Milieu*. Vilnius.
- Schudson, M. (1998) *A Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Schudson, M. (1999) What public journalism knows about journalism but doesn't know about 'public'. In T.L. Glasser (Ed.), *The idea of public journalism* (pp. 118-133). News York/London: Guilford Press.
- Somers, M. (1993) Citizenship and the Place of the Public Sphere. *American Sociological Review* 58: 587-620.
- Somers, M. (1995) Narrating and Naturalizing Civil Society and Citizenship Theory. *Sociological Theory* 13 (3): 229-74.
- Turner, B.S. (1993) Contemporary Problems in the Theory of Citizenship. In Turner, B.S. ed., *Citizenship and Social Theory*. SAGE Publications: London-Newbury Park-New Delhi, pp.1-19.
- Valionis, A. (2001) Socialinės ir politinės vertybės. In Matulionis, A., St.Juknevičius, Mitrikas, A. eds., *Europa ir mes*. Vilnius: Gervėlė, pp.245-284.
- Verba, S., Nie, N.H. & Kim, J.-O. (1978) *Participation and Political Equality*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Verba, S., Scholzman, K.L. & Brady, H.E. (1995) *Voice and Equality. Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Žiliukaitė, R. (2006) Ką renkames-laisvę telktis ar likti nuošalyje?. In Žiliukaitė, R., Ramonaitė, A., Nevinskaitė, L., Beresnevičiūtė, V., Vinogradnaitė, I., *Neatrasta galia. Lietuvos pilietinės visuomenės žemėlapis*. Pilietinės visuomenės institutas: Versus Aureus, pp. 20-42.
- Žiliukaitė, R., & Ramonaitė, A. (2006) Protesto politika: kraštutinė priemonė ar įprasta praktika. In Žiliukaitė, R., Ramonaitė, A., Nevinskaitė, L., Beresnevičiūtė, V., Vinogradnaitė, I., *Neatrasta galia. Lietuvos pilietinės visuomenės žemėlapis*. Pilietinės visuomenės institutas: Versus Aureus, pp.113-138.

## NOTAS

1. Based on the European Social Survey (2004), Hooghe and DeJaeghere (2007) analyzed the occurrence of postmodern forms of citizenship in Scandinavia. The precise wording of all questions can be found on the ESS website: [www.europeansocialsurvey.org](http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org).
2. Hooghe and DeJaeghere (2007) considered respondents who gave a positive answer on both questions as politically efficacious. Both questions were asked as Likert items. Positive answers therefore refer to answering possibilities 1 to 3 on a 5-point scale.
3. In the European Social Survey (2004), seven political actions are listed with the question of whether or not the respondents performed these acts in the last twelve months.
4. Hooghe and DeJaeghere (2007) indicate that the fourth criterion was implemented directly together with other free criteria (interest, efficacy and participation) and it led to 16 cells and not all of them were theoretically relevant. "For our purpose, we are not interested in finding out whether respondents in groups 2 to 8 are party members or not. For reasons of clarity, the fourth criterion will only be applied to the first group of active citizens" (Hooghe and DeJaeghere (2007:269)
5. Political participation is measured by asking 14 questions: 1) Did you contact a politician last year? 2) Did you contact any organization or association last year? 3) Did you contact any

government or local official last year? 4) Did you work in a political party last year? 5) Did you work in any local initiative group last year? 6) Did you work in any other organization last year? 7) Did you wear or display any badge or sticker of any campaign last year? 8) Did you sign a petition last year? 9) Did you contact or appear in the media last year? 10) Did you participate in a demonstration last year? 11) Did you participate in a strike last year? 12) Did you boycott certain products last year? 13) Did you perform an act of civil disobedience last year? 14) Did you participate in any other political activities last year?

---

## RESUMOS

Traditionally active citizenship has been conceived in statist terms and linked to citizen participation and support for democratic institutions. Proponents of the postmodern citizenship indicate that the decline of traditional forms of citizen participation such as memberships in political parties and trade unions, voting, declining trust in government and rising political cynicism among publics may be explained as the shift from traditional to the new forms of citizenship. Post-transitional problems such as rising aspirations of economic well-being and persisting inequality led to a decline of citizen participation rates in postcommunist countries. The focus of this article is to investigate what types of citizenship actually occurs in Lithuania. Based on the survey conducted in Lithuania in 2006, the article draws conclusions that postmodern citizenship occurs in Lithuania, but it does not confirm theoretical expectations. From the theoretical perspective of the postmodern citizenship, the characteristics of identified groups' (the traditional citizens, the monitorial citizens, the opportunistic citizens and the bold citizens) are mixed, because of socioeconomic and cultural conditions in Lithuania.

Tradicionalmente a cidadania activa tem sido concebida em termos estatísticos e ligada quer à participação dos cidadãos, quer ao apoio às instituições democráticas. Os defensores da cidadania pós-moderna afirmam que o declínio das formas tradicionais de participação cívica, como o envolvimento activo nos partidos políticos e nos sindicatos, a participação nas eleições, o declínio da confiança no governo e o aumento do cinismo político podem ser explicados com a mudança para as novas formas de cidadania. Os problemas pós-transição, tais como o aumento das aspirações de bem-estar económico e a persistente desigualdade, conduziram a um declínio das taxas de participação cidadã nos países pós-comunistas. O objectivo deste artigo é investigar que tipo de exercício da cidadania ocorre na Lituânia. Com base na pesquisa realizada na Lituânia, em 2006, o artigo conclui que o exercício de uma cidadania pós-moderna tende a ocorrer, mas não confirma as expectativas teóricas. Do ponto de vista teórico da cidadania pós-moderna, as características dos grupos identificados (os cidadãos tradicionais, os cidadãos que monitorizam os seus pares, os cidadãos oportunistas e os cidadãos filantropos) estão misturadas devido às condições socioeconómicas e culturais da Lituânia.

## ÍNDICE

**Keywords:** Lithuania, citizenship participation, the postmodern citizenship

**Palavras-chave:** Lituânia, participação cívica, cidadania pós-moderna

## AUTOR

### JŪRATĖ IMBRASAITĖ

Department of Sociology  
Vytautas Magnus University  
Jonavos street 66, room 306  
Kaunas LT 44191 Lithuania  
j.imbrasaite@smf.vdu.lt