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Introduction

Digital Citizens

Ramón Reichert and Karin Wenz

Today, engagement and participation are considered key when we investigate media and user practices. Participation has become a popular imperative of digital societies: “Calls for greater transparency and participation are heard not just by elected officials, but also in corporate headquarters” (Geiselhart 2004). A number of theoretical reflections on digital societies assume that social media are becoming a dominant media channel for participatory engagement.

Practices of participation and engagement are an indispensable part of our digital everyday lives: from chat rooms to community forums, from social media platforms to image boards, and from rating platforms to whistle-blowing websites. The Internet is used for a wide variety of forms of participation in culture, education, health, business and politics. On the one hand these digital collectives are deemed the torchbearers of the coming social and political transformation or hailed as self-organized collective intelligence. On the other hand state apparatuses are asking for participative activities to increase efficiency and to avoid friction. It is argued that the use of technology fosters participation and processes of consensus-building.

This discourse almost implies that these processes can be hardwired into digital technologies. The terms “cultural citizenship” and “digital citizenship” are expected to provide a broader but also a more critical approach to citizen engagement. In the meantime, there are numerous studies that examine the different forms and effects of participation on the Internet and its limitations (e.g. Fuchs 2014; Trottier/Fuchs 2015). Critical voices show that participation has long become a buzz word, often related to one-sided, positive perspectives: applauding the possibilities of user engagement and ignoring issues such as information politics and a digital divide, not only based on technological access but also on a lack of digital literacy (e.g. Jordan 2015; van Dijck et al. 2017). We observe not only liberation of users based on participatory practices but exploitation at the same time. The information politics behind design decisions are a relevant topic for a deeper understanding of the interrelation of technological developments and user practices.

Participation and sharing data by users also led to critical debates about surveillance (Albrechtslund 2013; Lyon 2017) and whether privacy matters any longer if we “have nothing to hide”. Under which circumstances do we have to consider privacy a commodity and how can we reestablish mechanisms of forgetfulness? Surveillance as observation and control from those in power has been accompa-
nied by a discussion about “sousveillance”, a term coined by Mann, Nolan, and Wellman (2003) to describe instances in which people watch and control those in power. What tools have been developed both for collecting private data and for protecting our privacy and in how far do they challenge our platform society?

In our special issue we are including different approaches from fields such as: digital sociology, STS, digital media studies, cultural studies, political sciences and philosophy reflecting on the role of the digital citizen. We are asking for the role and value of a digital sociology exploring the practices of digital citizens and we have collected contributions that are critically reflective about online practices in relation to new concepts of surveillance and control society.

In the first chapter of our special issue we deal with a historical and methodological overview of the digital citizenship. The investigations are opened by a literature review. In their article “Mapping a Changing Field: A Literature Review on Digital Citizenship” Louise Jørring, António Valentim and Pablo Porten-Cheé focus concepts of digital citizenship that have the potential to capture the shifting role of citizens under online conditions. Their article provides a comprehensive review of literature on digital citizenship. In this context they were investigating a sample of 139 articles and they identify three dominant approaches to digital citizenship: the normative, the conditional, and the contextual. In her paper “The Ironies of Digital Citizenship: Educational Imaginaries and Digital Losers across Three Decades” Lina Rahm addresses the question of how the concept of the digital citizen has been historically constructed. In this sense the digital citizen itself is a rhetorical construct of pedagogical discourse and in its historical development the digital citizenship became a primary target for educational solutions. The author examines the following topics: awareness campaigns, social programmes and adult liberal education about computers. The investigation period covers the following periods: the 1950s, the 1980s, and today.

Nelson Obinna Omenugha and Henry Chigozie Duru investigate in their paper “The New Media, the Youth and Renegotiation of Ethnic and Religious Identity in Nigeria” the new media use of the population of young Nigerians “with the view to assessing how much their use habit may have exposed them to this sort of socialization”. In their analysis, they conclude that the quest to promote cross-ethnic and cross-religious tolerance and harmony in Nigeria should discuss the opportunities presented by the new media. Against this background, they suggest that policymakers and other relevant institutions should work towards maximizing online intercultural communication especially among the youths. James Steinhoff initiates a discussion on the social consequences of Artificial Intelligence discourses. Before this background he is discussing the utilities and infrastructures of AI. In relation to the main topic of this issue he sketches how the idea of AI frames a social awareness beyond the groundbreaking issues of algorithmic control and the automation of work.

In his paper “Platform Humanism and Internal Opacity: The Limits of Online Service Providers’ Transparency Discourse” Artur de Matos Alves explores the
rhetorical figures on transparency of online service providers. His paper argues that online service providers share some of the “users’ concerns and policy priorities concerning government requests for information, judicial overreach, and generalized surveillance”. In their contribution “‘Going Rogue’: Re-coding Resistance with Type 1 Diabetes”, Samantha D. Gottlieb and Jonathan Cluck examine practices of self-documentation, self-objectification and self-measurement. Specifically, they analyze in case studies the lives of patients who are living with Type 1 diabetes (PWT1D). In their paper, they “focus on a community of patients, caregivers, and coders, to whom we refer as TiD hackers.” In their work, Gottlieb and Cluck demonstrate that patients have developed digital skills to better govern their own lives. The paper “Beyond Technological Literacy: Open Data as Active Democratic Engagement?” written by Caitlin Wylie, Kathryn Neeley and Sean Ferguson focuses the concept of the digital citizen in the history of science and technology: “Using the ethics of care, we explore a digital citizenship project about civic open data in Charlottesville, Virginia, as an example of stakeholders caring about and for the construction of digital technologies as well as relationships of mutual interdependence between government and citizens.” In their case study, the two authors elaborate the significance and potential power of intrinsic motivation for democratic engagement.

In his contribution “Understanding Cosmo-Literature. The Extensions of New Media”, the author Reham Hosny examines “the role of new new media in establishing world democracies and changing the social, cultural, and political world map”. In this context, he has set up new thesis in the field of philological research and is investigating the terms of “global village” and “cosmopolitanism” in relation to literature. The paper “Letters from the Future: Science Fiction as Source Material for Thought Experiments Describing Potential Arctic Futures” written by Marcin Dymet analyses the construction of the digital citizenship in the Arctic region concerning the mutual interrelation of climate change and the development of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs).
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Mapping a Changing Field

A Literature Review on Digital Citizenship

Louise Jørring, António Valentim and Pablo Porten-Cheé

Abstract

Digitalization is transforming the face of political participation. Citizens increasingly engage in politics in new and creative forms online. The concept of digital citizenship has the potential to capture the shifting role of citizens under online conditions. Yet this concept has been used inconsistently, provoking theoretical and operational shortcomings that complicate its analytical usability and may limit its academic and societal impact. This article provides a systematic review of literature on digital citizenship. Based on a review of 139 articles, we identify three dominant approaches to digital citizenship: the normative, the conditional, and the contextual. Additionally, we provide a systematization of alternative approaches to digital citizenship and discuss their potential to inform literature on this concept. Finally, we put forward a citizenship norms approach that may reconcile the different perspectives on digital citizenship. In sum, this article presents a review of the digital citizenship research and provides new avenues for the concept to be used in future research on the moving target that political participation presents under online conditions.
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Introduction

On February 14, 2018, a student opened fire against students and staff at Marjory Stoneman Douglas high school in Parkland, Florida, in what was one of the deadliest school shootings in modern times. Within just a few days, surviving students created a Facebook page, slogans, and hashtags that rapidly became widely used on various social media platforms (e.g., #NeverAgain and #EnoughIsEnough), aiming to push lawmakers to take legislative action concerning gun control. The students managed to organize multiple regional protests and the nationwide demonstration “March for Our Lives”, which in Washington, D.C. alone, its main event, is estimated to have attracted between 200,000 and 800,000 participants. What started out as posts on social media quickly turned into the widespread movement Never Again MSD.
The movement is an exemplary case of how digitalization is dramatically changing the face of political participation and citizenship. It is an illustrative example of what Bennett and colleagues have called *connective action*, which stresses how technology changes the role of citizens, making it possible for them to plan and mobilize collective action on a large scale, without the support of organizations (Bennett/Segerberg 2013).

Traditional citizenship understandings typically refer to the belonging to a nation state and revolve around different lists of expectations framed as the rights and responsibilities of the citizen (e.g., Marshall 1950). However, citizenship is also a concept that, affected by societal and historical events, is under constant change (Hartley 2010; Lünenborg/Klaus 2012; Schudson 1998; Pykett/Saward/Schaefer 2010). In recent decades, digitalization has become one of the main factors affecting the changing shape of citizenship, its conceptualization, and its practice. Besides being an exemplary case of the impact of digitalization on activism and citizenship, the Never Again movement further illustrates how everyday citizenship practices are being transformed; today, people are more and more frequently turning to the Internet to get informed, to communicate with others about politics, to contact politicians, to sign petitions, and, vitally, to form social movements with like-minded peers.

Many concepts have been suggested in an attempt to capture the transformations in citizenship brought about by digitalization. *Digital citizenship*, however, has been the most influential concept and has been used since the early days of digitalization. On top of that, the concept allows for the integration of all transformations deriving from digitalization in general, thus being more comprehensive than alternative concepts (e.g., *e-citizenship* or *Internet citizenship*). As such, the concept of digital citizenship has the potential to aggregate the theoretical means for exploring the shifting role of citizens in a democracy under conditions of online communication. However, the concept has been used in dispersed, and at time contradicting, ways that may hinder digital citizenship research from informing scholars, civil society, and political actors in a coherent way.

Aiming to contribute with a systematization of the concept of digital citizenship and to overcome the abovementioned shortcomings, this article provides a comprehensive and systematic literature review of the concept of digital citizenship. We systematize the literature by categorizing it according to different definitions of and empirical approaches to digital citizenship. Against this background, we map three different strands of digital citizenship research: the normative, the conditional, and the contextual. Additionally, we provide a systematization of alternative approaches to the transformations of citizenship in the digital world and how these can further our knowledge on the concept of digital citizenship. Finally, by applying a citizenship norms approach, the article sets a multidisciplinary agenda for future research on digital citizenship, that brings insights from the different strands outlined here together with the alternative models and previous research on citizenship.
Method

Scope

This literature review builds upon previous endeavors to reconcile the multiple approaches to digital citizenship. Moonsun Choi (2016) conducted a conceptual analysis of digital citizenship, providing useful insight into the different uses of the concept. Choi (2016) argues that there are four major elements comprising the concept of digital citizenship: ethics, media and information literacy, participation/engagement, and critical resistance, reflecting the multi-dimensionality and complexity of the concept of digital citizenship.

However, a number of aspects in Choi's (2016) analysis need to be revised. First, Choi focuses on defining different elements that together constitute digital citizenship. Choi scarcely discusses how different strands within the digital citizenship literature have different analytical approaches, which do not easily integrate into a cohesive concept but are, rather, often in conflict with each other. In contrast, our study identifies these different analytical approaches and shows how they conflict and overlap. It further explores whether digital citizenship possesses aspects of a coherent sub-discipline and discusses what conceptual contractions future scholars will need to overcome.

Second, Choi's conceptual analysis focuses on key scholarly texts and blog posts and how these conceptualize digital citizenship. In contrast, we put forward a comprehensive review of academic studies related to this concept. In doing so, we aim to provide an overview of the scholarly debate around this concept and to map the different approaches to it and their influence.

Last, Choi's main aim is to define digital citizenship within an education research framework and to discuss how it can be implemented in teaching (Choi 2016). Instead, the present study offers a revised concept of digital citizenship for all fields of social science. Our more specific aim is to explore how the concept is beneficial for future research on political participation and civic engagement in a digitalized world.

Against this background, our literature review revolves around the following questions:

1. Which different strands of digital citizenship literature can be identified, and how do the strands conflict and overlap?
2. What other theoretical conceptualizations of citizenship in the realm of digitalization exist, and how can they inform the literature on digital citizenship?
Search Procedure

The literature search was carried out in March 2018, using three databases: Scopus, Communication Source, and Google Scholar. We only included literature published in 2000 and onwards due to the fact that most popular social media platforms were developed in these years (as illustrative examples, Facebook was launched in 2004, Reddit in 2005, and Twitter in 2006). Similarly, an initial explorative search (outlined below) clearly showed that the academic literature on digital citizenship began to emerge in the early 2000s.

We used a two-step search approach: In the first step, we applied an explorative approach, in which we used a wide range of different search terms without limiting the search by using specific inclusion criteria. This step was necessary to gain insight into the size and directions of the body of literature and helped us identify important authors and alternative vocabulary used to describe digital citizenship.

In the second step, we narrowed the search and defined a set of inclusion criteria. We reduced our search to the following search terms: “digital citizenship”, “Internet citizenship”, “cyber citizenship”, “online citizenship”, and “media citizenship”. By definition, at least one of the search terms had to be a part of the article’s title, keywords, or abstract. Furthermore, we delimited our search to include only English-language peer-reviewed articles, books, and book chapters. Thus, book reviews, dissertations, editorials, white papers, and blogs were not included.

Our initial search yielded 221 sources, which were collected, read, and deemed relevant or irrelevant for the review. The literature was deemed irrelevant if access to the literature was denied, the articles proved to be not peer-reviewed, or the literature had digital citizenship in the title but did not conceptualize it or empirically focus on it. As a result, a total number of 139 sources were included in the review.

Results

The Three Strands

In this section, we present the three strands of digital citizenship literature: the normative, the conditional and the contextual. All sources were included in one of these strands, although not every source fits neatly into these categories. However, this classification makes it possible to grasp and present the main arguments in the literature and how they interrelate.

Scholars within the normative strand understand digital citizenship as the appropriate way to act online, those within the conditional strand focus on the
capability to participate online based on the given social conditions, and those within the contextual strand focus on digital citizenship as a fluid, context-dependent concept. Before thoroughly introducing each strand, we will briefly compare their prevalence and how they developed over time.

The normative strand is the most prevalent of the strands, with 70 publications, corresponding to 50% of the total number of publications included in this review (see Figure 1). The contextual strand consists of 50 publications, which is equivalent to 36% of the reviewed literature, and the conditional strand is the smallest of the strands, consisting of 19 publications, or 14% of the literature.

Figure 1: Distribution of publications on digital citizenship by strand

Figure 2 shows that digital citizenship has gained more attention from around 2011 onwards, at which point both the normative and contextual strands began to contribute an increasing amount of research. This development can most likely be explained by the vast popularity of social media platforms at the beginning of the 2010s.

Figure 2: Number of publications on digital citizenship over time (2000–2017)
The conditional strand, in contrast to the contextual strand, developed earlier. However, it has not accompanied the normative and contextual strand in their latest increase in number of publications. This might have to do with the fact that the contextual strand has broadened the meaning of digital citizenship and encapsulates aspects of the conditional strand. In order to answer our first research question, we will proceed to analyze the three identified strands and discuss their interrelations.

Normative strand
From the perspective of the normative strand, digital citizenship is understood as the ideal way to act online. This understanding of digital citizenship can be seen in relation to a common understanding of citizenship as there being a number of rights and duties that the members of a community should follow to be considered “good” citizens (see Kligler-Vilenchik 2017).

Mike Ribble (2015), who can be seen as one of the founders of the normative strand, defines digital citizenship as the norms of appropriate and responsible behavior concerning the use of technology. Ribble (2015) further defines nine general areas of behavior that constitute digital citizenship: etiquette, communication, education, access, commerce, responsibility, rights, safety, and security. This digital citizenship model is frequently used within the normative strand, being very influential in studies exploring what impacts this form of digital citizenship (e.g., Hollandsworth/Donovan/Welch 2017; Kim/Choi 2018). Likewise, several authors stress responsibility, respect, awareness, and safety as the deciding elements of what it takes to become a “good” digital citizen (e.g., Armfield/Armfield/Franklin 2016; Greenhow/Robelia 2009; Jones/Mitchell 2016) (see Table 1).

The ideal type of digital citizens is seen as a goal that ought to be actively pursued by educators, parents, and society in general (e.g., Citron/Norton 2011; Hui/Campbell 2018; Ohler 2010). Accordingly, this strand of research mostly revolves around youth behavior and stems from education studies. It is characteristic that the literature is composed of guidelines that should be followed and skills that should be learned in order for digital citizenship to be achieved (e.g., Berson/Berson 2004; Curran/Ribble 2017). The research typically applies a micro-level analytical approach, focusing on individual behavioral patterns and relations between, for instance, teachers and students. Although the empirical focus is on the micro level, the role of meso- and macro-level institutions in developing this form of citizenship is often acknowledged. Moreover, in more recent years, there has been a shift toward acknowledging digital citizenship as a multifaceted concept (e.g., Choi/Cristol/Gimbert 2018).
Table 1: Outline of the normative strand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypical publications</th>
<th>Areas of focus</th>
<th>Definition of digital citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berson/Berson 2004</td>
<td>There is one way to be a digital citizen: behave appropriately and responsibly online.</td>
<td>“Despite the natural enthusiasm that many young people have for online activities, they are often unaware that the privilege of ‘cybercitizenship’ requires skills beyond the technical capacity to search out information, engage in dialogue, or play games” (Berson/Berson 2004: 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohler 2010</td>
<td>There is a particular focus on young people’s ethical behavior and how it can be fostered by educators, parents, and society in general.</td>
<td>“[D]igital citizenship is described as the norms of appropriate, responsible behavior with regard to technology use” (Ribble 2015: 10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollandsworth/Dowdy/Donovan 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribble 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The normative approach can be used to describe and discuss ethical and moral considerations in relation to online participation. Moreover, it earns the merit of focusing on education as a tool to protect generations that have an ever-increasing exposure to online platforms and on how important societal issues, such as hate speech or cyber-bullying, can be tackled. However, the normative strand can also be criticized for having too narrow an idea of the meaning of digital citizenship. The implication of this can be that specific groups and alternative political behaviors online get labeled, excluded, or overlooked. In sum, the normative perspective might be useful for specific educational purposes, but applying this perspective requires that scholars critically and openly reflect on their own normativity so that the proposed guidelines for “good” digital citizenship are not seen as definite.

**Conditional strand**
Authors within the conditional strand understand access to the Internet to be a necessity or even a right (e.g., Dias 2012), as it allows individuals to be politically informed, perform their civic duties, and acquire economic gains (Mossberger/Tolbert/McNeal 2008). Therefore, Internet access is seen as a necessity for individuals to be full citizens in modern democracies.

The conditional strand of research adopts very comprehensive definitions of digital citizenship, such as it being one’s ability to participate in society online (Mossberger et al. 2008), and focuses on differential conditions of online access.
It argues that for digital citizenship and the democratic potential of the Internet to be fulfilled, all citizens must have equal access to the online public sphere (Mossberger et al. 2008).

Although the normative strand of research also mentions skills one should possess in order to be a full digital citizen, the general focus of the normative and conditional research streams is very different and thus worth stressing. While the normative strand of research is concerned mostly with cataloguing the skills students should be able to develop to be responsible users of online platforms, the conditional strand focuses on how socioeconomic inequalities impact one’s online access and, consequently, one’s access to civil society. As such, the conditional strand focuses on skills that allow citizens to participate in the digital society, while the normative strand focuses on what skills allow citizens to participate well in it. Some articles draw on both the normative and conditional strands, for example by aiming to develop “good” digital citizenship among young people but acknowledging that how this is achieved also depends on the given living conditions (e.g., Searson/Hancock/Soheil/Shepherd 2015; Powell/Henry 2017a, 2017b).

Research on citizenship has traditionally focused on issues of belonging and exclusion. There has been extensive research on the digital divide between those who are able to participate online and those who are not. Such literature has focused on how conditions of Internet access and the absence of skills needed for online participation might deter people from overcoming socioeconomic inequalities in accessing civil society (e.g., Zillien/Hargittai 2009). In this vein, the concept of the digital divide might be more frequently used than digital citizenship, which might also explain why the conditional strand is not as prevalent as the other strands in this review (see Figure 1).

The conditional strand of research on digital citizenship is interested in the same issues as those covered in the literature on the digital divide. As such, empirical studies within this strand have shown how gender or education impact access to the online public sphere (Buente 2015). Further, studies have shown that those who do not possess a set of technological skills (Beam/Hmielowski/Hutchens 2018; Shelley et al. 2004; Simsek/Simsek 2013) and those who belong to ethnic and racial minorities (Mossberger/Tolbert/Anderson 2017; Shelley et al. 2004) are hindered from acting as citizens due to limited access to the Internet. As such, policy solutions to overcome this divide are often presented within this literature (e.g., Mossberger 2008). With a focus on social differentiation and stratification structures, this strand often applies a macro-level approach (see Table 2). Micro-level aspects, such as individual experiences and identities, are rarely included.
Table 2: Outline of the conditional strand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypical publications</th>
<th>Areas of focus</th>
<th>Definition of digital citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelley et al. 2004;</td>
<td>There is one way of being digital citizen: having the required material and immaterial resources for democratic participation online.</td>
<td>“The authors contend that becoming a digital citizen is a process influenced by technological attitudes that may have the effect of widening the digital gap; in turn, racial and educational differences may have independent effects” (Shelley et al. 2004: 259).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberger/ Tolbert/McNeal 2008;</td>
<td>There is a focus on the effect of living conditions (e.g., one’s socioeconomic, ethnic, and racial background) and one’s technological skills on Internet access.</td>
<td>“‘Digital citizenship’ is the ability to participate in society online [...] We define ‘digital citizens’ as those who use the Internet regularly and effectively – that is, on a daily basis” (Mossberger et al. 2008: 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simsek/Simsek 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conditional approach to digital citizenship has been important in explaining how social, economic, demographic, and ethnic conditions can impact one’s participation in society in an increasingly digitalized world. As such, this strand has a critical role in stressing how the Internet’s democratic potential will not be merely self-fulfilling and how policy-makers should take that into consideration. However, it has focused mostly on the demand-side effects of Internet participation, leaving how individuals participate in this digitalized society mostly out of its scope. As such, this strand of research provides an important body of literature related to how participation in the online world can be shaped by socioeconomic conditions, but it has left the in-depth analysis of what digital citizenship actually looks like (i.e., how individuals participate in politics and civic life online, and how that impacts traditional notions of citizenship) mostly unexplored.

**Contextual strand**

In recent years, a set of authors have presented a more contextual and critical notion of digital citizenship, clearly differentiating it from the previous predefined conceptions of the normative and conditional strands. From the perspective of the contextual strand, digital citizenship is seen as a context-dependent concept, interwoven with offline citizenship and shaped within political, cultural,

The contextual strand’s fluid conception of digital citizenship leads to varying descriptions of what digital citizenship is and how digital citizenship can be researched. The definitions are often based on empirical studies, in particular a great number of ethnographic studies, that investigate diverse experiences of digital citizenship. As some examples, certain empirical studies explore how local memory websites can be seen as acts of collective digital citizenship (de Kreek/van Zoonen 2016) and others explore how political activists display stories and pictures of family members as a form of digital citizenship practice (Barassi 2017). A sub-group of this strand focuses specifically on digital citizenship and political participation in connection to the structures of local or national governmental systems (e.g., Adorjan/Yau 2015; Corradini/Paganelli/Polzonetti 2007; Schou/Hjelholt 2017).

Influenced by critical citizenship studies, a great number of authors within the contextual strand emphasize that digital citizenship is marked by control and power struggles (e.g., McCosker et al. 2016; Hintz et al. 2017; Isin/Rupperts 2015). Besides the power structures commonly referred to in citizenship studies – those related to aspects such as race, religion, gender and socio-economic inequalities – newer power structures linked to the use of data-traces, algorithms, and digital surveillance are explored (e.g., Barassi 2017; Hintz et al. 2017). Furthermore, a number of more radical approaches criticize forms of digital citizenship as based on neoliberal citizen ideals, highlighting how citizens in the digital era are expected to follow market-like dynamics, practicing a competitive, flexible, and efficient citizenry (e.g., Emejulu/McGregor 2014; Schou/Hjelholt 2017; Siapera 2016).

Given the wide range of articles within this strand, the analytical approach shifts between all three levels of analysis: micro, meso, and macro (see Table 3). This strand focuses on personal experiences of digital citizenship, how it is created through group dynamics, and how social power structures might influence it. In that sense, the contextual strand encompasses the analytical levels of both the normative and conditional strands.
Table 3: Outline of the contextual strand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypical publications</th>
<th>Areas of focus</th>
<th>Definition of digital citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isin/Ruppert 2015</td>
<td>There are many ways to be a digital citizen: the concept is a fluid and context-dependent construct.</td>
<td>“If indeed the premise of this book is that there is an emerging political subject called ‘the digital citizen’, we cannot assume that this subject is without history and geography. We cannot simply assume that being a citizen online already means something (whether it is the ability to participate or the ability to stay safe) and then look for those whose conduct conforms to this meaning [...]” (Isin/Ruppert 2015: 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barassi 2017</td>
<td>There is a focus on individual citizenship practices and how power structures influence these.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCosker/Vivienne/Johns 2017</td>
<td>The digital is seen as ubiquitous, and the boundary between the “virtual” and “real” are typically blurred.</td>
<td>“Digital citizenship, we argue, needs reframing through empirical research and critical scholarship so it can better reflect the diverse experiences that constitute a life integrated with digital and networked technologies” (McCosker et al. 2017: 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vromen 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, the concept of digital citizenship in the contextual strand encompasses very diverse experiences of what it is like to live as a citizen in the digital age. For those same reasons, this strand can be criticized for being too ambiguous and hard to test empirically. However, one can argue that both *citizenship* and *the digital* are abstract realms that are under constant change, which is why digital citizenship should also be investigated as a fluid and changeable concept. Furthermore, the fluidity of the concept makes it possible to investigate new individual participation patterns and media-transmitted identity building. All in all, the contextual strand of research provides a much-needed effort to stress the multi-faceted nature of the concept of digital citizenship, but further efforts are needed in order for it to be combined with empirical testing.
Alternative Citizenship Models

Our classification of the three strands provides an overview of the different approaches to digital citizenship. Nevertheless, in order to better discuss how the concept of digital citizenship is useful for future research on citizenship and political participation, it is important to draw on other useful theorizations that, although they do not use the term digital citizenship, focus on the changes in citizenship in the digital era.

Kligler-Vilenchik (2017) has reviewed several citizenship models, arguing that alternative citizenship models have in common the argument that citizenship is changing, partially due to the role of new media. Following the same argument and as a response to our second research question, in this section we will analyze alternative models of digital citizenship, which are a collection of relevant conceptualizations of citizenship in the digitalized world. Further, we will make suggestions about how these conceptions can inform understandings of what digital citizenship is.

Similar to the literature reviewed in the previous sections, these models examine new ways in which citizenship and political participation are being transformed by digitalization (e.g., Bennett 2008; Loader/Vromen/Xenos 2014; Rainie/Wellman 2012; Vromen/Xenos/Loader 2018a). These scholars use neither the term digital citizenship nor any of the search terms used in this review, referring instead to citizenship generally or creating their own conceptualization of new emerging forms of citizenship. As such, these authors highlight a number of processes that are critical to understanding current citizenship and that have been largely neglected by studies on digital citizenship.

Taken together, there are two main and common points raised by these authors that are particularly relevant for digital citizenship: the changing (but not decreasing) nature of current political participation and the transformation of value structures and forms of socialization and participation.

First, in opposition to what some authors (e.g., Putnam 2000) have claimed, these authors argue that political and civic participation is not decreasing, it is changing (e.g., Bennett 2008; Loader et al. 2014). As such, these authors argue that citizenship practices are going through strong transformations, which are partially due to (e.g., Vromen et al. 2018) or made stronger by (e.g., Bennett 2008) digitalization.

Second, these authors argue that industrialization and the development of the Internet have strongly impacted value structures, participatory behaviors, and socialization in general in Western, post-industrialized countries (e.g., Bennett/Segerberg 2013; Inglehart 1977). Post-industrial societies have been characterized by increased social fragmentation and lower identification with party politics and institutional settings, making citizens participate more in lifestyle politics (Bennett 1998; Giddens 1991). Lifestyle politics entail an increased sense of individual purpose and participation in the form of personalized acts,
enacted through engagement with horizontal peer groups (Bennett/Wells/Rank 2009).

At the same time as more personalized forms of participation are emerging, the Internet in general and social media in particular foster connectedness as a new value and as a new form of social and interpersonal interaction (e.g. Bennett 2008; Bennett/Segerberg 2013; van Dijck 2013; Vorderer/Hefner/Reinecke/Klimmt 2018). Hence, even though citizens are increasingly more engaged in personalized forms of participation, digitalization has made them increasingly and permanently connected to others, in what some authors have called networked individualism (Castells 2001; Rainie/Wellman 2012). This refers to how networks today are different from previous collectives (such as the family or neighborhood), being looser, more fragmented and more disperse. Although larger networks can be fostered, today it is the individual who is at its core (Castells 2001; Rainie/Wellman 2012). Thus, citizenship practices also have to be explored with the individual as the point of departure.

Agenda for Future Research

The two abovementioned arguments raised by the alternative models of digital citizenship have been mostly left out of the literature on digital citizenship, making it a clear limitation of this research. Against this backdrop, this section will suggest a norms approach to digital citizenship, as it allows for the integration of aspects of the different strands of research together with the alternative models of digital citizenship presented above.

Citizenship norms are a set of expectations about citizens’ roles in society, which shape political behavior by prescribing or proscribing what behaviors citizens are expected to enact as “good citizens” (Dalton 2008). Norms are a socially shared set of standards that assert what is expected and what is considered normal within a group or society (Forsyth 2010). By exploring what people and social groups think is expected of them as citizens, research on citizenship norms has been used as a tool for studying the changing patterns of political behavior and for understanding the rise of less traditional forms of engagement (e.g., Bolzendahl/Coffé 2013; Copeland 2014; Dalton 2008). Nevertheless, the perspective of participants themselves regarding the characteristics of a good citizen is often left unexplored.

Changing patterns of political behavior can be explored in many ways. Today it has become popular to study personal data traces on digital platforms to analyze and predict citizens’ behavior (e.g., Barassi 2017). However, we argue that the abovementioned citizenship norm approach is more constructive (and ethically correct). Instead of uncovering a perceived “truth” based on personal data traces, it is more useful to better understand the situated and experienced reality of the citizens themselves. That is, how citizens in their given context experience their
roles as citizens and what they expect from society in general, and political institutions in particular. In this way, possible expectations can better be met, challenges better detected, and political participation better understood. Thus, such an approach would be an important way to explore current changes in political engagement, which are fostered by digital platforms.

Additionally, a citizenship norms approach to digital citizenship allows one to combine the different strands reviewed in this article. According to this approach, there are certain ways of being a good citizen; nonetheless, and – in opposition to what is argued in the conditional and normative strands – such a normative notion is not rigidly defined a priori, being instead based on the beliefs citizens hold. As such, citizenship norms allow for the exploration of how different groups of activists, as well as different age and socioeconomic groups, see citizenship in different ways and how this affects their political participation.

Citizenship norms are not merely individually defined notions of what citizenship ought to be. At a more macro level, a citizenship norms approach allows for the integration of the impact of the cultural and historical background of citizens in their participation (e.g., Coffé/van der Lippe 2009). Thus, and given that norms have been shown to impact the effect of values in behavior (e.g., Bardi/Schwartz 2003), this approach can be a way of understanding the effects of changing values in the understanding of what citizenship is and its impact on political and civic engagement. Furthermore, it allows for an exploration of the effects the Internet, social media, and the abovementioned networked individualism might have on citizenship without isolating it from offline practices of citizenship or from how the impact might differ between different cultural and historical contexts.

Conclusion

In this article, we have presented a comprehensive and systematic review of digital citizenship literature, identifying the different strands making up the field. Through this review, we have elucidated the multidimensionality of digital citizenship, identified the main – and at times contradicting – arguments of digital citizenship research, and set up a future research agenda on this concept.

Our findings uncover three main strands of digital citizenship literature: the normative, the conditional, and the contextual. The different strands reveal that there are many overlapping and conflicting areas within digital citizenship literature. Of particular relevance, the three strands differ on their assumptions concerning whether there is one way or multiple ways in which to be a digital citizen. As such, while the normative and conditional strands stress ideal forms of being a digital citizen – such as behaving in a certain normative manner and having access to the Internet, respectively – the contextual strand moves away from such conceptions to stress how digital citizenship can be enacted in multiple ways and emphasizes its changing and contextual nature.
Being aware of the large body of literature studying currently changing patterns of citizenship, we reviewed what we called *alternative models of digital citizenship*. These are theoretical contributions studying the effect of digitalization on citizenship but using different concepts that stress the changing nature of political participation and of value structures in post-industrial societies, topics that have often been ignored in digital citizenship literature. Incorporating such arguments with the different strands reviewed earlier, we have put forward a citizenship norms approach to combine and expand the study of digital citizenship.

In sum, this article contributes to the existing literature in a number of ways. It offers a comprehensive overview of the digital citizenship literature, highlighting the necessity of being aware of changing forms of citizenship and of being politically active. Moreover, by exploring the alternative models of digital citizenship and suggesting a norms approach to digital citizenship, this article provides a valuable effort in combining multiple approaches from different academic traditions to exploring the concept of digital citizenship and new forms of political participation.

However, the study also has limitations and room for further development. The fact that the study only focuses on academic journals, books, and book chapters was a conscious choice, but this can also be seen as a limitation. By including discourse on citizenship in the digital era appearing in newspapers or the contributions made more recently by citizen journalists, it would be possible to add other perspectives on the phenomenon. Future research should explore the notions of digital citizenship these sources offer as a first exploration of the existing norms underlying digital citizenship.
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