

HISTORICAL TRANSFORMATION OF CITIZENSHIP THOUGHT: CLASSICAL, MODERN, CONTEMPORARY

Bambang Yuniarto

UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

bb_yunior@yahoo.co.id

Fajar Nurul Ikhlas

UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

fajarnurul.id@gmail.com

Mutiara Sapira Putri

UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

mutiarasapiraputri@gmail.com

Ihsan Ali Multazam

UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

tsaltsan69@gmail.com

Deris Ardian

UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

a05554095@gmail.com

Muhammad Indera Wiguna

UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

muhammadinderawiguna@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the historical transformation of citizenship thought from the classical, modern, to contemporary eras, and to understand the dynamics of changes in the concept of citizenship alongside social, political, and intellectual developments. The objective of this study is to identify the philosophical and structural turning points that have shaped the understanding of citizenship. The main problem of this research lies in the lack of comprehensive studies that integrally discuss the evolution of citizenship across periods, thus necessitating a study capable of systematically explaining the continuities and shifts in ideas. The limitations of previous studies often separate historical periods, failing to capture the evolutionary narrative. The method used is a qualitative descriptive-historical approach with a literature study that examines the works of classical, modern, and contemporary thinkers, analyzed through content analysis and comparative analysis techniques to identify patterns of thought change. The results show that the classical era emphasized virtue, morality, and active participation in public life, while the modern era shifted the focus to individual rights, the social contract, and the legal status of citizens. In the contemporary era, the concept of citizenship has evolved to become more inclusive, global, and multicultural, and is significantly influenced by

digitalization and transnational mobility. Overall, this research confirms that changes in citizenship thought reflect the dynamic relationship between the individual, the state, and the global community, and have important implications for developing adaptive, critical citizenship education that is relevant to global challenges.

Keywords: Citizenship, Multiculturalism, Political Participation, Individual Rights

INTRODUCTION

Thoughts on citizenship constitute one of the important pillars in the study of political science, civic education, and social sciences. Politically, citizenship enables the analysis of the relationship between individuals and the state, including rights, obligations, and forms of citizen participation in public life (Putri et al., 2023). In the context of civic education (for example, PPKn in schools), a conceptual understanding of citizenship becomes crucial for building political awareness, social responsibility, and national character, especially in the global and digital era (Widiatmaka et al., 2025). Social sciences also greatly require the study of citizenship because this concept reflects social structures, group identities, and power dynamics within society.

Historically, the concept of citizenship has evolved from the ancient Greek notion of active participation in the polis (city-state) to the modern formulation introduced by T.H. Marshall, which divided it into civil, political, and social dimensions. The civil dimension focuses on individual freedoms (such as freedom of speech and thought), the political dimension pertains to the right to participate in political power (e.g., the right to vote and be elected), while the social dimension encompasses the right to a minimum standard of economic welfare and security. Therefore, the study of citizenship does not stop at formal legal aspects, but also extends to issues of equality, distributive justice, and social inclusion, making it a crucial foundation for understanding the processes of democratization and the development of a just society.

The urgency of reviewing the historical development of citizenship thought, from the classical, modern, to contemporary eras, cannot be overlooked. This is because the concept of citizenship is not static; its meanings and practices continuously evolve alongside socio-political transformations and globalization. For example, in modern society, social contract theory and individual rights became a crucial foundation of citizenship, while in the contemporary era, concepts such as transnational or global citizenship have emerged, challenging the traditional nation-state-based model. Such studies help clarify how the values of citizenship have evolved and remain relevant in addressing the challenges of the modern and global age (Paparusso & Wenden, 2025).

This historical inquiry is also essential for understanding the theoretical roots of various pressing citizenship issues today, such as political participation, social inclusion, and minority rights. By retracing the philosophical frameworks and practices of citizenship in the past, we can identify patterns of failure and success in managing

diversity and promoting justice. This knowledge serves as a critical foundation for formulating public policies that are more inclusive and responsive to the complexities of citizen identity and allegiance in the 21st century.

Nevertheless, the main issue is the still limited number of comprehensive studies that compare the transformation of citizenship thought throughout history, from classical, modern, to contemporary ideas, within a systematic framework. Most literature only focuses on a single period or a single conceptual tradition. In fact, by presenting cross-era analysis, we can understand the continuities and fundamental shifts in citizenship discourse, as well as identify the socio-political factors driving that evolution. This deficiency hampers the development of robust and applicable citizenship theory, as without a deep historical understanding, efforts to formulate solutions to citizenship challenges in today's era of globalization and digitalization become less focused.

Therefore, this research has three main objectives. First, to describe the evolution of the concept of citizenship through three main periods: classical, modern, and contemporary. Second, to identify fundamental shifts in citizenship thinking, such as the transition from a virtue-oriented to a rights-oriented perspective, or from local status to global citizenship. Third, to analyze the influence of socio-political factors (such as globalization, migration, digitalization) on the development of the citizenship concept in each period. These three objectives aim to provide a comprehensive and detailed understanding of how the concept of citizenship, the foundation of political society, has transformed over time. Analyzing its evolution through the classical, modern, and contemporary periods will reveal continuities and discontinuities in the understanding of who is considered a citizen and what their rights and responsibilities are, while examining socio-political factors will elucidate the driving mechanisms behind these changes, thus resulting in a holistic picture of the dynamics of citizenship.

This research is also expected to have significant academic and practical benefits. Theoretically, this study expands the understanding of citizenship discourse in political and social sciences, linking classical thought with modern and contemporary challenges. Within the context of citizenship education, this historical understanding can enrich the curriculum and teaching of PPKn or civics, enabling teachers and policymakers to integrate citizenship concepts that are more contextual and relevant to today's global realities. Furthermore, this research offers a new perspective in understanding the dynamics of global and transnational citizenship, an issue increasingly important amid human mobility, migration, and cross-border identities (Usmi, 2023).

Theoretically, this research will utilize analytical frameworks from classical and modern citizenship theories (such as the ideas of Aristotle, Locke, or T.H. Marshall), as well as contemporary theories (such as transnational citizenship theory and multilevel citizenship). This study will also review sociological literature related to the social

implications of citizenship to illustrate the conceptual and practical dynamics that have occurred throughout the historical development of citizenship (Citizenship Theory and Sociological Implications: From Classical to Contemporary) (Suriaman et al., 2024). The use of these theories will assist the research in identifying and dissecting how the concepts of rights, responsibilities, and political membership have evolved alongside changes in global social and political structures. Thus, this comprehensive framework will not only serve as a foundation for conceptual analysis but also as a lens for understanding the empirical manifestations of contemporary citizenship issues, particularly those related to dual identities, population mobility, and challenges to traditional nation-state sovereignty.

Thus, the introduction of this paper positions citizenship as a highly dynamic and cross-disciplinarily significant concept, establishes the need for thorough historical analysis, and sets clear research objectives and contributions. This research is expected to provide a solid theoretical and empirical foundation for the subsequent discussion and analysis sections, while also paving the way for further reflection on citizenship in today's global and digital era. This paragraph then serves as a strong bridge toward the literature review and theoretical framework, where the concept of citizenship will be further dissected through the lenses of various scholars and paradigms. Consequently, readers will be prepared to understand how the historical evolution of citizenship interacts with contemporary challenges, such as identity issues, shifting political participation, and civil rights in a supranational context. This established framework ensures that the subsequent discussion is not merely descriptive, but also critical and analytical toward the complexities of the subject under study.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a descriptive–historical qualitative research type, which enables the researcher to depict and interpret the thought on citizenship across various eras in great detail. The qualitative method is chosen because the focus of the study is not on numbers or quantity, but rather on the profound meaning and interpretation of political philosophy texts as intellectual legacies from classical, modern, and contemporary thinkers (Mohajan, 2018). By using a descriptive approach, this research presents a systematic portrayal of the evolution of the concept of citizenship, without manipulating variables, but rather mapping the reality of thought within its historical context.

In this study, two main approaches are employed: the historical approach and the literature study approach. The historical approach is used to trace the development of citizenship thought over time, following the classical → modern → contemporary periodization. This approach is relevant because it enables the analysis of thought within the socio-political context of each period, as well as an understanding of how historical settings shape ideas of citizenship. This aligns with the use of the comparative-

historical analysis method in social sciences, which emphasizes contextualized historical analysis to explain macro social processes (Daniel P, 2014).

Meanwhile, the literature study approach was employed as a data collection strategy through a review of existing literature. The researcher examined texts from classical political philosophy (e.g., Plato, Aristotle, Cicero), works by modern thinkers (such as Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Kant, Marshall), as well as contemporary literature from figures like Kymlicka, Turner, Heater, Nussbaum and other global citizenship thinkers. These literary data were obtained from academic books, journal articles, anthologies of political thought, and international and national scholarly papers, thereby producing a solid and comprehensive theoretical foundation.

The research data sources consist of classical, modern, and contemporary thought as mentioned above. The primary data are the original works of philosophers: Plato's dialogues, Aristotle's writings, and Roman texts such as Cicero for the classical era; essays and social contract treatises by Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, as well as Kant's writings and social rights theory by Marshall for the modern era; and contemporary academic publications discussing multicultural, global, digital, and ecological citizenship. In addition, secondary literature is used in the form of academic analyses, modern interpretations of classical thought, as well as critiques and developments of contemporary theory. With this scope of data, the research is able to highlight the continuity and transformation of citizenship thought historically.

In terms of data type, this study employs textual qualitative data. All study materials are written texts containing conceptual and normative (philosophical) thoughts about citizenship. Since the data consists of words, arguments, concepts, and political metaphors, qualitative analysis is highly suitable for capturing the nuances, dynamics, and historical meanings of these ideas.

For data analysis, two main techniques were used: content analysis and comparative analysis. Content analysis was conducted to extract dominant themes of citizenship in each historical period, such as themes of political participation, individual rights, collective identity, globality, or inclusiveness. This technique allows researchers to identify conceptual patterns through systematic coding of philosophical texts. This content analysis is appropriate as it can uncover symbolic aspects and hidden meanings within texts, as explained in other qualitative studies (Sitasari, 2022).

After the main themes were identified, a comparative analysis was applied to compare and contrast the development of citizenship ideas across different eras. This comparative-historical approach is used to understand conceptual transformations: for example, how classical notions of citizenship, centered on virtue and participation, shifted into modern ideas that place greater emphasis on rights and legal status, then further evolved in the contemporary era into global or multicultural citizenship. The comparative-historical method is indeed common in socio-political studies to explain changes across time and contextual conditions (Osinsky & Eloranta, n.d.).

Next, the analysis process involves meaning-making and interpretation. The researcher first examines each thinker's work in depth, noting key concepts, arguments, and philosophical assumptions. Then, through content analysis, the meanings are coded according to thematic categories that reflect elements of citizenship (virtue, rights, identity, globality, and so on). Subsequently, through comparative analysis, these themes are compared across periods: the researcher explores the similarities and differences, as well as explains the historical factors driving the evolution. Thus, the analysis is not only descriptive but also interpretative and analytical.

Methodologically, this historical and literature-based approach also strengthens the validity of the research. Since the data originates from credible primary and secondary sources and is analyzed using two independent analytical techniques (content and comparative analysis), the interpretation of the results becomes more accurate and comprehensive. The researcher also acts as the primary instrument, interpreting meaning through a clear conceptual framework, in accordance with the nature of qualitative research.

Overall, this research method is highly appropriate for the research objective: to trace the transformation of citizenship thought from the classical to the contemporary era. By combining historical and literature study approaches, along with content and comparative analysis, this research is able to present a profound, contextual, and reflective portrayal of the evolution of the concept of citizenship. This approach not only delineates the intellectual journey but also interprets how socio-political contexts have influenced ideas of citizenship from one era to the next.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Classical Era Citizenship Thought

In the Classical era of Greece and Rome, the conception of citizenship emerged as a central idea in the political organization of the city-state (polis) and the early republic. Based on a literature review of Aristotle's work and analyses by contemporary thinkers, it can be traced how classical citizenship differs significantly from modern and contemporary understandings, particularly in the aspects of virtue, morality, exclusive membership, and public responsibility.

Based on an analysis of Aristotle's work in *Politics*, citizenship in Ancient Greece was not merely a matter of legal status, but of active participation in public life. According to Aristotle, a citizen is one who "has the right to participate in deliberative or judicial office". This participation includes public discourse, decision-making, and governmental duties inherent to the life of the polis. Theoretical data confirms that public participation was indeed the essence of classical citizenship.

In terms of morality and virtue, classical citizenship heavily emphasized the aspect of *virtue*. Aristotle saw humans as *political animals*, who within the polis achieve

their highest potential through moral and practical contributions to the public community. Within this framework, being a citizen meant not only enjoying rights, but also fulfilling moral obligations: the ideal citizen was one who engaged in governance (both ruling and being ruled), and thereby contributed to constitutional justice (Winarno, 2015).

Regarding citizen status and membership, citizen membership in the ancient polis was highly exclusive. Aristotle explicitly excluded several groups from the definition of a citizen: slaves, women, children, and foreigners (*xenoi*) were not considered full citizens because they did not meet the criteria for deliberative participation or public duties. This emphasis on exclusivity aligns with historical studies showing that often only free, adult male property owners were full citizens in the polis's politics. In the Roman context, the concept of *ius gentium* (law of nations) also illustrates the moral and legal boundaries between citizen and non-citizen membership, providing a less inclusive foundation for citizenship at that time.

Furthermore, classical citizenship thought strongly emphasized collective identity and public responsibility. Citizenship was not merely a passive status, but an active participation that connected the citizen with the constitution of the polis. In Aristotle's writings and contemporary interpretations, classical citizenship served as a means to achieve the *common good* through the moral engagement of its citizens. In Aristotle's view, a good citizen was one who was active in public affairs and understood the constitution as the foundation for collective action (Winarno, 2015).

Based on a synthesis of the literature, the main findings regarding classical citizenship thought are that this citizenship was heavily oriented towards moral responsibility and political participation. In the context of Greece and Rome, being a true citizen was not just about rights, but an active duty to preserve and develop the polis ethically. Because public participation and virtue were central to citizenship, membership became exclusive, with only a select, legitimate few deemed to meet the moral and political qualifications. Moreover, the collective identity of citizens reinforced that classical citizenship was inseparable from shared responsibility.

This analysis also aligns with interpretations of classical thought in modern citizenship discourse. For example, in the *Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*, Ryan Balot reaffirms that from the classical Greek and Roman traditions we can draw upon the "dialogic and ethical possibilities of citizenship" often overlooked in modern liberal models (Balot, 2017). In other words, the legacy of classical citizenship thought demonstrates that alongside rights and law, moral factors and active participation are fundamental elements that can enrich the understanding of citizenship in modern and contemporary eras.

Nevertheless, there is criticism regarding this classical exclusivity. Contemporary studies argue that the limitations on citizen membership in the Greek and Roman eras closed off opportunities for participation from broader groups, such as women, slaves,

and foreigners. This serves as an important lesson in the transformation of citizenship thought: although its moral and participatory values are highly valuable, the classical model of citizenship cannot be applied directly without adaptation to the contexts of inclusivity and plurality of the present day (e.g., in global citizenship discourse) (Gray, 2018).

Classical era citizenship thought laid the groundwork for a number of crucial elements, virtue, morality, public participation, and collective identity, which subsequently became subjects of reflection and critique in modern and contemporary citizenship theory.

Citizenship Thought in the Modern Era

In the modern era, an analysis of literature shows that the concept of citizenship underwent a significant transformation influenced by the Renaissance, Reformation, and Enlightenment. Through the study of philosophical and political literature, I find that these periods opened new spaces for thought: the awakening of individual rationality, the supremacy of reason, and the idea of natural rights as the core of the relationship between the individual and the state. These ideas later became the foundation for the birth of social contract theory, where individuals consciously surrender a portion of their freedom to the state for mutual security and order.

From analyzing the classic works of modern thinkers, a shift from traditional citizenship thought towards the concept of individual rights is evident. Thomas Hobbes, for example, in *Leviathan* depicts the natural condition of mankind as a "state of war of all against all" (*bellum omnium contra omnes*), thus necessitating a social contract where individuals surrender some of their rights to a sovereign state to maintain peace. In literary analysis, Hobbes emerges as a proponent of strong state authority so that the state's function as a guarantor of security can be realized. This finding is consistent with Agrindo Zandro's explanation that the "Leviathan state" is a control mechanism to achieve order within societal plurality (Zandro, 2024).

Meanwhile, John Locke offers a different perspective. In his *Two Treatises of Government*, Locke asserts the importance of individual natural rights such as life, liberty, and property. He argues that the social contract legitimizes the state, but the state still has the obligation to protect the fundamental rights of its citizens; if the state fails, the people have the right to resist. This finding is reinforced through a literature study where the author compares Locke's and Hobbes's views, showing that although both believe in the social contract as the basis of the state, Locke places more emphasis on the separation of powers and the guarantee of individual rights (Wijaya, 2016).

Jean-Jacques Rousseau continued the development of social contract thought in a more idealistic and collective manner. In Rousseau's theory, individuals surrender their rights to the community as a collective whole to form a "general will" that reflects the common interest. Literature shows that in Rousseau's thought, individual liberty is not completely lost, but is limited to align with the liberty of others in the community

(Airah, 2019). As noted in contemporary analysis, sovereignty for Rousseau lies with the people as a collective that actively participates in the formation of laws and political decisions (Daly, 2018).

Furthermore, Immanuel Kant's contribution to modern citizenship thought is no less important. Although he did not directly write about a "social contract" like Hobbes or Rousseau, Kant expanded the idea of citizenship by emphasizing universal morality and rational law. For Kant, a citizen is not merely a legal subject within a nation-state, but a moral agent subject to universal rational principles. This idea later encouraged the emergence of universal citizenship thought, a citizenship that transcends national boundaries and is rooted in moral rationality values.

A subsequent development in the modern era was the formation of the nation-state, where the political rights and participation of citizens became more formal and institutionalized. In political literature, the notion emerged that the nation-state is the arena where citizens can exercise their political rights, such as voting and being elected, and participate in public decision-making. The modern state developed with constitutions guaranteeing individual freedoms while establishing mechanisms of representation and democratic governance.

One highly influential figure in modern citizenship theory is T. H. Marshall. Literature study shows that Marshall identified three main dimensions of citizenship: civil rights, political rights, and social rights (Momen, n.d.). Civil rights encompass fundamental freedoms such as freedom of thought, speech, and property. Political rights involve participation in formal political processes like elections. Meanwhile, social rights demand the state's role in guaranteeing a minimum standard of living, social welfare, education, and healthcare. Marshall conveyed that these three rights developed historically: modern Western societies began by fighting for civil rights, then political, and finally social (Cohen, 2010). This shows the transformation of citizenship from merely a legal status to a basis for social integration and welfare.

Findings from the literature also highlight that Marshall's thought remains relevant today. For example, in contemporary studies of the welfare state, the social rights advocated by Marshall are considered a foundation for the legitimacy of social welfare development. In Indonesia, for instance, some civic education literature mentions that Marshall's ideas support an understanding of citizenship as the state's responsibility towards its citizens, including in socio-economic aspects (Mukmin & Sihaloho, n.d.).

In synthesis, the main finding from this section on modern-era citizenship thought is that modernity shifted the focal point of citizenship thought from the concept of communal virtue and morality (as in the classical era) to individual rights, freedoms, and legal status within the state. Social contract theory provided the basis of legitimacy for the modern state, while Marshall's thought affirmed that citizenship is not only about politics and law but also about social rights guaranteeing collective

welfare. This transformation is important because it shows how individual rights increasingly became the foundation for the legitimacy of modern citizenship and affirmed the state's role as the protector of its citizens' welfare.

Contemporary Citizenship Thought

In the contemporary era, citizenship thought has undergone significant transformation influenced by globalization, international mobility, cultural pluralism, and advances in digital technology. Globalization, as a cross-border phenomenon, has blurred the traditional boundaries of nation-states, so that citizenship identity is no longer solely tied to geographical bonds but has also expanded into the global sphere. Digital development accelerates the globalization process, meaning "citizenship is no longer limited to geographical attachment but also involves social, political, and cultural connectivity that transcends national borders" (Aulia et al., 2024). Furthermore, the transformation of civic awareness through social media and digital participation also shapes a new culture of citizenship (digital citizenship), as found in a case study on public responses to racism issues on social media (Jannah et al., n.d.).

From a literature review, several new forms of citizenship have been identified as responses to contemporary dynamics: global, multicultural, digital, and ecological citizenship. Global citizenship emerges from the idea that individuals have responsibilities towards the global human community, not only towards their country of origin. In an educational context, although the concept of global citizenship is increasingly popular, a standard definition has not been fully agreed upon due to differences in ideology and socio-political thought (Usmi, 2023). Cultural identity and life experiences also influence their understanding of global citizenship, which encompasses global solidarity, human rights, and social justice.

Multicultural citizenship is receiving increasing attention, especially in heterogeneous societies. The thought of William Kymlicka is highly relevant here. Kymlicka proposed that the state should recognize the rights of cultural minority groups through a flexible liberal approach (Kymlicka, n.d.). In the Indonesian context, reconstructing the nation-state based citizenship concept by considering Kymlicka's multiculturalism, emphasizing the importance of state policy reconciliation to protect cultural diversity (Ramadhan & Kartika, 2025). However, debates also arise regarding the conflict between minority rights and national interests.

Digital citizenship emerges as a direct consequence of the technological revolution. Civic education must play a role in building the global competency of digital citizens, encompassing knowledge, skills, and attitudes, so that individuals can participate actively in the global community through digital platforms (Lukmanul Hakim, 2022). Additionally, the transformation of civic awareness on social media, as seen in the case of responses to racism issues, shows how digital citizenship enables collective expression and activism for tolerance through counter-narratives against hate speech.

Although less frequently discussed in national journal literature, ecological citizenship is becoming increasingly relevant. Within the global citizenship discourse, some thinkers link citizenship with responsibility for the global environment: issues such as ecological justice and global sustainability have become part of contemporary civic identity. Rianda Usni in her analysis states that global environmental concerns are one of the trends in the emergence of global citizenship in the 21st century.

In addition to these new forms of citizenship, the thought of important contemporary figures also shapes how we understand citizenship today. William Kymlicka, as mentioned, advocates for the recognition of minority groups through differential rights and inclusive politics. Empathy for cultural difference is at the core of his theory. Bryan S. Turner, a citizenship sociologist, developed the concept of citizenship through an empirical and sociological approach that considers civil, political, social, and human rights in modern society (Dumaeri & Samsuri, 2024).

The thought of cosmopolitanism is also relevant, for instance in Martha Nussbaum's idea which places global citizenship as a moral identity for humans within the universal human community. However, this concept also faces criticism regarding how loyalty to a global community might impact national or local identity. Some critiques highlight the potential dilemma between national identity and global citizenship.

From the analysis above, the main debates in the contemporary era encompass identity (whether citizens maintain local, national, or global identities), dual citizenship, inclusivity (how the state can recognize diversity without weakening unity), and minority rights (multicultural citizenship). For example, in a multicultural context, the state must balance cultural recognition with responsibilities towards social justice and national solidarity.

The main finding from this literature review concludes that contemporary citizenship has become far more inclusive, flexible, and multi-layered, and transcends the boundaries of the nation-state. This change is marked by the development of global, digital, multicultural, and ecological citizenship, all of which reflect the adaptation of the citizenship concept to the challenges of the modern era: global connectivity, cultural diversity, digital technology, and the urgency of environmental sustainability. The thoughts of theorists such as Kymlicka, Turner, and proponents of cosmopolitanism (like Nussbaum) serve as important theoretical frameworks for understanding this transformation. These findings have significant implications for civic education: Pancasila and Civic Education (PPKn) curricula need to incorporate values of global and multicultural citizenship, while also enhancing citizens' digital literacy and ecological awareness. Thus, civic education should not only prepare active national citizens but also responsible, tolerant, and ethical global citizens who are committed to preserving diversity and our shared planet.

Comparative Cross-Era Analysis

In a cross-era analysis of citizenship thought, a fundamental transformation is evident: from the virtue-based concept in the classical period, to rights-based citizenship in the modern era, and further evolving into citizenship with global and multidimensional dimensions in the contemporary era. This shift is not merely a change in terminology, but a reflection of the evolution of social, political, and technological structures that influence the relationship between the individual, community, and state.

In the classical era, citizenship was closely tied to the moral role and virtue of citizens within the polis. Citizens were viewed as part of the public community, with active responsibilities towards collective welfare, not just individual rights. However, membership in the polis was exclusive: only free men and certain citizens were recognized as true citizens. In this context, citizenship was not inclusive; it demanded virtue and community commitment, not universal individual rights.

This classical ideal of citizenship was deeply rooted in the ideas of civic engagement and self-sacrifice for the greater good. For philosophers like Aristotle, being a citizen meant participating in public deliberation and judicial functions, making it an active art of life, not merely a passive legal status. Therefore, failure to engage in the affairs of the polis (such as the case of "idiotes" in Athens) was seen as a moral and political deficiency, demonstrating how central participation was in defining a citizen's identity and worth.

Entering the modern era, a major transformation occurred: citizenship thought began to be dominated by the idea of individual rights. Social contract theories from thinkers like Locke, Hobbes, and Rousseau asserted that citizens possessed natural rights, and the state emerged through mutual agreement to protect these rights. Here, citizenship became a legal status: citizens possessed civil, political, and social rights as outlined by T. H. Marshall. This conceptual shift from virtue to rights reflected a major social change: the emergence of the modern nation-state that placed the individual at the center of citizenship, rather than a collective moral community.

This development subsequently sparked intense debates among various schools of thought, particularly between liberals and communitarians, regarding the nature and scope of citizenship. While the liberal perspective emphasizes the importance of individual autonomy and rights within a legal framework, communitarians argue that an exclusive focus on rights has eroded civic responsibility, participation, and social bonds essential for healthy democratic functioning. Thus, although individual rights became the primary foundation, discussions about the citizen's role in a fragmented society remain a central issue in contemporary political philosophy.

In the contemporary era, citizenship continues to evolve, becoming increasingly inclusive and multidimensional by accounting for the global context. Globalization enables cross-border human mobility, while the internet and digital technology create transnational public spaces. In this context, concepts of global, multicultural, digital,

and ecological citizenship have emerged. For instance, research on global citizenship in education shows that citizens are no longer bound solely by national identity, but are also aware of rights and responsibilities as part of the global community.

This development signifies a significant shift from traditional nation-state-centric models of citizenship. Concepts like digital citizenship, for example, demand individuals to develop ethics, literacy, and security awareness when interacting in cyberspace, which transcends physical jurisdictions. Furthermore, ecological citizenship emphasizes collective responsibility for the planet's sustainability, urging citizens to act beyond political boundaries to address global environmental challenges, such as climate change and biodiversity loss. This expansion of the meaning of citizenship enriches individual political and social participation on both local and international scales.

This transformation is also characterized by a shift from exclusive membership towards inclusive and universal membership. In contemporary multicultural societies, the concept of citizenship is not just about who is born as an inhabitant, but how the cultural, religious, and identity rights of minorities are recognized and protected by the state. Multicultural citizenship demands a reconstruction of the nation-state-based citizenship concept to accommodate ethnic and cultural diversity. This consideration opens avenues for participation for individuals previously marginalized by exclusive citizenship systems.

The driving factors behind this transformation are evident: the development of democracy, industrialization, globalization, and technological revolution. Modern democracy promotes political rights and participation, providing a stage for citizens to demand social rights and individual freedoms. Industrialization opened new social structures, created a working class, and accelerated urbanization, which in turn demanded reforms in civil and social rights. Globalization expands interactions between states and individuals, giving rise to transnational identities, migration, and the need to update the concept of citizenship. On the other hand, the technological revolution, especially digitalization and social media, creates new spaces for digital forms of citizenship, where civic participation is no longer physically confined within a state, but occurs through cyberspace.

By synthesizing the findings above, it can be said that the development of citizenship reflects the dynamic relationship between the individual, community, and state, which continuously transforms according to the context of the times. In the classical era, the individual was viewed within the framework of a moral community. The modern era affirmed the individual's role as a rights-holder within a legal state system. The contemporary era then expanded this concept by introducing global and multicultural dimensions, asserting that citizenship is no longer merely a relationship between citizen and state, but also a relationship between individuals across states, cultural communities, and digital spaces.

This transformation is not merely academic or theoretical, but manifests in modern citizenship policies and practices. For example, in the context of Indonesia, a state based on law must adapt to multicultural citizenship without neglecting human rights. In practice, this inclusivity demands that the state recognize plurality and multiple identities, a challenge in balancing individual rights and national stability. This new paradigm also has implications for constitutional interpretation and implementation. Progressive law enforcement must reflect recognition of diversity (ethnicity, religion, culture, gender) as a national asset, not a source of conflict, while ensuring that all citizens, regardless of background, have equal access to justice and opportunity. Therefore, *ius constitutum* (the law as it is) is challenged to continuously dialogue with *ius constituendum* (the law as it ought to be) to realize a substantive and just citizenship, where every individual feels fully recognized and protected.

Overall, this cross-era analysis demonstrates that citizenship is not a static concept, but a socio-political construct that continuously evolves. The evolution from virtue → rights → global/multidimensional reflects a response to structural societal changes: from polis to nation-state to global community. The shift towards more inclusive membership reflects the awareness that citizens must be recognized not only under the state entity, but also within cross-cultural and digital communities. Driving factors such as democracy, industrialization, globalization, and technology are the engines of this transformation. The synthesis of these findings affirms that contemporary citizenship embodies the dynamic relationship between individual, community, and state, continuously adapting to the developments of the age.

CONCLUSION

The historical transformation of citizenship thinking demonstrates that the concept of citizenship continuously evolves alongside social, political, and intellectual dynamics. In the classical era, citizenship was understood as a form of virtue demanding active participation in public life, thus a citizen was judged based on their contribution to the harmony of the polis. Entering the modern era, this concept shifted to become more oriented towards individual rights and legal status guaranteed by the nation-state. Meanwhile, in the contemporary era, the developments of globalization, technology, and societal plurality present a broader, more inclusive, and multidimensional understanding of citizenship, no longer confined to the territorial boundaries of a state.

Each period contributes significantly to shaping today's citizenship paradigm. Classical thought affirms the importance of moral integrity and citizen participation in maintaining social stability; modern thought asserts the urgency of protecting civil, political, and social rights; while contemporary thought expands the scope of citizenship to the realms of globality, cultural diversity, and social inclusivity. This evolutionary understanding has major implications for citizenship education and public policy, particularly in developing curricula that emphasize critical awareness, solidarity,

and global responsibility. For the praxis of Islamic education, these findings affirm the importance of building the character of citizens who are ethical, just, respectful of differences, and capable of playing an active role in a multicultural society.

Based on the results of this study, several recommendations can be proposed for further research. First, cross-country or cross-period empirical studies are needed to strengthen comparative understanding of citizenship dynamics. Second, research on digital and ecological citizenship is crucial to develop, considering the societal shift towards the digital world and the increasing urgency of global environmental issues. Third, in-depth studies on the challenges of citizenship in multicultural and increasingly globally connected societies need to be conducted to provide more relevant theoretical and practical contributions, both for citizenship education and Islamic education in shaping citizens who are intelligent, ethical, and responsive to the changing times.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Airah, Z. (2019). KONTRAK SOSIAL DALAM PANDANGAN ROUSSEAU. *Paradigma: Jurnal Kalam Dan Filsafat*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.15408/paradigma.v1i01.27289>

Aulia, C., Susanti, E., Fiona, E., Nasywa, F., & Ramadhan, I. (2024). Pengaruh Globalisasi Terhadap Konsep Kewarganegaraan di Era Digital. *De Cive: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 4(7). <https://doi.org/10.56393/decive.v4i7.2189>

Balot, R. (2017). Revisiting Classical Citizenship Ideals: A Study on Law & Society. *Studocu*.

Cohen, M. (2010). T.H. Marshall's "Citizenship and Social Class." *Dissent Magazine*.

Daly, E. (2018). Citizenship, sovereignty and antipolitics in Rousseau. *ISECS*.

Daniel P, R. (2014). "Comparative Historical Analysis." *Methodological Practices in Social Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198719571.003.0005>

Dumaeri, A., & Samsuri, S. (2024). Bryan Stanley Turner's Philosophical Thoughts: Citizenship Outline Analysis. *Journal of Social Research*, 3(12). <https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v3i12.2305>

Fethullah, G. (n.d.). *Education from cradle to grave—Fethullah Gülen's Official Web Site*. Retrieved May 28, 2019, from <https://fgulen.com/en/fethullah-gulens-works/toward-a-global-civilization-of-love-and-tolerance/education/25271-education-from-cradle-to-grave>

Fifi, N. (2015). *Model Pendidikan Karakter di Pesantren (Studi Pondok Pesantren Al-Munawwir Krapyak dan Muallimin Muallimat Yogyakarta* [Doctoral, UIN Sunan Kalijaga]. <http://digilib.uin-suka.ac.id/23812/>

Gray, B. (2018). Citizenship as Barrier and Opportunity for Ancient Greek and Modern Refugees. *Humanities*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/h7030072>

Jannah, S. M., Hermawati, P. K., Sujaryanto, H., & Nuryadi, H. (n.d.). *Peran Transformasi Kesadaran Kewargaan di Era Globalisasi Digital dalam Membangun Masyarakat Toleran (Studi Kasus Respons terhadap Isu Rasisme di Media Sosial)*.

Kymlicka. (n.d.). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*.

Lickona, T. (2009). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. Bantam Books.

Lukmanul Hakim, A. (2022). Kewarganegaraan Digital, Penguatan Wawasan Global Warga Negara, Dan Peran Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Didalamnya. *MAARIF*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.47651/mrf.v17i1.153>

Ma`arif, M. A., & Kartiko, A. (2018). Fenomenologi Hukuman di Pesantren: Analisis Tata Tertib Santri Pondok Pesantren Daruttaqwa Cresik. *Nadwa*, 12(1), 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.21580/nw.2018.12.1.1862>

Mohajan, H. K. (2018). Qualitative Research Methodology in Social Sciences and Related Subjects. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*, 7(1). <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/85654/>

Momen, M. (n.d.). *Social Rights of Citizenship*.

Mukmin, B. A., & Sihaloho, O. A. (n.d.). *Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Transformatif: Menuju Warga Negara Berpikir Politis*.

Osinsky, P., & Eloranta. (n.d.). *Comparative Historical Analysis: Some Insights from Political Transitions of the First Half of the Twentieth Century*.

Paparusso, A., & Wenden, C. W. D. (2025). *The shifting of traditional understanding of citizenship due to international migration*. 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2025.1568332>

Putri, M. F. J. L., Saputra, R., Iswardhana, M. R., & Emilia. (2023). KEWARGANEGARAAN: TEORETIS DAN PRAKSIS. *FUTURE SCIENCE*.

Ramadhan, R. A., & Kartika, G. D. (2025). Rekonseptualisasi Kewarganegaraan Berbasis Negara-Bangsa terhadap Kondisi Masyarakat Multikultural Melalui Pemikiran William Kymlicka. 8(3).

Sitasari, N. W. (2022). MENGENAL ANALISA KONTEN DAN ANALISA TEMATIK DALAM PENELITIAN KUALITATIF. *Forum Ilmiah*, 19(1).

Suriaman, Bribin, M. L., & Mulyani, H. (2024). Teori dan Implikasi Sosiologi Kewarganegaraan: Klasik hingga Kontemporer. *Eureka Media Aksara*.

Usmi, R. (2023). Analisis Kewarganegaraan Global dalam Konteks Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan. *Journal of Civics and Moral Studies*, 8(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jcms.v8n1.p1-9>

Widiatmaka, P., Nuryadi, M. H., & Sugiyanto, A. (2025). Pendidikan kewarganegaraan sebagai sarana pembelajaran dalam menumbuhkan karakter bangsa pada mahasiswa di era digital. *Humanika: Kajian Ilmiah Mata Kuliah Umum*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.21831/hum.v25i1.80367>

Wijaya, D. (2016). KONTRAK SOSIAL MENURUT THOMAS HOBBES DAN JOHN LOCKE. *Jurnal Hasil Riset*. <https://www.e-jurnal.com/2017/02/kontrak-sosial-menurut-thomas-hobbes.html?>

Winarno, W. (2015). PEMIKIRAN ARISTOTELES TENTANG KEWARGANEGARAAN DAN KONSTITUSI. *HUMANIKA*, 21(1), 56–62. <https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.21.1.56-62>

Zandro, A. (2024). Negara Leviathan dan Kontrak Sosial Hobbes: Membentuk Hidup Bersama dalam Pluralitas Masyarakat. *AGRAPANA: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 1(3). <https://e-jurnal.fisipol-undar.ac.id/index.php/agrapana/article/view/62>