



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### What does society want adolescents to know about civics?

van Goethem, A.; Ten Dam, G.; Dijkstra, A.B.

**DOI**

[10.1080/02671522.2020.1864767](https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2020.1864767)

**Publication date**

2022

**Document Version**

Final published version

**Published in**

Research Papers in Education

**License**

CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

van Goethem, A., Ten Dam, G., & Dijkstra, A. B. (2022). What does society want adolescents to know about civics? *Research Papers in Education*, 37(5), 707-728.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2020.1864767>

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



OPEN ACCESS



## What does society want adolescents to know about civics?

Anne van Goethem<sup>a</sup>, Geert Ten Dam <sup>b</sup> and Anne Bert Dijkstra <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>GGZ Noord-Holland-Noord, Alkmaar, The Netherlands; <sup>b</sup>Research Institute of Child Development and Education (CDE), University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

### ABSTRACT

Using a mixed-methods approach, this paper investigates current views within society about what civic knowledge is important for students leaving secondary education. We combined questionnaire data from a representative national sample with data from a multiple-case study among several focus groups of stakeholders with various roles in society. The results show that there is broad consensus in society about the civic knowledge that is important for students, consistent with civic knowledge conceptualisations as used in common standardised measurement instruments. The data also show a different appreciation of the different aspects of civics. In particular, themes related to solidarity, democracy and civic empowerment and their relevance were seen as a prerequisite for successful participation in society. Themes that are less prominent in the lives of adolescents or less important for understanding other civic topics were seen as relatively less important. Moreover, although equal civic knowledge for all students was considered desirable in principle, the stakeholder groups differentiated between groups of students in terms of interests, educational track and their expected future role in society. Social inequality between students was not problematised. This calls for further research into desired levels of civic knowledge for different educational groups.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 28 June 2020

Accepted 12 December 2020

### KEYWORDS

Citizenship; citizenship education; secondary education; adolescents

## Introduction

For some time, people and governments in many Western countries have become increasingly concerned about individualisation and the erosion of the social fabric of society due to rapid social and economic changes in these countries. To address these problems and stimulate civic competences and social engagement among citizens, programmes for civic education have been introduced or are being intensified (Eurydice 2017). In addition to paying attention to aspects such as attitudes and skills, citizenship curricula frequently highlight the cognitive aspects of citizenship competences or, more specifically, increasing the civic knowledge of students.

Now that citizenship and civic knowledge have become more prominent in education, we can also notice a growing emphasis on the measurement of civic knowledge among students, for example in national and international comparative research (e.g. Schulz

**CONTACT** Geert Ten Dam  [G.T.M.Tendam@uva.nl](mailto:G.T.M.Tendam@uva.nl)  Research Institute of Child Development and Education (CDE), University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam 1012, The Netherlands

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

et al. 2018) or studies focusing on how effective schools are in civic knowledge teaching (Geboers et al. 2013; Isac et al. 2014; Coopmans et al. 2020). When it comes to mapping out civic knowledge, large-scale standardised assessment tests aimed at knowledge – for example, the civic knowledge tests used in the ICCS studies (Schulz et al. 2010, 2016), the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in the US (Department of Education 2010), the Citizenship Educational Longitudinal Study (CELS) in the UK (Keating, Kerr, and Benton et al. 2010) and the Civic Competences Questionnaire (CCQ) used in the School Career Cohort Study (COOL<sup>5–18</sup>) in the Netherlands (Ten Dam et al. 2011; Geijsel et al. 2012) – determine to a large extent the national and international understanding of adolescent civic knowledge and its distribution among groups of students. Moreover, descriptions of young people’s civic knowledge based on the outcomes of such instruments often figure in debates about civic education and its quality among educators, policymakers and society in general. This sometimes leads, as is currently the case in the Netherlands, for example, to a stricter formulation of the statutory obligation of schools to promote citizenship.

In the above studies, what is regarded as relevant civic knowledge for young people is primarily derived from theoretical conceptualisations of democracy and citizen participation). In particular the ideas of Barber (1984), who distinguishes between ‘thin’ and ‘strong’ democracies are recognisable. A strong democracy focuses on the participation of all people in various forms of social and political life. It aims at social justice and offers strong resistance against cynicism, apathy, self-interest, privatisation and alienation. Following this line of thought, democracy is then interpreted as ‘in the making’, or as put forward earlier by Dewey ‘a mode of associated living’. A democratic way of living involves a willingness to accept democratic authority, social justice, a capacity to empathise with others, recognition of the right of individuals to differ from each other, a willingness to accept others as they are, avoidance of discrimination and a willingness to resolve conflicts by peaceful means. Various political theories underline the societal relevance of promoting such democratic citizenship features. Since societies cannot depend on the existence of democratic institutions alone, democratic practices and principles should also be supported by citizens, and a basic set of commonly held non-disputed values and norms is necessary for people to coexist peacefully. In particular, equal rights, tolerance of diversity and non-violent conflict solution serve as common ground (Eidhof et al. 2016). The same applies to civic engagement in the form of collective action, which is held to be essential for the political and social vitality of a democratic society as it promotes informal ties between members of different groups, interpersonal trust, effective norms and the flow of information (cf. Coleman 1990). Other citizenship goals are more disputed as various political theories add and emphasise their own specific values and orientations based on their views on the social nature of man and the ordering of social relations (see Eidhof 2016 for an overview of liberal individualism, liberal communitarianism, egalitarian communitarianism and conservative communitarianism with regard to citizenship goals).

In general, the common interpretation of citizenship in the literature on citizenship education and measuring students’ civic competences concerns the competences needed to participate in by definition ‘hybrid’ cultures. To anchor in a specific political or philosophical orientation does not fit in with the openness of – public – education. Moreover, the resilience of a democracy stems from the combination of diversity and its multiple

representations as well as the value-loaded selections that citizens make from these representations. The main goal is equipping students with the knowledge, skills and attitudes that enables them to deal with different opinions and values, positioning themselves in the 'contested' domains. It is not primarily about, for instance, transferring a clear cut vision on societal issues, or the promotion of active social participation, but about learning the competences that are necessary to reflect on contested themes and adopt a position independently. Although contested elements of citizenship can (and should) be part of citizenship education, this view does primarily imply that the main focus is on learning about democratic principles such as the rule of law, agree to disagree, equal rights, and respecting all peoples access to citizenship and about contributing to society in one's own way.

Although the conceptual framework underlying the aforementioned instruments for assessing civic knowledge is sound, less attention is being paid to specific validations of scientific notions of the civic knowledge relevant to young people based on what students, schools and, more generally, groups in society consider important. Different groups in society probably have different views on what constitutes relevant civic knowledge. A longstanding tradition of international value studies, for instance, shows systematic differences in value orientations related to categories like age, ethnicity, gender and level of education, besides cultural and national variation (e.g. Inglehart and Welzel 2010; Robinson 2013). Empirical research also shows varying levels of citizenship competences, including civic knowledge and attitudes, of students from different socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds, between boys and girls, and between students in different educational tracks (e.g. Geijsel et al. 2012; Wanders et al. 2020). These findings underline the relevance of the question if and how social groups differ in their views on citizenship and where they share views. From an educational perspective, opinions in society on the civic knowledge that young people should acquire are not only relevant for the conceptualisation of the concept of citizenship as such or its relevance to curriculum design. Operationalisations that also take account of social views on desirable civic knowledge are important too because of the potentially large impact of outcome measurements in the domain of civic knowledge, for example for research into school effectiveness and as a basis for monitoring with a view to education policies and school improvement. Social validation of conceptualisations of citizenship thus contributes to the relevance of outcome measurements and the instruments used for such measurements. This paper will, therefore, answer the question of what ideas there are in society about the civic knowledge relevant to young people: what civic knowledge should young people have acquired when they graduate from secondary school? An understanding of shared *and* divergent views in this area may show to what extent the results of theory-based instruments – and the concerns that are sometimes sparked by their outcomes (e.g. Foa and Mounk 2016; Mounk 2017) – are consistent with ideas in society about what is, and what is not, important.

## Civic knowledge

Knowledge is an especially important aspect of young people's citizenship competences. Support for democracy, for example, is partly dependent on knowledge of democratic values (Cho 2014). Various researchers also point out that political knowledge is likely to have a positive influence on political interest and participation (Dassonneville et al. 2012; Carpini and Keeter 1996). In addition, empirical research shows that schools, in

particular, can influence the knowledge component of citizenship competences (Isac et al. 2014; Schulz et al. 2018).

Various instruments are used to examine the students' level of civic knowledge (see for an overview Daas, Ten Dam, and Dijkstra 2016). A frequently used type of instrument is the standardised multiple-choice test. Such instruments can often be used to test all students and be assessed, scored and compared quickly, easily and reliably. The tests used in the ICCS, NAEP, CELS and CCQ studies are examples of such measurement instruments, which are often constructed on the basis of scientific theories and theoretical research on what students should know about society and 'good citizenship'. Although such instruments are quite similar, they also show differences. For a long time, for example, civic knowledge topics primarily involved issues at the national level, for example, related to the nation-state, interdependence and responsibility, cultural differences and democratic values (Veugelers 2011). More recently, increasing attention has been paid to global citizenship and, in Europe, to European citizenship, leading to a broader notion of citizenship in which the scope has been broadened to include issues such as social justice across the globe and sustainability (Schulz et al. 2016).

Also the scope of studies into civic knowledge differs. Some almost exclusively focus on the political domain. Knowledge of how to influence political decision-making (enabling people to use or defend their democratic rights) is an important part of these civic knowledge instruments. The NAEP and CELS studies, for example, focus primarily on knowledge of the national political system and political participation through voting. Other studies emphasise the competences young people should develop to function adequately in today's society. The CCQ instrument highlights behavioural rules, handling conflicts and social and cultural differences and having a voice in local communities, for example, through democratic decision-making in schools, for successful participation in society as a young citizen (Ten Dam and Volman 2007; Ten Dam et al. 2011). The most recent ICCS study also includes the use of social media (Schulz et al. 2016).

Because the question of what civic knowledge students should acquire – let alone what 'good' citizenship *is* – is inherently a societal issue, scientific ideas about this matter must be validated and, if necessary, rounded out with ideas living in society. It is also self-evident that scientific ideas about relevant civic knowledge and good citizenship are not developed in a social vacuum. Only scant attention has been paid, however, to society's ideas about what civic knowledge students should acquire at school. The same applies to the question of the level of knowledge that students should subsequently achieve and the extent to which this involves a common minimum set of knowledge that all students should acquire.

An example of early research into these issues is the multiple-case study carried out by Torney-Purta, Schwille, and Amadeo (1999). This study – conducted in 24 countries – explored the views held by various groups in society on what 14-year-olds should 'learn about the rights and duties of citizenship, including the knowledge and attitudes concerning government that are presumed by the appropriate exercise of these rights and duties' (Torney-Purta, Schwille, and Amadeo 1999, 22). This concerned the views of social groups and individuals that 'were reflected in curriculum guides or educational materials, circulated in national publications or influential on occasions when civic education is discussed or policy is made' (p. 22). Among the groups included were

high school students, educators and policymakers. The civic knowledge domains which this study identified as important in all or most countries were included in the international CIVED study, the precursor of the ICCS studies. Although it is a fine example of how relevant societal validation is to the development of instruments to measure citizenship, the results of this multiple-case study are of limited use for the validation of current conceptualisations of relevant civic knowledge, since it was conducted almost 20 years ago and significant social developments such as the growing impact of migration, globalisation and information technology will have had an impact on various notions of citizenship.

Above we focused on the question of what civic knowledge is relevant to young people and, more specifically, how society feels about this against the background of the increased relevance of promoting citizenship in education in many countries (Eurydice 2017) and the associated attention that is being paid to measuring student civic knowledge. Research specifically aimed at investigating societal notions of citizenship mainly focuses on the question of what should be regarded as important aspects of 'good' citizenship in general. There are two main lines of research. The first constitutes large-scale studies into what people consider important aspects of citizenship which focus on general descriptions of societal notions and are often based on representative national samples. Examples of such studies are the European Social Survey (ESS), the Centre for Democracy and Civil Society (CDACS) survey conducted in the US and the International Social Survey Program (ISSP). The second line is more qualitative in nature and usually comprises small-scale, in-depth studies to explore notions of good citizenship, often among small specific groups, which take the form of interviews, case studies and text analyses of educational citizenship policy documents and curricula (e.g. Torney-Purta, Schwille, and Amadeo 1999; Ten Dam and Volman 2003; Westheimer and Kahn 2004; Dijkstra and De la Motte 2014; Nieuwelink et al. 2018).

Although these studies show that the relative importance of what constitutes good citizenship varies somewhat by country and respondent background characteristics (e.g. gender, age, educational track and level of political activism), there is broad consensus about what people consider the most important aspects of citizenship. For example, in 2014 the international ISSP study measured good citizenship among citizens in countries all over the world (Eder 2017). Participants were asked to rate the importance of nine characteristics of good citizenship on a 7-point scale. Across these countries, the most important aspects of good citizenship were considered to be obeying the law and abiding by the rules (e.g. paying taxes) and active forms of citizenship including helping less privileged people and political participation through voting. Other topics, for example, membership of social or political associations – a more formal and collective form of citizenship – were considered relatively unimportant. The same applies to boycotting products for political or environmental reasons and helping people elsewhere in the world. Qualitative research into ideas about important aspects of citizenship – such as the previously mentioned study by Torney-Purta, Schwille, and Amadeo (1999) – provides a more detailed picture and shows, for example, that broader conceptualisations of politics and democracy are also considered important. This involves topics related to the defining characteristics of democracy, democratic institutions and practices and the rights and responsibilities of citizens in a democracy. Other high-ranking topics

concerned national and supranational identity (e.g. what does it mean to be a member of a national community), diversity and social cohesion (e.g. how diverse is the nation).

In this paper, we aim to investigate contemporary views in society about what civic knowledge is relevant to young people and what civic knowledge students leaving secondary education should possess. Our main question is: *According to society, what civic knowledge should secondary school graduates have and is there a general minimum desirable for all students?*

Our study took place in the Netherlands. In contrast to more ‘comprehensive’ systems, the Dutch school system is characterised by early educational tracking. After the final year of primary school students, around the age of 12, a selection process determines what secondary-school type the student will attend: pre-vocational education (vmbo, 4 years), or one of the levels of general secondary education (havo, 5 years, or vwo, 6 years) that prepare for higher education or university. Promoting citizenship competences is a statutory task for all Dutch schools, and the objectives of both primary and secondary education are stipulated in legislation since 2005. The statutory citizenship obligation has been formulated in rather unspecified terms because the constitutional ‘freedom of education’ (see Glenn and de Groof 2002). This principle allows organisations and groups to found schools and allows schools to design their curricula to shape teaching in line with a religious or philosophical orientation. Schools can design citizenship education as they see fit, as long as it respects the basic values of the democratic state and is based on an underlying vision aimed at active citizenship and social integration. How schools meet the citizenship obligation (e.g. teaching it as a separate subject, or through projects or embedded in other subjects), what content they teach and how much attention they pay to it is up to each school individually. The high level of school autonomy in citizenship education together with the allocation of students to different educational tracks at age 12 is associated with relatively large differences between and within Dutch schools with respect to the citizenship competences of their students in particular their civic knowledge (Dijkstra, Ten Dam, and Munniksma 2021).

## Method

### Design

This study used a mixed-methods approach and two sets of data to examine the differences and similarities in society’s views of the civic knowledge that adolescents need. In order to obtain a broad and representative overview of citizens’ opinions about the relevance of civic knowledge topics and to identify and understand differences between the opinions of various social groups (differentiated by socioeconomic and migrant status), we used questionnaire data from a supplement to a national representative sample of adults (see below).

For a detailed understanding of the core aspects of citizenship and the differences and similarities between social groups, we also conducted a large multiple-case study. This study included seven stakeholder groups selected based on the expectation that if divergent roles and interests influence notions of citizenship, this would show up in a comparison between these groups, which comprised secondary-school students, parents of secondary-school students, teachers, school leaders and educationalists, employer

and union representatives, local council members (politicians), representatives of charity organisations and a mixed group. Following a multiple-case study approach (Yin 2013), each stakeholder group was conceptualised as a ‘case’. On the one hand, the results of the focus group interviews will both complement and supplement the results of the national survey, while the quantitative data will be used to triangulate the focus group data.

## **Data collection**

### **National survey**

A national sample of Dutch adults answered various questions to find out their opinions of what adolescents should know in terms of civic knowledge. We developed this civic knowledge questionnaire as a supplement to the Dutch panel of the 2014 International Social Survey Program (ISSP) study (GESIS 2016; Joye and Sapin 2017) and as part of our stakeholder case study. This national sample comprised 1,579 respondents (mean age = 56.26, SD = 16.01; 46.7% female), the majority of which was of Dutch descent (88.8%; both parents born in the Netherlands); based on the highest level of parental education, 18.1% had a low socioeconomic background, 40.5% an average and 41.4% a high socioeconomic background. The sample was representative of the Dutch population (GESIS 2016).

The participants answered questions about how important it is for secondary-school graduates to have acquired knowledge of various civic topics to be ‘good’ citizens. First, they indicated the relevance of 13 civic knowledge topics (see Table 1) on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = totally unimportant; 7 = of utmost importance). Then they were asked to choose and rank the four topics which they believed were the most important. This assignment was included to make respondents prioritise the topics. Thirdly, to explore how respondents felt about the extent to which civic knowledge is relevant to all students, we asked them to rank the importance of civic knowledge in general for three student groups on a 7-point Likert scale: students in general secondary education, students in vocational education and secondary-school graduates who start working.

The selected topics represented the main civic knowledge content found in the literature, which – apart from some intrapersonal topics such as a responsible lifestyle – focus on interpersonal (e.g. rules of conduct) and societal topics (e.g. what constitutes a democracy). The latter included both general (e.g. democracy), national (e.g. Dutch politics) and international (e.g. current world affairs) topics.

### **Stakeholder groups**

The civic knowledge questionnaire used in the quantitative study was also completed by the focus group sample representing the six stakeholder groups (n = 61; 47% female). The number of participants in each focus group<sup>1</sup> is consistent with Barbour’s (2007) recommendation of a minimum of three and a maximum of approximately eight participants. All stakeholders were recruited through relevant networks. The stakeholder civic knowledge questionnaire also contained an additional open-ended question on whether they would like to add civic knowledge topics to the list in the questionnaire. The questionnaire allows a comparison between the stakeholders’ opinions on civic knowledge and those of the representative national sample and was used as a point of departure for the



**Table 1.** Importance attached to civic knowledge topics in national sample and stakeholder groups (mean and standard deviation).

<i>Civic knowledge</i>	National sample*		Stakeholder groups**			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Diff</i>	<i>Pdiff***</i>
Values and norms in society(e.g. respect, tolerance)	6.46	0.95	6.44	1.01	a	.92
Rules of conduct(e.g. good manners)	6.34	1.01	5.93	1.25	be	<.01
Human rights (incl. children rights) (e.g. equality, freedom, education)	6.17	1.05	5.82	1.26	be	.01
Responsible/healthy lifestyle (e.g. taking care of yourself)	6.06	1.07	5.66	1.20	cf	<.01
What a democracy is (e.g. parliament, jurisdiction)	6.02	1.12	6.02	1.01	be	.98
Sustainability/environment	5.93	1.14	5.49	1.30	def	<.01
Current affairs in the world (e.g. poverty, war)	5.80	1.14	5.75	1.14	bde	.74
Possibilities to help others (e.g. civic -/volunteering organisations)	5.61	1.16	5.21	1.19	df	<.01
Diversity in society (e.g. customs, religions, lifestyles)	5.47	1.29	5.90	1.09	bce	<.01
Current civic affairs	5.37	1.19	5.41	1.13	cdf	.80
Dutch politics (e.g. political parties, political points of view)	5.26	1.24	5.36	1.07	d	.52
Possibilities for having a voice (e.g. youth participation, demonstrations)	5.08	1.33	5.18	1.12	d	.55
European collaboration (e.g. European Union)	4.96	1.46	4.75	1.33	g	.28

\* The importance attached to each topic is significantly different from the other topics ( $p < .01$ ). Topics ordered according to their importance.

\*\* Significant differences indicated with a letter (column *Diff*). Topics that not share a letter/letters are significantly different from each other ( $p < .05$ ).

\*\*\* *Pdiff*: significance of difference between national sample and stakeholder groups for importance attached to topics.

focus group interviews. Apart from a stakeholder group indicator, the questionnaire was anonymous to minimise socially desirable answers.

About a week after completing the questionnaire, the stakeholders participated in separate focus group sessions in which the participants could discuss their opinions about civic knowledge in depth (Fern 2001). We also formed a mixed group comprising other members of all stakeholder groups<sup>2</sup> to create a dynamic context to produce additional information about the opinions of the stakeholder groups (similarities and differences). Each focus group session (90 to 120 minutes) was hosted by two of the study's authors and detailed minutes were taken. An interview protocol was used to structure each focus group session. All participants were asked what civic knowledge topics they believed to be important and whether differentiation is necessary for different groups of students. Towards the end of each session, a presentation of the civic knowledge questionnaire results was used to stimulate further in-depth debate. All results were transcribed verbatim and interpretatively coded. More specifically, the transcription protocols were divided into text fragments and then coded (Corbin and Strauss 2008). The codes assigned initially were discussed during team meetings and modified based on consensus.<sup>3</sup>

## Results

### *National survey*

#### *Most relevant civic knowledge*

Table 1 presents the average 7-point Likert scores and differences in importance assigned to the civic topics within the national sample. The range of mean scores within the sample (4.96–6.46) indicates that all topics were considered relatively important but that there was also sufficient differentiation in importance assigned. Paired-samples t-tests show that all scores differ significantly from each other ( $p < .01$ ). The four most important civic knowledge topics were values and norms, rules of conduct, human and children's rights and responsible/healthy lifestyle. The four least important civic knowledge topics were European collaboration, possibilities for having a voice in society, national politics and current civic affairs.<sup>4</sup>

#### *Group differences*

We examined group differences in what was seen as relevant civic knowledge (see Table 2). Concerning the four most important civic knowledge topics, there appears to be much agreement between the groups despite their differences in social roles and economic position.

*Age.* We compared four age groups: 15–39,<sup>5</sup> 40–54, 55–65 and 65 and over. In all groups, knowledge about values and norms and rules of conduct were seen as the two most important topics. For the three younger groups, human and children's rights were also part of the top 4. For all groups except the 40–54 age group, democracy was part of the top 4, as was responsible/healthy lifestyle for the two older groups. The most important differences were found between the two younger groups and the two older groups (see Table 2). The two younger groups regard knowledge about having a voice in society, possibilities to help others and responsible/healthy lifestyle as less important than the two older groups. Adolescents and young adults see the natural environment as a less important knowledge topic than the two older groups.

*Gender.* Women had the same top 4 of civic knowledge topics as the total sample. For men, knowledge about democracy was one of the four most important topics, whereas responsible/healthy lifestyle was not. With regard to the average importance of all civic knowledge topics (see Table 2), except for democracy, all topics were rated significantly higher by women than by men.

*Socioeconomic status.* The SES groups had the same top 4 as the total sample, except for the high SES group. For the latter, democracy instead of responsible/healthy lifestyle was one of the four most important topics. Table 2 shows that most differences were found between the low SES and high SES group and between the low and middle SES groups on the one hand and the high SES group on the other. The low SES group regards knowledge of a responsible/healthy lifestyle as more important than the high SES group, while they deem having a voice in society as less important than the high SES group. Low and average SES groups think that knowledge of world affairs, diversity in society, civic issues, democracy and European collaboration are less important than the high SES group.



**Table 2.** Importance attached to civic knowledge in national sample, by individual background characteristics (mean and standard deviation)\*

	Age				Gend		SES		Migrant status		
	15–39 <sup>1</sup> M (SD)	40–54 <sup>2</sup> M (SD)	55–64 <sup>3</sup> M (SD)	≥65 <sup>4</sup> M (SD)	Male <sup>1</sup> M (SD)	Female <sup>2</sup> M (SD)	Low <sup>1</sup> M (SD)	Average <sup>2</sup> M (SD)	High <sup>3</sup> M (SD)	Native <sup>1</sup> M (SD)	Migrant <sup>2</sup> M (SD)
Civic knowledge	6.49 (.77)	6.47 (.82)	6.54 (.87) <sup>4</sup>	6.37 (1.14) <sup>3</sup>	6.38 (.98) <sup>2</sup>	6.55 (.90) <sup>1</sup>	6.31 (1.28) <sup>23</sup>	6.48 (.89) <sup>1</sup>	6.49 (.86) <sup>1</sup>	6.45 (.96)	6.54 (.83)
Values and norms in society	6.27 (1.03)	6.33 (.88)	6.45 (.90)	6.29 (1.16)	6.23 (1.07) <sup>2</sup>	6.46 (.93) <sup>1</sup>	6.33 (1.16)	6.42 (.93) <sup>3</sup>	6.23 (1.04) <sup>2</sup>	6.32 (1.02)	6.43 (.97)
Rules of conduct	6.11 (.96)	6.15 (.97)	6.23 (1.03)	6.16 (1.16)	6.05 (1.08) <sup>2</sup>	6.30 (.99) <sup>1</sup>	6.18 (1.23)	6.15 (1.05)	6.14 (1.00)	6.14 (1.06) <sup>2</sup>	6.32 (.98) <sup>1</sup>
Human rights (incl. children rights)	5.82 (1.14) <sup>34</sup>	6.00 (1.01) <sup>4</sup>	6.09 (1.09) <sup>1</sup>	6.22 (1.03) <sup>2</sup>	5.94 (1.11) <sup>2</sup>	6.20 (1.01) <sup>1</sup>	6.21 (1.11) <sup>3</sup>	6.05 (1.04) <sup>3</sup>	5.96 (1.10) <sup>12</sup>	6.02 (1.08) <sup>2</sup>	6.37 (.94) <sup>1</sup>
Responsible/healthy lifestyle	6.04 (1.03)	5.98 (1.04)	6.10 (1.13)	5.99 (1.21)	6.00 (1.11) <sup>2</sup>	6.05 (1.13) <sup>1</sup>	5.71 (1.43) <sup>23</sup>	5.99 (1.06) <sup>13</sup>	6.16 (1.00) <sup>12</sup>	6.02 (1.13)	6.03 (1.09)
What a democracy is	5.31 (1.17) <sup>34</sup>	5.96 (1.03) <sup>1</sup>	6.05 (1.10) <sup>1</sup>	5.93 (1.23) <sup>1</sup>	5.80 (1.18) <sup>2</sup>	6.07 (1.08) <sup>1</sup>	5.82 (1.34)	5.89 (1.12)	5.96 (1.07)	5.90 (1.15) <sup>2</sup>	6.11 (1.08) <sup>1</sup>
Sustainability/ environment	5.68 (1.14) <sup>234</sup>	5.86 (1.05)	5.85 (1.13)	5.68 (1.25)	5.73 (1.12) <sup>2</sup>	5.89 (1.17) <sup>1</sup>	5.57 (1.38) <sup>3</sup>	5.77 (1.12) <sup>3</sup>	5.96 (1.04) <sup>12</sup>	5.79 (1.15)	5.90 (1.11)
Current affairs in the world	5.31 (1.08)	5.53 (1.06) <sup>4</sup>	5.73 (1.13) <sup>1</sup>	5.75 (1.22) <sup>12</sup>	5.46 (1.15) <sup>2</sup>	5.79 (1.15) <sup>1</sup>	5.76 (1.28) <sup>3</sup>	5.60 (1.14)	5.51 (1.12) <sup>1</sup>	5.58 (1.17) <sup>2</sup>	5.80 (1.07) <sup>1</sup>
Possibilities to help others	5.56 (1.22)	5.44 (1.25)	5.55 (1.26)	5.37 (1.35)	5.26 (1.30) <sup>2</sup>	5.79 (1.15) <sup>1</sup>	5.20 (1.46) <sup>3</sup>	5.39 (5.66) <sup>3</sup>	5.66 (1.17) <sup>12</sup>	5.43 (1.29) <sup>2</sup>	5.83 (1.20) <sup>1</sup>
Diversity in society	5.28 (1.11)	5.31 (1.09)	5.47 (1.21)	5.40 (1.29)	5.29 (1.18) <sup>2</sup>	5.46 (1.20) <sup>1</sup>	5.19 (1.43) <sup>3</sup>	5.32 (1.17) <sup>3</sup>	5.49 (1.07) <sup>12</sup>	5.35 (1.19)	5.46 (1.19)
Current civic affairs	5.31 (1.17)	5.16 (1.15)	5.33 (1.27)	5.26 (1.30)	5.15 (1.26) <sup>2</sup>	5.39 (1.20) <sup>1</sup>	5.11 (1.44)	5.25 (1.23)	5.30 (1.16)	5.27 (1.23)	5.21 (1.31)
Dutch politics	4.99 (1.21) <sup>34</sup>	4.98 (1.19) <sup>34</sup>	5.28 (1.38) <sup>12</sup>	5.07 (1.41) <sup>12</sup>	4.98 (1.32) <sup>2</sup>	5.19 (1.32) <sup>1</sup>	4.90 (1.61) <sup>3</sup>	5.05 (1.29)	5.16 (1.21) <sup>1</sup>	5.05 (1.32) <sup>2</sup>	5.26 (1.32) <sup>1</sup>
Possibilities for having a voice	5.01 (1.41)	4.98 (1.28)	4.97 (1.55)	5.01 (1.54)	4.87 (1.47) <sup>2</sup>	5.07 (1.44) <sup>1</sup>	4.58 (1.65) <sup>23</sup>	4.87 (1.44) <sup>13</sup>	5.22 (1.27) <sup>12</sup>	4.94 (1.46) <sup>2</sup>	5.19 (1.44) <sup>1</sup>
European collaboration											

\* Significant differences for background characteristic in importance attached to civic topics are indicated by the numbers in superscript. These numbers label categories within groups, and indicate for each group if they significantly differ from any of the other groups ( $p < .05$ ).

Finally, knowledge of values and norms is less important to the low SES group than to the entire sample and the high SES group. Overall, the differences between SES groups appear to be slightly larger compared to differences related to the other background characteristics.

***Migrant background.*** The two migrant status groups (native Dutch, immigrant) had the same top 4 as the total sample. The group of native Dutch respondents felt knowledge of a healthy/responsible lifestyle to be as important as knowledge of democracy in general. With regard to the average importance of topics (see Table 2), half of the civic knowledge topics (7<sup>6</sup> of 13) were more important to respondents in the migrant group than to the native group.

### ***Differentiation in civic knowledge***

Finally, we calculated the mean importance of civic knowledge for students graduating from schools with various levels of education. The importance of civic knowledge for the higher education level was 6.05 (SD = 1.14), for vocational education 6.02 (SD = 1.14) and for students who start working after secondary school 5.78 (SD = 1.38). Comparisons between these groups showed that civic knowledge was seen as less important for school leavers than for the other groups.

### ***Stakeholder groups***

#### ***Stakeholders compared to the national sample***

As in the national sample, all topics were considered relatively important (see Table 1). Knowledge about values and norms were significantly most important and European collaboration was by far the least important knowledge topic among the themes ( $p < .05$ ).

Due to the small sample size, no statistical comparison was made between the different stakeholder groups. A qualitative account of the stakeholder opinions (see below) will show that, overall, these groups share common ideas for most themes. The rankings of the civic knowledge topics are also substantially the same for the stakeholder groups and the national sample.

#### ***Civic knowledge: topics and goals***

Although in all stakeholder groups, all civic knowledge topics were considered important, participants prioritised certain civic knowledge themes and topics. Several reasons were given for this ranking.

First, some topics were considered more prominent in the lives of adolescents than others. The arguments used focused on whether or not civic knowledge was necessary to function properly, especially within the context of daily life at home, school or work. Secondly, some knowledge aspects were seen as a basic requirement for learning other elements of civic knowledge. For example, a student who valued knowledge of European collaboration more than civic affairs said: ‘When issues occur at the European level, you will be better able to understand the [various] perspectives [on] how this European collaboration works than when you think about civic affairs and related problems without knowing how this collaboration works’. Thirdly, we found that civic knowledge topics were often seen as related to

one another so that they could be placed into different topic categories. For example, the importance of knowledge about equality and why this is important could be linked to knowledge about dealing with diversity, human and children's rights and democracy and about norms and values in general. In addition, some specific, smaller subjects were seen as part of broader topics, for example, in the mind of one of the parents in the sample: 'the less important ones are, for example, automatically represented in the important ones. Having values and norms and respect in general automatically results in sustainability and respect for society'. For this reason, the broader knowledge topics (e.g. values and norms) were given priority over the narrower ones (e.g. sustainability).

Although the present study investigates civic knowledge, the various stakeholders also emphasised the relevance of other civic competences: attitudes, skills and behaviour. As one of the school leaders said, '... knowledge is one thing. But it is also about interacting with others, experiencing differences, having respect. School is not just a "knowledge factory" but also a place where people develop social skills'. These civic skills and attitudes were often mentioned as goals that could be reached by acquiring civic knowledge, for example, by one of the students: '... learning about Dutch politics to prepare students for participation in society'.

### *Civic knowledge and society*

Two important civic knowledge themes come to the fore that can foster participation in society: knowledge about solidarity and democratic values and their importance.

Solidarity concerns adolescents' civic responsibilities. The stakeholder groups believe that the focus here should be on providing students with the knowledge to help them realise that they – like their fellow citizens – are responsible for their immediate environment (e.g. neighbourhood and sports club). Respondents often link this responsibility to the realisation of interconnectedness and interdependence. 'Knowledge is also learning that a sports club cannot exist when you do not also volunteer as a referee sometimes. Clubs that give you something also need you'. Having the knowledge to feel responsible for one's immediate environment, and awareness of this responsibility, is often thought to precede the development of responsibility towards society in general: '... that they can have an influence by voting or becoming a member [of a political party/union], by using their democratic rights' (politician A); '... there is a step before that: knowing that citizen initiatives ... are possible and appreciated' (politician B in reaction to politician A).

Knowledge of and consequently identification with democracy, the democratic system and democratic values were all considered important for adolescents to acquire. Understanding that democratic values, especially equality and freedom, are important appears to be obvious to the respondents. On the few occasions that respondents provided arguments to support this, they said that knowledge and identification lead to greater involvement in democracy and thus a stronger democracy.

### *Underlying general knowledge*

The panel discussions also uncovered various underlying general themes relevant to several aspects of civic knowledge: knowledge about society and democracy and knowledge required to successfully participate in the democratic process.

Concerning knowledge of society and democracy, the knowledge component of democratic skills and critical thinking was seen as the main requirement for participation in a democratic society. According to the respondents, democratic skills involve respecting others, particularly people who have different habits, beliefs and opinions. According to the stakeholder groups, it is important that adolescents realise that they live in a diverse society, that they are familiar with the important religious and cultural groups in society and know that it is important to respect diversity, because – as one politician said – ‘... you have to deal with each other to keep society going’. Procedural knowledge on how to treat people respectfully and understand different perspectives was also considered valuable. Examples include knowing how to communicate in a non-aggressive or non-discriminating way and using self-knowledge to relate to others. These aspects of knowledge were thought to lead to a respectful attitude towards diversity; as one student said, ‘It is difficult to appreciate other choices when you do not know that people from other cultures or religions make other choices’.

The stakeholder groups also indicated that adolescents often lack sufficient knowledge of information sources. They should be aware that information sources – especially popular ones such as social media – are not always reliable. They also regularly mention the importance of knowing that various motives can influence the information presented by these sources. As one of the teachers said, ‘You should know how things are presented and what underlying message, intension and interests are involved in this’. The motivations that were given for the importance of critical thinking skills (procedural knowledge) show that respondents believe that critical thinking skills help adolescents to function in a society where they are confronted with huge amounts of information of varying quality and, on a more general level, that critical thinking skills help to increase society’s democratic resilience.

Respondents also emphasised the importance of the knowledge required to participate successfully in democracy; in other words, knowing democratic ways to have a voice in society (civic empowerment). They highly appreciate knowledge of the democratic system, including its institutions, laws and political processes, and acting in accordance with this knowledge as an important value for preserving our democratic society. For example, one of the school leaders said, ‘... to be able to vote, for example, you have to understand the democratic process and democratic society’. Various ways of having a voice that were often mentioned include individual voting, spontaneous collective action and institutionalised collective action such as political party membership.

### *Differences between stakeholders*

Apart from the politicians, who mentioned themes related to the societal component of citizenship (e.g. social cohesion and democracy) more often, all groups give priority to civic knowledge that contributes to personal development. Trade union and employer representatives paid most attention to themes related to personal development and less to topics such as the knowledge component of critical skills and knowledge of diversity. Another difference between the stakeholder groups is that politicians paid more attention to knowledge of collective forms of civic empowerment than the other groups, which focus more on general or individual aspects, especially voting. Finally, knowledge of democratic skills was valued most in the parent and student groups.

### *Differentiation of civic knowledge: micro-knowledge and macro-knowledge*

All groups regularly mentioned differentiating between students when teaching citizenship. In the context of the Dutch education system, it is not surprising that the focus was mainly on the difference between students in general education on the one hand and those in vocational or prevocational education on the other hand. The stakeholder groups, however, had different ideas about how differentiation should be organised. Two methods were mentioned: differentiation in civic content (what to teach) and differentiation in instructional approach (how to teach). With respect to differentiation strategies, there was also some tension concerning the general aim of citizenship education: should the focus be on furthering personal development or on societal goals? This was often a point of debate within the various groups, more specifically, how these dimensions of citizenship are related and which should come first.

The participants in the student group link differentiation to a student's future position in society. The main goal of citizenship education in (pre)vocational education was often defined as enabling equal opportunities for participation rather than stimulating contributions to society. As one student said, '... it is crucial to look at the world in which those students will find themselves and [to enable] their functioning [within that world]. ... It is dependent on their educational track: students in general secondary education, who probably enrol in higher education and will find themselves in a much wider world, need knowledge about world [issues]. For less highly educated students, more practical [knowledge], related to their interests, is important'. More specifically, the student group believed that the future role and responsibility of students in vocational and prevocational education is primarily within their community. Accordingly, they mentioned more microknowledge topics as being important for these students. For students in general secondary education, they mentioned more macrolevel topics since they assumed that these students would more likely operate at a national or global level.

Differentiation in civic knowledge teaching is contested, however, and was especially criticised by teachers and school leaders. According to one teacher, 'the level of depth can be different [between those groups of students], but I do not say that they [students in vocational education] need fewer [topics]'. Differentiating between students in terms of topics and dimensions to be covered was seen as increasing the differences between students and reducing their present or future opportunities to participate in and contribute to society. Several teachers, for example, emphasised the importance of covering certain knowledge topics with vocational students: 'Maybe the need to teach certain basic knowledge is even greater for vocational students than for students in general education. Students in general education will ask certain questions automatically'. And, as one school leader said, 'it is for every student in all educational tracks important to have specific knowledge, for example, about democracy. And particularly so, perhaps, for the more vulnerable students since those students do not acquire this knowledge [at home]. ... This knowledge will help them to live successfully in this society'. Instead of excluding certain civic topics and skills, the focus should be on stimulating these students to 'think for themselves'.

Most stakeholder groups emphasised that all students need a common basic knowledge of citizenship (citizenship literacy): '... the general outline should be [offered to] all. But based on the student's track, one could approach it more or less abstractly' (employer). Or, as one parent stated: 'Basic knowledge, which is the same for everyone: the nation-state, the function of a king, voting. ... But the differences can be found in the

language [to approach these topics]’. One politician added: ‘Vocational students should also be able to become politicians and I like that idea. . . . So we cannot limit them in that way [topics]. It’s about how we discuss those topics on different levels’. According to this line of reasoning, differentiation in civic knowledge should be realised by differentiating the complexity or amount of civic knowledge and by differentiating the instruction.

## Conclusion

Our study examined societal views on the civic knowledge that is considered important for students leaving secondary education. To obtain a broad, representative view of people’s opinions about the importance of civic knowledge topics, we examined questionnaire data from a national sample of Dutch adults. To obtain an in-depth understanding of these civic knowledge topics, we complemented these data with data from a multiple-case study among several focus groups of stakeholders with various roles and interests in society. With this paper, we provide an up-to-date picture of societal opinions about civic knowledge for secondary-school students. As far as we know, there as to date not been such a systematic comparative analysis of citizenship notions among both a representative national sample and a broad range of stakeholder groups, and it offers a robust validation of measurement instruments primarily based on theoretical conceptualisations of citizenship.

Before discussing our conclusions, we should note that, despite the benefits of the approach followed, this study also has some limitations. We used nationally representative data in addition to the data derived from the stakeholder groups, but the composition of the stakeholder groups is almost by definition selective. Although the stakeholder groups had a broad membership covering a variety of sections of society, a selection of other groups and participants might have led to different emphases. Further research can lead to a better understanding of this aspect.

Another limitation is that some stakeholder groups are more removed from education than others. Although this is not a problem to answer the first research question, which concerns the knowledge deemed desirable, it was found to be the case for the second question. This question, which focuses on the knowledge that should be realised, was answered by part of the stakeholder groups in terms of general desirability without further specification, for example, in terms of level, scope or instruction.

In brief, the answer to the first part of our research question – What civic knowledge is important? – shows that the relevant aspects of civic knowledge derived from theoretical conceptualisations of democratic citizenship (Eidhof et al. 2016) and included in most standardised assessment test used in large-scale studies of student citizenship competences are also considered relevant in society. Our study does not reveal any new topics other than those already included in standardised knowledge tests. Conversely, there are no indications that the topics included in these instruments are considered irrelevant. This leads us to the conclusion that, in general, the instruments used in quantitative large-scale studies such as the ICCS or CCQ are supported by society, more specifically by various stakeholders, in terms of their coverage of the aspects of citizenship that students should know. Conceptualisations based on theoretical considerations are thus compatible with views on relevant civic knowledge held by various groups in society. This also means that the picture that emerges from standardised instruments and their use for



educational policy-making and development is in line with what is seen as important in society.

However, the data also show that there are differences in the appreciation of the various aspects of citizenship. In both our quantitative and qualitative studies, the topics considered most important were knowledge of values and norms, rules of conduct, human rights (including children's rights), a responsible and healthy lifestyle and knowledge about what democracy entails. The least important knowledge topics were European collaboration, opportunities for having a voice in society, national politics and current civic affairs. The ranking that the respondents assigned to the various themes is in line with the findings of Dutch studies of what adults consider to be important aspects of citizenship (Dekker and Den Ridder 2016), particularly with regard to the subjects that are considered the most important for young people to have learned by the time that they leave secondary education.

The panel study with the stakeholder groups allowed the collection of more specific information about the content of these civic knowledge topics and the reasons why they are important. Themes related to – the importance of – solidarity, democracy and civic empowerment were highlighted in particular. Specifically, knowledge of the constitutional state, democratic decision-making, critical thinking and how to use different sources of information were seen as conditions for successful participation in a democracy. Moreover, the focus group data gave an insight into the reasons why some civic knowledge topics are seen as relatively less important. The main reason given was that they are less prominent in adolescents' lives or are less important for understanding other civic topics. Remarkably, the fact that civic knowledge topics should play a role in the daily lives of young people is given as the most important motive for incorporating such topics in secondary education. Apparently, stakeholders do not believe that adolescence is a very significant phase in the development of citizenship. The literature shows, however, that adolescence is particularly important since adolescents are relatively open to changes in their social and political views that will have a lasting impact (e.g. Russo and Stattin 2017; Shehata and Amnå 2017) and this is promoted by learning civic knowledge (Cho 2014; Dassonneville et al. 2012). Although most young people only make use of opportunities for having a voice in society later in life, knowledge of such opportunities is crucial for the resilience of a democracy. From an educational point of view, the question should therefore be how such a civics topic can be taught meaningfully to adolescents.

Another important element in our question about society's views on the civic knowledge that is important for adolescents is whether these views differ under the influence of differences in, for example, life stage, economic position or role in society. Do young people who are gradually gaining their place in society, for example, have different ideas about what are important aspects of citizenship than older people with vested interests? Or do entrepreneurs have different views on what matters than employees? Our results show that opinions in society about civic knowledge relevant to students are widely shared since there are far more similarities than differences in the opinions voiced. This finding is in line with the broad consensus existing between various theoretical conceptualisations of important notions of democratic citizenship (Eidhof et al. 2016). In both the national sample and the stakeholder groups, all topics presented were regarded

as relevant. All stakeholder groups particularly emphasised that civic knowledge should contribute to students' personal development.

The second part of our research question – should schools provide all students with the same civic knowledge – appears less simple to answer. The stakeholder group data give an insight into whether and why civic knowledge should be differentiated to accommodate students of various school tracks. As shown by the national data, civic knowledge was considered important to very important for students of all levels of secondary education, albeit a little less so for students who start working after secondary school. In general, the stakeholder groups think that there is a minimum level of civic knowledge, that all students need to be able to participate in society and that schools should teach this minimum level. However, respondents in some stakeholder groups stated that differentiation between students is required for them to reach the same basic civic knowledge level and that schools can and should compensate for societal inequality.

Remarkably, the opinions of most stakeholders do not agree with the actual situation, with students in different educational tracks having different levels of civic knowledge (Schulz et al. 2018). This applies even more to the Netherlands. Of all ICCS countries, the percentage of the total variance (differences) between Dutch schools is the largest (Munniksmas et al. 2017). In addition, the differences in civic knowledge between the school types are now even larger than in 2009 (see Isac et al. 2014; Munniksmas et al. 2017; Dijkstra, Ten Dam, and Munniksmas 2021) because the knowledge level of students in prevocational education in 2016 was about the same as in 2009, while students in the higher school types scored higher than in 2009. In the externally differentiated Dutch education system, the students' sociocultural background, in particular, is strongly related to the type of school they attend and this explains most of the differences in students' civic knowledge levels between schools. However, longitudinal research in Germany and the UK shows that placement in different educational tracks has a separate and independent effect on citizenship outcomes and leads to more divergent results (Eckstein, Noack, and Gniewosz 2012; Janmaat, Mostafa, and Hoskins 2014). Although there are relatively large differences between students in the vocational and prevocational tracks on the one hand and the general secondary-school tracks on the other, the vast majority of stakeholders take little notice of the influence of the students' socio-cultural characteristics and student grouping on their civic knowledge level. We relate this observation to several considerations. The stakeholder groups recognise the differences that exist between students in the various educational tracks, both in learning outcomes and in the expected differences in their later school and professional careers. In doing so, the respondents seem to take into account both functional considerations about the civil effect (in which competences are seen as important in the students' further professional career) as well as the democratic ideal that unequal equipment for active democratic participation is undesirable. That the tension between both is not explicitly problematised can be attributed to the focus of the interviews, of which addressing this tension was not a subject. Also, the interviews gave the impression that the stakeholder groups have no clear cut views on this complex question, which essentially focuses on the relationship between a critical, or a conventional citizenship curriculum, aimed at equipping the expected course of life – a finding that given the distance of the majority of the respondents to curriculum design is not very surprising.

In our view, the increasing divide between people with different levels of education in terms of social and political knowledge and orientations (Janmaat, Mostafa, and Hoskins 2014; Van de Werfhorst 2017) underlines the importance of a more equal distribution of civic knowledge in society. The results of our study underline that differentiation in the civic knowledge that students should acquire is not considered desirable by stakeholder groups in society. However, the consequences of aiming for a general civic knowledge base for all currently seem to receive little attention. The civic knowledge gap between students in vocational and general education is hardly seen as a problem, for example, and stakeholders do not have a clear notion of the implications of a target level for all. Most of them view differentiation in teaching civic knowledge in terms of extent, depth or level of abstraction only from the perspective of the students' interests, aptitude or expected future role in society, and do *not* link it to the issue of inequality.

In all, our results can be understood as a societal validation of conceptualisations of citizenship based on sound analyses and their subsequent operationalisations in standardised measuring instruments. This is important for enlisting support for the use of the results in educational policy and practice. For future research it is important to explore the demand for desired levels of citizenship mastery and to specify this in terms of different degrees of complexity and societal domains. This will not only deepen our understanding of inequality in civic knowledge of secondary-school leavers, which society sees as undesirable, but also stimulate a broader debate on this issue.

## Notes

1. See Appendix A.
2. With the exception of an employer and union representative, who could not participate due to practical reasons.
3. A coding structure was developed and refined for this purpose. After coding each focus group transcript, cross-case and comparative analyses were conducted to discuss systematic similarities and differences between codes and focus groups. Preliminary interpretations were shared and discussed in a process of 'constant comparative analysis'. ATLAS.ti was used to code the units and derive specific codes and categories.
4. As an alternative ranking method, the four most important topics were given scores ranging from 0 to 4 (most important: 4; fourth important: 1; topic not included: 0). The rankings of the topics using the two methods were largely the same: the four most important and four least important topics were the same except for current world affairs. Using the top 4 scoring method, current world affairs were as important as responsible/healthy lifestyle ( $p = .13$ ) and children's and human rights ( $p = .12$ ).
5. The original dataset (ISSP 2014) on which our (secondary) analysis was based contained six age categories, the youngest of which was defined as 21–30 years of age, comprising 10% of all respondents. This relatively small size of the youngest category (mean age 56.26), and the small number of young respondents (secondary and tertiary education students, ages 15–21) in the stakeholder data, resulted in merging the two youngest age groups, resulting in an age distribution allowing for comparison by age.
6. These topics are human and children's rights, responsible/healthy lifestyle, sustainability, diversity in society, helping others in society, having a voice in society and European collaboration.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Notes on contributors

*Dr Anne van Goethem* (annevgoethem@gmail.com) is a psychologist at the GGZ Noord-Holland-Noord, Alkmaar, The Netherlands.

*Prof. dr Geert ten Dam* (g.t.m.tendam@uva.nl) is, in addition to the President of the Executive Board of the University of Amsterdam, full professor of education at the Research Institute of Child Development and Education (CDE) of the UvA. Her work concentrates on social inequality, citizenship and citizenship education.

*Anne Bert Dijkstra* (A.B.Dijkstra@uva.nl) is a professor by special appointment in the field of Supervision and Evaluation of Socialization in Education at the University of Amsterdam. He is also Program Director for the quality of supervision in the social domain by the Inspectorate of Education in the Netherlands. His academic research focuses on school effectiveness and social outcomes of education.

## ORCID

Geert Ten Dam  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2929-7920>

Anne Bert Dijkstra  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4296-0443>

## References

- Barber, B. R. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barbour, R. 2007. *Doing Focus Groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carpini, M., and S. Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.
- Cho, Y. 2014. "To Know Democracy Is to Love It: A Cross-National Analysis of Democratic Understanding and Political Support for Democracy." *Political Research Quarterly* 67 (3): 478–488. doi:10.1177/1065912914532721.
- Coleman, J. S. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Coopmans, M., G. Ten Dam, A. B. Dijkstra, and I. Van der Veen. 2020. "Towards a Comprehensive School Effectiveness Model of Citizenship Education: An Empirical Analysis of Secondary Schools in the Netherlands." *Social Sciences* 9 (9): 157. doi:10.3390/socsci9090157.
- Corbin, J., and A. Strauss. 2008. *Basics of Qualitative Research. Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daas, R., G. T. M. Ten Dam, and A. B. Dijkstra. 2016. "Contemplating Modes of Assessing Citizenship Competences." *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 51: 88–95. doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.10.003.
- Dassonneville, R., E. Quintelier, M. Hooghe, and E. Claes. 2012. "The Relation between Civic Education and Political Attitudes and Behavior: A Two-year Panel Study among Belgian Late Adolescents." *Applied Developmental Science* 16 (3): 140–150. doi:10.1080/10888691.2012.695265.
- Dekker, P., and J. Den Ridder. 2016. *Gedeelde Waarden En Een Weerbare Democratie Een Verkenning Op Basis Van Bevolkingsenquêtes (Shared Values and a Resilient Democracy)*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

- Dijkstra, A. B., G. Ten Dam, and A. Munniksma. 2021. "Inequality in Citizenship Competences. Citizenship Education and Policy in the Netherlands." In *Influences of the IEA Civic and Citizenship Education Studies: Practice, Policy, and Research across Countries and Regions*, edited by B. Malak-Minkiewicz and J. Torney-Purta. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Dijkstra, A. B., and P. I. De la Motte, eds. 2014. *Social Outcomes of Education*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Eckstein, K., P. Noack, and B. Gniewosz. 2012. "Attitudes toward Political Engagement and Willingness to Participate in Politics: Trajectories Throughout Adolescence." *Journal of Adolescence* 35 (3): 485–495. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.07.002.
- Eder, A. 2017. "Cross-country Variation in People's Attitudes toward Citizens' Rights and Obligations: A Descriptive Overview Based on Data from the ISSP Citizenship Module 2014." *International Journal of Sociology* 47 (1): 10–25. doi:10.1080/00207659.2017.1265309.
- Eidhof, B., G. Ten Dam, A. B. Dijkstra, and H. van de Werfhorst. 2016. "Consensus versus Contested Citizenship Education Goals in Western Europe." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 11 (2): 114–129. doi:10.1177/1746197915626084.
- Eurydice. 2017. *Citizenship Education at School in Europe*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Fern, E. F. 2001. *Advanced Focus Group Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foa, R. S., and Y. Mounk. 2016. "The Danger of Deconsolidation." *Journal of Democracy* 27: 5–17. doi:10.1353/jod.2016.0049.
- Geboers, E., F. Geijsel, W. Admiraal, and G. Ten Dam. 2013. "Review of the Effects of Citizenship Education." *Educational Research Review* 9: 158–173. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2012.02.001.
- Geijsel, F., G. Ledoux, R. Reumerman, and G. Ten Dam. 2012. "Citizenship in Young People's Daily Lives. Differences in Citizenship Competences of Adolescents in the Netherlands." *Journal of Youth Studies* 15 (6): 711–729. doi:10.1080/13676261.2012.671932.
- GESIS. 2016. *ISSP 2014 – Citizenship II. Variable Report*. Cologne: GESIS.
- Glenn, C. L., and J. de Groof. 2002. *Finding the Right Balance: Freedom, Autonomy and Accountability in Education*. Utrecht: Lemma.
- Haste, H. 2010. "Citizenship Education: A Critical Look at A Contested Field." In *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*, edited by L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, and C. A. Flanagan, 161–188. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Inglehart, R., and C. Welzel. 2010. "Changing Mass Priorities: The Link between Modernization and Democracy." *Perspectives on Politics* 8: 551–567. doi:10.1017/S1537592710001258.
- Isac, M. M., R. Maslowski, B. Creemers, and G. Van der Werf. 2014. "The Contribution of Schooling to Secondary-school Students' Citizenship Outcomes across Countries." *School Effectiveness & School Improvement* 25: 29–63. doi:10.1080/09243453.2012.751035.
- Janmaat, J. G., T. Mostafa, and B. Hoskins. 2014. "Widening the Participation Gap: The Effect of Educational Track on Reported Voting in England." *Journal of Adolescence* 36: 473–482. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.03.011.
- Joye, D., and M. Sapin, eds. 2017. *International Social Survey Programme. ISSP 2014 – Citizenship II.* Study Monitoring Report. Lausanne: Swiss Center of Expertise in the Social Sciences.
- Keating, A., D. Kerr, T. Benton, E. Mundy, and J. Lopes. 2010. *Citizenship Education in England 2001–2010: Young People's Practices and Prospects for the Future: The Eighth and Final Report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*. London: DfE.
- Mounk, Y. 2017. *The People Vs. Democracy. Why Our Freedom Is in Danger and How to Save It*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Munniksma, A., A. B. Dijkstra, I. Van der Veen, G. Ledoux, H. Van de Werfhorst, and G. Ten Dam. 2017. *Burgerschap in Het Voortgezet Onderwijs. Nederland in Vergelijkend Perspectief. [Citizenship in Secondary Education. The Netherlands in a Comparative Perspective]*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Nieuwelink, H., G. Ten Dam, F. Geijsel, and P. Dekker. 2018. "Growing into Politics? the Development of Adolescents' Views on Democracy over Time." *Politics* 38 (4): 395–410. doi:10.1177/0263395717724295.
- Robinson, O. C. 2013. "Values and Adult Age: Findings from Two Cohorts of the European Social Survey." *European Journal of Ageing* 10 (1): 11–23. doi:10.1007/s10433-012-0247-3.

- Russo, S., and H. Stattin. 2017. "Stability and Change in Youths' Political Interest." *Social Indicators Research* 132 (2): 643–658. doi:10.1007/s11205-016-1302-9.
- Schulz, W., J. Ainley, J. Fraillon, B. Losito, and G. Agrusti. 2016. "IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016." *Assessment Framework*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Schulz, W., J. Ainley, J. Fraillon, D. Kerr, and B. Losito. 2010. *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic Knowledge, Attitudes, and Engagement among Lower Secondary School Students in 38 Countries*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Schulz, W., J. Fraillon, G. Agrusti, J. Ainley, B. Losito, and T. Friedman. 2018. "Becoming Citizens in a Changing World. IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 International Report." Amsterdam: IEA.
- Shehata, A., and E. Amnå. 2017. "The Development of Political Interest among Adolescents: A Communication Mediation Approach Using Five Waves of Panel." *Communication Research* 1: 1–23.
- Ten Dam, G., and M. Volman. 2007. "Educating for Adulthood or for Citizenship: Social Competence as an Educational Goal." *European Journal of Education* 42: 281–98. doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2007.00295.x
- Ten Dam, G., F. Geijsel, R. Reumerman, and G. Ledoux. 2011. "Measuring Young People's Citizenship Competences." *European Journal of Education* 46: 354–372. doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2011.01485.x.
- Ten Dam, G., and M. Volman. 2003. "A Life Jacket or an Art of Living. Inequality in Social Competence Education." *Curriculum Inquiry* 33: 117–137. doi:10.1111/1467-873X.00254.
- Torney-Purta, J., J. Schwille, and J. Amadeo. 1999. *Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. 2010. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). 2010 Civics Assessment. Available online: <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>
- Van de Werfhorst, H. G. 2017. "Vocational and Academic Education and Political Engagement: The Importance of the Educational Institutional Structure." *Comparative Education Review* 61 (1): 111–140. doi:10.1086/689613.
- Veugelers, W. M. M. H. 2011. "The Moral and the Political in Global Citizenship: Appreciating Differences in Education." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 9 (3–4): 473–485. doi:10.1080/14767724.2011.605329.
- Wanders, F. H. K., A. B. Dijkstra, R. Maslowski, and I. Van der Veen. 2020. "The Effect of Teacher-student and Student-student Relationships on the Societal Involvement of Students." *Research Papers in Education* 35: 266–286. doi:10.1080/02671522.2019.1568529.
- Westheimer, J., and J. Kahn. 2004. "What Kind of Citizen? the Politics of Educating for Democracy." *American Educational Research Journal* 41 (2): 2370. doi:10.3102/00028312041002237.
- Yin, R. K. 2013. *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

## Appendix A. Description of stakeholder groups and focus group sessions

<i>Stakeholder group</i>	<i>Filled out questionnaire</i>	<i>Took part in focus group sessions</i>	<i>Short description of stakeholder group</i>
Employers/ employees	<i>n</i> = 6	<i>n</i> = 6	Representatives of worker unions and employer organisations
Politicians	<i>n</i> = 5	<i>n</i> = 5	Aldermen of average-sized cities and members of the national parliament (across the political spectrum)
Teachers	<i>n</i> = 13	<i>n</i> = 7	Teachers of civics, science and language
School leaders	<i>n</i> = 6	<i>n</i> = 9	Secondary school leaders, educational staff (responsible for quality programmes), educational developers (across the denominational spectrum)
Students	<i>n</i> = 8	<i>n</i> = 7	Students in secondary general and vocational education and social science students in higher education
Parents	<i>n</i> = 24	<i>n</i> = 23	Members of PTAs (across the denominational spectrum)
Mixed group	<sup>a)</sup>	<i>n</i> = 5	Members of different stakeholder groups (not participating in group sessions mentioned above).

<sup>a)</sup> Number of participants who filled out the questionnaire is unknown: questionnaire data only indicated what stakeholder group participants were part of.