



**UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)**

**Typology of student citizenship**

Geboers, E.; Geijssel, F.; Admiraal, W.; ten Dam, G.

*Published in:*  
European Journal of Education

*DOI:*  
[10.1111/ejed.12091](https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12091)

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Geboers, E., Geijssel, F., Admiraal, W., & ten Dam, G. (2014). Typology of student citizenship. *European Journal of Education*, 49(4), 514-528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12091>

**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.

## Typology of Student Citizenship

Ellen Geboers, Femke Geijsel, Wilfried Admiraal & Geert ten Dam

### Introduction

To lay a solid foundation for citizenship education, considerable effort has been made to understand the citizenship of students of different ages. In empirical studies, various dimensions of citizenship of students have been described and analysed (Cleaver *et al.*, 2005; Ireland *et al.*, 2006; Geijsel *et al.*, 2012; Schulz *et al.*, 2010). Ten Dam and Volman (2007) analysed the citizenship behaviour of students and the citizenship competences on which this behaviour is built in terms of specific knowledge, attitudes, skills, and reflection (Rychen & Salganik, 2003). In their work, the authors clearly situate the content of citizenship in the social practices which constitute the daily lives of young people (Biesta, Lawy, & Kelly, 2009). In the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), a distinction is made between three dimensions of citizenship (Schulz *et al.*, 2010): a content dimension (subject matter about civic society and systems, civic principles, civic participation, and civic identities); an affective-behavioural dimension (value beliefs, attitudes, behavioural intentions, and behaviours); and a cognitive dimension (knowing and reasoning, and analysing). In the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) by the Department of Education and Skills (DfES) in England, Cleaver *et al.* (2005) developed another framework to describe the dimensions of citizenship. They distinguished students' knowledge, understanding and conceptions; students' views, trust and experiences; students' attitudes; and students' participation and engagement.

The ultimate goal of the various attempts to understand the concept of student citizenship is to provide schools with frameworks on which to build. These largely academic discussions led to rather complex empirical frameworks of citizenship elements, dimensions, and underlying components, which are not easy to interpret for teachers. Moreover, many theoretical assumptions underlying the citizenship classifications were not based on measurements of student citizenship. The endeavours to classify and understand the different types of citizenship have been classifications in terms of the citizenship elements outlined by teachers and schools, not of the students' citizenship competences. One exception is the work of Torney-Purta *et al.* (2008) who examined the variation and clustering of citizenship attitudes, skills and knowledge among 14-year-old students. They identified a number of *profiles*. In this article, we intended to continue on this path and search for clearly interpretable types of student citizenship. The aim was to help teachers to recognise forms of citizenship in daily classroom practice and to align their educational goals and strategies with the daily citizenship of students, which could improve the quality of citizenship education.

### Citizenship Competences, Citizenship Orientations and Citizenship Knowledge

Research conducted in the field of citizenship education has been mainly concerned with the relationship between young people's citizenship and background

characteristics (Cleaver *et al.*, 2005; Geijsel *et al.*, 2012; Ireland *et al.*, 2006; Schulz *et al.*, 2010). Yet the picture in the literature is still rather diffuse and fragmented because of a focus on the isolated components of citizenship competences (i.e. knowledge, attitudes, skills and reflection). Linked to the students' citizenship competences, citizenship *orientations* reflect how people assess their affinities, perspectives and attitudes towards citizenship participation and provide a more holistic meaning of students' daily citizenship. From a developmental perspective, citizenship orientations can be understood as socialised and internalised elements of citizenship, which can also be influenced by education (Van de Werfhorst & De Graaf, 2004). Via their participation in everyday situations, young people develop a picture of themselves as citizens (i.e. identity development; Haste, 2004) which constructs the underlying pattern of citizenship attitudes, skills, and reflection. We denote these patterns as students' citizenship orientations. In our nationwide study of the citizenship of students in the Netherlands, a comprehensive framework was developed for four citizenship orientations (societal interest, pro-social ability, reflective thinking and assertiveness) and two domains of citizenship knowledge (societal knowledge and interpersonal knowledge).

*Societal interest* concerns students' interest in social issues and tolerance towards social differences. *Pro-social ability* indicates students' capability to adapt to social rules, moral values and social conventions in daily life and to empathise with others. *Reflective thinking* refers to students' critical thinking about social issues and structures. *Assertiveness* concerns students' ability to stand up for their ideas and clearly formulate them. *Societal knowledge* concerns the political domain or more abstract knowledge about democratic principles of society, the organisation of society and the norms in society. And *interpersonal knowledge* reflects primarily the social domain of knowledge and thus knowledge of prevailing social values, behavioural rules and everyday social manners.

### Types of Citizens

Various attempts have been made in the literature on citizenship to unfold citizenship in categorisations, classifications or types. Based on theoretical reasoning about what constitutes 'good' citizenship that appeared in the curricula of democratic citizenship programmes, Westheimer and Kahn (2004) classified three types of citizens. There is the *personal responsible citizen* who is willing to act responsibly in the community, help those in need, work, pay taxes and obey laws. There is the *participatory citizen* who is actively involved in community organisations, in organising community efforts to care for those in need and knows how government agencies work. And there is the *social justice citizen* who critically assesses social, political, and economic structures; knows about social movements; detects and addresses domains of injustice; and tries to be fair and promote equal opportunities. Leenders, Veugelers and De Kat (2008) examined teachers' perceptions of the pedagogical goals for citizenship education and identified the following three types of citizens: the *adapting citizen* who focuses on discipline, social values and rules with otherwise relatively little attention to autonomy and reflective thinking. The *individualistic citizen* who emphasises discipline and autonomy with relatively less attention to social values and rules. And the *critical democratic citizen* who emphasises autonomy, social values and rules and with relatively little attention to discipline. Torney-Purta *et al.* (2008) identified clusters of citizenship for students in the ICCS-sample. The political skills

of 14-year-old students and their attitudes towards political activities, voting and community activities together with their knowledge of civic content were found to cluster into four citizenship profiles. These are: 1) the *indifferents*, or students showing average scores for attitudes such as trust, efficacy and support but who are not particularly interested in participation and are only willing to do the absolute minimum as citizens; 2) the *social justice supporters*, or students who score above average in citizenship skills; show strong support for the rights of immigrants, minorities and women; and are most willing to construct social change; 3) the *conventionals*, or students who score highest in citizenship norms, trust and patriotism, but show average scores in support for rights; and 4) the *alienated*, or students who score the lowest in all civic attitudes and disagree with nearly all beliefs about democracy and political culture. In our opinion, these profiles present an interpretable and detailed picture of student citizenship and may therefore be of value for citizenship education efforts.

### **The Present Study**

Building upon the work of Torney-Purta *et al.* (2008), we examined the citizenship of students using a wider range of variables and ages. In doing so, the following research questions were considered:

1. Which types of citizenship could be distinguished in primary and secondary education?
2. How do the types of citizenship relate to the individual characteristics of students?
3. How do types of citizenship differ across school levels?

Patterns of scores on citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge were clustered in order to identify student profiles of citizenship. In this study, not only political citizenship attitudes, skills and knowledge were examined, but also reflective thinking about citizenship with an emphasis on social competences. Our operationalisation concerns a broad conceptualisation of citizenship which includes not only the political domain, but also the social domain, as the latter is thought to be more suitable for understanding the actual citizenship of students (Ten Dam *et al.*, 2011; Geijssel *et al.*, 2012). Additionally, in the present study, a large age range of students between 11 and 16 years were included in order to provide insight into the actual citizenship of students in different age groups. By exploring student profiles, we aimed at enhancing an expressive understanding of the citizenship of students in contemporary society, thereby helping educators with the design of their citizenship education.

The focus on differences of citizenship depending on the school level was investigated because the Dutch educational system is highly differentiated. Students are selected and differentiated at the age of 12 for separate schools for pre-vocational versus general secondary education, with different tracks of secondary education being offered as a result. Previous research has shown marked variation in citizenship education depending on school track with the elementary rules of social interaction and adaptation emphasised in pre-vocational education (i.e. the lower levels of secondary education) and critical citizenship and societal knowledge emphasised in general secondary education (i.e. the highest levels of secondary education; Ten Dam & Volman, 2003; Leenders, Veugeliers, & De Kat, 2008).

## Method

### Participants

Data were collected in 14 schools for primary education; 13 schools for pre-vocational education; and 11 schools for general secondary education. These 38 schools were part of the Dutch Citizenship Alliance in which schools, universities and institutes for curriculum development and testing cooperated with the Dutch Inspectorate of Education on the development and evaluation of citizenship education in the Netherlands. The schools varied with regard to denomination and were located throughout the country. Data were collected from 7,768 students in the school year 2007–2008 (see Table I).

TABLE I. Number of students measured

School year	Primary education	Secondary education	
		Prevocational	General
2007–2008	Grade 5 N = 390	Grade 7 N = 1,926	Grade 7 N = 1,840
	Grade 6 N = 360	Grade 9 N = 1,812	Grade 9 N = 1,440

### Instrument

The comprehensive framework of citizenship, which distinguishes four citizenship orientations and two knowledge domains form the input variables of the typology. The citizenship orientations and knowledge are measured using the Citizenship Competences Questionnaire (CCQ; Ten Dam *et al.*, 2011). In this questionnaire, citizenship is situated in the daily social practices of young people. It consists of 94 items divided across 17 scales. Students were asked to estimate their own attitudes, skills and reflections regarding citizenship along a four-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating a higher frequency or greater applicability. A total of 10 scales represent the four citizenship orientations and 4 scales represent the two domains of citizenship knowledge; three scales were not included in the framework.

A *societal interest orientation* is measured via 2 scales indicating attitudes towards acting democratically and dealing with differences. The general question *To what extent do you agree with this statement?* was posed for these scales.

A *pro-social ability orientation* is measured using 5 scales indicating attitudes towards dealing with conflicts, the skills to act democratically, skills to act in a social responsible manner, skills to deal with conflicts and skills to deal with differences. A question like *How good are you at — for example — finding a solution that makes everyone happy after a quarrel?* was posed for these scales.

A *reflective thinking orientation* is measured using 3 scales indicating the extent to which the student thinks about democratic issues, issues of social responsibility and differences between people. A question like *How often do you think about — for example — whether students in your school are listened to?* was posed for these scales.

An *assertiveness orientation* is measured using 1 scale indicating the skills of the student to formulate and assert one's own opinion. A question like *How good are you at — for example — making your opinion clear in a discussion?* was posed for this scale.

*Societal citizenship knowledge* is measured via multiple choice items concerned with knowledge of democracy and three response options accompanied by the

instruction to indicate *which option best answers the question*. For example: *A country is referred to as undemocratically when: a) political parties criticize each other, b) people have to pay high taxes, c) people are not allowed to criticize the government*. Option c is the correct answer here and assigned a score of 1; the other options are assigned a score of 0.

*Interpersonal citizenship knowledge* is measured via multiple choice items like the following: *You have had a heavy fight with one of your classmates. It turned out afterwards that you were wrong. What could you do at best? a) ignore each other, b) say that you are sorry and that you were wrong, c) not speak about the incident but treat at each other normally*. Option b is the correct answer here and assigned a score of 1, the other options were assigned a score of 0.

The reliability coefficients and means are presented in Table II for the citizenship orientations of the students and their citizenship knowledge.

TABLE II. Reliability coefficients (cronbach's alpha) and means (standard deviations (sd)) for citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge

		N = 7,644	$\alpha$	Mean (sd)
Citizenship orientations	Societal interest (2 scales, 9 items)		.85	2.77 (.58)
	Prosocial ability (5 scales, 18 items)		.88	3.01 (.44)
	Reflective thinking (3 scales, 20 items)		.91	2.14 (.59)
	Assertiveness (1 scale, 3 items)		.75	3.19 (.58)
Citizenship knowledge	Societal knowledge (2 scales, 13 items)		.88	.78 (.20)
	Interpersonal knowledge (2 scales, 14 items)		.85	.72 (.22)

### Student backgrounds

Information on the students' backgrounds was obtained by posing 9 questions following administration of the CCQ. Students were asked, for example, what grade they were in, their age and their parents' school level. In addition, the students' citizenship participation and perceptions of the school climate were probed. The students were asked if they participated (yes/no) in societal activities like scouting, multicultural organisations, human rights organisations or volunteer work. They were asked if they participated (yes/no) in school activities like the student council, the school paper, class captain or the organisation of school celebrations and about their engagement with the news as presented in newspapers or television programmes. In addition, the students were asked about their perceptions of the school climate, they were asked — for example — *Whether the teachers respect the students?* (student-teacher relationships); *Whether the students bully each other?* (student relationships); or *Whether the students are willing to help each other, even if they are not friends* (social behaviour between students; see Table III).

### Analysis

Cluster analyses were conducted in order to decide which citizenship profiles or types of citizenship could be distinguished for primary and secondary education students. Groups of individual students were formed on the basis of the similarity of their scores for the four citizenship orientations and the two domains of citizenship knowledge. A K-means cluster analysis was applied, which means that differences in the citizenship orientations and knowledge between the students *within* groups were minimised and differences *between* groups were maximised.

TABLE III. Overview of student characteristics in percentages; means (sd) for citizenship participation and perceptions of school climate

Background characteristics							
Gender	51.8%	Boy	48.2%	Girl			
SES	5.3%	Low	38.7%	Middle	56.1%	High	
Ethnic origin	79.3%	Non-minority	20.7%	Minority			
Language spoken at home	87.4%	Dutch	2.4%	Dutch dialect	10.1%	Not Dutch	
Age	7.5%	10–11 years	49.0%	12–13 years	37.9%	14–15 years	5.7%
Grade	5.0%	Grade 5	4.6%	Grade 6	48.3%	Grade 7	42.1%
School level	9.6%	Primary	47.8%	Prevocational	42.6%	General secondary	
						$\alpha$	Mean
Citizenship participation							
Societal participation (8 activities, mean activity)							0.11 (.13)
School participation (5 activities, mean activity)							0.05 (.80)
News engagement (4 items, judged using 4-point Likert scale)						.78	2.16 (0.73)
Perceptions of school climate							
School climate 1: student-teacher relationships (6 items, 4-point Likert scale)						.94	2.94 (0.65)
School climate 2: student relationships (5 items, 4-point Likert scale)						.92	2.70 (0.80)
School climate 3: social behavior between students (5 items, 4-point Likert scale)						.92	2.62 (0.63)

Unlike the more commonly used hierarchical cluster analysis, this analysis is appropriate for use with very large data sets (Stoffel & Belkoniene, 1999).

In a first step involving the full sample of 38 schools, the students were clustered into 2 to 10 clusters. Dividing students into 4 clusters provided an optimal discrimination between different types of student citizenship with the highest VRC (Variance Ratio Criterion; Calinski & Harabasz, 1974) in combination with the lowest  $\omega$  (omega) ( $VRC = 2427.71$ ,  $\omega = -61.65$ ) (see Table IV). The use of 4 clusters explained between 38.0% and 58.2% of the variance in the citizenship orientations of the students but much less of the variance in both of the knowledge domains (societal knowledge: 1.2%; interpersonal knowledge: 3.7%).

After determination of the 4 clusters of students we checked the stability of the clusters for two subsets of 75% and 50% of the original data, which resulted in a satisfactory correspondence with the grouping in the whole data set (Rand's statistic (Rand, 1971) = .97 and .89 respectively) (see also Morey & Agresti, 1984).

To cross-validate the clustering, we checked if the 4 clusters of students were stable in a separate representative sample of 15,940 sixth and ninth Grade students from 80 Dutch primary and secondary education schools from the COOL study (Dutch National Cohort Study Educational Careers Students 5 to 18 years).

Chi-square tests and ANOVAs were conducted to determine how the four types of student citizenship related to the students' individual characteristics. Similarly, we conducted chi-square tests and ANOVAs to determine if the distribution of the types of citizenship differed significantly depending on the level of education (primary, pre-vocational or general secondary education).

TABLE IV. Overview of cluster analysis with Variance Ratio Criterion (VRC),  $\omega$  (omega) for four citizenship orientations and two domains of citizenship knowledge

	Cluster 10	Cluster 9	Cluster 8	Cluster 7	Cluster 6	Cluster 5	Cluster 4	Cluster 3	Cluster 2
	VRC = 1,527.98	VRC = 1,658.59 $\omega = -122.71$	VRC = 1,667.48 $\omega = 224.68$	VRC = 1,901.05 $\omega = -84.78$	VRC = 2,049.85 $\omega = -37.23$	VRC = 2,161.42 $\omega = 199.73$	VRC = 2,472.71 $\omega = -61.65$	VRC = 2,722.35 $\omega = 705.97$	VRC = 3,677.96
Citizenship orientations	.70	.70	.67	.68	.62	.64	.56	.45	.47
Societal interest	.46	.45	.47	.44	.41	.40	.38	.30	.32
Pro-social ability	.73	.70	.66	.68	.66	.58	.53	.43	.39
Reflective thinking	.74	.75	.70	.66	.66	.56	.58	.53	.19
Assertiveness	.08	.07	.06	.06	.06	.03	.01	.00	.00
Citizenship knowledge	.12	.10	.09	.09	.08	.07	.04	.02	.03
Societal knowledge									
Interpersonal knowledge									



## Results

In the following, we present a typology of student citizenship and describe the differences between the types. In Table V, the mean scores and standard deviations for the citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge of the students according to the type of citizenship are presented.

TABLE V. Means (sd) for citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge according to the type of citizenship

Clusters of citizenship	N	Citizenship orientations				Citizenship knowledge	
		Societal interest	Pro-social ability	Reflective thinking	Assertiveness	Societal knowledge	Interpersonal knowledge
Committed citizen	1,824	3.40 (.37)	3.42 (.34)	2.74 (.49)	3.67 (.34)	.79 (.19)	.77 (.19)
Indifferent citizen	1,448	2.17 (.40)	2.62 (.37)	1.62 (.38)	2.60 (.49)	.75 (.21)	.64 (.23)
Ordinary citizen	2,348	2.86 (.35)	3.01 (.30)	2.33 (.37)	2.84 (.36)	.77 (.21)	.74 (.21)
Self-assured citizen	2,024	2.56 (.44)	2.93 (.38)	1.77 (.38)	3.57 (.33)	.81 (.18)	.71 (.21)
Total	7,644	2.77 (.58)	3.01 (.44)	2.14 (.59)	3.19 (.58)	.78 (.20)	.72 (.21)

### Types of Citizenship

The first cluster included 24.0% of the students. They showed relatively high scores overall and can therefore be considered to be broadly knowledgeable and orientated towards citizenship; they are willing and able to participate adequately in society. Above all, they reflect on societal issues and stand up for their opinion. These students are committed to deal with daily citizenship tasks and thus this cluster is labelled *committed citizenship*.

The second cluster included 19.0% of the students. They had relatively low scores for all the citizenship orientations (i.e. societal interest, pro-social ability, reflective thinking, and assertiveness) and also for the two domains of citizenship knowledge (societal knowledge and interpersonal knowledge). These students are much less knowledgeable and oriented towards citizenship than those with a committed citizenship. The relatively low score of these students in the citizenship orientations show them to consider themselves neither able nor willing to participate in society and to reflect upon societal issues or stand up for their opinions. These students are little concerned with daily citizenship tasks and thus this cluster is labelled *indifferent citizenship*.

The third cluster included one third of the students (30.5%). These students show average scores for the two domains of citizenship knowledge, average scores for three of the citizenship orientations (i.e. societal interest, pro-social ability, and reflective thinking) and relatively low scores in assertiveness, which shows them to have little affinity with publicly standing up for their opinions. This cluster concerned the largest percentage of the students and therefore indicates the mainstream student in the Netherlands. The cluster is therefore labelled *ordinary citizenship*.

The fourth cluster included 26.5% of the students. This group shows the most diverse scores for both citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge. These students score relatively high in societal knowledge and assertiveness; average in societal interest, pro-social ability and interpersonal knowledge; and relatively low in reflective thinking. They are thus quite knowledgeable in societal issues, and their relatively high scores in assertiveness show them to be inclined to stand up

and give their opinion. The relatively low scores for reflective thinking accompanied by high scores for assertiveness suggest that these students base their opinions on what they know and not on reflection. This cluster of students is therefore labelled *self-assured citizenship*.

### **Relations of the Types of Citizenship to Characteristics of the Students and School Level**

The background characteristics of the students but also their mean scores for citizenship participation and perceptions of the school climate are presented in Table VI for the four types of citizenship we identified. The percentages according to the types of citizenship were compared to the row totals in Table VI.

The four types of citizenship relate significantly to the students' background characteristics. The chi-square results showed the types of citizenship to differ depending on gender ( $\chi^2(3) = 172.87, p = .001, \eta = .023$ ). Compared to the row totals in Table VI, the percentages for gender according to the four types of citizenship showed that significantly higher percentages of students in the indifferent or self-assured type of citizenship were boys, while a significantly higher percentage of the students in the committed type of citizenship were girls.

The types of citizenship also differed significantly depending on the age of the students ( $\chi^2(9) = 234.46, p = .001, \eta = .025$ ). There was a higher concentration of young students (10–11 years) in the committed citizenship cluster than in the other three types. The ordinary and the self-assured types of citizenship included significantly higher percentages of older students (12–13 years and 14–15 years). There was a significantly higher percentage of the oldest students (16 years or older) in the indifferent citizenship cluster than in the other clusters.

The four types of citizenship differed significantly depending on the ethnic origin of the students ( $\chi^2(3) = 260.47, p = .001, \eta = .035$ ). The committed cluster of citizenship showed a significantly higher percentage of minority students than the other clusters of citizenship. Small but significant differences were found in the four types of citizenship depending on the social economic backgrounds of the students and the language spoken at home ( $\chi^2(6) = 45.65, p = .001, \eta = .002$  and  $\chi^2(6) = 109.14, p = .001, \eta = .013$  respectively).

When the four types of citizenship were examined in relation to the students' reported engagement and perceptions of the school climate, close relations were detected. ANOVAs showed the types of citizenship to differ depending on students' news engagement ( $F(3,7420) = 371.72, p = .001, \eta = .131$ ). Not surprisingly, students in the committed citizenship cluster showed the highest scores for news engagement when compared to the students in the other clusters. Similarly, students in the committed citizenship cluster showed the highest scores for perceptions of student-teacher relationships in the school (school climate 1;  $F(3,7604) = 241.00, p = .001, \eta = .087$ ) and perceived social behaviour of students in the school (school climate 3;  $F(3,7600) = 250.81, p = .001, \eta = .090$ ).

Students in the ordinary citizenship cluster showed the highest scores for perceptions of the relationships between students in the school (school climate 2;  $F(3,7600) = 9.66, p = .001, \eta = .004$ ). Students in the indifferent citizenship cluster showed the lowest scores for all measures of perceptions of the school climate

Other differences in the four types of citizenship concerned the students' participation in societal and/or school activities. The differences were very small

TABLE VI. Frequencies (%) of student characteristics and means (sd) for citizenship participation and perceptions of the school climate according to type of citizenship

Student characteristics	Committed citizen (N = 1,824)	Indifferent citizen (N = 1,448)	Ordinary citizen (N = 2,348)	Self-assured citizen (N = 2,024)
Gender				
Boy	41.8%	62.8%	48.2%	56.6%
Girl	58.2%	37.2%	51.8%	43.4%
SES				
High	6.9%	4.2%	5.5%	4.2%
Medium	33.0%	45.5%	39.2%	38.8%
Low	60.1%	50.3%	55.3%	57.0%
Ethnic origin				
Non-Minority	67.7%	89.4%	78.5%	84.2%
Minority	32.3%	10.6%	21.5%	15.8%
Language spoken at Home				
Dutch	81.7%	91.3%	87.9	89.1%
Dutch dialect	2.2%	2.9%	2.0%	2.7%
Other language	16.2%	5.8%	10.1%	7.8%
Age				
10–11 years	10.9%	4.7%	7.8%	6.1%
12–13 years	56.4%	40.1%	53.2%	44.3%
14–15 years	28.1%	48.8%	33.5%	43.7%
16 years and older	4.6%	6.5%	5.5%	5.9%
Grade				
Grade 5	8.1%	3.2%	5.2%	3.4%
Grade 6	5.3%	3.3%	4.6%	5.1%
Grade 7	56.2%	39.1%	53.1%	42.5%
Grade 9	30.4%	54.4%	37.2%	49.0%
Mean (sd)				
Citizenship participation				
News engagement	2.53 (.76)	1.75 (.60)	2.22 (.65)	2.03 (.70)
Societal participation	0.14 (.14)	0.08 (.13)	0.11 (.12)	0.09 (.11)
School participation	0.08 (.15)	0.04 (.13)	0.05 (.12)	0.04 (.10)
Perceptions of the school climate				
1: student-teacher relationships	3.22 (.62)	2.66 (.66)	2.99 (.57)	2.82 (.69)
2: relationship between students	2.70 (.86)	2.61 (.78)	2.75 (.75)	2.67 (.82)
3: social behaviour between students	2.88 (.68)	2.34 (.57)	2.67 (.55)	2.51 (.61)

and only significant for societal participation (societal participation:  $F(3,7260) = 15.41$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $\eta = .006$ ; school participation:  $F(3,7260) = 1.21$ ,  $p = .303$ ,  $\eta = .001$ ). Students in the committed citizenship cluster participated the most in society when compared to the students in the other clusters.

Table VII presents the distribution of the four types of citizenship according to the level of school. The percentages per type of citizenship were again compared to the row totals in the Table. Small but nevertheless significant relations were detected ( $\chi^2(6) = 93.25$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $\eta = .002$ ). In primary education a significantly higher proportion of students who showed a committed type of citizenship was found when compared to the other levels of school. In pre-vocational education, a higher proportion of students who showed an indifferent type of citizenship was found and in general secondary education a higher proportion of students who showed a self-assured type of citizenship was found when compared to the other levels of school.

TABLE VII. Percentages of the types of citizenship for the school levels

School level	Committed citizenship N = 1,824	Indifferent citizenship N = 1,448	Ordinary citizenship N = 2,348	Self-assured citizenship N = 2,024	Total N = 7,644
Primary education	13.1%	6.6%	9.7%	8.5%	9.7%
Pre-vocational education	43.8%	56.8%	45.7%	46.4%	47.5%
General secondary education	42.8%	36.7%	44.5%	45.1%	42.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In sum, the results of our analysis show the typology of citizenship identified on the basis of the citizenship orientations and knowledge of students to relate differently to students' characteristics, which differ according to the level of school.

### Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, we were able to distinguish four types of citizenship for students of different ages and in different levels of primary and secondary education. A typology of student citizenship was successfully constructed using the patterns of responding to the four citizenship orientations (i.e. social interest, pro-social ability, reflective thinking, and assertiveness) and the two domains of citizenship knowledge (societal knowledge and interpersonal knowledge). The four types of citizenship identified and validated for a wide range of students in primary and secondary education are: committed citizenship, indifferent citizenship, ordinary citizenship and self-assured citizenship.

Students with a committed citizenship generally show great willingness to contribute to society and report having the necessary skills for this. They also possess a relatively high level of citizenship knowledge. Their knowledge and skills give them ample opportunities to further develop their citizenship competences. This group of students consists of relatively young girls, mostly from ethnic minority groups, with generally positive perceptions of their school climate; relatively high engagement with the news; and active participation in their daily environment (e.g. volunteer work, school council).

The group of students with an indifferent citizenship shows less willingness to contribute to society than the other types and reports not having the necessary

skills to participate in society. This group also possesses relatively less citizenship knowledge than the students in the other groups. This could explain the indifference to participate in and deal with daily citizenship tasks. Relatively older boys from mostly a non-minority background are present in this group of students. They generally have negative perceptions of the school climate; are the least engaged with the news of all groups; and participate least of all in the daily environment.

The group of students with an ordinary citizenship shows an average citizenship across the board and report having the necessary skills for this. The group also possesses an average or mainstream level of citizenship knowledge for The Netherlands. This group of students consists of boys and girls from both minority and non-minority groups and is represented by all grades and at all ages. The students in this group show relatively positive perceptions of the school climate; average engagement with the news; and average participation in the daily environment.

The group of students with a self-assured citizenship generally shows less willingness to contribute to society than committed or ordinary students and reports not having the necessary citizenship skills to participate. Nevertheless, this group of students possesses a relatively high level of societal knowledge and also shows a relatively high assertiveness in their opinions of society which suggests that these students base their opinions only on what they know, not on reflection. This group of students consists of relatively older boys who show relatively negative perceptions of their school climate; less engagement with the news; and generally participate less in their daily environment.

To summarise: Four clearly interpretable types of citizenship can be distinguished with different patterns of citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge, which relate differently to the individual characteristics of students, their citizenship participation in society and their perceptions of the school climate.

Our results further showed significant differences in the predominant types of citizenship for the different levels of education. The committed type of citizenship is over-represented in primary education. The indifferent type of citizenship is relatively common in pre-vocational education and relatively less common in both primary and general secondary education. The self-assured type of citizenship is relatively common in general secondary education.

The citizenship of the students in pre-vocational education can therefore be typified as less assertive and reflects less of an interest in society than the citizenship of students in either primary or general secondary education. The same holds for the citizenship knowledge of the pre-vocational students, who we found to score lower than the students in either primary or general secondary education. These findings confirm the results of earlier empirical research in The Netherlands. Both Geijsel *et al.* (2012) and Maslowski *et al.* (2010) have shown: the higher the educational level of the students, the greater their citizenship knowledge. Other research has also shown students in adolescence to have more citizenship knowledge but less positive attitudes towards social citizenship than younger students in primary education (Cleaver *et al.*, 2005; Geijsel *et al.*, 2012; Ireland *et al.*, 2006). In other words, the students' background characteristics and their level of education clearly influence the type of citizenship they show.

Student characteristics *could* explain the pattern of association found between the different types of citizenship and the school level of the students. The present results nevertheless raise the question of whether the educational practices of the teachers might underlie the difference observed per level of school. According to

Leenders *et al.* (2008) and Ten Dam & Volman (2003), teachers in pre-vocational education show a tendency to teach students how to behave in an appropriate manner by emphasising the basic rules of social interaction and adaptation while, in contrast, teachers in general secondary education focus on the competences needed for active and critical participation in society. These different pedagogical goals for citizenship education might, in combination with the characteristics of the individual students, contribute to the type of citizenship displayed in the different school levels. Further research is needed to examine the possible influence of school perceptions of what constitutes 'good citizenship' and the concomitant educational practices of teachers on the types of citizenship displayed by students in different levels of education.

The next step in the development of the citizenship typology initiated here is to further validate the types of citizenship we identified. The typology presented in this study is based on a sample of student saged 11 to 16. It was cross-validated for a representative nationwide sample of students from the COOL study in The Netherlands. International validation is called for, as types of citizenship may certainly differ across countries. For example, Torney-Purta *et al.* (2008) found not only different distributions of the types of citizenship in Sweden compared to the US, but also additional — but differing — types of citizenship for the two countries: in Sweden, the *nationalist citizen* was also found; in the US, the *alienated citizen* was also found. These country-specific types of citizenship point to the influence of social structures in a society (Banks, 1993). In other words, the types of citizenship could be influenced by social systems and (in)equality of the society in which one lives (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010). Further characterisation and analysis of the social and cultural context in which citizenship develops are needed. Further cross-cultural comparison should certainly be promoted, as this can give us insight into the impact of national educational institutions on the development of citizenship and (in)equalities in citizenship (Van de Werfhorst & Mijs, 2010).

Finally, longitudinal research is called for in order to trace the development of individual citizenship. The types of citizenship we identified reflect a profile which is not static and thus not tied to a particular set of personality traits or an archetype. Under the influence of societal conditions and citizenship education, students can change from one type to another. Our results indeed show differences in the distribution of the four types of citizenship depending on the age of the students. We cannot draw conclusions about the specific development of the different types of citizenship, however, as this requires tracing the same students over time. A longitudinal study of how students develop from — for instance — indifferent citizenship into committed citizenship is needed.

One must recall that the broader aim of the present research was to shed light on the actual citizenship of students and thereby help schools to provide high quality citizenship education. This study was not the first to identify types of citizenship. Westheimer and Kahn (2004) also analysed citizenship programme materials to identify clusters of citizenship education and thus types of citizenship. Leenders *et al.* (2008) clustered citizenship according to the goals which teachers want to achieve for the citizenship of students. In both the curriculum-oriented approach and the teacher-oriented approach, however, the actual citizenship practices and competences of students were not to be found. Our study fulfils this need and thereby provides a bridge between the teachers' pedagogical goals and

the aims outlined in programme materials on the one hand, and the actual citizenship practices of students, on the other. The influence of citizenship education can thus be studied more carefully in the future in relation to the students' individual characteristics and their citizenship participation. Pedagogical goals of education can thus be embedded in the actual citizenship orientations and knowledge of students.

The study by Torney-Purta *et al.* (2008) is — to our knowledge — the only study so far in which a student-oriented approach was adopted to identify clusters of citizenship characteristics. However, the profiles they developed are based on political citizenship, which omits the social domain of students' citizenship. In our study, we adopted a broad conceptualisation of citizenship (Ten Dam, *et al.*, 2011; Geijsel *et al.*, 2012) and considered both the political and social domains of citizenship. By also doing this in the context of the daily lives of students, we discovered a different set of distinct and clearly interpretable types for the citizenship of students in primary and secondary education.

*Ellen Geboers, Department of Child Development and Education, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam, P.O. Box 19268, 1000 GG Amsterdam, The Netherlands, E.A.M.Geboers@uva.nl*

*Femke Geijsel, Netherlands Academy of Leadership in Education and Department of Child Development and Education, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, F.P.Geijsel@uva.nl*

*Wilfried Admiraal, ICLON — Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching, Willem Einthoven gebouw, Wassenaarseweg 62A, 2333 AL Leiden, The Netherlands, W.F.Admiraal@iclon.leidenuniv.nl*

*Geert ten Dam G. T. M., Department of Child Development and Education, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam, P.O. Box 19268, 1000 GG Amsterdam, The Netherlands, G.T.M.Tendam@uva.nl*

## REFERENCES

- BANKS, J. A. (1993) The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education, *Educational Researcher*, 22, pp. 4–14.
- BIESTA, G., LAWY, R., & KELLY, N. (2009) Understanding young people's citizenship learning in everyday life, *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 4, pp. 5–24.
- CALINSKI, R. B., & HARABASZ, J. (1974) A dendrite method for cluster analysis, *Communications in statistics*, 3, pp. 1–27.
- CLEAVER, E., IRELAND, E., KERR, D., & LOPES, J. (2005) *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Second cross-sectional survey 2004*. DfES Research Report 626. (London, DfES).
- GEOBERS, E., GEIJSEL, F., ADMIRAAL W., & TEN DAM, G. (in press). Citizenship orientations and knowledge in primary and secondary education, *Social Psychology of Education*.
- GEIJSEL, F., LEDOUX, G., REUMERMAN, R., & TEN DAM, G. (2012) Citizenship in young people's daily lives. Differences in citizenship competences of adolescents in the Netherlands, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 15, pp. 711–729.
- HASTE, H. (2004) Constructing the citizen, *Political Psychology*, 25, pp. 413–440.

- IRELAND, E., KERR, D., LOPES, J., & NELSON, J. (2006) *Active Citizenship and Young People: Opportunities, Experiences and Challenges In and Beyond School. Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Fourth Annual Report* (London, DfES).
- LEENDERS, H., VEUGELERS, W., & DE KAT, E. (2008) Teachers' views on citizenship education in secondary education in the Netherlands, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 38, pp. 155–170.
- MASLOWSKI, R., NAAAYER, H. M., ISAC, M. M., OONK, G. H. & VAN DER WERF, M. P. C. (2010) *Eerste bevindingen International Civic and Citizenship Education Study. Rapportage voor Nederland*. [First findings of the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study. Dutch Rapport] (Groningen, GION).
- MOREY, L. C., & AGRESTI, A. (1984) The measurement of classification agreement: An adjustment to the Rand statistic for chance agreement, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 44, pp. 33–37.
- RAND, W. M. (1971) Objective criteria for the evaluation of clustering methods, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 66, pp. 846–850.
- RYCHEN, D. S., & SALGANIK, L. H. (2003) *Key Competencies for a Successful Life and Well-functioning society* (Göttingen, Hogrefe & Huber Publishers).
- SCHULZ, W., AINLEY, J., FRAILLON, J., KERR, D., & LOSITO, B. (2010) *Initial Findings from the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study* (Amsterdam, IEA).
- STOFFEL, K., & BELKONIENE, A. (1999) Parallel *k/h*-Means Clustering for large data sets, in: P. AMESTOY et al. (Eds) *Euro-Par'99, LNCS 1685, 1451–1454* (Berlin, Heidelberg, Springer-Verlag).
- TEN DAM, G., & VOLMAN, M. (2003) A life jacket or an art of living. Inequality in social competence education, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 33, pp. 117–137.
- TEN DAM, G., & VOLMAN, M. (2007) Educating for adulthood or for citizenship: social competence as an educational goal, *European Journal of Education*, 42, pp. 281–298.
- TEN DAM, G., GEIJSEL, F., REUMERMAN, R., & LEDOUX, G. (2011) Measuring citizenship competences of young people, *European Journal of Education*, 46, pp. 354–372.
- TORNEY-PURTA, J., BARBER, C., WILKENFELD, B., & HOMANA, G. (2008) Profiles of civic life skills among adolescents: indicators for research, policymakers, and the public, *Child Indicators Research*, 1, pp. 86–106.
- VAN DE WERFHORST, H. G., & DE GRAAF, N. D. (2004) The sources of political orientations in post-industrial society: social class and education revisited, *British Journal of Sociology*, 55, pp. 211–235.
- VAN DE WERFHORST, H. G., & MIJS, J. J. B. (2010) Achievement inequality and the institutional structure of educational systems: a comparative perspective, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, pp. 407–428.
- WESTHEIMER, J., & KAHN, J. (2004) What kind of citizen? The politics of education of democracy, *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, pp. 237–269.
- WILKINSON, R. G., & PICKETT, K. (2010) *The Spirit Level: why greater equality makes societies stronger* (New York, Bloomsbury Press).