



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Citizenship of young people

Geboers, E.A.M.

Publication date
2014

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Geboers, E. A. M. (2014). *Citizenship of young people*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

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, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Chapter 4

*Typology of student citizenship*¹

Most of the empirical frameworks and theories concerned with the development of citizenship today are quite complex and only provide some guidance for what citizenship education should attend to; they do not provide insight into the actual citizenship of students. We constructed a typology of student citizenship, on the basis of data collected from students. Patterns of scores for the citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge of students were examined, and four clearly interpretable profiles could be identified (committed citizenship, indifferent citizenship, ordinary citizenship and self-assured citizenship). A sample of 7,768 students from grades 5-9 from 38 primary and secondary education schools participated in this research. The typology was then cross-validated on a separate sample of 15,940 students from Dutch primary and secondary education schools. The types of the citizenship differed depending on the individual demographic characteristics of the students and their level of education. Implications of the typology for citizenship education and future research are discussed.

1 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, Ireland, Kerr, & Lopes, 2005; Ireland, Kerr, Lopes, & Nelson, 2006; Geijsel, Ledoux, Reumerman, & Ten Dam, 2012; Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010;). Ten Dam and Volman (2007) have 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 (cf. 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 (cf. 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) from the Department of Education and Skills (DfES) in England, Cleaver et al. (2005) have developed another framework to describe the dimensions of citizenship. They distinguish students' knowledge, understanding and conceptions; students' views, trust and experiences; students' attitudes; and students' participation and engagement.

The ultimate goal of the various attempts undertaken to understand the concept of citizenship of students is to provide schools with frameworks to build upon. These largely academic discussions of student citizenship have led to rather complex empirical frameworks of citizenship elements, dimensions, and underlying components, which are not easy to interpret for teachers. Moreover, many of the theoretical assumptions underlying the citizenship classifications have not been 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; they are not in terms of the citizenship competences of students.

One exception is the work of Torney-Purta, Barber, Wilkenfeld and Homana (2008) who examined the variation and clustering of citizenship attitudes, skills and knowledge among 14-year-old students. They identified a number of citizenship profiles. In the present research, we intended to continue on this path and searched for clearly interpretable types of student citizenship. The aim of

¹ Geboers, E., Admiraal, W., Geijsel, F., & Ten Dam, G. (in press). Typology of student citizenship. *European Journal of Education*.

this research was to help teachers to recognize 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.

1.1 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 laid-out in the literature is still rather diffuse and fragmented due to a focus on the isolated components of citizenship competences (i.e. knowledge, attitudes, skills and reflection). Linked to the citizenship competences of students, citizenship orientations reflect how someone assesses his or her affinities, perspectives and attitudes towards citizenship participation and provide a more holistic meaning of daily citizenship of students (see Geboers, Admiraal, Geijsel, & Ten Dam, submitted). From a developmental perspective, citizenship orientations can be understood as socialized and internalized elements of citizenship, which can be influenced by education as well (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; cf. Haste, 2004) which construct the underlying pattern of citizenship attitudes, skills, and reflection. We denote these patterns as citizenship orientations of students. In a nationwide study of the citizenship of students in the Netherlands (Geboers et al., submitted), a comprehensive framework was developed for four citizenship orientations (societal interest, prosocial 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. Prosocial ability indicates students' capability to adapt oneself to social rules, moral values and social conventions in daily life, and to empathize with others. Reflective thinking refers to students' critical thinking about social issues and social structures in society. Assertiveness concerns students' ability to stand up for their own ideas and clearly formulate these ideas. Societal knowledge concerns the political domain or more abstract knowledge about democratic principles of society, the organization 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 social everyday manners.

1.2 Types of citizens

Various attempts have been made in the literature on citizenship to unfold citizenship in categorizations, classifications or types. Based on theoretical reasoning about what constitutes "good" citizenship that appeared in the curricula of democratic citizenship programmes, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) classified three types of citizens. There is the personal responsible citizen who is willing to act responsibly in the community, helps those in need, works, pays taxes and obeys laws. There is the participatory citizen who is actively involved in community organizations, in organizing 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 promotes 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 accentuates discipline and autonomy with relatively less attention to social values and rules. And the critical-democratic citizen who emphasizes 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 such attitudes as trust, efficacy and support but not particularly interested in participation and only willing to do the absolute minimum as citizens; 2) the social justice supporters or students who score above average on 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 on citizenship norms, trust and patriotism but show average scores on support for rights; and 4) the alienated or students who score the lowest on all civic attitudes and disagree with nearly all beliefs about democracy and political culture. In our opinion these citizenship profiles present an interpretable and detailed picture of citizenship of students and may therefore be of value for citizenship education efforts.

1.3 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 along with an emphasis on social competences. Our operationalization concerns a broad conceptualization of citizenship which includes not only the political domain but also the social domain of citizenship as the latter is thought to be more suitable for understanding the actual citizenship of students (Ten Dam, Geijsel, Reumerman, & Ledoux, 2011; Geijsel 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 tender age of 12 for separate schools for prevocational 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 emphasized in prevocational education (i.e. the lower levels of secondary education) and critical citizenship and societal knowledge emphasized in general secondary education (i.e. the highest levels of secondary education; Ten Dam & Volman, 2003; Leenders et al., 2008).

2 METHOD

2.1 Participants

Data was collected in 14 schools for primary education; 13 schools for prevocational 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 was collected in the school year of 2007-2008, from 7,768 students (see Table 1).

Table 1. Overview of measurements and number (N) of students

School year	Primary education	Secondary education		Total
		Prevocational	General	
2007-2008	Grade 5 N = 390	Grade 7 N = 1926	Grade 7 N = 1840	N = 4156
	Grade 6 N = 360	Grade 9 N = 1812	Grade 9 N = 1440	N = 3612
Total				N = 7768

2.2 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. The questionnaire consists of 85 items divided across 17 scales. Students are 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 (see Geboers et al., submitted).

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? is posed for these scales.

A prosocial 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? is 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? is 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? is posed for these 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 2 for the citizenship orientations of the students and their citizenship knowledge.

Table 2. Overview of the means, standard deviations, and reliability (Cronbach's α) of the citizenship orientations and knowledge domains (N=7644)

Citizenship orientations	Mean	(sd.)	α
Societal interest (2 competence scales)	2.77	(.58)	.85
Prosocial ability (5 competence scales)	3.01	(.44)	.88
Reflective thinking (3 competence scales)	2.14	(.59)	.91
Assertiveness (1 competence scale)	3.19	(.58)	.75
Societal knowledge (2 scales)	.78	(.20)	.88
Interpersonal knowledge (2 scales)	.72	(.22)	.85

2.3 Student backgrounds

Information on the backgrounds of the students is obtained by posing 9 questions following administration of the CCQ. Students are asked, for example, what grade they are in, what their age is and what the school level of their parents is. In addition, the students' citizenship participation and perceptions of the school climate are probed. The students are asked if they participate (yes/no) in societal activities like scouting, multicultural organizations, human rights organizations or volunteer work. The students are asked if they participate (yes/no) in school activities like the student council, the school paper, class captain or the organization of school celebrations. The students are asked about their engagement with the news as presented in newspapers or television programmes. In addition, the students are 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 3).

Table 3. Overview of student characteristics in percentages; means (sd.) for citizenship participation and perceptions of school climate (N=7768; N of schools=38)

Background characteristics								
Gender	51.8%	Boy	48.2%	Girl				
SES	5.3%	Low	38.7%	Middle	56.1%	High		
Ethnic origin	79.3%	Majority	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%	16 years or older
Grade	5.0%	Grade 5	4.6%	Grade 6	48.3%	Grade 7	42.1%	Grade 9
School level	9.6%	Primary	47.8%	Prevocational	42.6%	General secondary education		
Students' citizenship participation:				α	Mean	Sd.		
Societal participation (8 activities, mean activity)					0.11	.13		
School participation (5 activities, mean activity)					0.05	.13		
News engagement (4 items, judged using 4-point Likert scale)				.78	2.16	.73		
Students' perspective on school climate:								
1: student-teacher relationships (6 items, 4-point Likert scale)				.94	2.94	.65		
2: student relationships (5 items, 4-point Likert scale)				.92	2.70	.80		
3: social behaviour between students (5 items, 4-point Likert scale)				.92	2.62	.63		

2.4 Analysis

Cluster analyses were conducted in order to decide which citizenship profiles or types of citizenship can 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. *K*-means cluster analysis was applied, which means that differences on the citizenship orientations and knowledge between the students within groups were minimized and differences between groups were maximized. Unlike the more commonly used hierarchical cluster analysis, *K*-means cluster analysis are 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, 1973) in combination with the lowest ω (omega) (VRC= 2427.71, $\omega = -61.65$) (see Table 4). 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 identifiable and stable in a separate representative sample of 15,940 sixth and ninth Grade students from 80 Dutch primary and secondary education schools from the so-called COOL study (Dutch National Cohort Study Educational Careers Students 5 to 18 year).

Table 4. Overview of cluster analysis with VRC, ω (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=1527.98	VRC=1658.59	VRC=1667.48	VRC=1901.05	VRC=2049.85	VRC=2161.42	VRC=2472.71	VRC=2722.35	VRC=3677.96
	$\omega = -122.71$	$\omega = -84.78$	$\omega = 224.68$	$\omega = -37.23$	$\omega = 199.73$	$\omega = -61.65$	$\omega = 705.97$		
N = 7643									
Citizenship orientations									
Societal interest	.70	.70	.67	.68	.62	.64	.56	.45	.47
Prosocial ability	.46	.45	.47	.44	.41	.40	.38	.30	.32
Reflective thinking	.73	.70	.66	.68	.66	.58	.53	.43	.39
Assertiveness	.74	.75	.70	.66	.66	.56	.58	.53	.19
Citizenship knowledge									
Societal knowledge	.08	.07	.06	.06	.06	.03	.01	.00	.00
Interpersonal knowledge	.12	.10	.09	.09	.08	.07	.04	.02	.03

Chi-square tests and ANOVAs were conducted to determine how the four types of student citizenship relate to the individual characteristics of the students.

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, prevocational or general secondary education).

3 RESULTS

In the following, we present a typology of student citizenship and describe the differences between the types. In table 5 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 5. Means (sd.) for citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge according to the type of citizenship

Clusters of citizenship	N	Citizenship orientations				Citizenship knowledge	
		Societal interest	Prosocial ability	Reflective thinking	Assertiveness	Societal knowledge	Interpersonal knowledge
Committed citizen	1824	3.40 (.37)	3.42 (.34)	2.74 (.49)	3.67 (.34)	.79 (.19)	.77 (.19)
Indifferent citizen	1448	2.17 (.40)	2.62 (.37)	1.62 (.38)	2.60 (.49)	.75 (.21)	.64 (.23)
Ordinary citizen	2348	2.86 (.35)	3.01 (.30)	2.33 (.37)	2.84 (.36)	.77 (.21)	.74 (.21)
Self-assured citizen	2024	2.56 (.44)	2.93 (.38)	1.77 (.38)	3.57 (.33)	.81 (.18)	.71 (.21)
Total	7644	2.77 (.58)	3.01 (.44)	2.14 (.59)	3.19 (.58)	.78 (.20)	.72 (.21)

3.1 Types of citizenship

The first cluster contained 24.0% of the students. These students showed relatively high scores overall and can therefore be considered to be broadly knowledgeable and orientated towards citizenship; these students 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 as committed citizenship.

The second cluster contained 19.0% of the students. These students have relatively low scores for all of the citizenship orientations (i.e. societal interest, prosocial 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 students with a committed citizenship. The relatively low score of these students on the citizenship orientations show them to consider themselves neither able nor willing to participate in society, and inclined to reflect upon societal issues or to stand up for their opinions. These students are little concerned with daily citizenship tasks and thus this cluster is labelled as indifferent citizenship.

The third cluster contained 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, prosocial ability, and reflective thinking) and relatively low scores

on 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 as ordinary citizenship.

The fourth cluster contained 26.5% of the students. This group of students shows the most diverse scores for both citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge. These students score relatively high on societal knowledge and assertiveness; average on societal interest, prosocial ability and interpersonal knowledge; and relatively low on reflective thinking. These students are thus quite knowledgeable of societal issues, and their relatively high scores on assertiveness shows 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 in general and not on reflection. This cluster of students is therefore labelled as self-assured citizenship.

3.2 Relations of the citizenship types 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 6 for the four types of citizenship we identified. The percentages according to the types of citizenship were compared to the row totals in Table 6.

Table 6. 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 = 1824)	Indifferent citizen (N = 1448)	Ordinary citizen (N = 2348)	Self-assured citizen (N = 2024)	Total (N = 7644)
Gender	Boy	41.8%	62.8%	48.2%	56.6%	58.6%
	Girl	58.2%	37.2%	51.8%	43.4%	48.4%
SES	High	6.9%	4.2%	5.5%	4.2%	5.3%
	Medium	33.0%	45.5%	39.2%	38.8%	38.7%
	Low	60.1%	50.3%	55.3%	57.0%	56.0%
Ethnic origin	Non-Minority	67.7%	89.4%	78.5%	84.2%	79.5%
	Minority	32.3%	10.6%	21.5%	15.8%	20.5%
Language spoken at home	Dutch	81.7%	91.3%	87.9%	89.1%	87.5%
	Dutch dialect	2.2%	2.9%	2.0%	2.7%	2.4%
	Other language	16.2%	5.8%	10.1%	7.8%	10.1%
Age	10-11 years	10.9%	4.7%	7.8%	6.1%	7.5%
	12-13 years	56.4%	40.1%	53.2%	44.3%	49.1%
	14-15 years	28.1%	48.8%	33.5%	43.7%	37.8%
	16 years and older	4.6%	6.5%	5.5%	5.9%	5.6%
Grade	Grade 5	8.1%	3.2%	5.2%	3.4%	5.0%
	Grade 6	5.3%	3.3%	4.6%	5.1%	4.7%
	Grade 7	56.2%	39.1%	53.1%	42.5%	48.4%
	Grade 9	30.4%	54.4%	37.2%	49.0%	42.0%

Citizenship participation	Mean (sd.)				
Societal participation	0.14 (.14)	0.08 (.13)	0.11 (.12)	0.09 (.11)	0.11 (.13)
School participation	0.08 (.15)	0.04 (.13)	0.05 (.12)	0.04 (.10)	0.05 (.13)
News engagement	2.53 (.76)	1.75 (.60)	2.22 (.65)	2.03 (.70)	2.16 (.73)
Perceptions of the school climate					
1: student-teacher relationships	3.22 (.62)	2.66 (.66)	2.99 (.57)	2.82 (.69)	2.93 (.66)
2: relationship between students	2.70 (.86)	2.61 (.78)	2.75 (.75)	2.67 (.82)	2.69 (.80)
3: social behaviour between students	2.88 (.68)	2.34 (.57)	2.67 (.55)	2.51 (.61)	2.61 (.63)

The four types of citizenship relate significantly to the background characteristics of the students. The chi-square results showed the types of citizenship to differ depending on gender ($\chi^2(3) = 172.87, p = .001, \eta^2 = .023$). Compared to the row totals in Table 6, the percentages for gender according to the four types of citizenship showed 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 ($\chi^2(9) = 234.46, p = .001, \eta^2 = .025$). There was a higher concentration of the young students (10-11 years) in the committed citizenship cluster as opposed to 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 compared to the other clusters.

The four types of citizenship showed further to differ significantly depending on the ethnic origin of the students ($\chi^2(3) = 260.47, p = .001, \eta^2 = .035$). The committed cluster of citizenship showed a significantly higher percentage of minority students compared to 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 ($\chi^2(6) = 45.65, p = .001, \eta^2 = .002$ and $\chi^2(6) = 109.14, p = .001, \eta^2 = .013$ respectively).

When the four types of citizenship were examined in relation to the students' reported engagement and perceptions of the school climate, significant relations were detected. ANOVAs showed the types of citizenship to differ depending on students' news engagement ($F(3,7420) = 371.72, p = .001, \eta^2 = .131$). 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; $F(3,7604) = 241.00, p = .001, \eta^2 = .087$) and perceived social behaviour of students in the school (school climate 3; $F(3,7600) = 250.81, p = .001, \eta^2 = .090$).

Students in the ordinary citizenship cluster showed the highest scores for perceptions of the relationships between students in the school (school climate 2; $F(3,7600) = 9.66, p = .001, \eta^2 = .004$). 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 participation of the students in societal and/or school activities. The differences were small (societal participation: $F(3,7586) = 61.54, p = .001, \eta^2 = .022$; school participation: $F(3,7599) = 36.67, p = .001, \eta^2 = .014$). Students in the committed citizenship cluster showed to participate the most in society and/or at school

when compared to the students in the other clusters of citizenship.

In Table 7, the distribution of the four types of citizenship according to the level of school is presented. The percentages per type of citizenship were again compared to the row totals in the table. Small but nevertheless significant relations were detected ($\chi^2(6) = 93.25, p = .001, \eta^2 = .002$). 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 prevocational 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.

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 differentially relate to students characteristics, which differ to the level of school.

Table 7. Percentages of the types of citizenship for the school levels

School level	Committed citizenship N=1824	Indifferent citizenship N=1448	Ordinary citizenship N=2348	Self-assured citizenship N=2024	Total N=7644
Primary education	13.1%	6.6%	9.7%	8.5%	9.7%
Prevocational 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%

4 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 for the four citizenship orientations (i.e. social interest, prosocial 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 show a generally high willingness to contribute to society and report having the necessary skills for this. This group also possesses a relatively high level of citizenship knowledge. The knowledge and skills of this group of students 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 a lower willingness to contribute to society relative to the other types and also report not having the necessary skills to participate in society. This group of students also possesses relatively less citizenship knowledge than the students in the other groups. This might explain the indifference of this group to participate in society. Relatively older boys from mostly a non-minority background are present in this group of students. These stu-

dents have generally negative perceptions of the school climate; they are the least engaged with the news of all groups; and they 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 both 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 a lower willingness to contribute to society relative to committed or ordinary students and report 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 towards their own opinions of society which suggest that these students base their opinions only on what they generally know of society but 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 summarize: four clearly interpretable types of citizenship can be distinguished with different patterns of citizenship orientations and citizenship knowledge, which relate differentially to the individual characteristics of students, their citizenship participation 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 overrepresented in primary education. The indifferent type of citizenship is relatively common in prevocational education and relatively less common in both primary education and general secondary education. The self-assured type of citizenship is relatively common in general secondary education.

The citizenship of the students in prevocational education can therefore be typified as less assertive and reflects less of an interest in society than the citizenship of students in either primary and general secondary education. The same holds for the citizenship knowledge of the prevocational students, who we found to score lower than the students in either primary education or general secondary education. These findings confirm the results of earlier empirical research in the Netherlands. Both Geijsel et al. (2012) and Maslowski, Naayer, Isac, Oonk, & Van der Werf (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 background characteristics of students and their level of education clearly influence the type of citizenship which they show.

Student characteristics might 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 prevocational education show a tendency to teach students how to behave in an appropriate manner by emphasizing the basic rules of social interaction and adaptation while, in contrast, teachers in general secondary education focus more 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 within 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 students who were 11 to 16 years of age. It was cross-validated for a representative nationwide sample of students from the so-called 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 United States but also additional -but differing- types of citizenship for the two countries: in Sweden the nationalist citizen occurred as well; in the United States, the alienated citizen occurred as well. 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 characterization and analysis of the social and cultural context within which citizenship develops is 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 presumably 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.

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) have similarly 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 remained out of sight. Our study fulfils this need and thereby provides a bridge between the pedagogical goals of teachers and the aims outlined in programme materials on the one hand, and the actual citizenship practices of students, on the other hand. The influence of citizenship education can thus be studied more carefully in the future and in relation to the individual characteristics of students 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 until now in which a student-oriented approach was adopted to identify clusters of citizenship characteristics. However, the profiles developed by Torney-Purta et al. are based upon political citizenship, which leaves the social domain of students' citizenship out of sight. In our study, we adopted a broad conceptualization 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.