UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Promoting citizenship competences for a resilient democracy

Balancing between central control and local variety

ten Dam, G.

DOI
10.4337/9781803928111.00010

Publication date
2025

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Research Handbook on Education and Democracy

License
Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (https://www.openaccess.nl/en/policies/open-access-in-dutch-copyright-law-taverne-amendment)

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
ten Dam, G. (2025). Promoting citizenship competences for a resilient democracy: Balancing between central control and local variety. In J. G. Janmaat, & A. B. Dijkstra (Eds.), *Research Handbook on Education and Democracy* (pp. 49-65). (Elgar handbooks in education). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781803928111.00010

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.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:21 May 2026

4. Promoting citizenship competences for a resilient democracy: balancing between central control and local variety

Geert ten Dam

INTRODUCTION

Democracy requires continuous attention and maintenance. While education can never be solely responsible for this, schools do have a role to play in sustaining a resilient democracy. They can offer students a pedagogical context for acquiring the competences they need to shape their lives and collectively learn to stand for freedom, equality, solidarity, and trust. Adolescence is a crucial period for the development of citizenship (Shehata & Amnå, 2017). It is the stage of life in which people begin to become cognitively capable of contemplating and analysing a variety of democratic principles and procedures (Rest et al., 2000) and in which a broad range of socialising agents come into play, including parents, peers, teachers, and society at large. After adolescence, political attitudes and orientations stabilise and become less susceptible to change (Russo & Stattin, 2017).

The idea that schools should enhance citizenship has become widely accepted in nearly all European countries in recent decades, often being set out in centralised regulations (Eurydice, 2017). However, what exactly this task should entail is far from clear. What citizenship competences should students learn, and to what extent is variety between schools and students acceptable or even desirable? Whether the citizenship task is being met for all students merely touches the foundation of a democratic society where everyone is able to participate and feels represented and where people can live together in freedom.

In this chapter, I discuss the citizenship education of adolescents in secondary schools. I focus on the differences between young people and, in particular, differences related to their sociocultural backgrounds. What role does education play among other socialising agents in this regard? The Netherlands is an interesting case study to examine this question. Compared to other countries, the Netherlands has a highly (externally) differentiated education system with various types of schools. In addition, schools have a great deal of autonomy. In today's complex, networked society (Bauman, 2005; Castells, 1996), it is crucial that schools have the freedom to tailor their education to local needs, expectations, and partners (Levin, 2010, Moureshed et al., 2011). This freedom is deeply rooted in the Dutch education system. The constitutional freedom of education (Glenn & De Groof, 2002) allows schools to choose the structure and content of their citizenship education. This raises the question of how to balance local variety on the one hand and, on the other, central control of citizenship education by the government as the guardian of the democratic rule of law and social cohesion.

In the next section, I will first outline the pillars of a resilient democracy and the citizenship task of schools that it implies. Then, an overview of what we know about adolescents' citizenship competences will be provided, with a focus on Dutch adolescents versus their peers in

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

comparable countries. In the second half of this chapter, I turn to the steering question: How can the government steer the quality of citizenship education in a system with autonomous schools?

A RESILIENT DEMOCRACY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF RECIPROCITY

A democratic society essentially involves living together in such a way that people have ownership over and take responsibility for their own lives, while allowing others to do the same. Mutual trust and solidarity are necessary for social cohesion, as well as the rule of law that offers legal certainty, transparency, and protection. This description is in line with what Barber (1984) once referred to as strong democracy. While a so-called thin democracy revolves around individual rights and citizens' representation in government, a strong democracy is characterised by the participation of all people in all aspects of social and political life. It focusses on social justice and resists the excesses of liberalism, such as cynicism, apathy, self-interest, privatisation, and alienation. Democracy is never a given, but is by definition 'in progress', or as expressed by Dewey (1966): 'a mode of associated living'. Citizenship therefore refers to individuals' agency not only within the domain of government and politics, but also within the social domain in which citizens interact with each other and shape their identities. Because people themselves give meaning to their citizenship in the context of their daily lives and the power relations at play therein, there is by definition no single interpretation of citizenship. Therefore, various forms must be able to coexist peacefully.

An important pillar of a resilient democracy is citizens' trust in democratic institutions and identification with democratic values. A certain degree of critical distance keeps democracy on its toes, but mistrust can undermine representative democracy and the rule of law (Van der Meer & Zmerli, 2017). Social inequality and injustices gnaw at our democracy and contribute to the erosion of trust. For example, unequal political participation has negative effects on the quality of and support for democracy (Levinson, 2010). If underprivileged groups vote less than more privileged groups, politicians will be less inclined to consider their interests (Schakel, 2021). This can further alienate marginalised groups from the democratic state and widen the gap with the political elite. This example also clearly shows the importance of reciprocity. Without the feeling that 'politicians listen' and represent citizens' interests, voting becomes a ritual dance. The director of the scientific office of the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA) puts it bluntly: 'why vote if you are nothing more than electoral cattle and only matter when the voting booth opens?' ('S Jongers, 2022).

For trust in democracy and being willing and able to uphold it, it is crucial that the government can deal with differences in citizens' lived experiences, wishes, and needs. Otherwise, it exacerbates inequality, and makes democracy fragile, not only because of income and wealth disparities, but also due to the psychological effects on identities and interrelationships (Payne, 2018) and the meritocratic ethos of winners and losers (Sandel, 2020). A resilient democracy requires a robust public sector that supports vulnerable citizens and mitigates inequalities. But under the influence of New Public Management (NPM), fundamental social rights have been rapidly dismantled in recent decades. The presupposition of NPM is that central control leads to conservation and nips all incentives for innovation in the bud. Housing, education, social security, youth services, and healthcare had to be more efficient, more effective, and, above

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

all, more economical. In addition, the government assumes possible abuse of public services in advance, leading to excessive scrutiny of the socially vulnerable who are suspected of welfare fraud (Putters, 2022). However, government's trust in citizens goes hand in hand with citizens' trust in the government. Finally, reciprocity as a democratic principle also refers to the horizontal relationships between citizens themselves. The freedom of one should not take away that of another. In a diverse society, it is crucial to be able to take and change perspective.

Based on the above characterisation of a resilient democracy, enhancing citizenship is a task for all schools. Promoting social cohesion and teaching adolescents to take responsibility for this is an important goal of education. However, the content of such a task must allow for diversity between schools and between students, due to both the increasing ethnic composition of populations in most Western countries and the diversification of value patterns and individual life paths. Learning to act on the basis of fundamental democratic values makes it possible for citizens with different visions of 'a good life' to peacefully coexist. Values like equality, tolerance, freedom of speech, and individual autonomy ensure 'unity in diversity'. A democratic, pluralist society requires all citizens to put so-called small virtues into practice, such as 'looking out for each other', 'helping others' and 'being able to deal with differences and conflict' (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). It also requires citizens to be capable of making their own contribution to democracy, with room for change and criticism (Oser & Veugelers, 2008; ten Dam & Volman, 2004). A resilient democracy must rely on self-willed citizens and be able to build on the democratic process itself. Citizenship education should therefore provide space for specific values and experiences, for that which drives and binds people. At the same time, and this is key, it should focus on reciprocity: treat others as you would like to be treated.

CITIZENSHIP COMPETENCES OF YOUNG PEOPLE AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

What Do We Know About Citizenship Competences?

In recent years, a solid international body of knowledge has been established regarding the citizenship competences of adolescents. Various studies use representative samples and generally look at secondary school students, focussing primarily on the relationships between citizenship competences and young people's background characteristics. The results show that the majority of adolescents have a positive view of democracy. They prefer democracy over other forms of government, such as oligarchy or aristocracy, and they support underlying aspects of democracy like freedom of speech, equal rights for all, and free elections (Daas et al., 2023; Mulder et al., 2022; Munniksma et al., 2017; Schulz et al., 2018; Schulz et al., 2023). However, there are clear differences between groups. Adolescents with less well-educated parents score lower on various aspects of citizenship than students with well-educated parents. They have less civic knowledge (Geboers et al., 2015; Geijsel et al., 2012; Schulz et al., 2010; Schulz et al., 2018; Schulz et al., 2023), are less interested in politics (Janmaat et al., 2022; Neundorf et al., 2013), have less trust in public officials (Stals et al., 2022), and are less likely to support equal rights for men and women and for different ethnic groups (Isac et al., 2012; Schulz et al., 2018; Schulz et al., 2023). Less support for equal rights is mainly related to their lower level of civic knowledge. The difference between children of well-educated and

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

less well-educated parents in terms of confidence in their own citizenship skills is relatively small. With regard to gender, girls have more civic knowledge on average than boys (Geijsel et al., 2012; Schulz et al., 2018; Schulz et al., 2023) and are more likely to emphasise inclusive democracy, while boys, on average, emphasise competition (Hooghe & Stolle, 2004). Gender differences in citizenship attitudes and skills, however, are significantly smaller than those in knowledge (Geijsel et al., 2012; Schulz et al., 2018; Schulz et al., 2023). Migration background is also a factor. Students without a migration background demonstrate a relatively higher level of civic knowledge than other students (Geijsel et al., 2012; Munniksma et al., 2023; Schulz et al., 2018; Schulz et al., 2023). And while ethnic majority group students are more likely to vote than ethnic minority group students (Lopez, 2003), the latter express greater interest in politics (Cleaver et al., 2005; Schulz et al., 2010) and rate their own citizenship skills higher (Geijsel et al., 2012; Schulz et al., 2023). Students with a migration background also have a more positive attitude towards equal rights for different ethnic groups (Munniksma et al., 2023).

The International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) provides a comparison among 14-year-olds in different countries. The 2016 and 2022 studies each cover 24 countries from around the world and include data on various aspects of citizenship (see Schulz et al., 2018; Schulz et al., 2023). A distinction is made between knowledge, attitudes, skills, and behaviour, and different domains of citizenship. For both ICCS 2016 and ICCS 2022, we analysed the outcomes of several participating countries[1] that are comparable to the Netherlands on the Human Development Index,[2] with the Netherlands as the reference country (Daas et al., 2023; Munniksma et al., 2017). Our analysis of ICCS 2022 considered the democratic content of the countries to be selected as well.[3] Finally, to deepen our understanding of trends over time, ICCS 2009 results have also been included where possible (Maslowski et al., 2012; Schulz et al., 2010).

Dutch students clearly have less civic knowledge than their peers in similar countries. In addition, the group of students who score high on knowledge is relatively small, and the group of students who score low is relatively large. Compared to the 2009 ICCS, Dutch students' civic knowledge did improve in 2016, but the gap in relation to comparison countries did not close. In 2022, we see a decline in the citizenship knowledge of both Dutch and international students (Schulz et al., 2023).

Dutch secondary school students are lagging in other areas as well. Students in the Netherlands attribute less importance to conventional aspects of citizenship, such as voting in elections and learning about the country's history, than students in the comparison countries. They also find aspects of socially responsible citizenship less important, such as participating in peaceful protests and helping people in the local community. This picture is consistent across the years analysed. Trust in political parties, the national parliament, and people in general is relatively low. The majority of Dutch students support equal rights for men and women and for ethnic minorities, but this majority is the smallest compared to the comparison countries. Since 2009, however, students in the Netherlands have begun to view equal rights for all ethnic groups in society as more important. Although this trend did not continue in 2022. This was also the case internationally. Dutch adolescents' social and political involvement and participation also lags behind that of their peers in the comparison countries. Finally, Dutch students still rate their own citizenship skills relatively low.

The differences observed in citizenship competences between students with different sociocultural backgrounds (gender, ethnicity, SES) are more or less similar to those in the

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

comparison countries, confirming what has also emerged from other studies. However, the educational differences in the Netherlands are consistently larger. Adolescents with less well-educated parents have less civic knowledge and are less committed to equal rights for ethnic groups and equal rights for men and women than comparable adolescents in other countries. They also have lower trust in social institutions and are less likely to vote than their peers elsewhere.

What could explain these differences? Below, I first consider the possible effect of differentiation in the Dutch education system (tracking) and the varying content of citizenship education. The relatively high degree of autonomy afforded to Dutch schools is discussed in the section thereafter, also in light of the steering instruments used by the government.

Educational Differentiation and Citizenship Education

The Dutch school system is characterised by early selection and, from an international perspective, strong external differentiation in various school types. After the last year of primary school, at the average age of 12, students are assessed based on their cognitive performance and referred to one of the levels of pre-vocational secondary education or one of the levels of general secondary education that prepare them for higher education or university. An early selection system is associated with greater inequality in citizenship outcomes (Eckstein et al., 2012; Hoskins et al., 2016; Janmaat, 2018; Janmaat et al., 2014). This is also evident in the Dutch ICCS studies. At the age of 14, students in the types of schools that provide preparation for higher education possess more civic knowledge, have more confidence in their own citizenship skills, and find social and political participation more important (Daas et al., 2023; Maslowski et al., 2012; Munniksma et al., 2017). However, the results of the Dutch Adolescent Panel on Democratic Values (DAPDV) show that differences between the school types with regard to citizenship outcomes are already apparent at the start of secondary education. In the first three years of secondary education, the initial differences remain more or less constant (Mulder et al., 2022). This is an indication that the 'diploma democracy' (Bovens & Wille, 2017) is indeed related to the positioning of students in different school types, but is largely rooted in students' social and cultural backgrounds.

Even in a differentiated education system, schools can work on their students' citizenship competences in a targeted way. Important issues include creating a pedagogical climate with room for discussions and dialogue in class, where controversial topics and differing opinions are not shied away from and teachers actively focus on providing different perspectives. This allows students to gain experience in dealing with different viewpoints and sharing ideas, learn from others, and practice citizenship skills (Geboers et al., 2013; Knowles et al., 2018; Sampermans, 2019). The same goes for a democratic, participation-oriented school culture (Coopmans et al., 2020; Sampermans, 2019). Including specific citizenship lessons in the formal curriculum is also effective (Hooghe & Dassonnville, 2011; Janmaat et al., 2014). Analyses of Dutch citizenship education based on the ICCS data (Daas et al., 2023; Munniksma et al., 2017) show that schools pay little attention to citizenship in the curriculum. The range of extracurricular activities outside school is relatively limited as well. Furthermore, compared to their peers abroad, Dutch students are least likely to state that there is room for discussion during class. Moreover, in their opinion, they learn little about citizenship at school. All in all, what is missing is an integrated and school-wide approach to citizenship education that fits the vision and context of the school (Coopmans et al., 2020).

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

Inequality in Citizenship Objectives: Art of Living or Life Jacket

Schools can not only increase students' citizenship competences, but they can also compensate for inequality (Deimel et al., 2020). At schools where citizenship is taught on a regular basis, the differences in civic knowledge between students from different sociocultural backgrounds are smaller than at schools where citizenship education is more or less neglected (e.g. Gainous & Martens, 2012; Hoskins et al., 2017; Neundorf et al., 2016). With regard to political participation, students from underprivileged families benefit more from citizenship education than middle-class students (Hoskins et al., 2017). However, this compensatory effect does not occur during free-form discussions of social issues in class. This difference in effect could be related to the fact that such active forms of education are often not compulsory, which means that students from disadvantaged backgrounds are less likely to participate. And these students are not used to doing so at home (Hoskins et al., 2019). In addition, the perception of an open classroom climate differs according to students' social backgrounds. Students from high SES families are more likely to perceive the classroom climate as open for discussion (Hoskins et al., 2021; Mennes, 2023).

Students' sociocultural backgrounds interact with the external educational differentiation which is characteristic of the Netherlands. Students with an underprivileged socio-economic background are most likely to be advised to enter one of the pre-vocational tracks, more so than fellow students who perform equally well but come from a more favourable socio-economic background (Education Inspectorate, 2016; Education Inspectorate, 2020). There are clear indications that different types of schools pursue different citizenship goals for their students. Six extensive case studies of secondary schools in the Netherlands reveal a pattern that points to the (re)production of social inequality (ten Dam & Volman, 2003). In the academic tracks, there is a greater focus on the meaning of changes in society for students and the contribution they themselves can make to those changes (citizenship as an 'art of living'). In contrast, projects focussing on citizenship in pre-vocational education are aimed at improving students' chances at school and in society by developing social competences that, according to education professionals, they have not acquired at home or in earlier stages of their school career, such as self-confidence and social and communication skills (citizenship as a 'life jacket'). Subsequent research has suggested a similar pattern (Leenders et al., 2008). Schools that prepare students for higher education believe critical citizenship and personal development are important, while schools with vocationally oriented learning tracks focus more on adaptive citizenship and social behaviour. Differentiated education thus reinforces social differences because, as mentioned, relatively large numbers of students in the lower levels of secondary education have an underprivileged background (low SES, ethnic minorities).

Meanings of Democracy and Citizenship

Much of the data about the citizenship competences of adolescents comes from large-scale quantitative studies. This has undeniable advantages, such as the ability to compare results between students and, on an aggregate level, between schools or even countries. However, there are also disadvantages. Standardised tests and questionnaires leave little room for context-specific configurations of citizenship and for adolescents to give meaning to citizenship and democracy in the context of their everyday life. Biesta et al. (2006) were among the first to situate citizenship in the daily lives of young people. As opposed to citizenship-as-outcome,

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

which concerns the knowledge and skills that young people should master in order to participate in society as adults, they propose citizenship-as-practice. Young people learn to be citizens and interact with others through participation in social and cultural practices that are part of their daily lives (e.g. family, leisure time, school, work). By participating, they develop an image of themselves in relation to the world, their possibilities, and their personal preferences. One of the findings from the interviews held with adolescents highlighted that they do not learn about citizenship at school. Having to follow rules without explanation, discussion, or input can lead to disengagement, especially among older adolescents (Lawy & Biesta, 2006).

In the Netherlands, Nieuwelink and colleagues used a similar qualitative approach. Forty young people between the ages of 13 and 17, in the second and fourth years of secondary education, were interviewed. The interviews focussed on their opinions about democracy and democratic decision-making in the context of both everyday situations and political democracy. The results add nuance and detail to the picture of students' political views provided by the quantitative studies mentioned above. At 14-years-old, most students have general ideas about how democracy works. If they have to choose between the will of the majority and the interests of a minority, they prefer decision-making based on consensus. The group with this viewpoint is largest among students in the academic tracks. But as students get older, it is precisely these students who are more likely to develop a one-dimensional view of how democracy works (Nieuwelink et al., 2018). They gradually begin to equate democracy with majority decisions. Among students in the pre-vocational tracks, there is a larger group that continues to emphasise that several principles are important: majority decision-making in relation to minority rights, seeking consensus, and accentuating collective decision-making. In the literature, these are typically referred to as 'better' democratic ideas (Verba et al., 1995).

The study by Nieuwelink et al. shows that the process of growing into politics is not just related to young people's increasing cognitive ability to deal with complexity. The way in which young people perceive and give meaning to the world around them also plays an important role. The growing emphasis on majority decision-making reflects changes in Dutch political culture and its coverage in newspapers, on TV, and on the radio. There is more emphasis on competition between political parties, on winning seats, and on policies made by small majorities without seeking broader support. Through the media, adolescents who follow the news – mainly students in the academic tracks – are fed the image of a democracy that has little regard for the needs and wishes of its citizens. Structural inequalities have not been reduced. Over 20 percent of people face an accumulation of problems related to income, employment, loneliness, health, and discrimination, and the Dutch childcare benefits scandal in particular has undermined the social contract between the government and its citizens (Putters, 2022). The one-dimensional majority perspective likely 'colonises' their initial multidimensional ideas about decision-making in everyday situations (Nieuwelink et al., 2018). The education system may also contribute to this, as news and politics are regularly discussed in history and social studies lessons in the academic tracks, while students feel this content is almost completely absent in the pre-vocational tracks (Nieuwelink et al., 2019).

All in all, qualitative studies provide a broader and more nuanced picture of young people's views on democracy and citizenship and of the sociocultural differences between groups of adolescents. This can offer new starting points for meaningful citizenship education.

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

GOVERNMENT CONTROL IN A SYSTEM WITH AUTONOMOUS SCHOOL BOARDS

Networked Society and Space for Schools

Within the Dutch education system, neither the government nor schools have a monopoly on citizenship education. There is a great deal of autonomy at a decentralised level, and many organisations are involved in the steering of educational practices (Burns & Köster, 2016; Waslander et al., 2016). Ensuring the quality of education therefore requires a continuous process of coordination, both between the national and local level and between different parties such as teachers, parents, school administrators, local government, businesses, and care providers (Theisens et al., 2016). The tension between central frameworks and autonomy that is inherent to complex education systems has long been characteristic of the Netherlands and is rooted in the constitutional freedom of education. We now see this tension which began in the 2000s occurring in more countries (Datnow et al., 2006). How can the government steer effectively in a system of autonomous education boards, and what can we learn from the Netherlands in this respect?

Since 1917, Article 23 of the Dutch Constitution has defined the principles of the Dutch education system. Article 23 states that education is 'of ongoing concern to the government' and that 'education is free'. Civil society has the right to establish and design schools based on specific religious or philosophical views.[4] These schools are also publicly funded. The government bears responsibility for the quality of all schools, but it must exercise restraint in order to not interfere with schools' freedom. For example, it is explicitly up to both state-funded private and public schools to choose which learning resources they wish to use and which pedagogical-didactic approach they wish to follow. Parents' free school choice, which goes hand in hand with the freedom of education, promotes internal cohesion and value congruence between schools and their respective environments. Shared values can facilitate citizenship formation at school (Dijkstra et al., 2023). The downside is that parents thus pass on their own social and cultural capital to their children because most parents choose a school that, in their eyes, fits with their own culture, lifestyle, and group (see Bell, 2009). This leads to segregation and inequality as a result of so-called pathway dependencies. Particularly in an externally differentiated education system with early selection at the age of 12, the composition of the student population in primary schools largely determines students' subsequent path in secondary and higher education.

The freedom for schools that is so deeply ingrained in the Dutch education system is crucial to achieving long-term educational quality in a complex, networked society (Levin, 2010; Moureshed et al., 2011). Modern societies are characterised by increasing flexibility, decreasing hierarchy, growing demand for information, fragmentation of ethical frameworks, and increasing significance attached to individuality (see Bauman, 2005; Castells, 1996). Many societal problems are complex, have no clear solution, and involve numerous parties. To cope with complexity, schools are increasingly operating in local partnerships and networks in which they collaborate with many different parties with diverse and changing needs and expectations (see Santizo Rodall & Martin, 2009). Having the space to adjust to the local level promotes the engagement and trust of students, parents, and surrounding organisations, which is essential for sustainable quality improvement (Ranson, 2012). Since the 1980s, national governments have therefore been working on education policies aimed at decentralisation and

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

greater autonomy for educational institutions, while at the same time introducing or intensifying standardised performance and accountability measures (Ranson, 2003; OESO, 2012). This approach seeks to strike a delicate balance between national uniformity and local variety.

While this task is relatively new to many countries, Dutch education policy has been balancing between centralised control and accountability on the one hand, and local variation and stakeholder dialogue on the other, for over a century. Education professionals have a relatively high degree of freedom in their scope of practice, stakeholders have many possibilities to exert influence – even outside the institutionalised, official consultative structures – and the government uses a wide array of steering strategies, ranging from central assessment to covenants and subsidies (ten Dam & Waslander, 2018). Thus, in principle, key conditions for a well-functioning education system are met (Harris, 2011; Wößmann, 2007).

Statutory Citizenship Task

In 2006, Dutch schools were required by law to enhance citizenship (Bulletin of Acts and Decrees, 2005). The formulation of this requirement reflects both the government's restraint in the normative domain, consistent with the freedom of education, and the spirit of the times. In the context of an increasingly multicultural society, citizenship is associated with the issue of declining social cohesion and desired assimilation of immigrants. Citizenship is defined as 'the willingness and ability to be part of a community and to make an active contribution to it', and the aim of including citizenship development in the remit of schools is to promote 'a common and shared perspective among young people on the contribution they can make to society as citizens (regardless of their ethnic or cultural background)' (Bulletin of Acts and Decrees, 2005). How schools subsequently pursue this aim is up to them, as long as they have a vision and plan for its implementation. They must also have insight into the outcomes of their efforts and the citizenship development of their students. From a legal standpoint, doing 'something' with citizenship and not inciting discrimination or extremist ideas is enough.

Unsurprisingly, the non-committal nature of the citizenship task given to schools does not lead to flourishing citizenship practices. In its annual education reports, the Education Inspectorate repeatedly notes that little progress has been made towards an 'explicit curriculum, with concrete objectives and corresponding activities' (e.g. Education Inspectorate, 2010). The Education Council of the Netherlands (2012) has therefore advised the government to provide more guidance: offer schools a content-based compass and define the citizenship task in further detail. Imparting knowledge about the democratic rule of law, promoting adherence to fundamental democratic values, and teaching students to act in a democratic society is a shared responsibility for all schools, regardless of their views or beliefs. Within this, there needs to be space to align teaching with schools' respective identities. However, a new updated Citizenship Education Act was not introduced until 2021 (Bulletin of Acts and Decrees, 2021). According to the new Act, schools must actively promote knowledge, attitudes, and skills relating to the basic values of our democratic state: freedom of speech, equality, tolerance and understanding for others, non-discrimination, individual autonomy, and a sense of responsibility. The school culture should reflect these values as well.

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

Lessons Learned

Paradoxically, greater government control takes place at a time when the same government has less monopoly and direct influence on public issues than before (Bauman, 2005). The shift from 'government' to 'governance' requires a broader set of policy tools (Zehavi, 2012). In addition to an updated legislative framework, education professionals must also be willing and able to contribute to the citizenship development of their students. This requires a delicate balancing act on the government's part (Waslander et al., 2016). Rules that are too strict can disrupt fragile capacity-building processes in schools, but overly generic rules or frameworks – or none at all – may not bring about any action towards improvement (Harris, 2011).

Overall, there are three lessons to be learnt from the Dutch situation with respect to effective government steering of citizenship education in a system with autonomous schools. First, it is important to have a common framework for all schools. With the 2021 introduction of the new statutory citizenship task, the Dutch government made schools responsible for actively promoting basic democratic values. If citizens do not identify with these values, a democratic society in which individual freedoms are protected both 'vertically' (in relation to the government) and 'horizontally' (in relation to fellow citizens) is not possible. Much can be said about the precise formulation of the Citizenship Education Act and the assumptions it contains regarding the position of ethnic minorities (see De Groot et al., 2022), but what matters here is that the government is striving for unity in diversity. A resilient democracy is home to a plurality of opinions and identities that must be able to coexist. Democratic core values provide the basis for this. They promote mutual trust and respect, which is crucial for a society based on solidarity. A statutory citizenship task for schools should aim to promote that, without prescribing or conceptualising one specific type of citizenship.

However, a common framework does not necessarily mean that schools and education professionals will be willing and able to take on the responsibility for citizenship in their local educational practice. Taking ownership presupposes that they have an understanding of what they want to teach their students and why, and that they can discuss this with each other and reach alignment (Dijkstra et al., 2021). If schools are to truly make a difference for their students while also compensating for social inequality, then it is necessary to invest in their professionalism and capacity. This is the second lesson that can be learnt from the Netherlands. Support for schools has thus far been minimal, with the exception of a few small local and private initiatives. There are few opportunities for professionalisation, no efforts are made to facilitate networks between schools, and time and resources to invest in school development are lacking. The implications of this are poor citizenship competences among students and growing inequality between tracks and students with different sociocultural backgrounds. The government's appeal to schools' organisational capacity pertains first and foremost to students' cognitive learning performance in traditional school subjects. In government supervision, schools bear primary responsibility for this and failure to comply has consequences. In the interests of fostering co-ownership of the citizenship task of schools and strengthening their development capacity, the government should focus on facilitating professional learning communities in which school leaders and teachers work together, ideally with researchers, so that scientific knowledge is used as well (see Schenke et al., 2016). In 2006, several knowledge institutions founded the Citizenship Alliance, in which they collaborate with a group of schools on the development of citizenship education in various contexts. In the alliance, a

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

great deal of attention has been devoted to creating a shared narrative on the importance of citizenship development and identifying ways to make adolescent citizenship visible.

This brings me to the third lesson. Evaluation and monitoring are important steering elements. Citizenship education is partly influenced by the degree to which the relevant outcomes are made visible and by any associated consequences (Ehren & Dijkstra, 2014; Hoek et al., 2022). At present, monitoring students' citizenship competences almost never happens in the Netherlands: not within schools, and not at the system level either. This affects the allocation of attention, time, and resources. Monitoring the outcomes of citizenship education is part of the government's system-level responsibility. Insight into outcomes not only provides input for central government control, but also stimulates innovation within schools. The government should also actively promote the development of evaluation tools that enable schools to monitor students' development in a way that suits them. Such tools would provide insight into the fulfilment of statutory requirements and societal expectations.

CONCLUSIONS

The government's primary task is to safeguard democracy and the rule of law. This implies care for shared democratic values that act as a social glue holding people and groups together. That includes enabling young people to be empowered and responsible citizens, respecting freedom and equality. Education is a key driver of this, all the more so because it serves as a socialising agent for all young people. In addition, adolescence is a stage of life in which devoting explicit attention to democratic education is especially important. It is during this period that the foundation is laid for later attitudes and orientations; these are less susceptible to influence in adulthood (Russo & Stattin, 2017). Young people's views on democracy are therefore a gauge of the democratic condition of our future society. Growing disparities and inequalities in young people's citizenship development are the metaphorical canary in the coal mine. They are a warning about the future of our democracy.

For government steering to be effective, it needs more than just enshrining a legal citizenship task and monitoring compliance. In keeping with the characteristics of complex networked societies, the government must also steer in a way that both allows and encourages schools and education professionals to take responsibility for fostering students' citizenship in their local educational practice and in their own way (cf. Waslander et al., 2020). Particularly in the area of citizenship education, there must be scope for personal interpretations. After all, room for diversity – including views on citizenship – is characteristic of a resilient democracy.

This chapter has described the citizenship competences of Dutch students in relation to the government policies pursued. Early selection for one of the externally differentiated or other tracks in secondary education, combined with the constitutional freedom of education with free school choice for parents and free curriculum design for schools, has a major influence on the relatively large disparities in citizenship outcomes. Government supervision of the quality of citizenship education in the school system has been minimal for years, resulting in a lack of integrated and school-wide approaches (Coopmans et al., 2020). The typically Dutch tension between central frameworks and freedom for school boards can be seen in several other countries as well (Datnow et al., 2006). The Dutch case shows that the government, in a complex networked society with a high degree of autonomy for school boards, can and should use both

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

direct and indirect ways of steering. Direct steering through legislation and system monitoring; indirect steering through the fostering of professionalisation and capacity-building.

What should citizenship education in schools focus on? In a general sense, education should contribute to students' ability and willingness to independently, meaningfully, and critically participate in real-world social practices and activities that make up democracy. In a previous study (ten Dam & Volman, 2007), we operationalised this in the form of four social tasks that can be considered exemplary of the daily citizenship practices of adolescents: acting democratically, acting in a socially responsible manner, dealing with conflicts, and dealing with differences. Learning to fulfil these tasks in a responsible and critical manner contributes to young people's identity development in the broad domain of citizenship. In particular, the ability and willingness to change perspectives and empathise with others is the social foundation of democratic citizenship. However, adolescents today are growing up not only in a plural society, but also in a fluid and increasingly uncertain world. This places further demands on their citizenship competences. In my opinion, 'dealing with uncertainty' is a new social task that should receive explicit attention in education. It can protect against polarisation within and between groups and organisations, thus strengthening democracy. But above all, it supports young people's resilience. In this day and age, the ability to deal with uncertainty is necessary in order to shape one's life course and do so in connection with others.

Finally, the government should not only play a major role in education but should also better embody a strong democracy itself. Both in the Netherlands and elsewhere (Cohen & Ladaique, 2018), recent decades have been marked by growing inequality in wealth and education and the dismantling of fundamental social rights and public services. Survey research shows that Dutch citizens' trust in the government has fallen significantly (Den Ridder et al., 2022). The 'gap' between politicians and citizens mainly concerns citizens with a low socio-economic status and migrants. Citizens' trust in the government is declining because the government fails to take into account the differences between citizens in terms of perceptions, motives, and capabilities. The political arena reflects a minimalist conception of democratic decision-making in which the majority vote counts, and little attention is paid to minorities. A resilient democracy should, above all, instil in everyone the confidence that they belong and that they matter.

NOTES

1. The selected countries were Belgium (Flanders), Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden (ICCS 2016), and Denmark, the German state of North Rhine-Westphalia, Norway, and Sweden (ICCS 2022).
2. The Human Development Index (HDI) was developed under the United Nations Development Programme and provides a summary of a country's status with respect to three key dimensions of human development: public health (average life expectancy), education level (illiteracy and participation in primary, secondary, and tertiary education), and standard of living (GNI per capita). The selected countries have scores in the highest HDI category (>0.90).
3. The Freedom in the World Index (Freedom House, 2023) and the Democracy Index (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2023) were used for this purpose. Both the Netherlands and the selected countries can be classified as 'full democracies'.

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

4. With effect from 2021, the procedure for establishing a new state-funded school has been adjusted so that the supply of schools can better adapt to the changing demands of society. It is now possible to start a school on the basis of pedagogical or other principles, rather than just on the basis of certain religious or philosophical beliefs.

REFERENCES

Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy. Participatory politics for a new age.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bauman, Z. (2005). *Liquid life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bell, C.A. (2009). All choices created equal? The role of choice sets in the selection of schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 84*, 191–208.

Biesta, G., & Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: Overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 36*(1), 63–79.

Bovens, M., & Wille, A. (2017). *Diploma democracy. On the tensions between meritocracy and democracy.* Utrecht/Leiden: NWO.

Burns, T., & Köster, F. (Eds.) (2016). *Governing education in a complex world*. Paris: OECD.

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Cleaver, E., Ireland, E., Kerr, D., & Lopes, J. (2005). *Citizenship education longitudinal study: Second cross-sectional survey 2004*. London: DfES.

Cohen, G., & Ladaique, M. (2018). 'Drivers of growing income inequalities in OECD and European countries', in R.M. Carmo, C. Rio, & M. Medgyesi (Eds.), *Reducing inequalities: A challenge for the European Union.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 31–43.

Coopmans, M., ten Dam, G., Dijkstra, A.B., & van der Veen, I. (2020). Towards a comprehensive school effectiveness model of citizenship education: An empirical analysis of secondary schools in The Netherlands. *Social Sciences, 9*(9), 157.

Daas, R., ten Dam, G., Dijkstra, A.B., Karkdijk, E., Naayer, H., Nieuwelink, H., & van der Veen, I. (2023). *Burgerschap in beeld. Burgerschapscompetenties en burgerschapsonderwijs in vergelijkend perspectief. Resultaten uit de ICCS 2022 studie* [Citizenship in focus. Citizenship competences and citizenship education in comparative perspective. Results of the ICCS 2022 study]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Datnow, A., Lasky, S., Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (2006). *Integrating educational systems for successful reform in diverse contexts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

De Groot, I., Daas, R., & Nieuwelink, H. (2022). Education for democratic citizenship in Dutch schools: A bumpy road. *Journal of Social Science Education*, *21*. https://doi.org/10.11576/jsse-5381

Deimel, D., Hoskins, B., & Abs, H.J. (2020). How do schools affect inequalities in political participation: Compensation of social disadvantage or provision of differential access? *Educational Psychology, 40*, 146–166.

Den Ridder, J., Miltenburg, E., Kunst, S., Van 't Hul, L., & Van den Broek, A. (2022). *Burgerperspectieven 2022 | bericht 1.* Den Haag: Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau.

Dewey, J. (1966) [1916]. *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.

Dijkstra, A.B., ten Dam, G., & Munniksma, A. (2021). 'Inequality in citizenship competences. Citizenship education and policy in the Netherlands', in B. Malak-Minkiewicz, & J. Torney-Purta (Eds.), *Influences of the IEA civic and citizenship education studies: Practice, policy, and research across countries and regions*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 135–146.

Dijkstra, A.B., Daas, R., Munniksma, A., & ten Dam, G. (2023). Citizenship in public, non-religious private and religious private schools. A comparison of student citizenship competences in Dutch secondary education. *Educational Review.* https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2203393

Eckstein, K., Noack, P., & Gniewosz, B. (2012). Attitudes toward political engagement and willingness to participate in politics: Trajectories throughout adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*, 485–495.

Economist Intelligence Unit (2023). *Democracy index 2022. Frontline democracy and the battle for Ukraine.* Economist Intelligence.

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

Ehren, M., & Dijkstra, A.B. (2014). 'Evaluation of social outcomes through school inspections', in A.B. Dijkstra & P.I. de la Motte (Eds.), *Social outcomes of education. The assessment of social outcomes and school improvement through school inspections.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 51–71.
Eurydice (2017). *Citizenship education at school in Europe*. Brussels: European Commission.
Freedom House (2023). *Freedom in the world 2023. Marking 50 years in the struggle for democracy.* Washington, DC: Freedom House.
Gainous, J., & Martens, A.M. (2012). The effectiveness of civic education. Are 'good' teachers actually good for 'all' students? *American Politics Research, 40*, 232–266.
Geboers, E., Geijsel, F., Admiraal W., & ten Dam, G. (2013). Review of the effects of citizenship education. *Educational Research Review, 9,* 158–173.
Geboers, E., Geijsel, F., Admiraal, W., Jorgensen, T., & ten Dam, G. (2015). Citizenship development during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 45*, 89–97.
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*, 711–729.
Glenn, Ch., & De Groof, J. (2002). *Finding the right balance: Freedom, autonomy and accountability in education, volume II.* Utrecht: Boom Juridische Uitgevers/Lemma.
Harris, A. (2011). System improvement through collective capacity building. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*, 624–636.
Hoek, L., Munniksma, A., & Dijkstra, A.B. (2022). Improving citizenship competences: Towards an output-driven approach in citizenship education. *JSSE-Journal of Social Science Education, 21.* https://doi.org/10.11576/jsse-4303
Hooghe, M., & Stolle, D. (2004). Good girls go to the polling booth, bad boys go everywhere: Gender differences in anticipated political participation among American fourteen-year-olds. *Women & Politics, 26*(3–4), 1–23.
Hooghe, M., & Dassonville, R. (2011). The effects of civic education on political knowledge. A two year panel survey among Belgian adolescents. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 23*, 321–339.
Hoskins, B., & Janmaat, J.G. (2016). Educational trajectories and inequalities of political engagement among adolescents in England. *Social Science Research, 56*, 73–89.
Hoskins, B., Janmaat, J.G., & Melis, G. (2017). Tackling inequalities in political socialisation: A systematic analysis of access to and mitigation effects of learning citizenship at school. *Social Science Research, 68*, 88–101.
Hoskins, B., & Janmaat, J.G. (2019). *Education, democracy and inequality: Political engagement, and citizenship education in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Hoskins, B., Huang, L., & Arensmeier, C. (2021). 'Socioeconomic inequalities in civic learning in Nordic schools: Identifying the potential of in-school civic participation for disadvantaged students', in H. Biseth, B. Hoskins & L. Huang (Eds.), *Northern lights on civic and citizenship education*. Cham: Springer, 93–122.
Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Education Inspectorate] (2010). *De staat van het onderwijs. Onderwijsverslag 2008/2009* [The state of education. Education report 2008/2009] Utrecht: Inspectie van het Onderwijs.
Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Education Inspectorate] (2016). *De staat van het onderwijs. Onderwijsverslag 2014/2015* [The state of education. Education report 2014/2015]. Utrecht: Inspectie van het Onderwijs.
Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Education Inspectorate] (2020). *De staat van het onderwijs. Onderwijsverslag 2018/2019* [The state of education. Education report 2018/2019]. Utrecht: Inspectie van het Onderwijs.
Isac, M.M., Maslowski, R., & Van der Werf, G. (2012). Native students' attitudes towards equal rights for immigrants: A study in 18 European countries. *Journal of Social Science Education, 11*, 7–27.
Janmaat, J.G. (2018). Educational influences on young people's support for fundamental British values. *British Educational Research Journal, 44*(2), 251–273.
Janmaat, J.G., & Hoskins, B. (2022). The changing impact of family background on political engagement during adolescence and early adulthood. *Social Forces, 101*, 227–51.

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

Janmaat, J.G., Mostafa, T., & Hoskins, B. (2014). Widening the participation gap: The effect of educational track on reported voting in England. *Journal of Adolescence, 37*, 473–482.
Knowles, R.T., Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. (2018). Enhancing citizenship learning with international comparative research: Analyses of IEA civic education datasets. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning, 13*, 7–30.
Lawy, R., & Biesta, G. (2006). Citizenship as-practice: The educational implications of an inclusive and relational understanding of citizenship. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 54*, 34–50.
Leenders, H., Veugelers., W., & De Kat, E. (2008). Teachers' views on citizenship education in secondary education in the Netherlands. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 38*, 155–170.
Levin, B. (2010). Governments and education reform: Some lessons from the last 50 years. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*, 739–747.
Levinson, M. (2010). 'The civic empowerment gap: Defining the problem and locating solutions', in R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth*. Hoboken, N.J: John Wiley & Sons, 331–362.
Lopez, M.H. (2003). *Electoral engagement among Latino youth*. College Park, MD: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
Maslowski, R., Werf, M.P.C.V. D., Oonk, G.H., Naayer, H.M., & Isac, M.M. (2012). *Burgerschapscompetenties van leerlingen in de onderbouw van het voortgezet onderwijs: Eindrapport van de International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) in Nederland* [Citizenship competences of pupils in lower secondary education: Final report of the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) in the Netherlands]. Groningen: GION.
Mennes, H.I. (2023). *Inequalities in education for democracy: Governance and supply of educational opportunities in the civic domain.* Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
Mourshed, M., Chinezi, C., & Barber, M. (2011). *How the world's most improved school systems keep getting better.* New York: McKinsey and Company.
Mulder, L., La Roi, C., Mennes, H., Van Alebeek, C., ten Dam, G., Van der Meer, T., & Van de Werfhorst, H. (2022). *Democratische kernwaarden in het voortgezet onderwijs. Adolescentenpanel Democratische Kernwaarden en Schoolloopbanen jaar 3 - 2020/2021* [Democratic core values in secondary education. Adolescent panel Democratic Core Values and School Careers Year 3 - 2020/2021]. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam.
Munniksma, A., Dijkstra, A.B., Van der Veen, I., Ledoux, G., Van de Werfhorst, H., & ten Dam, G. (2017). *Burgerschap in het voortgezet onderwijs. Nederland in vergelijkend perspectief* [Citizenship in secondary education. The Netherlands in comparative perspective]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
Munniksma, A., Daas, R., Dijkstra, A.B., & ten Dam, G. (2023). Is classroom diversity related to citizenship competences of ethnic minority and majority students? *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 48(1), 37–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2023.01.001
Neundorf, A., Smets, K., & García-Albacete, G. (2013). Homemade citizens: The development of political interest during adolescence and young adulthood. *Acta Politica, 48*, 92–116.
Neundorf, A., Niemi, R., & Smets, K. (2016). The compensation effect of civic education on political engagement: How civics classes make up for missing parental socialization. *Political Behavior, 38*(4), 921–949.
Nieuwelink, H., ten Dam, G., Geijsel, F., & Dekker, P. (2018). Growing into politics? The development of adolescents' views on democracy over time. *Politics, 38*, 395–410.
Nieuwelink, H., ten Dam, G., & Dekker, P. (2019). Adolescent citizenship and educational track: A qualitative study on the development of views on the common good. *Research Papers in Education, 34*, 373–388.
Onderwijsraad [Education council] (2012). *Verder met burgerschap in het onderwijs* [Taking citizenship further in education]. Den Haag: Onderwijsraad.
Oser, F., & Veugelers, W. (2008). 'Introduction', in F. Oser & W. Veugelers (Eds.), *Getting involved*. Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers, 1–13.
Payne, K. (2018). *The broken ladder: How inequality affects the way we think, live, and die*. New York: Penguin Press.

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

Putters, K. (2022). *Het einde van de BV Nederland. Over de noodzaak van een verhaal voor onze samenleving* [The end of the Dutch BV. On the need for a story for our society]. Amsterdam: Prometheus.
Ranson, S. (2003). Public accountability in the age of neo-liberal governance. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*, 459–480.
Ranson, S. (2012). Schools and civil society: Corporate or community governance. *Critical Studies in Education, 53*, 29–45.
Rest J.R., Narvaez, D., Thoma, S.J., & Bebeau, M.J. (2000). A Neo-Kohlbergian approach to morality research. *Journal of Moral Education 29*, 381–395.
Russo, S., & Stattin, H. (2017). Stability and change in youths' political interest. *Social Indicators Research, 132*, 643–658.
Sampermans, D. (2019). *The democratic school climate: Active citizenship at school*. Leuven: KU Leuven.
Sandel, M. (2020). *The tyranny of merit*. New York: Penguin Press.
Santizo Rodall, C.A., & Martin, C.J. (2009). School-based management and citizen participation: Lessons for public education from local educational projects. *Journal of Education Policy, 24*, 317–333.
Schakel, W. (2021). Unequal policy responsiveness in the Netherlands. *Socio-Economic Review, 19*, 37–57.
Schenke, W., Van Driel, J. H., Geijsel, F.P., Sligte, H.W., & Volman, M.L.L. (2016). Characterizing cross-professional collaboration in research and development projects in secondary education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 22*, 553–569.
Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *Initial findings from the IEA international civic and citizenship education study*. Amsterdam: IEA.
Schulz, W., J. Fraillon, J., Agrusti, G., Ainley, J., Losito, B., & Friedman, T. (2018). *Becoming citizens in a changing world. IEA international civic and citizenship education study 2016 international report*. Amsterdam: IEA.
Schulz W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., Friedman, T., & Damiani, V. (2023). *Education for citizenship in times of global challenge: IEA international civic and citizenship education study 2022 international report*. IEA.
Shehata, A., & Amnå, E. (2017). The development of political interest among adolescents: A communication mediation approach using five waves of panel. *Communication Research, 1,* 1–23.
'S Jongers, T. (2022). *Het Marathon interview*. 24 december 2022. NPO1, VPRO.
Bulletin of Acts and Decrees [Staatsblad van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden] (2005). Wet van 9 december 2005, houdende opneming in de Wet op het primair onderwijs, de Wet op de expertisecentra en de Wet op het voortgezet onderwijs van de verplichting voor scholen om bij te dragen aan de integratie van leerlingen in de Nederlandse samenleving [CE law]. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Staatsblad 2005, 678.
Bulletin of Acts and Decrees [Staatsblad van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden] (2021). Wet van 23 juni 2021 tot wijziging van een aantal onderwijswetten in verband met verduidelijking van de burgerschapsopdracht aan scholen in het funderend onderwijs [CE law]. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Staatsblad 2021, 320.
Stals, L., Isac, M.M., & Claes, E. (2022). Political trust in early adolescence and its association with intended political participation: A cross-sectional study situated in Flanders. *YOUNG, 30*(1), 110330882210770.
ten Dam, G., & Volman, M. (2003). A life jacket or an art of living. Inequality in social competence education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 33*(2), 117–137.
ten Dam, G., & Volman, M. (2004). Critical thinking as a citizenship competence: Teaching strategies. *Learning & Instruction, 14*, 359–379.
ten Dam, G., & Volman, M. (2007). Educating for adulthood or for citizenship: Social competence as an educational goal. *European Journal of Education, 42*, 281–298.
ten Dam, G., & Waslander, S. (2018). 'Sturen in samenspraak [Steering in dialogue]', in P. Slaman e.a. (Red), *In de regel vrij. 100 jaar politiek rond onderwijs, cultuur en wetenschap*. Den Haag: Ministerie van OCW, 341–361.

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat

Theisens, H., Hooge, E., & Waslander, S. (2016). Steering dynamics in complex education systems: An agenda for empirical research. *European Journal of Education 51*, 463–477.

Van der Meer, T.W., & Zmerli, S. (2017). 'The deeply rooted concern with political trust', in S. Zmerli & T.W.G. van der Meer (Eds), *Handbook on political trust*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 1–18.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L., & Brady, H.E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic volunteerism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waslander, S., Hooge, E.H., & Drewes, T. (2016). Steering dynamics in the Dutch education system. *European Journal of Education, 51*, 478–494.

Waslander, S., Hooge, E.H., Theisens, H.C., & Pater, C.J. (2020). Steering in complex education systems; Why similar aims can have dramatically different results. *Journal of Education Policy, 35*, 168–187.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*, 237–269.

Wößmann, L. (2007). International evidence on school competition, autonomy, and accountability. A review. *Peabody Journal of Education, 82*, 473–497.

Zehavi, A. (2012). 'New governance and policy instruments: Are governments going "soft",' in D. LeviFaur (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 242–254.

Geert ten Dam - 9781803928111
Downloaded from https://www.elgaronline.com/ at 06/23/2025 12:01:04PM by
g.janmaat@ucl.ac.uk
via g janmaat