



Education and Culture DG

With the support of
Lifelong Learning Programme

Peace and development education in the Netherlands



SHAPING CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Wilco Kalff 2011

Adapted and translated by Léon Beckx 2014



Content

Introduction

A 'Pedagogical task'

Views on citizenship education

'The color of the school'

'Colorful classroom'

'The competent citizen'

The meaning of citizenship for education

Practice: the implementation of citizenship education

What are the government's criteria for citizenship education?

What are the views and activities of schools in relation to citizenship education?

Examples of activities of schools in relation to citizenship education

Civics

Citizenship education between innovation and oppression

Concluding Remarks

References

Websites

Interviews

Other Resources



Introduction

Peace and development education consists of a wide and varied tapestry of practices made up of many individual threads that weave together. Instead of looking at all these separate practices we try to look at some common lines for best practices and methods available in the field of peace and development education. In the Netherlands peace and development education as a term and as a subject is not part of the regular school curriculum. Instead much of the content of peace education is reframed to citizenship education, which wants to prepare students for living in a diverse and pluralistic society. Although citizenship education is compulsory for schools, they have a lot of freedom as how they go about teaching citizenship to their students. As such, in this document will be exploring various viewpoints on citizenship education and how it is implemented in practice.

This document is an adaptation of a paper written by Kalff (2011) titled 'Starting with Citizenship: an exploration of citizenship education' and uses policy documents, scientific articles and interviews with schools, consultants and advisors to explore the developments in citizenship education.



A 'Pedagogical task'

"When a member of a well-regulated society shall comply to the obligations, which he as a man and as a citizen has to fulfill: so it is absolutely necessary that he, at first, understands the language of his country; secondly, that he knows how to convey his thoughts to others through writing. Third, that he is experienced in arithmetic in so far that, if need be, he's able to arrange his own affairs. Fourth, that he knows the duties, which he is indebted to the Supreme Being, himself and his fellow man. Fifth, that he is instructed in the constitutions, according to which the Society, in which he keeps his residence, is governed, to behave accordingly as a good citizen."

(from: General Notions of the National Education, 1796)

This report focuses on citizenship and peace education. In 1796 this was addressed on the one hand as knowing "the duties, which he is indebted to the Supreme Being, himself and his fellow man", and on the other knowing "the constitutions, according to which the Society, in which he keeps his residence, is governed, to behave accordingly as a good citizen." Between 1796 and 2015 society not only changed, but also the idea of citizenship. Social changes in society also resulted in social changes within schools. Individualization, globalization, and migration have increased the social and cultural diversity within society and "put pressure on the social cohesion and mutual involvement of citizens" (Bronneman-Helmers 2008:173). These changes are also visible in schools (ibid; Peschar 2010: 19-20). At the same time schools are expected to respond to the consequences of these changes, like intolerance or segregation. These expectations have especially grown since the 90's of the last century. These changes and expectations have led to an increased attention for the 'social function' of education (OR 2008: 9-10). Socialization is not the only goal of education.

Goal	Function
Contribute to personal development of students as part of their upbringing	Provide knowledge, skills and attitudes to manage and develop oneself in society (qualification)
Contribute to social and cultural development , partly as a preparation to future citizenship	Provide more or less common values that assist participation in society (socialization)
Prepare for employment and entering the workforce	Prepare for different positions in society by distinguishing pupils from each other, through selection groups (differentiation)



The degree in which education has complied with the above goals and functions differs per school and period. The school differences can be explained by the constitutional freedom of education. The variety per period relates to the economic, cultural, political and thus social changes within the society. In the 1970's the focus was on personal and social-cultural development. In the 1980's the emphasis shifted to the preparation for employment. In the 1990's there was a revaluating of the goals of the 1970's, culminating in a 'pedagogical task' of education – a mission voiced by the minister of education (1992) and supported by the *Platform Pedagogische Opdracht van het Onderwijs* (Platform Pedagogical Task of Education) (1993-1995). This platform pointed to the social changes and problems, but made no compulsory statements about values within education. Therefore the reappraising of the educational socialization in the 1990's didn't lead to big policy changes on schools. Ten years later these policy changes did happen. Schools had to make an active contribution to citizenship development. According to the WRR (The Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy) (2003) schools should have more room in their curriculum for the moral dimension of development, education and citizenship. This should apply to all citizens – *autochtoon* and *allochtoon*.

Allochtoon (plural: allochtonen) is a [Dutch](#) word (from [Greek](#) ἀλλόχθων, from ἄλλος (*allos*), other, and χθών (*chthōn*) earth/land), literally meaning "originating from another country". It is the opposite of the word *autochtoon* (in English, "autochthonous" or "autochthone"; from [Greek](#) αὐτόχθων, from αὐτός (*autos*), self and again χθών), literally meaning "originating from this country".

In the Netherlands (and Flanders), the term *allochtoon* is widely used to refer to immigrants and their descendants. Officially the term *allochtoon* is much more specific and refers to anyone who had at least one parent born outside the Netherlands.^[1] Hence, third-generation immigrants are no longer considered *allochtoon*. The [antonym](#) *autochtoon* is less widely used, but it roughly corresponds to *ethnic Dutch*. Among a number of immigrant groups living in the Netherlands, a "Dutch" person (though they are themselves Dutch citizens) usually refers to the ethnic Dutch.

Wikipedia

In 2005 this attention for citizenship resulted in the law 'Incentive active citizenship and social integration' that was to be implemented in education in 2006. This time citizenship is complemented with social integration. The 'pedagogical task' for education is described as follows: 'education assumes that students grow up in a plural (*pluriform*) society, and is partly focused on encouraging active citizenship and social integration and aims that students are knowledgeable of and have acquainted with diverse backgrounds and cultures of peers'. The goal of the law was twofold: to stimulate social cohesion and to emphasize Dutch culture. However the constitutional 'freedom of education' gives schools permission to adhere to this new pedagogical task according to their own views (Bronneman-Helmers 2008: 173-176).



Views on citizenship education

Citizenship in education is a complex concept that can be approached from different angles. In analyzing the current debate about citizenship Wilco Kalff (2012) talks about three fields. First on the level of the school there is much attention for the issue of **segregation in education** and the debate focuses on so-called 'white schools', 'black schools' and 'mixed schools'. Teachers, scientists and politicians are especially concerned about the opportunities for education and the social integration of ethnic minorities; particularly of students with an immigrant (*allochtoon*) background that are educated in the 'black' schools in the Netherlands. A strong segregation in education would endanger the social cohesion (Leeman 2001: 259-260). Secondly the diversity of the society also affects ethnic and social differences within a school. Within the classroom there is therefore a lot of attention for the **multi-cultural interaction** between students and between students and teachers. Finally, there is attention for the pupils: which **social skills** do students need to sustain and develop themselves in a multicultural society? And how can these students learn these social skills in a way that they can participate in society (Ten Dam 2002: 71)?

'The color of the school'

The concentration of ethnic minorities in large cities and in education could have a negative effect on the social integration and educational opportunities of these minorities; resulting in a deterioration of the social cohesion of the whole society. Furthermore the population growth of these 'foreigners' or 'new Dutch' is higher (20% between 1996 and 2000) than the population growth of the total population (2.5% between 1996 and 2000). Especially in primary or elementary education, this increase is visible. Schools where more than half of the students belong to ethnic minorities are labeled as 'black schools'. These occur mainly in the four major cities: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. In secondary education, the concentration of minorities on 'black schools' is not only based on the neighborhood of the school and the living environment of the learner, but also on the social environment and level of education of the pupil. In a large city like Amsterdam, besides the distinction between 'black' and 'white' schools, one can also distinguish between 'black' VMBO departments (lower vocational education) and 'white' VWO departments (pre-university education) (Leeman 2001: 259-264). This segregation can be explained in part by school choice processes by parents and the hiring and profiling policy of schools.

The effects of educational segregation are not unequivocal. In 1998, the inspectorate found that schools with many immigrant students had worse outcomes, based on academic performance and mobility prospects. Teachers at schools with many immigrant students have difficulty matching the material to diverse pupils. The schools themselves have difficulty finding and retaining good teachers. On the other hand, it is possible that schools with many immigrant students specialize in the collective needs like prior knowledge, language deficiencies, environment and upbringing of these students. For example, in the U.S. the positive approach of the 'black school' resulted in improvements to the learning environment. It is also possible that pupils with different levels of education can benefit from each other 'low achievers' benefit from their interaction with 'high achievers', and although the school performance of these 'high achievers' is not influenced by this interaction, they do practice their social skills (dealing with different students and levels) (ibid: 268-269).



There are several ways taken to reduce educational segregation and its effects. The effects of segregation can be addressed by the educational specialization of 'black schools', though this intervention will not solve the segregation itself. Contact between students on the basis of ethnicity, culture and level, is desirable to avoid the "physical segregation of minorities 'and the' symbolic exclusion of groups of pupils". Ethnically mixed schools already offer a context for inter-ethnic contact, but cannot guarantee "that this contact is also achieved in reality." Contact between 'white' and 'black' schools predominantly takes place in exchange projects, but in these contexts is the question whether such a project leads to a sustained contact between different students. Moreover, many of the interventions are incidental rather than structural.

The success of an interethnic school policy is determined not only by the extent to which the contact between students with different backgrounds is structural, but also by the extent to which this contact is equal. Yvonne Leeman and Laurenz Veendrick wonder whether "the realization of the multicultural society depends only on the efforts of immigrants." They reject the current vision on citizenship and integration that only seems to require adjustments on the side of the immigrants. Instead of an unequal adaptation of 'black' schools and their 'minority' students, we should strive for an equal and structural interaction between different types of schools and student populations.

'Colorful classroom'

The articles 'interaction in the multicultural classroom' (Hajer 2002: 126) and 'social competence in the multicultural society' (Ten Dam 2002: 72 and 78) criticize the one-sided vision of multiculturalism, integration and participation of minorities, and its effects on school and classroom. The focus is too much on adaptation and language impairments of 'immigrant' and 'vulnerable' youth. Instead, our attention should go to the social interactions and skills among *all* students in a class. Every student, teacher and school director, after all, is part of an interaction in which the meaning of integration and citizenship - as 'vague' directions in a changing discourse (driers 2008: 65) - is constantly being shaped. According to Geert ten Dam (2002: 79) schools should open their doors 'to include a variety of people and a cultural codes in their pedagogical space.'

From the school perspective we'll focus more on the perspective of the classroom. To highlight the perspective of the classroom we'll use ethnographic research. The conversation-analytical methods of ethnography make it possible, for example, to do research into the daily life in classes and on the importance of ethnic difference in those classes. It is not only important to consider the way in which students experience, think and communicate, but also the teacher and his students should be 'culturally competent' to 'fully understand the intentions of others' (Hajer 2002: 126-127).

Communication, especially intercultural communication is an important part of the interaction in the classroom. Differences in the classroom can be both an added value, as well as a hindrance. On the one hand a heterogeneous learning community enables students to learn from each other's experiences, habits, attitudes and values. On the other hand, there may be confrontations that affect the mutual tolerance and security within a class (Ten Dam 2002: 78). Maaïke Hajer (Utrecht 2003) states that teaching colorful classes especially asks every teacher to be aware of differences in knowledge, skills and support needs among pupils. It calls for more attention for the language in the classroom so that the material is more accessible and attractive. Teachers should also consider whether the western context of their



subject matters is understandable for students with a different background, or could adapt their explanations and tests to the prior knowledge that the diverse students already possess (Hajer 2002: 50). However, dealing with differences is not only an important didactic pedagogical goal in language focused vocational education, but also in the social skills of the students.

Developing social skills as 'dealing with differences' among pupils, is a difficult task for teachers and schools. Because of the gap between home and the school environments, students can not apply the skills they learned outside their school or classroom (Hajer 2009: 14). The community school model (Brede School) may be able to narrow this gap because of their emphasis on the integration of learning in the classroom with participating in society. A community school should not only focus on the extracurricular activities, but also on the social interaction within and outside the classroom. Learning as an end in itself is exchanged for learning in a meaningful context for the students. Geert ten Dam warns however that greater participation of students is not *the* solution. Striving for greater participation of especially immigrant youth implies the assumption that these young people - as deviations from a Dutch standard - do not participate and contribute to society. The idea of social participation is just as one-sided constructed like the idea of social integration, with a negative self-image of these young people as a result. The community school can close the gap between the family, the neighborhood and the school and thereby stimulate a meaningful development of social skills, if diverse categories of people and ideas are to be included in the pedagogical space of the school (Ten Dam 2002: 78).

Another problem is the gap between the academic and social goals of school education. The development of social skills in schools usually receive attention in the form of isolated projects, anti-bullying programs or cultural exchanges and excursions. During regular courses no explicit attention is paid to social skills, despite the fact that many courses teach students how they can (or should) deal with others. Furthermore, knowledge and skills are not learned 'by doing'. It is therefore a pedagogical (core) task of schools to pay explicit attention to (the reflection on) social skills in a way that contributes to the cohesion of knowledge, skills, cultural practices (at school or home) and identity development of the student (ibid: 76-77).

'The competent citizen'

Important social skills are known as social competences. Social competences are not a clear construct and are difficult to measure (ibid: 74). In 'Citizenship measured' (Ten Dam 2003) an attempt is made to improve clarity and measurability. The idea of social competence emerged from two traditions. From the psychological development perspective social competencies are related to (1) the development of a child, (2) the interaction between a child and others, and (3) the interaction of the child with the social demands placed on him or her. From the perspective of political participation and citizenship, young people are expected to function in a heterogeneous, democratic and multicultural society that requires some flexibility in 'choosing' behavior and capabilities. Both perspectives contain normative frameworks, but unlike the psychological approach, the political approach includes a 'chosen' normativity. All schools pay attention to both approaches, whether consciously or unconsciously. The developmental psychology perspective, however, is only relevant for schools when a student has social problems that hampers his cognitive development. In contrast, 'ought' schools to pursue the socio-political perspective in their education. Both approaches, however, hardly appear as educational goals (Ten Dam 2003: 24-32 and 129).



In the context of citizenship measurement tools have been developed, by amongst others the University of Amsterdam and the SLO (Dutch national expertise center for school curricula development), in which social competencies are made explicit and measured. Geert ten Dam (UVA) distinguishes in its *Measuring Instrument Citizenship* four competencies: democratic conduct, socially responsible action, dealing with differences, and dealing with conflict (Ten Dam 2010). This instrument was developed after an extensive review of more than eighty national and international instruments (Ten Dam 2003). Jeroen Bron (SLO) on the other hand has separated three distinct competencies based on the concepts of democracy, participation and identity (source 2010: 105). These competencies refer both to the role and participation of citizens in social and political structures as 'democracy' and 'society' and, secondly, to the personal identity of the citizen and his or her dealings with *the Other* - the fellow human with whom this citizen differs or with whom he or she has a conflict. The intrapersonal dimension is lacking on purpose, unlike the social and interpersonal dimensions, in both instruments.

According to Wiel Veugelers (2004: 362) these competencies and their underlying values demonstrate which type of citizenship is pursued there. He distinguishes three ideal types of citizenship, each comprising a different communication model.

Type of citizenship	Meaning and communication of values
Adaptive citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adaptation and disciplining • importance of shared values in the community, and the loyalty and obligations • transfer of fixed values for the purpose of formation of character and reproduction by students • no appropriation of values
Individual citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • independence and critical opinions • importance of individual development and self-awareness, and the freedom and autonomy that is needed • communication of values in favor of analytical, reflective and critical thinking by students • only focus on skills; no attention to values (or the Other)
Critical-democratic citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social involvement • importance of the active participation and involvement in social and political domain and the equal relations therein • stimulation and communication of changeable values for the benefit of developing students' values and meaning • focus on skills and values (and the Other)

Wiel Veugelers advocates 'for a critical democratic citizenship because today's society, which is characterized by individualization and globalization, calls for continuous value creation' and a joint (active and creative) design of standards (ibid: 368). In this way a balance is sought between the personal development of students (autonomy and critical thinking) and their social development and emancipation (ibid: 373). An education without value communication and stimulation only leads to the ability to judge others, while an education without attention for skills does not stimulate students to 'think independently and to act in accordance with the chosen values' (ibid: 363). An 'identity development which covers critical democratic citizenship thus relates both to values and skills' (ibid: 368).

DIVERSITY JOY



Skills of critical and democratic citizenship can also be linked to certain levels (ibid: 369-370). On the upper-school level, it is possible to take part in political activities. At the school level, it is possible to introduce methods of self-government for students, and practicing democratic decision-making processes. This is addressed as the school as a 'training ground' for civic processes. At the classroom level 'controversial subjects' can be explored through active and collaborative learning. The school then becomes a pedagogical space for reflection. Also the Education Council (2003) has developed several types of citizenship per level.

Level	Goal
School citizenship (micro level)	compliance with norms of civilized interpersonal exchange within the school community
Social citizenship (meso level)	able and willing to contribute in the form
Political or citizenship (macro level)	social and / or political participation

In other words, important to both 'to bring the world inside the school,' and also 'lead students to the world' (Ten Dam 2002: 77).

Citizenship does not only refer to skills and abilities, but also dimensions. Education policy makes a distinction between national, market and moral education ideology. In the Netherlands, the focus is especially on the economic orientation of the market and knowledge economy (Veugelers 2010: 49-50). This division in political, economic and cultural orientation we also find in the report of the MBO Council, which is the Netherlands Association of VET Colleges. This association represents all government-funded colleges for secondary vocational education and training and adult education in the Netherlands. The MBO Council made a distinction between socio-cultural (community involvement), political-legal (active contribution to the state), economic (active participation in employment and income) and vital (care for themselves) citizenship (MBO Council in 2010; Source in 2006: 7).

It is important to realize that none of the above forms of citizenship has a monopoly on the meaning of citizenship. Each selection of skills or competencies address a particular perspective on this topic. For schools it is therefore not only important to have an overview of the (communicative, social, political, democratic, economic, etc.) competencies of citizenship, but should, according to Veugelers (2004: 367), also be challenged to develop their own vision and policy on citizenship: **what is the 'ideal' student as a citizen for the school?** In addition, schools must realize that the pursuit of a collection of civic competences in education, directly intervenes on the identity development of young people, and that this identity is not unified, but rather a collection of several cultural orientations. Thus there are 'multiple identities of citizenship' (Veugelers 2010: 44).



The meaning of citizenship for education

We can conclude that the meaning of citizenship is unclear. Citizenship can be defined using different ideal types at different levels, in different dimensions and with different competencies. And even the meaning and focus of these competencies have proven changeable. Attention to language impairments of predominantly immigrant students resulted in a focus on language skills. Attention to the different backgrounds of students in a class resulted in a focus on intercultural competences of the teacher, and ultimately the student. Attention to cultural competence shifted to a focus on social, and citizenship competencies. For education for a renewed focus on citizenship especially means a renewed attention to the importance of social and interpersonal interactions between students and their environment on the one hand, and personal development and social opportunities on the other.

The focus on citizenship in education depends on the chosen competencies, the values and skills associated with them, and of the normative framework in which citizenship derives its meaning. This normative framework is primarily based on some social problems in society: the lack of integration, adaptation and educational disadvantages of 'ethnic minorities' in the Netherlands and of the immigrant (*allochtoon*) population in the big cities in particular. Choosing citizenship as educational purpose can therefore, especially on the basis of a nationalistic perspective on this issue, result in social exclusion. A normative framework that favors interaction rather than integration; equality instead of deprivation; and identity development instead of assimilation, however, offers the opportunity to take advantage of the diversity in the classroom and in the school.

Several initiatives, including the factors and conditions that determine the success of these initiatives have already been mentioned from this interaction perspective.

- the contact between pupils
- the widening of the school (community school)
- social skills training
- making social competencies explicit
- the communication and promotion of values
- the critical democratic citizenship

The success of citizenship education in schools depends not just on schools or governments themselves to show initiative in the development and implementation of several points, but also depends on the ability of policy-makers and educators to make a coherent whole of this series of initiatives.



Practice: the implementation of citizenship education

The meaning we give to citizenship finds its main expression in practice. How does the government (since the *Act Promoting active citizenship and social integration*) implement citizenship in schools? And how do schools go about this? What activities do schools already do that may be related to citizenship, and they do so consciously or unconsciously? Or perhaps they act according to what 'feels right'. The main question is whether the ideas of the government and education match, and how their implementations are assessed?

What are the government's criteria for citizenship education?

What are the government requirements for citizenship education and how will these requirements be checked, and experienced by the schools? The demands of the authorities are described in the report *Supervision of citizenship and integration of the Inspectorate of Education (2006)*. This report not only makes clear what the requirements are for citizenship education, but also what the quality should be. From 2006 schools have to adapt their citizenship education on "*risks and unwanted views, attitudes, behaviors of students about citizenship and integration*". Since 2008, schools must also have a vision and systematic interpretation of citizenship and integration. Other concerns of the inspectorate are the accountability of the school for the vision and implementation, and evaluation of the results of their citizenship education (ibid: 7).

The citizenship curriculum will be assessed on the following points (ibid: 8-9):

- the (structural) attention to and promotion of **social skills**
- the attention for and **openness towards society** and the diversity and engagement therein; brings students from different backgrounds in contact with each other and society
- the promotion of **basic values** and the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to participate in the **democratic constitutional state**
- the contribution that **school as 'training ground'** brings into practice for citizenship and integration

Although these requirements provide a first impression, the implementation of citizenship education by the government becomes even more apparent when we look at these basic social values. And what does this interpretation of the government say about the meaning they wish to convey to social competences and citizenship? And which type of citizenship does the government promote? The diagram below specifies the demands the Inspectorate of Education (2006) places on the schools in relation to citizenship education:

DIVERSITY JOY



Offer	Core goals education: <i>The student learns...</i>		Types of Citizenship
Social competence	35 (≈ care)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> care for themselves, others and their environment the safety of themselves and positively influence others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vital critical democratic
	36 (≈ opinion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to take a substantiated point of view and defend respectful dealing with criticism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> individualistic
Social competence and openness to society	36 (≈ community involvement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to ask meaningful questions about social issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social/civic critical democratic
	43 (≈ life styles)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> about similarities, differences and changes in culture and religion in the Netherlands own and other people's lifestyles the importance of respecting each other's views and lifestyles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sociocultural critical democratic
Openness to society	38 (≈ orientation and recognition)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using a contemporary image of their own environment, the Netherlands, Europe and the world in order to place phenomena and developments in their own environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social/civic
	47 (≈ conflict and cooperation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> placing current tensions and conflicts in the world seeing the impact of these on individuals and societies to see the interdependence in the world understanding the importance of human rights to see the significance of international cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> world political-legal moral critical democratic
Basic values and democratic state	44 (≈ democracy and participation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> how the Dutch political system operates as a democracy how people in different ways may be involved in political processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> political-legal state national critical democratic
	45 (≈ Europe)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> understand the importance of European cooperation and the EU itself, the Netherlands and the world 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> European political-legal economically
	Basic Values (≈ adaptive)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> freedom of speech equality tolerance autonomy reject intolerance reject discrimination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> political-legal moral critical democratic
School as a training site			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> school



In the above scheme - which is above all a tool - it is striking that the criteria or rather the desired competencies of the inspectorate can refer to many different citizenship types based on different sources as the Education Council and the MBO Council, and on distinctions between Dutch, European and global citizenship. Also, all three types of citizenship mentioned by Veugelers are present in the scheme.

Schools should not only promote these core values, but also to protect 'the teaching of the school is not in conflict with basic values and corrects violations of pupils systematically.' In other words, the fact that there are basic values that need to be promoted and protected, regardless of an individualistic or social-democratic interpretation of these values, relates to an adaptive type of citizenship. This assumption is confirmed by the following quote: "The school has a structural curriculum that focuses on the *transfer* of knowledge, attitudes and skills needed for citizens to participate in a democratic constitutional state..." So there is both an accommodating transfer of 'fixed' and 'shared' basic values, as well as an individualistic autonomy and critical opinions in the interpretation of government.

Special attention is given to *what* schools should do and what students should 'know', but *how* they can do that is largely left to the schools, because of 'freedom of education'. Also what pupils should be able to do is hardly mentioned. And this while the focus on social competences was the main reason for the government to establish the law Promoting active citizenship and social integration! Social competences are mostly explained as cognitive skills. The question is whether the government is aware of its unilateral appointment of cognitive skills.

From the theory it was concluded that citizenship is not an unambiguous, value free concept. The same applies to the interpretation of this concept in education. The significance of this concept differs per sector. The government aims explicitly for active citizenship, social inclusion and social participation. They have established some quality and curriculum requirements for this. In discussing the theory, however, it became clear that not integration and participation, but a policy focused on equality and interaction is desirable. And it became clear that citizenship could theoretically have different meanings. Citizenship can be interpreted and used in different ways. It is remarkable that citizenship within the educational practice has no concrete meaning. As we see next schools do not appreciate civic education that much, but emphasize the promotion of correct manners and conduct much more.

What are the views and activities of schools in relation to citizenship education?

Over 80% of schools have a vision on how to address the social mission of citizenship education, which they develop depending on the 'nature of the student population,' and the 'identity of the school' (Bronneman-Helmers, 2008: 182). We now take four schools under scrutiny regarding their views on citizenship. As will become clear, none of these schools has a specific policy or vision of citizenship.

Paul Scheltes (2011) says that there is no specific citizenship policy was shaped by **De Meergronden**, a secondary school in Almere, near Amsterdam. According to Scheltes, manners and conduct are especially important. The responsibility of the students to apply to these rules of engagement is also necessary when the relationship between teachers and students is informal. An example of this is a respectful way of addressing the teacher with his first name.



Rosanne Bekker (2011) also describes that the **Spinoza Lyceum**, a school for secondary education in Amsterdam, has no policy for citizenship. However, the deputy headmaster emphasized that the philosophy of Spinoza and the Dalton education are normative for the education policies, and therefore for citizenship education (Out 2011): the identity of the Spinoza thus largely determines the vision of citizenship. Bekker (2011) confirms that the Dalton principles are especially important in 'dealing with different levels' and with 'helpfulness towards others.' Both on De Meergronden and the Spinoza Lyceum there are no major conflicts. The question is whether this lack of conflict is consequence or cause of the lack of a policy vision of citizenship.

Gijs de Vries (2011) of **OSB** or Open Scholengemeenschap Bijlmer, a school for secondary education in Amsterdam SouthEast, associates citizenship with manners and mutual respect, as well as with rights and obligations. In addition, according to the website (Open Scholengemeenschap Bijlmer 2011: 'Our vision'), great attention is paid to cultural and educational differences, and cognitive and social skills. At the same time, there are no strict boundaries between teachers and the students. The teachers' room is open to pupils and manners and conduct are free.

Also on the **PNC** or Pieter Nieuwland College, a school for secondary education in Amsterdam, Jeroen van Morselt and Petra Krijnen (2011) made clear that manners, such as unwritten rules of behavior, are central to their citizenship vision. The manners are mainly borne by the 'atmosphere' and the positive influence (of new students) and correction (between students) on the PNC. As a result, there is, in spite of the mixed pupil population, no structural tension. It is only necessary to discuss manners and conduct when there are disturbances, such as fights. They also mentioned that the school's atmosphere was somewhat disturbed by recent renovations and relocations. There clearly was a lack of a 'common' space, such as an auditorium. The renovations had made the students 'restless'. The school brochure of the PNC (2011: 4 and 16-17), however, makes clear that not only the atmosphere is important, but also dealing with cultural differences and the responsibilities as a citizen.

Even more than on de Meergronden and the Spinoza Lyceum, the OSB and the PNC have to deal with major cultural differences in their schools. Structural conflicts, however, do not appear according to the teachers. Question is therefore whether the diversity of the student population is a reason (or condition) for schools to develop a policy on citizenship. Diversity of the pupils or identity of the school can, on the other hand, affect the interpretation of the concept citizenship in practice.

More than a concrete vision on citizenship, schools profile themselves with their activities inside and outside the school: from exchanges and school trips to internships and sports. Schools present themselves as 'more than just a school', as umbrella terms such as '*OSB Broad*' (Open Scholengemeenschap Bijlmer 2011: 'OSB Breed ') and '*Meergronden More*' (De Meergronden 2011: 27) indicate. Examples of these different activities carried out by schools are European International Orientation, Civic Internship, International Award for Young People, debate contests, Mentor program, Project 'ID', conversation circles and mediation training. More specifically in Project 'ID' of the PNC pupils go to an outside art center for a week to participate in a range of workshops, such as poetry, yoga, clothes making, etc. In this week they work on their identity and in the end they have translate their exploration in an art form, such as a poem or painting.



Examples of activities of schools in relation to citizenship education

The "ID" project offers many connections with social skills. Students work on identification processes and social and community issues are the means to do so. A theme is chosen, to which belong certain values. Whether fixed values are transferred, or inherent values that are communicated and promoted, is still a question. The process takes place in an environment in which students talk to each other and listen to each other. This not only addresses the identity of the individual, but also the group's cohesion. Nevertheless, the social competences are not explicitly named to the student. The question is whether this would be desirable and beneficial.

Another element is the **consistency** within the regular and vocational education. Precisely because most projects are incidental, they are rarely framed in the regular curriculum. The "ID-project" is a possible exception, because before the start of the project week different subjects relate to the week.

Another project is the **civic internship**, which mostly mean that students do some kind of voluntary work. This civic internship is for none of the four schools a major part of the curriculum. On de Meergronden it is perceived as an activity "next to" the teaching that the pupil follows at school. At PNC, the civic internship only took the shape of an "orientation day". Although research has shown that schools have a greater interest in the civic internship- as a means to allow the student to work with others, to develop social skills, and to get acquainted with volunteering (Bronneman-Helmers, 2008: 185) - then expected, it is not yet clear how the training is valuable, and whether it should explicitly be linked to school education: performance on the stage, reflection on school (Peschar 2010: 43). At the four schools it has not been a major topic of discussion, which possibly implies a low value for their educational practice.

A more structural approach to citizenship education is particularly reflected in the **mentorship**. Mentor classes will not only address study skills, but also social skills. Especially the first years of pupils at schools there is intensive guidance in mentoring.

On the OSB there is almost daily contact between the mentor and his students. This contact is not only created by the mentor lessons (1 to 2 times per week), but also by the subjects that the mentor teaches. On the OSB mentors are expected to teach several subjects, so that the contact between mentor and student is frequent. The mentor on the OSB is responsible not only for the individual support of students, but also for cooperation between pupils. At the beginning of the school year, the mentor makes groups of four students, working together in the same composition in each subject. The OSB has chosen to put heterogeneous groups together; notably on the basis of gender, ethnicity and level.

The OSB contains a large degree of diversity. According to De Vries it therefore important that students work with different ethnicities and backgrounds. This prevents students with the same ethnicity always huddling together. Opposition to the composition of heterogeneous groups is not that big. It is perceived as normal by the students. It not only requires students to 'work together' and 'dealing with difference', but it also requires from teachers that they can teach differentiated and communicate intercultural, and from mentors that they can accompany these heterogeneous groups. The internal development of mentorship has translated into an 'OSB mentormap' (ibid). At a time when the school went through a huge growth, the mentormap offered support and tools for teachers to fill their mentor classes (Hoedemaker 2011).



Recently, this OSB mentormap has been traded by the *Lifestyle method*. Although the Lifestyle method overlaps with our own OSB method, the new method is not used optimally. Bernard Kuitwagen (2011), teacher at the OSB, shared that regular classes last 45 to 55 minutes, but the training instructions of Lifestyle are based on a 60 minute lesson! In addition, the effective working time can be half of a lesson or even less. A successful translation of a method to the school practice is not only dependent on the teacher, but also the flexibility of the methods. Customization and 'small' exercises are desirable (ibid).

The mentor not only takes a central place on the OSB. Also on de Meergronden new pupils are intensively monitored. Here they chose for the *Kanjertraining*. This 'Hunk'-training consists of a series of lessons with accompanying exercises to keep the good atmosphere in the classroom (preventive) or improve (curative) it. The Kanjertraining began in 1996 as a parent-child training. Meanwhile, the training has become a full-fledged method for primary and secondary education, and pursues the following objectives:

- The promotion of confidence and security in the classroom.
- The strengthening of social skills in students.
- Control of various solution strategies in bullying and other conflicts.
- Awareness of identity among students.
- Learn to take responsibility.
- Promoting active citizenship and social integration.

According to Paul Scheltes (2011) the effectiveness of the Kanjer-method does not only depend on the flexibility and accessibility of the methods offered in the method, but also the enthusiasm of the teacher and the disciple, "you have to believe in it" (ibid).

Besides mentoring, some schools also offer a mini-mentoring, in which it is not the teacher who coaches the students, but the students themselves! Mini-mentoring is a very popular at the Spinoza Lyceum. About twenty students are mini-mentor. The popularity and success of the mini-mentoring is not only based on the mediation training that these pupils receive, but also on the low threshold between the senior mini-mentor student, and the younger mentor students. A mini-mentor does not work independently, but, if necessary, is asked by the teacher-mentor (Bekker 2011).

Civics

So far, the focus on school activities led us to social training, socio-cultural projects and mentoring methods. These forms of education mainly relate to social and socio-cultural skills. To what extent these forms of education also relate to citizenship skills is still questionable. It is clear that citizenship is not an end in the "ID" project of the PNC, the mentorship of the OSB, de Meergronden or the mini-mentorship of Spinoza. Civic education on the other hand will be reflected in the **civics** course (*maatschappijleer*). This course has, since its creation in the early seventies, been subject to many changes. The content of civics changed from themes to domains such as parliamentary democracy, welfare and plural society. History instructors first gave the subject in addition to their core subject; now it is taught by special civics teachers. The evaluation of the course also changed: Civics became part of the exams. On the one hand, the examination was a "salvation" of the profession, on the other hand, this 'formalization' meant a shift towards the cognitive skills of the profession: 'testing of attitudes was not considered possible' (Bronneman-Helmers, 2010: 183). The question is to what extent a cognitive approach of the domains -



and the basic values that underlie them – provide a suitable platform for the development of social skills. Strikingly in the interviews on the four schools, this subject was barely mentioned.

Citizenship education between innovation and oppression

It has become clear *how* schools pay attention to social skills. The question of *why* schools pay attention to these skills is initially answered by the importance of manners and conduct. It is clear that the mentioned mentoring programs and projects do not refer directly to citizenship education. A lack of a concrete vision of citizenship underlies them. Affirming the identity or the promotion of cultural expression and social involvement of students, as shown in the "ID" project, can be an important motivation for a school to focus on social competences. Not the educational visions of citizenship determine the focus and activities for the promotion of social skills, but 'intuitive' and / or 'methodical' attention to manners and conduct or processes of identification, collaboration and social involvement. Also when it comes to peace and development education, the vision and goals need to be translated to the everyday context and needs of the schools. When the distance of between policy and practice becomes to big the motivation for the implementation seem to suffer.

The importance of motivation for implementation is confirmed also by the teachers themselves. Paul Scheltes (2011) pointed out the importance of motivation. Thus, the effectiveness of the Kanjer-training or preparing a debate competition depends on the enthusiasm of teachers and students. How can different methods, instruments and competency frameworks as described in this chapter contribute? What value teachers attach to this? It has become clear that teachers do not initiate social activities at school from the pursuit of 'active citizenship and social integration'. They promote these activities for social cohesion and identification processes, but also for social skills such as cooperation and dealing with differences or conflicts. According to Geert ten Dam (2011), it is especially important that schools, choose a particular competency direction, from their own vision and motivation. However, choosing a particular direction depends on the knowledge teachers have about social competences, and civic education, their vision on citizenship and the normative framework, their motivation and coordinating capacity to carry out this vision, and the methods and resources that are available for this purpose.

Concluding Remarks

In this paper we intended to give an overview of peace and development education in the Netherlands. We re-framed this subject to the more relevant citizenship education. It became clear that citizenship education is a field with many views –and underlying basic values. Also the translation from policies to the implementation in the educational practice is not self-evident. This is in part because the policies and guidelines are mostly framed as cognitive skills. This leaves schools to manifest social competences as they see fit. Different methods exist, such as Lifestyle or the Kanjer-training, but their effectiveness depends much more on the motivation of the teacher and his/her circumstances than on methodological differences.



References

- Source, J. en E. van Vliet, Het ontwikkelen van een kernleerplan Actief burgerschap en sociale integratie voor het algemeen vormend onderwijs (SLO: 2009) Paper ORD 2009.
- Source, J., 'Het leerplan burgerschap in ontwikkeling', in: J. Peschar e.a. (red.), Scholen voor burgerschap (Apeldoorn 2010).
- Source, J., 'Voorstel voor een kernleerplan', in: J. Peschar e.a. (red.), Scholen voor burgerschap (Apeldoorn 2010).
- Source, J., 'Een agenda voor de toekomst: op weg naar een kennisbasis voor burgerschapsonderwijs', in: J. Peschar e.a. (red.), Scholen voor burgerschap (Apeldoorn 2010).
- Bronneman-Helmers, R., 'Burgerschapsvorming in het onderwijs', in: P. Schnabel e.a. (red.), Betrekkelijke betrokkenheid: studies in sociale cohesie (Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2008) (Den Haag, 2008).
- Dam, G. ten, 'Sociale competentie: reddingsvest of levenskunst', Pedagogiek 20:2 (2000).
- Dam, G. ten, 'Sociale competentie in de multiculturele samenleving', Pedagogiek 22:1 (2002).
- Dam, G. ten, e.a., Sociale competentie langs de meetlat (Den Haag 2003).
- Dam, G. ten, e.a., 'Burgerschapscompetenties: de ontwikkeling van een meetinstrument', Pedagogische Studien 87 (2010).
- Deelen-Meeng, L. van, e.a., Leerlingen in contact: uitwisselingen tussen scholen in het kader van burgerschapsvorming (CPS: Amersfoort 2010).
- Droogers, A., 'Integratie? Een pleidooi voor een alternatieve cultuurvisie', Pedagogiek 28:1 (2008).
- Ebbens, S. en S. Ettekooven, Effectief leren: basisboek (Groningen 2009).
- Enslin, P. en K. Horsthemke, 'Can ubuntu provide a model for citizenship education in African democracies?', Comparative Education 40:4 (2004).
- Inspectie van het Onderwijs, Toezicht op burgerschap en integratie (Den Haag 2006).
- Kalff, W., Beginnen met burgerschap: een verkenning van burgerschapsonderwijs (Interfacultaire Lerarenopleiding; Amsterdam 2011). MBO Raad, Loopbaan en burgerschap (Bunnik 2010).
- Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, Onderwijs met ambitie: samenwerken aan kwaliteit in het Voortgezet Onderwijs (Den Haag 2008) Kwaliteitsagenda Voortgezet Onderwijs 2008-2011.
- Onderwijsraad, Onderwijs en maatschappelijke verwachtingen: advies (Den Haag 2008).
- O'Reilly, K., Ethnographic methods (Londen 2005).
- Hajer, M. e.a., 'Interactie in de multiculturele klas: inleiding op het themadeel', Pedagogiek 22:2 (2002).
- Hajer, M., Op zoek naar docentcompetenties in de multiculturele klas (Utrecht 2002) Brochure Programmamanagement EPS.
- Hajer, M., Kleurrijke gesprekken: interactie in een multiculturele school (Utrecht 2003) Lectoraat Lesgeven in de multiculturele klas, Hogeschool van Utrecht.
- Leeman, Y. en L. Veendrick, 'De kleur van de school: inleiding op een serie artikelen over etnische concentratie binnen het onderwijs', Pedagogiek 21:3 (2001).
- Peschar, J., e.a. (red.), Scholen voor burgerschap: naar een kennisbasis voor burgerschapsonderwijs (Apeldoorn 2010).
- Roede, E. e.a., Kiezen voor sociale competentie: een keuzegids (Amsterdam 2005) SCO-Rapport 738.
- SLO, Jonge burgers: een basis voor burgerschap (SLO Projectgroep Burgerschapsvorming: Enschede



2006).

- Veugelers, W., 'Waardevormend onderwijs en burgerschap', *Pedagogiek* 24:4 (2004).
- Veugelers, W., 'Denken over burgerschapsvorming', in: J. Peschar e.a. (red.), *Scholen voor burgerschap* (Apeldoorn 2010).

Websites

- Diversity Joy, Presentatie E-motive (Den Haag 2008)
<http://www.diversityjoy.nl/index.php?sid=26&l=eng>.
- Diversity Joy, 'Het verschil' (2011) <http://www.diversityjoy.nl/index.php?sid=170&l=eng>.
- Open Scholengemeenschap Bijlmer, 'Onze visie' (2011)
<http://www.openschoolgemeenschapbijlmer.nl/index.php?hash=db677740dcdbca7cf309eaeff310a4a2&type=2&menuid=99>.
- Open Scholengemeenschap Bijlmer, 'Onderwijspraktijk' (2011)
<http://www.openschoolgemeenschapbijlmer.nl/index.php?hash=98e9a3d3064f361e20e40cf75cd5b544&menuid=101&type=2&refid=161.65>
- Open Scholengemeenschap Bijlmer, 'OSB-Breed' (2011)
<http://www.openschoolgemeenschapbijlmer.nl/index.php?hash=f4f8a1daed38f5b6c3affbcfb9aeba38&type=2&menuid=217>.
- OSG De Meergronden, 'Schoolgids 2010-2011' (2011)
<http://www.xs4all.nl/~kbeenken/meergronden/schoolgids.pdf>.
- Pieter Nieuwland College, 'Schoolgids 2011-2012' (2011)
http://www.pieternieuwland.nl/hetpnc/schoolgids/2011_schoolgids.pdf.
- Rijksoverheid, 'Wat is competentiegericht onderwijs (cgo) in het middelbaar beroepsonderwijs (mbo)?' (2011) <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/vragen-en-antwoorden/wat-is-competentiegericht-onderwijs-cgo-in-het-middelbaarberoepsonderwijsmbo.html>.
- Spinoza Lyceum, 'Dalton op het Spinoza' (2011) <http://www.spinozalyceum.nl/dalton.html>.
- Spinoza Lyceum, 'Sterke punten' (2011) <http://www.spinozalyceum.nl/spinoza/sterkepunten.html>.

Interviews

- Bekker, R., Interview gehouden op 24-01-2010 te Amsterdam, Spinoza Lyceum (2011).
- Source, J., Interview gehouden op 28-01-2011 te Veenendaal (2011)
- Dam, G. ten, Interview gehouden op 25-01-2011 te Amsterdam, ILO (2011).
- Deelen-Meeng, L. van, Interview gehouden op 02-02-2011, per telefoon (2011).
- Hoedemaker, W., Informatie verkregen op 03-02-2011, per email (2011).
- Kruitwagen, B., Oriënterend gesprek gehouden op 01-02-2011 te Amsterdam, Open Scholengemeenschap Bijlmer (2011)
- Morselt, J. van en P. Krijnen, Interview gehouden op 13-01-2011 te Amsterdam, Pieter Nieuwland College (2011).
- Out, M., Oriënterend gesprek per telefoon (2011).



- Scheltes, P., Interview gehouden op 01-02-2011 te Almere, OSG De Meergronden (2011).
- Vries, G. de, en W. Aerns, Interview gehouden op 01-02-2011 te Amsterdam, Open Scholengemeenschap Bijlmer (2011).

Other Resources

- Diekstra, R. en C. Gravesteijn, Levensvaardigheden: docentenboek (NIGZ: Woerden 2008) Inhoudsopgave.
- Edu'Actief, Leefstijl VSO Klas 1 (2011) Proefles.
- OSG De Meergronden, Kanjer Ontwikkellijnen (2011) Rubric.
- SLO, Doorlopende leerlijn vaardigheden in de Mens en maatschappijvakken (2009) PO – HAVO/VWO.
- Spinoza Lyceum, Dalton Leerlijnen (2011) Leerdoelen leerjaar 1-6.