Programa Marco *Inter*universitario para una Política de Equidad y Cohesión Social en la Educación Superior

Inter-university Framework Program for Equity and Social Cohesion Policies in Higher Education

riaipe 3

REPORT INFORME

2011

UN. OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES UTRECHT | UN. OF AMSTERDAM

INSTITUCIONAL NETHERLANDS

21.12.2010 to 20.12.2013

EuropeAid/ 129877/ C/ ACT/ Multi

A project implemented by COFAC/ ULHT
This project is funded by the European Union. ec.europa.eu

Red RIAIPE 3

The construction of a Interuniversity Framework Program for Policies of Equity and Social Cohesion in Higher Education, co-funded by the European Union Alpha Program, throughout 2011/ 2013 represents a major challenge for the Riaipe3 Network.

A project brought up to light in 2006 by Researchers teams from numerous Universities throughout Europe and Latin America.

The work starting point of RIAIPE 3 Network was the necessity to build an alternative to education policies of the neoliberal agenda where knowledge is perceived as commodities.

Such Neoliberal policies had very strong impact both in Latin America and in Europe.

To that point of view, RIAPIE 3 retorts with an innovative project of education for all, a project able to accomplish in its structure cohesion and social justice.

As there can be no social justice without cognitive justice, higher education has a privileged place in this historic process of building a more "rounded and less edgy" society, in the good words of Paulo Freire.

We are facing challenging times, where citizen's intervention is particularly decisive, no matter the subject.

This is our playing field, that of social scientists: the construction of an education (higher) capable of generating social emancipation, beauty and happiness.

António Teodoro
General Coordinator RIAIPE3 network

PROGRAMA ALFA DE LA UNIÓN EUROPEA PARA AMÉRICA LATINA

PROGRAMA MARCO INTERUNIVERSITARIO PARA UNA POLÍTICA DE EQUIDAD Y COHESIÓN SOCIAL EN LA EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR

REPORTE INSTITUCIONAL

3

Equipo de investigación

Wiel Veugelers (Coordinador)

INPUT FOR THE PROGRAM RIAIPE3

In this paper I bring together three practices of educational change processes relevant for our initiatives in changing higher education. I have been involved in these practices as organizer and researcher.

The selection for these practices have been in a meeting with Ivor Goodson (University of Brighton) and Elsa Estrella (Program Manager RIAIPE3) February 2011 in London. With Ivor Goodson these practices and the possibilities for RIAIPE3 have also been discussed in a meeting in Utrecht, May 2011.

The first case is about creating networks of schools. In these networks an university works together with schools to support each other in changing education. These networks are an example of bottom-up collaboration that tries to empower schools, create educational communities, link schools and university and tries to counterbalance top-down educational policy. A network can choose for a particular educational vision. In our case a critical pedagogy oriented to democratic citizenship.

The second case is a transition program for students of secondary education to enter university. The program tries to help students from non-academic milieus to get familiar with university life and to enhance their social capital needed for academic and social life in universities.

The third case is about recent policy and practice on citizenship education, in particular on implementing a more critical-democratic oriented citizenship education. Constraints for this kind of education in policy, schools and in academic discourses are analyzed. New possibilities for a more democratic and dialogical education are developed.

1. NETWORKS OF SCHOOLS AND CONSTRUCTING CITIZENSHIP

For changing upper secondary education in the Netherlands and for the collaboration of schools and university, we stimulate bringing schools together in networks. Schools learn from each other, analyze each other's practices, develop various joint initiatives, and try to influence together educational policy. In this article we will present our experiences and analyze critical elements in creating and sustaining networks. We will focus on the political, cultural and educational climate that stimulates starting networks, the rise and fall of networks, the internal structure of the network, me pedagogical identity of the network and in particular the kind of citizenship we want to develop.

Adapted from Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (2004). Networks of Schools and Constructing Citizenship in Secondary Education, In Hernandez, F. & Goodson, I.F. (Eds.) Social Geographies of Educational Change Dordrecht/ Boston/ Londen: Kluwer Academic Press

INTRODUCTION

For restructuring upper secondary education in the Netherlands, we stimulate bringing schools together in networks. Schools learn from each other, analyze each other's practices and develop various joint initiatives. In this article we will present our experiences and analyze critical elements in creating and sustaining networks. In particular we will focus on the following issues:

(1) The political, cultural and educational climate and the rise and fall of networks: What political, cultural and educational developments stimulate the arising of school networks? What are positive impulses and negative constraints? The development of our and similar networks in the Netherlands will be analyzed.

(2) The internal structure of the network: What are the internal structural characteristics of school networks? Our network aims for a shared ownership and actual participation of both schools and university at all levels. An important question is how to keep the network a flexible organization and at the same time structure the network and network participation (Veugelers & Zijlstra, 1998a)?

(3) Identity of the network: Like schools, a network has its own educational philosophy. This philosophy will at the same time steer the activities of the network and will become concrete in practice. This philosophy binds the participants and creates an outer world. According to us one learns in a network a lot from differences. What is the balance between differences in the network and the own identity of the network?

(4) Network participants and the other members of the school: Networks, as we organize them, can create an aristocracy of involved and powerful members. Even when a network promotes democratic education in which it emphasizes the empowerment of teachers, students and parents, the effect in practice may be that it empowers an elite in the schools. Lieberman (1996) speaks of in- and outsiders. What kind of activities in schools can enhance the participation of all members in school development?

THE POLITICAL, CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL CLIMATE

We begin with analyzing the political, cultural and educational climate in which our school network started.

Growing up in Modern Society

Growing up in modern society demands of youngsters that they have different knowledge, skills and attitudes than before (Beck, Giddens & Lash, 1992). The amount of knowledge is growing rapidly; in a formal way it is easier to get entrance to knowledge. But getting access to knowledge is not the same as getting a more theoretical insight into knowledge. Students have to learn to construct their own working theories; they have to give their own meaning to the outer world. The growing amount of knowledge and the fast changing character of knowledge, asks for youngsters who can construct their own meaning and can build their own theory. In these construction processes, they use the cultural notions and commodities they find in their surrounding world and in the media. In giving a personal and authentic meaning to their life, they position themselves in their social world.

But in modern society, youngsters also have to find a way to adapt and to participate in social processes: in their own community and in the global world. However, both these communities and the global world are changing rapidly. Through the growing mobility of people, both the local communities and the global world are becoming more divers, even if there are still processes of cultural and ethnic segregation. Modern society needs citizens that contribute actively to maintaining and transforming society. In present-day society, youngsters have a greater responsibility for finding their own way in the social world. But this responsibility is not a choice: to survive in society means to get actively involved, to take your own responsibility (Dieleman et al. 1999).

Bringing Ideology Back into the Educational Discourse

To a certain extent, the described development of society and identities seems a natural process. A process that has its own logic and that is not based in different ideologies. However, ideologies give their own signification to the more general trend, they propose their own solutions and their own educational philosophies. For understanding the relation between educational change and identity development, we use the concept of citizenship (Giroux, 1989; Van Gunsteren, 1992; Turner, 1993). We distinguish three main types of citizenship: the adapting citizen, the individualized citizen, and the critical-democratic citizen (Veugelers, 2000; 2001). In the vision of the adapting citizen, a person has to accommodate to society and the traditional values society tries to maintain. Changes in society are at best incorporated in traditional ways of life. The local community is celebrated, and in education the emphasis is on the traditional curriculum and on character education.

In the vision of the individualized citizen, society is a liberal market in which each idea and every person has to find his own way. The individual has his own responsibility and is accountable for its competences. It is a technical rationality based in a liberal philosophy. In education, it emphasizes choice, individualization, self-regulation and accountability. The vision of the critical-democratic citizen tries to combine individual and social development. A person is seen as a social being that actively participates in society and is critically engaged in the transformation of the community, in working with cultural differences. In this, a balance has to be found between personal development and social commitment and emancipation. The educational foundation for critical-democratic citizenship is critical pedagogy or critical theory and certain forms of cooperative learning and moral education. For education for Democratic citizenship see for example Goodman (1992), Apple & Beane (1995) and O'Hair, McLaughlin & Reitzug (2000).

Educational Policy and Citizenship Development

Of course, in the concrete educational policies of governments, schools or teachers, one will not recognize these three types of citizenship in their pure forms. One will always see a specific articulation. We believe that at present in the philosophy of the policymakers the individualized citizen is the dominant form in the western world, but elements of the adapting citizen and the critical-democratic citizen are also part of that educational policy. We will describe the educational philosophy as it has been worked out in senior secondary education in the Netherlands.

From the vision of individualized citizenship it borrows:

- Stimulation of self-regulation of the students' learning processes;
- Support for individual learning routes and flexibility;
- Focus on learning skills;
- Stimulation of the use of information technology;
- Measuring student development on 'objective' assessment.

From the educational view of the adapting citizen it retains:

- The emphasis on traditional subjects;
- Traditional methods of assessment;
  Disciplinary practices;
- Keeping control over schools, educational goals and the learning process of students;
- Conformity to local community.

From the critical-democratic view, it incorporates to a certain extent ideas of:

- Authentic learning with space for personal signification processes and extracurricular activities;
- Critical thinking, but often in a formal - value-neutral way - not in a transformative way;
- Cooperative learning as a way to learn to work together;
- Attention for cultural differences.

These ideas on changing education show many similarities with the restructuring movement in the USA (Newmann, 1993; Lieberman, 1995). They have the same broad scope of theoretical possibilities; central in them is the more active learner and a constructivist vision on learning. But concrete educational policy practices may still differ a lot from the more idealistic vision. The policy can even be to some extend different from the philosophy. Schools in the Netherlands have the freedom, within certain boundaries, to work out their own interpretation of national policy. They can, for example, focus more on the adaptive perspective, or they can emphasize more the critical-democratic perspective.

MANAGING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Similar Processes at Different Levels

In education, government sets out a cultural policy in which it steers the development of certain educational practices. To a certain extent it is a top-down operation: top-down first from the government to the schools, than from the principal to the teacher, and from the teacher to the learner. But this policy allows schools room for developing their own interpretation of that policy: in formulating their own educational views, in making choices in interpreting the formal curriculum, in organizing the learning process. Modern educational ideas as presented in the first part of this article ask however for an active learning process in which the learner co-construct his own education. At the micro-level there is therefore not only a top-down movement at play, but also a bottom-up movement from the learner to the curriculum and to the school The concrete process on the micro-level of the learning process is a combination of top-down and bottom-up.

Similar processes can be seen to play at the school level between the principal and the teachers (Hargreaves, 1994). The teachers together co-construct the curriculum, the culture and the organization of the school. On this meso-level too, there is a

combination of top-down from principal to teachers and bottom-up from teachers to principal. Together they create the learning organization in which school development and professional development coincide. The same processes can be seen at work between the government and schools (Hartley, 1997).

Education in the Netherlands

In 1988, the Dutch Ministry of Education started a restructuring process for senior secondary education. In senior secondary education, students of the age of 15-18 prepare themselves for a study at an university or polytechnic. There is a pre-university variant (VWO) and one for entering polytechnics (HAVO). About 40% of the youngsters of that age group are in senior secondary education in the Netherlands. The other 60% are in vocational education. In the Netherlands, the curriculum and assessments are centralized and well controlled by government. Only 30% of the schools are public schools. The 70% 'private' schools consist of 25% Catholic, 25% Protestant and 20% with some special pedagogical vision like Montessori or Dalton. These 'private' schools are public funded and have to follow the national curriculum and assessments, but they do have some space for religious or humanistic education. All schools may appoint their own teachers and have some room for an own pedagogical vision and education.

The government formulated the problems in senior secondary education in the beginning of the 1990's as:

- A lack of motivation among a lot of students;
- Traditional teaching methods;
- Insufficient flexibility in the school organization and in teachers' tasks;
- Insufficient level of the curriculum;
- Too many choices between subjects for students.

In the first half of the Nineties there has been a broad discussion about these problems and a search for 'solutions'. The solutions chosen by the government can be summarized with:

1. Reduction of choice by introducing four learning 'profiles': culture, economics, health, technology;
2. New curricula with higher standards and with more learning skills;
3. More centralized assessments;
4. Introducing new forms of teaching methods for more active learning;
5. More opportunities for schools to organize their own way of teaching.

Before the new curricula were formally introduced in 1998, some schools experimented with the introduction of more learning skills in the curricula, new forms of teaching and other ways of organizing their education (more flexibility in the timetable and in grouping students). In 1998, all schools started with the new curricula, the 'profiles' and the new exams. In this process of educational change we can roughly distinguish four periods (of course there is some overlap):

1988-1992. Analysis
1992-1995. Formulating possibilities
1995-1998. Experiments in schools and making the national curriculum and exams
1998-2004. Implementation of the new curriculum and exams

This is the educational context in which our network started and created a practice of change

.

THE ARISING OF NETWORKS

In 1988, we started our network. We invited schools we worked with in earlier projects and schools that were partners in the teacher education of the University of Amsterdam. We started with discussing the first text published by the Ministry of Education on restructuring secondary education. This text was called 'Modularization of secondary education' and was really a technical approach to education so popular at the end of Eighties. The vision in it was that of an individualised citizen, but without any moral or pedagogical ideas. In monthly meetings we analyzed in the network this text and formulated a critique that we later discussed with several officials of the Ministry of Education. In this analysis and in the discussions, schools were also looking at their own educational practice. They tried to find out which problem is being articulated in 'my' school and what kind of solutions 'we' want to work on. Right from the beginning, we wanted to create in the network a learning culture in which there could be a reflexive practice with all participating in, in which we could dream about possibilities, in which we could find communalities in experiences, and in which we could support each other.

At that time, we were referring to our group as a 'workgroup'; at the beginning of the Nineties when our group became 'institutionalized', we called ourselves a 'network'. We believe that a network has to be constructed; you cannot just declare a network. People have to experience themselves that they have something in common and that they can contribute to each others' school development and professional development. After a few years working, we were able to formulate several functions our network has for the participants.

Functions of the Network

Several functions distinguish our network (see also Veugelers & Zijlstra, 1995a; 1996a):

1. Interpretation of Government Policies. Discussions among teachers from different schools can provide greater insight into consequences of governmental policy and the various possibilities for restructuring education and implementing policy.
2. Influencing Government Policies. A network of schools can also try to influence government policies by giving feedback as a group.
3. Learning from Other's Experiences. In our view, learning from one another is the most important difference between professional development in networks and other forms of professional development.
4. Using Each Other's Expertise. A participating school may invite expertise from another school or from the Center for Professional Development.
5. Developing New Educational Approaches and Materials. Participants create products other schools can use. For example guidebooks, curriculum timetables, bring some coherence to the teaching of skills, or changing the moral climate in the school.
6. Creating New Initiatives. In a true partnership, both schools and university can benefit from the collaboration and can develop new initiatives together.

When we compare the functions of our network with the characteristics of networks in the US as described by Lieberman and Grolnick (1996) and by Pennell & Firestone (1996), our network is focused more on policy; on analyzing policy, but also on trying to influence policy. In particular in the period of formulating solutions, our network had many meetings with officials of the Ministry of Education. At one point we received an invitation from the Minister of Education herself to talk about our ideas about assessment. The cause was that we had sent a letter to parliament, in which we argued for more influence of the schools in the assessment. The Minister, a social democrat, mentioned to us that educational traditionalists were already feeling threatened by her new policy proposals, and she hoped for our support and not creating a radical attack on her views. We regarded this even as a stimulation to oppose her policy and to counterbalance the traditional attacks on the restructuring ideas.

Organization and Practice of the Network

At present, 20 schools participate in the network. From each school two persons (usually one of them being a vice-principal) participate in the regular network meetings. These meetings are held once a month. The meetings focus on the educational vision of the schools, the school organization and the implementation process. Besides that, we also have thematic workgroups. First, in the period of experimentation, we had groups

on career education, self-regulated learning, and moral and democratic education. Now, in the period of implementation, we have four working groups that are subject based: humanities, social studies and economics, health and technology, and career education. The former topics are now integrated in these groups. In each group, eight teachers from different schools participate. Beside the secondary school teachers, teachers of the University of Amsterdam are members of these workgroups. These groups focus on the content of the curriculum and on the pedagogical-didactical teaching methods. These groups meet six times a year. Furthermore we have two conferences each year, sometimes with student panels of the schools. From the 20 schools, approximately 120 teachers have participated in the network over the past two years.

Staff members of the Center for Professional Development in Education of the University of Amsterdam chair these groups. Some of them, like the second author, are working in one of the schools of the network but are hired by the University to chair groups in the network. The chair and three teachers from the schools prepare the sessions. The network facilitates these teachers for doing this work. All the meetings are on Thursday afternoons; most of the meetings are at the university because its place is really in the center of the area, some of the meetings are at different schools. These school based site visits are prepared together with the school.

In each meeting there is a specific topic. Someone gives a presentation of that topic, and together we reflect on that practice and everybody bring in their ideas and experiences. The presentations can be about plans, ongoing projects or evaluated projects. For the teachers it is a kind of action research in which they reflect on their work and collect data. We prefer to monitor such developments in the network or the workgroup. About every second year we bring examples of 'good practice' or a good description of failures together in a book. In each book we have about 20 different contributions. The five published books have sold quite well and have been important sources for other schools (Veugelers & Zijlstra, 1995b; 1996b; 1998b; 2008). For the first book, the network became in 1996 the first winner of the price for the best project in secondary education in the Netherlands

Networks in the Netherlands

Our network has been a model for starting more networks. A principal of one of our schools was assigned by the government to stimulate the start of networks nationwide. The government has been giving grants to start networks. By the mid Nineties, there were about 30 networks for secondary education in the Netherlands. The arising of more networks was an opportunity for schools to choose between networks. In our region, most traditional protestant and catholic schools are members of an alternative network of the Christian university in Amsterdam.

EVALUATION OF THE NETWORK

What Participants Appreciate in the Network?

How do the participants assess the functions of the network? We conducted a survey-research in our network. For collecting data we developed a written questionnaire in which the participants could indicate how the network provides the different functions for themselves.

According to the participants, the network mainly provides the functions of learning from other's experiences' and 'using each other's expertise'. Learning from other's experiences gets a high score: 61% of the respondents regard this to be fairly or strongly important and another 26% of the respondents credit it with at least some importance. Moreover, 54% of the participants use the network to 'use each other's expertise' and 23% of the respondents say that this is more or less the case.

Table 1: Importance of network functions according to participants (percentages)

	Not	little	some	fairly	strong
Interpretation of government	13	16	18	46	7
Influencing government	56	24	13	7	0
Learning from other's	4	9	26	26	35
Using each other's expertise	7	11	28	26	28
Developing new education	22	24	33	15	6
Creating new initiatives	13	15	27	38	7

53% of the respondents stress the importance of a joint interpretation of government policies, yet the chances of influencing government policies are considered minimal: 44% of the respondents feel that the network can provide this function only in a very limited way. Several years ago, government policy with regards to secondary education was still being developed. But presently the government has made its decisions. During the period of policy development, the network, we believed, had more influence on procedure and content than when policy decisions are actually being implemented. Working together in the network can lead directly to a joint development of new initiatives. 45% of the respondents thinks this is a fairly or strong function. It is, though, a stimulus for new initiatives in one's own school and own practice. 67 % of the participants recognize this function more or less strongly.

In reply to a question regarding the differences between meetings of the network and traditional ways of teacher education, many respondents (42%) pointed at the

importance of an exchange of experiences and learning from someone else's practices. The meetings were characterized by 'equality amongst participants who discuss experiences from a practical view and with emphasis on finding solutions.' The exchange of experiences was in no way limited to the Thursday afternoon meetings at the university. 40% of the participants indicate that they also consult, phone, or visit each other outside the meetings to ask and give information. The network is mainly associated with active participation and continuity of activities, as 'giving and taking.' Traditional teacher education, on the other hand, is often 'passive' and oriented towards 'taking.'

Going In and Out the Network

Another important parameter for evaluation of the network is the participation of the schools. In 1989 we had 20 schools in the network. And now in 2011, we have 20 schools again. Most of the schools are the same ones. But over time a total of 42 schools have been in the network for a longer or shorter period. Two groups of schools joined the network but left again. The first group consisted of schools coming from the north of Amsterdam, a rural and more traditional area. They were mixed with some other new schools in a new sub network. After a few years they left the network partly because they had to travel too much to get to Amsterdam, but also because of their educational philosophy. They themselves emphasize more adaptive ideas and less the critical-democracy ideas that were then the dominant view of the network.

The second group consisted of six gymnasia. They wanted to have a sub network of independent gymnasia. We agreed as an experiment for one year and we hoped that they would later on want to integrate more in the larger network and our working groups. For them too, the educational vision of the network was too critical-democratic and they found that schools that have different types (levels) of education in their schools dominated the network. Some of these schools also provide vocational training and there are even some comprehensive schools. For us, as directors of the network and for the old network schools, their departure was not a great problem. Schools that want to join our network are always welcome, but we do have our own educational vision. Of course there is space for other educational visions but within some common foundation. This foundation is not always well articulated but is the 'local color' of the network; it provides the boundaries of the educational vision. We are even proud that people recognize our vision and from a democratic and plural perspective it is good that they make the choice for their own vision.

But also some schools left because the participants found that their school had blocked their development and they felt that they could not contribute anymore to the network. We tried to support these people by accepting their passive participation for a while but mostly they left one or two years later, with the hope of coming back in

better times. A few schools left because they believed that they did not learn enough from the network. Mostly these schools themselves where not the most innovative schools. Two, for us interesting schools left because they prefer to concentrate on their own development. So the network creates an identity that attracts schools and thrust out schools.

DISCUSSION: The Network in its Educational Environment

Bottom-up Flow in Formulating Possibilities and Doing Experiments

Networks are powerful tools in circumstances where schools have possibilities to shape their own education, when they can think and work together in finding out how education might be arranged. In the second half of the Nineties we had that opportunity in upper secondary education in the Netherlands. Schools could experiment with their pedagogical and methodological approach. Students, and sometimes parents, got involved in thinking about desirable changes and evaluated ongoing experiments. Despite a lot of criticism, the involvement in schools of quite a lot of students became much better. Occasionally, student panels of different schools meet as a network. Also many teachers got involved in their school and in the network activities. People got a feeling of empowerment.

The type of citizenship teachers could officially work on was the individualized person, but a more humanistic version with emphasis on self-responsibility, creativity and personal development. There were also possibilities for a critical-democratic citizenship in cooperative learning and in students' own research projects in and outside schools.

Top-down Restriction in Implementation

The final curriculum with its high standards and centralized assessments that started in 1998 restricted the possibilities for restructuring secondary education. The content is strictly controlled by the central assessment and the curriculum is overloaded. Teachers really have to concentrate on time-on-task. They do not have much time for more experimental learning and they have to intensively monitor students' progress. Traditional subjects and traditional content in subjects maintained their position in the curriculum. The new learning skills, the research activities for students and the more social oriented themes came on top of the traditional curriculum instead of being substitutions for parts of the old curriculum. When the Ministry had to diminish the overload in the curriculum, it even further reduced the new content.

Another restriction for a possible bottom-up process was the changes in assessment. More subjects are now being assessed nationally (for most of the students more than seven subjects). Even the school-based assessment is more strictly regulated.

Schools themselves feel monitored too, because the role of the school inspectorate has been intensified. Teachers have the feeling that there is an enormous intensification of their work. And this is not only a subjective feeling.

Possibilities for citizenship

The type of citizenship that is aimed for now is still that of the individualized person, but now a more adaptive one as a result of the traditional curriculum content and the intensive monitoring of students. The possibilities for a more critical-democratic citizenship are still there, but marginalized. It is interesting to see that, for the common Dutch secondary school, there is compared with the era before more room for personal, humanistic and also more critical-democratic education. For the majority of Dutch schools, education has been changed to the better. But the opportunities for the more innovative schools like we have in our network, to shape their own education in more critical and democratic ways of learning, are even smaller than before under the old system.

Consequences for the network

For the network, all this means that the era of experimentation is over and that, now the time has come for implementing the new curriculum, schools have to defend their achievements. In the network the discussions are often about how still realize a more critical and democratic education with opportunities for students to do their own research projects and in choosing their learning activities.

The intensification of teachers' work and that of principals means that they have less time to come to meetings of the network. The schools that are still in the network want the network to continue, maybe with fewer meetings a year. They still appreciate working together and they want to benefit from the mutual trust and expertise in the network.

We needed this contextualization of the network in the educational landscape, because making and sustaining a network is not context-neutral. We have seen that a bottom-up movement in a period of exploring possibilities and experimentation provides better conditions for a network than a top-down movement during implementation. Also schools must have the possibilities, the conditions and the subjective feeling that they can articulate their own educational vision, organization and pedagogical-didactical method. Networks can benefit from an educational and political climate in which schools can give their own interpretation of the national policy and the official curriculum. Where they can learn from differences and similarities. It might be phrased in another way too. Networks can flourish in an era when people can have their educational dreams, when they can do their own projects, in which they can function together as a collaborative group.

In periods of a strong top-down movement, the strategy of a network is more defensive: defensive in its educational goals but also in its chances for survival. We still try to learn from each other, now more from the small steps each school takes. We also try to give participants in the network new possibilities to experience educational practices in other countries. For that we actively participate in The International Network of Networks for Democratic Education. With 20 teachers and principals we went in 2001 to Finland to meet the networks of the universities of Helsinki and Tampere. In 2003 we visited the network of the Autonoma University in Barcelona. In 2005 the UK, in 2008 again Finland and Estonia, and in 2009 Belgium. Together with these networks and some networks outside Europe (US, China and Middle-East) we published in 2005 the book 'Network Learning for Educational Change' (Veugelers & O' Hair, 2005)

And of course we work hard to get more room for a bottom-up approach for active learning of students, for professional development of teachers and for school development. Maybe developments in society, the more 'objective' and the more ideological, force this bottom-up approach. The type of citizenship modern plural society needs cannot be only an individualized one. Society has to organize its moral and democratic support, a type of citizenship that is needed must be more critical-democratic.

Developments in the Network

The development of the network depends not only on the educational policy. Internal factors are important as well. In this last part of the chapter we will analyze them.

Shared Ownership of the Network

Schools and university both must have a feeling of ownership in the network. Networks cannot be organized top-down. In our network, we try to combine the influence of schools and the university on all levels. We have two directors (the two authors), one from one of our network schools and one from the university. Teachers and principals of a school chair some of the groups. When we receive grants, a great part of the money goes to the schools so they can facilitate teachers to participate in the network and to do action-research. All participants together formulate the agenda for the year program and for each meeting.

Most networks for secondary schools in the Netherlands that started in the Nineties, in the period of experimentation, stopped their work. Often they didn't succeed in sharing power in the network. And unfortunately some universities and Institutes for Professional Development of Teachers never had the intention of empowering the participants and in sharing grants. They wanted short time profit of

money and research possibilities or they even still believe in top-down implementation strategies.

Important factors for networks to sustain successfully are:

- A shared ownership and a sense of belonging among all participants;
- An established tradition so it is really a decision to break;
  Continuation of participants;
- Being productive so participants receive concrete products and they themselves can show their own products;
- Finding new challenges all the time.

Network Participation and the Other Teachers in the School

We believe that networks are powerful tools in restructuring education. But in the way we organized our network, only a small part of the workers in the school participate actively in the network. One might even say that we focus mainly on the management of schools and that we support those change-agents in their work. Another possibility for a network would be to have the whole staff involved. Some of our network schools have sometimes conferences together. Although promoting democratic education, a network like we have supports in particular the most powerful people in the school. Other ways of school development and professional development have to be added to networking.

Extended Professionalism

A final remark is about the professionalism that networks develop. Working closely together with colleagues of other schools can broaden teachers' perspectives. Teachers are experiencing to be part of a larger educational community. It helps to see the particular and the common in your own educational experience. You have to reflect on your educational practice together with colleagues that become 'critical friends'. It gives you information about other practices. You know better what to do or what not to do in your classes and in your schools. You become a critical reflective practitioner, maybe to some extend a critical-democratic practitioner (Listen & Zeichner, 1991; Beyer, 1996). The network gives teachers a collective voice. However, a changing practice is the proof of the pudding. And of course we realize that the network cannot realize all its intentions, neither can it explain all changes in the teachers' practice.

When university teachers and researchers are working together with schools, they have to make their theoretical notions more concrete. For them, participating in networks is a kind of action-research too. It gives them practical knowledge. The work

relations between university based staff and school staff in networks is more equal than in traditional research or restructuring projects. Schools and universities can both benefit of this kind of partnership. For us, and then we mean all network participants, the challenge is now to continue under a less stimulating educational climate.

REFERENCES

Apple, M. & Beane, J. (1995). Democratic Schools. Alexandria: ASCD.

Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Lash, S. (1992). Reflexive Modernisation: politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order. Cambridge: Polity.

Beyer, L.E. (1996). Creating Democratic Classrooms. The struggle to integrate theory and practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dieleman, A.J. (ed.), Lans. J. van der (ed.), Bogt, T. ter, Daalen, R. van, Meijers, F., Mommaas, H., Pels, T. & Veugelers, W. Heft in eigen handen. Zelfsturing en sociale betrokkenheid bijjongeren (Control in your own hands. Self-regulation and Social Commitment among youngsters). Assen: Van Gorcum.

Giroux, H.A. (1989). Schooling for Democracy. London: Roudedge.

Gunsteren, H.R. van (1992). Eigentijds Burgerschap (Contemporary Citizenship). Gravenhage: SDU.

Goodman,}. (1992). Elementary Schooling for Critical Democracy. New York: Suny.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing Teachers, Changing Times. London: Cassell.

Hardey, D. (1997). Re-schooling Society. London: Farmer Press.

Lieberman, A. (ed.) (1995) The work of restructuring schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (1996) Creating intentional learning communities. In: Educational Leadership. 54, 3, 51-55.

Lieberman, A. & Grolnick, M. (1996). Networks and Reform in American Education. In: Teachers College Recorded. 98,1,7-45.

Listen, D.P. & Zeichner, K.M. (1991). Teacher Education and the Social Conditions of Schooling. New York: Roudedge.

Newmann, P.M. (1993) Beyond common sense in educational restructuring. The issues of content and linkage. In: Educational Researcher, 22, 2, 4-13.

O'Hair, M.J., McLaughlin, HJ. & Reitzug, U.C. (2000). Foundations of Democratic Education. Fort Worth: Harcourt.

Pennell, J.R. & Firestone, W.A. (1996). Changing Classroom Practices through Teacher. Networks: Matching Program Features with Teacher Characteristics and Circumstances. In: Teachers College Record, 98, 1, 41-76.

Turner, B.S. (1993). Citizenship and Social Theory. London: Sage.

Veugelers, W. (2000). Different Ways of Teaching Values. In: Educational Review, 50, 1, 37-46.

Veugelers, W. (2001). Teaching values and critical thinking. In: Steinberg, S.R. (ed.) (199-215). Multi/Interculturalism. New York: Peter Lang.

Veugelers, W. & O' Hair, M.J. (Eds.) (2005). Network Learning for Educational Change. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (1995a). Learning together: In-service education in networks of schools. In: British journal of In-Service Education, 21,1, 37-48.

Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (1995b). Netwerken aan de Bovenbouw van HAVO en VWO (Networking in Upper Secondary Education). Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.

Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (1996a). Networks for Moderncing Secondary Schools. Educational Leadership, 54. 3, 76-79.

Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (1996b). Praktijken uit het Studiehuis (Good Practice from the Study House). Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.

Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (1998a). Learning in networks of schools and university. In: International Journal of leadership in Education, 1, 2,169-180.

Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (1998b). Lesgeven in het Studiehuis (Teaching in the Study House). Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.

Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (2001). Leren in het Studiehuis (Learning in the Study House). Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.

Veugelers, W. & Zijlstra, H. (2008). Het Studiehuis leert (The Study House learns). Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.

2. TRANSITION FROM PRE-UNIVERSITY EDUCATION TO HIGHER EDUCATION

[1]The transition from pre-university education, the highest level of secondary education, to the university has often been seen as a problematical issue. In the Netherlands problems are particularly reflected in the first academic year: many students (25%) quit their study or fall considerably behind. Moreover, it appears that a considerable number (42%) of qualified pre-university students do not opt for university studies (25% of the students opt for higher vocational education and 17% students do not enroll in higher education). These students might not have made the right career choice or have not used their opportunities in higher education well. Both groups, students with problems in the first academic year and students who do not move on to universities, comprise comparatively many youngsters from the working-class, among which a large number belong to (ethnic) migrant groups (Hofmeister, 1998). These groups follow pre-university education comparatively less often. Moreover female and male students are not equally divided among the various branches of university studies.

The University of Amsterdam intends to improve the link-up between the pre-university education sector and the university by developing a more intensive collaboration with these pre-university education schools. Apart from efficiency considerations and the general wish to increase the number of students entering higher education, the University of Amsterdam also takes certain justice aspects into consideration, especially in its effort to increase the number of migrant students as well as to improve their performance. For these reasons the University of Amsterdam has started a special program. The program is a partnership program for students (Osguthorpe, Harris, Harris, & Black, 1995; Veugelers & Zijlstra, 1996; Wilbur & Lambert, 1991).

Aims of the Crossover Program Pre-university Education at the University of Amsterdam

The aims of this program are as follows (Hofmeister, 1998; Hofmeister, Veugelers & Van Welie, 1993):

1. improve the motivation of pre-university education students for university studies;
2. increase their understanding of the requirements implied by university education;
3. improve social and learning skills required by university studies;
4. improve the way pre-university education students are being taken care of in their first academic year.

The program is concerned with motivational aspects in opting for university studies, social aspects related to study, learning attitudes, study skills required by higher education and

[1]Adapted from Jane Hofmeister & Wiel Veugelers (1999). Career Education in the Netherlands: Learning by Experience and Values Stimulation. Educational Research Journal, 14, 2, 279-300

identity formation. The program is aimed at increasing students' knowledge of university education, enforcing their motivation for higher education and improving their skills in such a way that, both socially and in their performance, they are able to maintain their position at the university. A curriculum has been developed for students who attend the fifth and sixth grades of pre-university education and for students in the first academic year.

Didactic Approach and Organizational Set-up

Characteristic of this program is the guidance for students in their transition from pre-university education to university education. It is a career education program in which students orientate themselves and collect information about studying and professions. Orientation, experience and reflection are the key concepts in this career education crossover program. Orientation and reflection takes place at school, whereas in pre-university education students experience the issues at the university by paying a visit, to the university. All the faculties organize special programs for those issues. The career advising and planning process is given attention by carefully fostering students' self-concept, their educational and occupational knowledge and identification with realistic alternatives, the influence of other people, and decision-making knowledge.

As part of the program pre-university education students pay visits to the university for undergoing realistic experiences like lectures, tutorials/ seminars and laboratory sessions. During these visits university students are their mentors. Mentoring is especially focused on broadening students' view of the social aspects of the subject they study and their daily life at and outside the university; as well as helping them to reflect on these confrontations with their own determination. This project method implies an intensive collaboration between the pre-university education schools and the University of Amsterdam (Veugelers & Zijlstra, 1998). It deepens the ties between the university and its environment. Representatives from the interested faculties and schools have also developed the program.

Teachers both of pre-university and university have a collective responsibility for a group of students in the process of moving on from pre-university to higher education. The project implementation started in the school year 1993 -1994 in the 5th grade of pre-university education in 14 schools with a total population of 767 pupils. Thirty-two teachers from the University of Amsterdam collaborated in the program in schools. In 1998 - 1999, more than 1,500 students of 36 schools were involved in the program.

The program consists of four themes:

1. **Developing one's possibilities and investing in one's future**

This theme provides an orientation to one's possibilities to attend higher education. Questions like "What are people's motives in opting for higher education, in general?" "What are my own motives?" and "What would be the implications of other options for organizing

my own life?" are central in this theme. This theme should increase pre-university education-students' motivation for higher education.

2. Choosing a study and a profession

This theme deals with choosing a specific study and the relations between the study subject and the professional perspectives. The theme should increase students' knowledge regarding the various branches of study and professions and improve their motivation for a particular study. The intention is to give students real insights into their optional study subject.

3. Studying at the university

What sort of learning attitudes and study skills are required by higher education? What is studying as a day-to-day activity? What is the difference between studying at the university and being a pre-university education student? Which is the best way to prepare oneself for becoming an university student? This theme intends to increase students' knowledge and experience of social and learning skills required by university study.

4. Life at the university

Studying at the university does not only imply acquiring knowledge. One also needs certain attitudes and social skills in order to be able to function well as a student at the university, in a tutorial or seminar and also in communicating with fellow students, housing mates, lecturers, advisors and counselors. This theme is handled in the sixth grade and these pre-university education students may spend a day accompanying a university student, often one of the student mentors, who is studying the subject of their choice. In this way the pre-university education students can become more familiar with various aspects of university life and studies.

Evaluation of the Crossover Program

The program is evaluated every year through research by university professors, pre-university teachers and, of course, their students. Data are acquired from observations, evaluation consultations, and written questionnaires for teachers and students. The students' questionnaire consists of evaluation questions concerning the program and questions about the teaching effects experienced by the students. The students' evaluation data are presented here. Students evaluated five aspects of the program on a scale of 1 to 10, with 5 and below being unsatisfactory ratings. There are no remarkable evaluation differences over the past six years.

The pre-university education students appreciated the program; nearly 90% gave a positive rating. The visits to the university were also positively rated Over the years the visits have been rated six or higher (of a scale to 10) by about 80% of the pre-university education students. The schools and the university too consider the visits to be embedded in an extensive school program which has to be part of the regular educational curriculum and to which several school subjects and teachers should contribute. The students' evaluation show that they are also quite positive about the school's contribution to the program: 72 % rated it higher than six. The pre-university education students appreciated the contribution paid by the university and some were even very enthusiastic about it (ratings like nine and ten); a majority of 80% rated it higher than six. All in all, it seems that university professors and student mentors responded well to pre-university education students' questions.

3. ENHANCING DEMOCRACY IN CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

POLICY, SCIENCE AND EDUCATION IN THE NETHERLANDS

[2]Citizenship education is a concept encountered in many debates and publications. This concept though is often very differently addressed in politics, in conversations in schools, in public opinion and among scholars. Debates on citizenship education can be very lively, as is the case in the Netherlands. The concept of citizenship itself is continuously broadened and deepened. It is broadened in the sense that citizenship is no longer limited to the nation state (the Netherlands), but also relates to European citizenship and even global citizenship. There is a deepening of the concept, because citizenship no longer exclusively relates to the political level, but also extends to the social and the cultural levels and even to the interpersonal level – how people live together. The broadening, and especially the deepening of the concept means that citizenship increasingly relates to a person's identity. Moral development and citizenship development are linked. Citizenship education encroaches upon the development of identity of young people.

In this article we will analyze several themes that play a role in these debates and link them with research into citizenship education. Special attention will be given to differences in defining the concepts of citizenship and citizenship education, the introduction of other cultures, and the school as a practice ground. The second part analyses the developing of citizenship education and its possibilities at two policy levels: government, and schools. At the system level, we will consider: the educational policy discourse; curriculum policy; civil society; autonomy of schools; differences between schools, and the pedagogical discourse. At the school level we will analyze the place of citizenship education in the curriculum, ownership of teachers, pedagogical-didactic approach and student views on citizenship education. The article ends with a ply for a more critical-democratic citizenship education.

Developments in the concept of citizenship education

Educational institutions are supposed to give attention to citizenship education. The concept of citizenship itself is continuously broadened and deepened. It is broadened in the sense that citizenship is no longer limited to the Netherlands, but also relates to European citizenship and even global citizenship. There is a deepening of the concept, because citizenship no longer exclusively relates to the political level, but also extends to the social and the cultural levels and even to the interpersonal level – how people live together. The broadening, and especially the deepening of the concept means that citizenship increasingly relates to a person's identity. Citizenship education encroaches

[2] Adapted from Wiel Veugelers, W. (2011). Theory and Practice in Citizenship Education Revista de Educacion (in press)

upon the development of identity of young people. Education always had a socializing effect on people, usually through the "hidden" curriculum. The required explicit focus on citizenship education means that the role of education in the development of identity is recognized and that a conscious attempt is made to influence this development of identity.

The broadening and deepening of the concept of citizenship have made its meaning broader but also more diffuse: citizenship incorporates a large part of a persons' life. Furthermore it is recognized in particular in the social sciences that an identity is not a unit, but is a build-up from various cultural orientations. We encounter this perception of multiple or many-voiced identities in psychological literature (Haste, 2004) as well as in cultural sociological approaches (Banks, 2004). Citizenship identities are then a connection of many forms of participation. Citizenship and the related citizenship practices can acquire meanings that partly supplement each other, but may also overlap or even conflict with each other. There are multiple identities of citizenship.

From a critique on the linking of the concept of citizenship to one's own country, a more morally inspired cosmopolitan citizenship has been advocated (Nussbaum, 1997). This is about moral values that concern responsibility for the whole world and all its inhabitants. An open attitude towards other people is one of its important aspects (Hansen, 2008). Recently this morally inspired global citizenship has been criticized for its lack of attention for political power relations (Mouffe, 2005; Thayer-Bacon, 2008; Veugelers, 2011a). A stronger relation between the moral and the political are advocated here: moral values should be analyzed within social and political relations. Veugelers (2011a) studied the views of teachers with regard to global citizenship. In the theoretical orientation a distinction was made between an open global citizenship, a moral global citizenship and a social-political global citizenship. The interviews with teachers made clear that they prefer a moral global citizenship to be the pedagogical goal. Teachers are also aware of social-political relations, but they are reserved when it comes to focusing on political relations.

Because of the deepening of the concept of citizenship, current ideas about citizenship encroach more and more upon the identity of people. In Dutch politics we see this aspect in the emphasis on desired manners, on national identity and on attention for world views. The government even specifies the manners it desires, informally as well as formally. It does the same for the identity of the country, by referring to "cultural heritage" and "canon". With regard to world views the Dutch government is more reserved, but schools are required to pay attention to world view movements and to develop respect for other world views.

Citizenship education within this framework encroaches deeply upon the identity of people. This is of course not entirely new; it always happened. The whole system of education is imbued with values and these values influence the development of identity. What is new, is the conscious focus in citizenship education on values and the development

of identity and the recognition that there is diversity in identities. That diversity in identity has long been hidden under a semblance of uniformity. Diversity in identities furthermore increases through immigration; internationalization is in presence through the media, and the citizen himself increasingly visits various foreign countries.

In learning this broadening of the concept of citizenship is also present. Haste (2004) shows that identities are changing and that new forms of participation are tested. Citizenship education is thus connected more and more with moral development (Oser & Veugelers, 2008). In Dutch politics the emphasis in citizenship education is upon active participation and social integration. In the social sciences, the political dynamics are usually described with the concept of democracy (Gutman, 1987; Parker, 2004; Veugelers, 2007; De Groot, in press). Following Dewey, democracy is seen as a "way of life": democracy is more than formal procedures, it is a way of living together, of bridging differences of opinion and of protecting minorities.

We will now specifically address three themes that are central in the Dutch discourse about citizenship education:

- Different types of citizenship
- To get familiar with other cultures
- The school as a practice ground

Types of citizenship

It is often suggested that everyone gives the same meaning to citizenship, that we all know what good citizenship is. In many empirical studies though, we have found that there are different understandings of citizenship and citizenship education. We find these differences among teachers, school leaders, parents, and students as well. We could distinguish between three types of citizenship: adaptive, individualizing and critical democratic citizenship (Veugelers, 2007; Leenders, Veugelers, & De Kat, 2008a, 2008b). These three types have different combinations of clusters of pedagogical goals: discipline, autonomy and social involvement. The adaptive type combines discipline en social involvement, the individualizing type combines autonomy and discipline , and the critical democratic type autonomy and social involvement.

A survey among teachers in secondary education showed that 53 % of the teachers aim at a critical democratic type of citizenship, 39 % at an adaptive type, and 18 % at an individualizing type. In vocational education the emphasis was slightly more on adaptation, while in pre-university educations a individualizing type was slightly preferred (Leenders et al. 2008a). It is remarkable that parents, teachers and students alike, indicate that the cluster of discipline is more easily realized than the clusters of autonomy and social involvement.

The three types of citizenship education have a differing emphasis in their goals and are connected with differing pedagogical and didactical practices. Methodically, the adaptive type emphasizes the transfer of values and the regulation of behavior; the individualizing type independent learning and developing critical thinking, and the critical democratic type cooperative learning and developing critical thinking through inquiry and dialogue (Leenders & Veugelers, 2006). Westheimer and Kahne (2004) found a similar three-split (see also Westheimer, 2008 and Johnson & Morris, 2010). They identify a personally responsible citizen, a participating citizen and a citizen who strives for social justice. These studies show that developing citizenship is not a linear process from passive to active, but that citizenship can have different meanings and socio-political orientations.

Bridging with other cultures

The introduction to other social and cultural groups is seen as an important aspect of citizenship education. Putnam (2000) points out that a person's social capital is composed of bonding (exclusive) and bridging (inclusive). Bonding is a social-psychological necessity for a person in order to join and hold one's own in a cultural group. What Putnam calls bridging, connecting with other people, is what a society needs to function as such, to create social cohesion. Bridging can take on various forms: being considerate, being involved, or showing solidarity with others.

In the framework of citizenship education, schools are explicitly asked to bring different groups of young people together in order to introduce them to each other, to promote their mutual understanding and appreciation, and to further the cooperation between groups. In social psychology much research has been done into the conditions under which such meetings of differing groups does promote understanding and appreciation. These studies show that this kind of learning processes are rather complex and that the results are usually not predictable. Schuitema and Veugelers (2011) studied several projects in which students from different social and ethnic groups meet each other. The study shows that effects are hard to prove, but that it is important that joint activities are undertaken during the meetings and that there is interaction at the individual level. The contacts between students in the projects could under favorable conditions stimulate an open attitude and awareness of one's preconceptions about the other groups.

The educational institute as a learning society

Sociology of education has shown how schools employ rules and behavior for socializing young people, especially in an adaptive sense (Brint, 1998; Veugelers, 2008). Many psychologists on the other hand emphasize the student's self-regulation in his learning, for instance the control over one's own learning process. Bandura (1995) and Dieleman and

Van der Lans (1999) see this self-regulation as being a form of developing identity, as a control over one's life course. Educationalists place the emphasis more on learning social and democratic behavior. Dewey (1923) and De Winter (1997) see the school as a practice ground for citizenship and argue for more democratic forms of school culture.

More democratic forms of the organization of education can be found in the Moral Education tradition in the Just Community Schools (Power, Higgins & Kohlberg, 1999; Althof, 2003) and in the Critical Pedagogy tradition in Democratic Education (Giroux, 1989; Apple & Beane, 1995; Parker, 2004). Actively participating in democratic practices in the school should provide students with valuable learning experiences. Participation as such is not sufficient; it needs to be participation in democratic relations and an orientation on justice, dialogue and social action (Veugelers, 2009).

The metaphor "the school as a practice ground" hints at a school culture with an active participation of students in organizational and policy aspects. The curriculum could include democratic and dialogical ways of communication as well. Schuitema, Veugelers, Rijlaarsdam and Ten Dam (2009) showed that a dialogical approach of citizenship education as an integral part of history classes helps students with developing a well-founded opinion about moral issues in the subject matter.

Citizenship education still in progress

Reflection on and practices of citizenship and citizenship education are still being further developed. The concept of citizenship is broadened and deepened en encroaches more and more upon people's identities. Citizenship and citizenship education can have different meanings. Citizenship can aim for various pedagogical goals and citizenship education can have a variety of educational practices. Central to citizenship is the relationship op people with other social and cultural groups and the way in which a society is organized. Participation takes place in any kind of society, what matters is therefore are the leading political and pedagogical principles in citizenship education: is it adaptation, is it individualization, or is it a critical democratic development?

Citizenship education at various levels

In the second part of the article an analysis will be made of citizenship education at the various levels of the educational system and of the level of the school.

Citizenship education at the system level

At the system level, we will consider: the educational policy discourse; curriculum policy; civil society; autonomy of schools; differences between schools, and the pedagogical discourse.

Educational policy discourse

Educational policy is the result of discourse and decision making about education. Spring (2004), in his book "How educational ideologies are shaping global society", distinguishes three important educational ideologies: 'Nationalist Education in the Age of Globalization'; 'Schooling Workers for a Global Free Market' and 'Globalizing Morality'. The nationalist educational ideology emphasizes the native language, the national culture, the national history, nation-building and security. The global free market ideology emphasizes comparability and standardizing, economic and technological development, and the international competitive position of countries. In subject matter the emphasis is placed on languages, on mathematics and science. This ideology is strongly promoted by organizations like the World Bank and the OECD. The globalizing morality ideology emphasizes human rights, democracy, cultural diversity and sustainability. In content, the emphasis is on moral development and a morally founded sustainable global citizenship. This ideology is especially promoted by UNESCO and NGO's.

According to Spring each educational system possesses a specific combination of these ideologies. He presents case studies from several countries. It would be interesting if similar educational sociological research was undertaken in the Netherlands. Which ideological mix is found in the Netherlands, especially in relation with citizenship education? With some caution we present the following analysis. The nationalist ideology with its emphasis on the national culture and history and much attention for security and safety is strongly present in the Dutch educational policy discourse on citizenship education. There is also attention for the global morality ideology, but is not as strong as for the nationalist ideology. The global free market ideology is dominant in the Dutch political educational discourse and is even strong enough to marginalize the nationalist ideology in educational policy. The emphasis in the Dutch educational policy is on the international competitive position and the "knowledge society": languages, mathematics and science. Citizenship education in its global, but especially in its nationalist perspective is important in Dutch national policy, but subsidiary to the "knowledge society".

Curriculum policy

In spite of the non-dominant position of citizenship education, the Dutch government does pay a lot of attention to citizenship as a content area. Since 2006, schools are required to give attention to citizenship education. The government points out its importance, but leaves it to the schools to organize this subject area. The government, under reference to the freedom of education and the autonomy of the schools, is very reluctant when it comes to specifying a curriculum. Contrary to other subjects areas lacks citizenship education a subject title, exam requirements, goals and qualifications. The curriculum is quite open. An interesting question is how the possible advantages of this freedom relate to the existing subjects. In these other subjects, schools and students are under much tighter control. At present, schools find it very difficult to provide the content area of citizenship education with a firm place in the school curriculum.

The national curriculum institute SLO is developing frameworks and example materials (Bron, Veugelers & Van Vliet, 2009) but the materials can only be examples and not descriptive. The National Educational Council and SLO have declared the desirability of a core curriculum for citizenship education. Such a core curriculum could reinforce the focus on this subject and establish a minimum with which schools have to comply. A more elaborate description of the subject matter and the attainment levels could enhance the visibility and programmability of citizenship education.

Denominationalism in Dutch education and civic society

An important characteristic of the Dutch educational system is denominationalism. Two-thirds of the schools are denominational schools, although they are state financed and have to use the required curriculum. Denominational schools are allowed to develop their own subject matter for world view education. Citizenship education is of course closely connected to denomination. This is a major reason for the government to be reluctant in further specifying the subject matter of citizenship education.

The national organizations of denominational education are very active in the area of citizenship education and they are developing their own vision, provide examples and start research programs. But the relationship between the national organizations of denominational schools and the schools themselves is presently, now traditional religious institutions have been weakened, not that close anymore that these organizations could put requirements on the schools. The government has given denominational education much space. There are some interesting projects, but denominationalism has lost to a large extent its grip on education.

The influence of civil society, including denominations, can be strengthened by a stronger emphasis on the relationship between education and society. The further specification of citizenship education could be undertaken in close cooperation with students, parents and society. Networks of schools would have to take up their

responsibilities for the regional community as a whole, not just for their own cultural community (Veugelers & O'Hair, 2005; Hargreaves & Fink 2006).

Autonomy of schools

Over the past 15 years, the autonomy of schools in the Netherlands has increased. Many schools take interesting initiatives, in the area of citizenship education as well. But the School Inspectorate, the National Educational Council and SLO conclude that this development stagnates and that the schools are unsure about what is expected from them. Schools use their autonomy only sparingly. Of course one might say that not making a big deal of citizenship education is a form of autonomy as well.

Hargreaves and Shirley (2008) show that the autonomy of schools in many countries is in practice limited tot the organization of classes and the distribution of financial means. With regard to subject matter, governments have even tightened their grip on attainment levels, examination and inspectorate. This analysis is also relevant for Dutch education, where the school inspectorate is much stricter than in less centralized educational systems. In the case of citizenship education too, the government tries to monitor through the school inspectorate where serious problems are registered and remedies demanded. Because of the lacking attainment levels, subject title and examination for citizenship education, is it of course much harder for the Inspectorate to supervise citizenship education than the strongly structured school subjects.

The unclear mutual expectations of schools and inspectorate are the cause of uncertainty on the part of the schools and sometimes even of irritations between school and inspectorate about what is to be expected in citizenship education. Within a more elaborated framework, the government could ask the school to further detail their visions, attainment levels and activities. It is an interesting question whether a stronger accountability would make the schools more, or less, dependent on the school inspectorate.

Segregation between schools and school types

Discourses on citizenship education often refer to the importance of introductions to other social and cultural groups (see also 1.3). Dutch schools are not only separated along denominational lines, but in secondary education they are also separated into school types. Schools can encompass several school types or they can be organized categorical. When there are several school types within one organization, the connections between the different types can also be designed in various ways (separate buildings, separate classrooms after the first year or heterogeneous classrooms, etcetera).

For higher school types (especially pre-university), parents often prefer a categorical school. Schools follow the preferences of parents by separating the higher school types from lower types. The free choice of school in secondary educational system with separate school types implies that groups of students are also separated, especially with regard to their social environment and its related ethnicities and cultures. In combination with the free choice of a school of a certain denomination, this causes many students to grow up in social and cultural isolation. Citizenship education will then be strongly focused on the own group and will not teach making connections and handling diversity.

The government acknowledges this problem, but the policy of fusions of school types and denominations has no priority in present educational policy. Growing up in one's familiar environment seems to be more important than working on social cohesion and democratic relations through education. The government does require schools to organize activities where the various groups can meet. This causes enormous irritations in secondary schools with a student population with a less valued social and cultural capital. They claim that government policy first separates the students and next demands artificial meetings. From the perspective of a democratic citizenship education, further cooperation and integration of various school types and various denominations would be preferable.

Pedagogical discourse

The dominant pedagogical discourse in Dutch secondary education is a combination of child oriented, advancing autonomy, and an individualized form of equal opportunity thinking. These pedagogical accents are also promoted in academic disciplines. In pedagogy the center stage is taken by the individual and his development and well-being. In educational psychology it was until recently that autonomous learning was dominant. A more social oriented organization of learning processes hardly received attention. Sociology of education promotes individualization by a dominant focus on selection and equal opportunities and the complete disappearance of any attention for socialization and for the content of the curriculum.

Presently it seems that a rectification might be underway, certainly in those academic disciplines, possibly out of criticism on over-the-top individualization in Dutch society. The problem though lies as much at a more theoretical level, where the individual is disconnected from the social, where the person is not situated and society is not characterized by connections but by total of freely floating individuals.

The individual oriented pedagogical discourse does not succeed to make connections between the individual and the social. Attention for the social is demanded within the dominant approach of individualization. Therefore this attention for the social will remain limited to regulating the behaviors between individuals. From the perspective of democratic citizenship it would be desirable to regard the individual as being situated and

connected. This means a central place for democracy as a concept of society, more learning in groups, and connecting persons and institutions, also outside one's own community.

Citizenship education at the school level

The developments as mentioned above at the system level, have a major influence in actual education. The possibilities for citizenship education can also be studied at the school level.

Ownership of citizenship education

Who owns the subject area of citizenship education in the schools? At the level of the teacher organizations, it is especially the teachers of the subject religion and world views who claim a big share. The more personal developing of identity is claimed by the students' mentors. At the level of the school, it seems to be a matter of personal preferences of teachers. The school management often selects one person who is given the responsibility for developing a vision and making an inventory, sometimes also for initiating new activities. It is desirable to give the responsibility for the subject area of citizenship education to a group of teachers, for instance social studies, world view and the mentors. That way, citizenship education will become a recognizable subject with coordinated activities at the school level.

The question remains whether separate classes for citizenship education would promote its development. For instance two classes of one hour weekly in each year. The title of the subject could be "personal and social education". This title does more justice to the deeper effects of citizenship education in developing identity and the broadening of citizenship from the political level to the social level of the Netherlands and abroad. Even then links could be established with other subjects and projects.

Position in the curriculum

At present, citizenship education lacks a clear position in the curriculum. Its position in relation to the traditional school subjects is therefore very weak, especially within the dominant educational ideology of the Global Free Market. Citizenship education is oriented towards knowledge, skills and attitudes. In educational subjects there is always the risk that assessment tends to stress only knowledge and skills, and usually the kind of knowledge that does not require much insight and the skills that are mainly instrumental. But citizenship education needs a strong attitude component: whether aimed at proper behavior, democratic stance or social action, it always concerns the will to give evidence of

that behavior. This attitude though is not easily measured or assessed. It is important to recognize that assessing attitudes is difficult, while at the same time not to limit the pedagogical goals matters that are easily measured. Furthermore, schools ought to be reluctant when assessing attitudes. A critical democratic view on citizenship stresses free speech, dialogue and inquiry. The law and the democratic state of course are the frames of reference here. But this does not mean that teachers shouldn't challenge their students to reflect on their attitudes and have a dialogue about them with others.

Pedagogic-didactical approach

Critical democratic citizenship education demands a dialogical, reflexive and socially embedded learning environment. In our studies, teachers often indicate that the large number of students and the filled schedules of students and teachers make it very difficult to coach dialogical and reflexive educational processes. And class teaching is still the norm in most schools, sometimes supplemented with individualized forms of teaching. More cooperative forms of learning are seldom seen and appear usually more often in cognitive areas rather than in educational processes. Controllability seems to be more important for teachers than pretty pedagogical goals (Veugelers, 2008). Real space and attention for dialogue, reflection, giving meaning, and identity development can only seldom be found in the classroom. The competences of the teachers in this area are of course important too, but the influence of the conditions for these learning processes seems greater than a possible lack of teacher competences.

In Dutch education, small groups are only found where there are big problems with learning and behavior, when there is dangerous machinery, or in the case of optional subjects with only a few students (often in the higher school types). Proper citizenship education demands halved classes or even better two teachers in a group. This increases the possibilities for dialogical and reflexive learning processes. Team teaching makes it possible to split the class and teachers together can cooperate and reflect on their pedagogic-didactical approaches.

Student participation and teachers' behavior by example

What do students feel about citizenship education? The results are very diverse (see e.g. Veugelers 2008). Students think that it is the teacher's task to discipline the students (preferable of course the other students) and students like to further develop their autonomy through citizenship education. Social involvement and developing a critical democratic citizenship is overall less important to them, except in some special situations. In several studies we have found that students like to broaden their horizon and that they, even more than the teachers, want to discuss politics in the classroom. But our research

had also shown that students have the opinion that teachers should not interfere too much with their identity development.

In their pedagogical relations, teachers must find a balance between on the one hand providing space and keeping their distance, and on the other hand supporting students in their identity development. When students experience dialogical and reflexive learning processes, intercultural contacts and democratic relations, that will hopefully contribute to developing a critical democratic citizenship.

Conclusion: building a social justice oriented democracy

In this article we have shown that Dutch educational policy pays attention to citizenship education, but that this attention is subordinated to preparing students for the "knowledge economy". We have also shown that government is reluctant in specifying the content of citizenship education, because of denominational education and increased autonomy of the schools. Still, the Dutch government does have some general ideas about the content matter of citizenship education and tries to get a grip on its deployment in the schools through the school inspectorate.

Differences between schools and between school types greatly influence the possibilities for citizenship education. Students from different social, cultural and religious groups grow up in their own environments. The child oriented and individualizing pedagogical discourse does not stimulate a critical democratic citizenship either. The poor framing of citizenship education within a strongly structured educational system in turn does not strengthen the position of this content area in the school and in the curriculum. Students are required to actively participate in citizenship education, but real participation is hard to realize in strongly structured education.

The practice of citizenship education in the Netherlands shows more adaptive and individualizing tendencies than some politicians, but certainly many teachers, parents and students wish. A more critical democratic citizenship education requires education policy as cultural politics, a linking of schools and society, social oriented pedagogical thinking and especially more dialogical, reflexive and socially integrative educational practices.

REFERENCES

Althof, W. (2003). Implementing 'just and caring communities' in elementary schools: An Deweyan Perspective. In Veugelers, W. & Oser, F.K. (Eds.), Teaching in moral and democratic education in secondary schools (153-172). Bern / New York: Peter Lang.

Apple, M.A., & Beane, J.A. (1995). Democratic schools. Alexandria: ASCD.

Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1995). Self-efficacy in changing societies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2004). Diversity and citizenship education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brint, S. (1998). Schools and society. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Pine Forge Press.

Bron, J., Veugelers, W., & Vliet, E. de (2009). Leerplanverkenning actief burgerschap (Curriculum exploration active citizenship). Enschede: SLO.

Dewey, J. (1923). Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan.

Dieleman, A., & Lans, J. van der (Red.). (1999). Heft in eigen handen. Zelfsturing en sociale betrokkenheid bij jongeren (Take in control. Self-regulation and social concern of youngsters). Assen: Van Gorcum.

Giroux, H. A. (1989). Schooling for democracy. London: Routledge.

Groot. I. de (2010). Why we are not demcratic yet?. In Veugelers (eds.) (2011) Education and Humanism. Rotterdam/Taipeh/Boston: SensePublishers.

Gutman, A. (1987). Democratic education. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hansen, D.T. (2008). Curriculum and the idea of cosmopolitan heritage. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 40, 3, 289-312.

Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). Sustainable leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hargreaves, A., & Shirley. D. (2009). The Fouth way. Thoasand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen. Political Psychology, 25, 3, 413-440.

Johnson, L., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards for a framework for critical citizenship education. The Curriculum Journal, 21, 1, 77-96.

Leenders, H., & Veugelers, W. (2006). Different perspectives on values and citizenship education. Curriculum and Teaching, 21, 2, 5-20.

Leenders, H., Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. de (2008a). Teachers' views on citizenship in secondary education in the Netherlands. Cambridge Journal of Education, 38, 2, 155-170.

Leenders, H.., Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. de (2008b). In Oser, F.K. & Veugelers, W. (Eds.),

Getting involved. Citizenship education and sources of moral values. (57-74). Rotterdam/Taipeh/Boston: SensePublishers.

Mouffe, C. (2005). On the political. London: Routledge.

Nussbaum, M. (1997). Cultivating humanity. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Oser, F., & Veugelers, W. (Eds.). (2008). Getting involved. Global citizenship development and sources of moral values. Rotterdam/Taipeh: SensePublishers.

Parker, W. (2004). Teaching democracy. New York: Teachers College Press.

Power, F.C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education. New York: Columbia University Press.

Putnam, R.D. (2000). Bowling alone. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Schuitema, J. A., Veugelers, W., Rijlaarsdam, G. & Dam, G. ten (2009). Two instructional designs for dialogic citizenship education. an effect study. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 73. 3, 439-461.

Schuitema, J., & Veugelers, W. (2011). Multicultural contacts in Education. Educational Studies, 37, 1, 101-114..

Spring, J. (2004). How educational ideologies are shaping global society. Mahwah NJ : LEA.

Thayer-Bacon, B. (2008). Beyond liberal democracy in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Veugelers, W. (2007). Creating critical-democratic citizenship education: empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch education. Compare, 37, 1, 105-119.

Veugelers, W. (2008). Youngsters in transformative and reproductive processes of moral and citizenship education. In Tirri, K. (Ed.), Moral sensibilities in urban education (79-91). Rotterdam/Taipeh/Boston: SensePublishers.

Veugelers, W. (2009). Active student participation and citizenship education. Educational Practice and Theory, 31, 2, 55-70.

Veugelers, W. (2011a). The moral and the political in global citizenship education. Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9, 2.

Veugelers, W. (Ed.) (2011). Education and Humanism. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipeh: Sensepublishers.

Veugelers, W. & O'Hair, M.J. (eds.) (2005), Network Learning for Educational Change. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Westheimer, J., & J. Kahne (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of education of democracy. American Educational Research Journal, 41, 2, 237-269.

Westheimer, J. (2008). On the relationship between political and moral engagement. In Oser, F. & Veugelers, W. (Eds.), (2008). Getting involved. Global citizenship development and sources of moral values (17-30). Rotterdam/Taipeh/Boston: SensePublishers.

Winter, M. (1997). Children as fellow citizens: participation and commitment. Oxford: Radcliff Medical Press.