

Wiel Veugelers

Learning and Teaching in Critical-Democratic Citizenship Education



Wiel Veugelers analyses developments in theory, policy and practice of moral education and citizenship education in the past few decades. He criticises the strong focus on the individual and its adaptation to society. Instead, he argues for a stronger link of autonomy with social concern and social justice, connecting the moral and the political, and a critical and dynamic concept of democracy.


Learning should be considered as a reflective, dialogical and democratic process of meaning giving. In guiding these learning processes, teachers should include different perspectives and introduce moral values as criteria in reflection and critical thinking. Schools should be as democratic and inclusive as possible. He argues for a return to the 'sixties' and their combination of personal and collective emancipation, or in more contemporary concepts: the combination of autonomy and social justice.

Wiel Veugelers (1950) was professor of education at the University of Humanistic Studies in Utrecht, the Netherlands, from 2002 to 2019.



Universiteit voor Humanistiek





Wiel Veugelers

Learning and
Teaching in
Critical-Democratic
Citizenship
Education

Wiel Veugelers took formal leave as professor of education at June 20 2019 and gave in a condensed form this valedictory speech.



Learning and Teaching in Critical-Democratic
Citizenship Education
Prof. dr. Wiel Veugelers

ISBN 978 908 253 5884

NUR 715

Published by the University of Humanistic Studies
Publisher: Net aan Zet, Utrecht (2019)

The text of this valedictory speech can be found online at the
website of the University of Humanistic Studies: www.uvh.nl.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Moral and Political Changes over Time	7
2. Learning Values: A Social-constructive Perspective	11
3. From Moral Learning to Teaching Moral Values	15
4. School Culture, the Practice of Moral and Civic Learning	21
5. Moral Values: Discipline, Autonomy and Social Concern	25
6. Moral Education and Citizenship Education	28
7. The Academic Field of Citizenship Education	30
8. Global Citizenship Education	33
9. Democracy	34
10. Crucial Topics for Educational Change	36
Acknowledgements	41
References	42
Academic Career Wiel Veugelers	54

LEARNING AND TEACHING IN CRITICAL-DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

VALEDICTORY SPEECH

JUNE 20, 2019

1. Moral and Political Changes over Time

Let's start with the 'sixties'. The sixties, which includes not only the sixties but also the first part of the seventies, was an important historical period, particularly for youngsters growing up in that era. But it was also an important period for society at large. The sociologist Marwick (1998) speaks of a cultural revolution that was worldwide and that influenced all generations and all parts of life.

It was a period of social, cultural and political change, or at least the promise of it, and there was optimism: a belief in a better and more just and peaceful world. In the Western world, but also in Latin America with people's movements, in Africa with its many newly independent and hopeful nations, and in Asian countries that opened up their borders and their mystical cultures.

I consider myself a 'child of the sixties', and I started my university study and later my academic career in that period. A valedictory

speech is a good opportunity to look back, as well as to look forward. What have I learned and what do I hope the future will bring?

I will speak about learning and teaching in the domain of moral and citizenship education. And I start with an analysis of social and political change and education since the sixties.

Personal and collective empowerment

The sixties were about both personal empowerment and collective empowerment, in social, cultural and political respects. The personal and the collective were seen as two sides of a coin. Each individual had the right to make personal choices, and to pursue a personal life-style. And we all embraced the possibility of making our own choices; even if we were in a way just following other norms. Like the Beatle George Harrison said: 'we all started to grow our hair, and we all thought it was our own idea'.

Personal empowerment at that time meant leaving the closed society of the 'fifties' and making own choices in life-style and cultural identity. Collective empowerment was considered necessary to create a better world that would give all people the chance of personal empowerment and to live in a just and peaceful world. 'Make love not war', 'give peace a chance' and 'power to the people' were powerful slogans. Change was not just about claiming political participation and an own life-style. Increasing democracy in schools, universities and factories was considered necessary to create more equal power relations and a critical and engaged civic life for all.

In this sixties worldview, real personal empowerment was always considered part of collective empowerment. And vice-versa, collective empowerment was expected to create room for personal empowerment. This linking of the personal and collective empowerment was crucial in the sixties ideology.

This linking soon came under pressure, however; in fact already at the end of the sixties, and both from within and from outside. Within, due to some groups who internalised the personal through a strong spiritual orientation. They overemphasised the inner world and neglected the social and cultural context of their life. On the other hand, some other groups within the sixties movement abandoned the personal as too egocentric and inward-directed and developed an embrace of the influence of the social and political: sometimes in terms of fairly dogmatic and not very critical politically left persuasions.

The link between personal and collective emancipation was also attacked from outside: in particular in education. Politics was banned from classrooms, either formally or in an instrumental way. The curriculum and teachers had to be neutral. Project-based learning, a political perspective in social studies, and alternative economy lessons were marginalised.

Towards the end of the seventies a technological-instrumental approach to policy and to organising social life and education became more influential. Education was all about proper organisation, good planning and providing value-free knowledge. Education was no longer viewed as a social-cultural project of both personal and collective empowerment, but as developing capacities and creating individual opportunities.

Personal emancipation could be linked to this instrumental way of thinking. Although it lost part of its spirituality, the focus on personal choices and one's own responsibility could continue in this new 'neutral' era.

Ideologies had left the discourses of education and later on even the discourses of society and politics, in the so-called 'Third Wave' politics of Blair, Clinton and the Dutch 'polder' model. This was not presented as an ideology but as a good way of organising society; but in practice it supported a neo-liberal market-oriented ideology of competition, own responsibility and a small government that doesn't intervene in society. It developed as what Gramsci (2000) called a

hegemonic ideology: that is, an ideology that doesn't present itself as an ideology but as a natural way of organising life and society. It is an ideology that disqualifies all other ways of organising society or even thinking about other possibilities.

The linking-up of the personal and the neo-liberal became very clear in notions such as personal responsibility, employability and active citizenship. This combination of the personal and the market became a very prominent feature of policy in the Western world, but also by the process of globalisation in some parts of the Non-Western world. Globalisation can be seen as a linking together of different parts of the world, as a neutral concept. However, such a concept is always embedded in ideologies, and increasingly a neo-liberal market ideology became dominant, also in globalisation.

The return of moral values

In recent years we have seen a resurgence of calls to pay attention to the social orientation of living together and building society. It is increasingly recognised, in policy and academic research, that human beings are social beings that need each other, and have some responsibility not only for themselves but also for other people and for society, now and in the future.

It is not only about a recognition of humanity (Nussbaum, 1997), but also about building communities and social cohesion in society (Putnam, 2000), about living together in a culturally diverse world (Banks, 2004; 2017), about taking responsibility for a global world (Appiah, 2005).

This requires attention for care; bonding and bridging, multi-cultural education, democracy, and so on. This means, in short, that moral education is again becoming very relevant for education. Not in the form of abstract moral values, but as moral values embedded in social and cultural practices. Moral education should not focus only on autonomy development but also on the social, on living together.

Including morality in education gives us the opportunity to think about what a 'good life' and a 'good world' could be, and how we can contribute to this in education. It also means that we don't need to follow human and societal developments as if they were natural processes. Human beings can and do influence these developments.

This rediscovery of the social is not necessarily inspired by political ideologies of collective emancipation, but mostly by the idea that society and living together need some social orientations to co-exist. Let's see if we can make this social orientation more political and more transformative.

In this valedictory speech I will include the results of many studies which I have performed with lots of wonderful colleagues over the past 40 years. I will speak about learning, teaching, the school culture, pedagogical goals, citizenship, and the relationship of the moral and the political. And I will refer to the research I was involved in and to the work of my PhD students.

I shall attempt to sketch future directions in teaching and research in moral and citizenship education with a focus on linking the personal and the social, hopefully in a transformative, emancipatory and critical-democratic perspective.

2. Learning Values: A Social-constructive Perspective

In the past decades, the ideas about learning and teaching have also been changed. I will first speak about learning and then about teaching, because there is already learning before teaching. An active person, even a small child, tries to get a grip on its environment and its own development. Teachers try to stimulate and to influence this learning and of course teaching can challenge learning. However, teaching is not the origin of learning. Therefore I will first look at learning and then at teaching.

There appears to be a lot of research on moral development in the field of moral education, but in fact it is not so much on development as on measuring skills and values. We don't have that much research on learning, on how students develop moral values, on real learning processes in and outside the classroom.

There are also many publications on moral education, but most of these focus on the goals of teachers and schools, on teachers' beliefs or on the professional development of teachers or student teachers. There is not much research on processes of education: on teaching and learning itself. I hope to show how important it is that in both research and teaching we focus more on moral learning and on how teachers can stimulate and guide this learning: so on classroom practices. We should pay attention to the moral learning of students; on how students learn about moral values and how they develop their own values, in their personal learning processes. Attention for learning is always important, but in particular in the moral domain.

An important strand of psychology today is social-constructivism. The paradigm of social-constructivism is visible in most social sciences (Lock & Strong, 2010). From a social-constructivist learning perspective, each student develops his or her own knowledge, own skills and own attitudes. Learning is seen as an active personal activity of signification. Each person gives personal meaning to the objects and discourses they encounter; it is a process of signifying the world (consider for example the work by psychologists like Gergen, Hermans and Bruner). The pedagogue Biesta (2011) speaks of subjectification, of developing one's own subjectivity, of creating an own voice of being in the world. This process of signification is well articulated by the pedagogue Paulo Freire (1985a) when he says that "people don't read the word but the world" (Veugelers, 2017b). In learning a word, people give meaning to the world. Learning is not a technical process but a process of meaning making.

This personal construction of knowledge and meaning is not purely an individual activity; it is a social activity. In particular the work by Vygotsky (1962) and cultural activity theory have made clear that a learner always interacts with other people. A learner is permanently in dialogue with other people. This dialogue can be explicit but also implicit, and the other can be present or just virtual or even imaginary. This dialogical process of meaning making is very complex, multi-faceted and never complete or finished.

The process of dialogical meaning making builds on the personal experiences and expertise the learner already possesses. As Dewey (1923) showed, the learner's experiences frame and shape new learning processes. In Dewey's view, learning is a permanent process of reconstructing one's experience.

Such a social-constructivist view on learning, also on learning in the moral domain, is rather distant from, or perhaps even opposed to the notion of learning as transfer. Transfer implies a mechanical view on learning that goes back to behaviouristic ideas about learning, which leaves no room for a personal articulation of knowledge, skills and attitudes. Within the notion of transfer there is no attention for a personal process of meaning giving; instead it is seen as passively following the teacher.

Learning in general, and in particular learning in the social and moral domain, should be considered from a social-constructivist perspective. To 'measure' effects and outcomes of education, research on moral learning should investigate the personal learning process of each student; or, the personal narrative each student develops. See for example the PhD-study of my colleague Isolde de Groot (2014) on adolescents' democratic engagement. To investigate real learning processes, both the active construction of the learner and the dialogues with others (other learners, the teachers, and significant others) should be analysed.

This kind of research on learning is necessary but very complex, as shown by the study by Bartels (2013) on ‘philosophy with children’ and studies with Schuitema on dealing with controversial issues (Schuitema & Veugelers, 2010; Schuitema, Radstake, Van den Bos & Veugelers, 2017). It is very difficult to grasp learning processes, in particular dialogical learning processes.

Several other research groups are performing this kind of classroom research on moral learning processes. Research by Haste (2004) at Harvard, Berkowitz in St-Louis, (Berkowitz, Althof, Turner & Bloch, 2008) and Nucci (2016) and colleagues at Berkeley address elements of these complex learning dynamics and take into consideration the dialogical nature of learning processes.

Reflective, dialogical and democratic Learning

Future research on moral learning should deconstruct the learning process by taking the perspective of the learner on how he or she reconstructs earlier knowledge, skills and attitudes and incorporates and transforms new information. This, really, is research at the micro-level of education: on the cognitive, attitudinal and emotional aspects of individual learning. It is certainly not reducing learning processes to external tests or to internal neuropsychological brain waves. It should be research on what I call reflective, dialogical and democratic learning processes (Veugelers, 2011a). These learning processes are central parts of a critical-democratic citizenship education:

- *Reflective learning* refers to personal reflections on moral values. There are many publications that deal with reflection. However, most of them see reflection as a process and a logical activity, and not as value-related thinking. Often moral values determine the outcomes of reflection (Veugelers, 2000; 2010a), therefore moral values should be part of reflective learning.

- *Dialogical learning* refers to dialogues with others and an open inquiry-oriented dialogue without fixed outcomes. Dialogues are different from debates because they involve a collective inquiry-oriented process, rather than taking opposing positions and fighting for one's own standpoint. In dialogues people think together.
- *Democratic learning* refers to making, in a deliberative and democratic way, agreements with others about living together and so developing morality and society. It is about coming together, but also about respecting other voices.

Classroom observations and personal reflections of the learner on learning experiences can help us to understand how moral learning takes place and can reveal differences in learning and in learning outcomes. Such ethnographic classroom research is necessary to understand how moral learning takes place. Such research is methodologically complex, takes a lot of time and is difficult to generalise, but it can produce insights into the development of moral values. Such knowledge on moral learning is a necessary prerequisite when considering the teacher's role in moral education.

Giving students the opportunity to develop moral values in a social-constructivist way is a means of supporting their autonomy, their personal empowerment. It is a condition for a democratic life in which they can have freedom of expression and in which society expects their active participation. Teachers and researchers should therefore focus more on the learning processes of students.

3. From Moral Learning to Teaching Moral Values

With such ideas about learning, we have moved beyond the notion of transfer. We are not arguing for spontaneous learning processes without any pedagogical goals or a role for teachers. But how can

teachers influence the learning process of students? The above-presented social-constructivist view on learning has important consequences for teaching, in particular moral teaching. Teachers cannot simply transfer knowledge and values. The teacher's role in working with values is, like student learning, very complex.

Teachers have to guide the personal learning of each individual student. And guiding is both proactive and on the spot. Proactive guiding means organising learning environments, learning tasks, and offering knowledge. Guiding on the spot is the guiding of the learning process itself by reacting to the students' activities, expressions and statements. In this guiding process, teachers need to make judgements, and some of these judgements will be moral judgements (Veugelers, 2010a). Pedagogical and ethical sensitivity is part of these moral judgements (Schutte, 2018; Diemel, 2019).

Teachers do not guide this learning process in a vacuum. Their pedagogical performance as a teacher is steered by the purpose of education and the concrete goals of the curriculum. As Oser (1994) and Tirri (1999) have shown, teachers' pedagogical ethos is at the heart of the teaching profession. Even when these guiding processes are not very transparent, a teacher's performance is always driven by an explicit and implicit purpose and ethos (Veugelers, 2010a).

Like learning, teaching is dialogical, but teaching differs from learning by its intention to influence the learner; it is purposeful action. It is a pedagogical and goal-oriented intention to influence the development of students (Veugelers, 2000). The teacher's intention to influence the identity development of students is legitimised by the purpose and aims of education. It is this professional pedagogical task that constitutes the normative foundation of teachers' work.

Teachers, moral values, and the curriculum

Teachers always work with goals in educational practices. These goals are embedded at different curriculum levels: in theory, in policy, in the curriculum material, at the school level, and in the classroom (Goodlad, 1979). Each level shapes the curriculum and at the same time creates room for a teacher's own articulation. Such a curriculum model is not a top-down model. At each level actors can influence the curriculum.

Research that takes into account the different levels of the curriculum and teachers' activities can show coherence and differences between the distinguished levels and can show the own interpretation - the own refraction - made by teachers. It also shows the difficulties that teachers are confronted with at a more concrete level.

Teachers, like learners, construct their educational practice actively and dialogically. It is their craftsmanship, their way of making teaching a lively and creative profession. Education systems differ in the way and the extent to which they structure the teachers' pedagogical work and leave room for their professional autonomy (Veugelers & Zijlstra, 2004). But in most systems teachers have some autonomy, although this 'autonomy' is always limited by formal goals, regulations and assessments. Teachers need to navigate between policy and students' development. This navigation is steered by their pedagogical ideals.

In this paragraph on teachers we first spoke about their pedagogical role, and then their position in the education system. Now we move on to include the content, more specifically, moral values. This means focusing more on teachers' methodology, or on what is called 'didactics' on the European continent. It is about the way teachers work with students.

Moral values are always embedded in the curriculum and in teacher's activities with students (Veugelers & Vedder, 2003). The

values can be formulated as goals, but this is often not the case. Instead, the values are ‘hidden’ in the curriculum and in the teacher’s activities. Research can try to make these hidden values explicit and analyse how they contribute to the students’ moral learning.

As with student learning, we again take a social-constructivist perspective. In this perspective we cannot speak of value transfer by teachers, but this doesn’t mean that teachers are value-free or value-neutral. In their teaching and their use of the curriculum, teachers show and present moral values: teachers bring these values into the dialogue with students; teachers demonstrate them through their examples and through their answers to students’ questions. Each teacher stimulates certain values: therefore we introduced the concept of ‘value stimulation’ (Veugelers, 2000). The concept of ‘value stimulation’ makes clear that teachers (always) stimulate certain values. Even if they cannot transfer values into the students’ heads and hearts, teachers are not neutral in their pedagogical actions.

Given the pedagogical relationship involved in an educational context, students need to react - formally or informally - to the values stimulated by the teachers. Students cannot ignore the values teachers present. And given the hierarchy in the structure of education, the pedagogical authority of the teacher, and the assessment of students by the teacher, the values-input of a teacher exceeds that of the students. Teachers are in charge, even if students have a strong voice in education (Veugelers, 2015a; Bron & Veugelers, 2016). Students need to take the values of the teacher seriously to stay part of the educational community (Veugelers, 2008). Teachers formally control processes of inclusion and exclusion in the educational community.

In teaching it is very important to examine how teachers work with their own values. Teachers always show their values, but they can differ in how strongly they emphasise their own values and how clearly they present other moral values and other perspectives. In

several research projects among students, we found that teachers stress their own values quite strongly, while according to the students they could present more different perspectives and place less emphasis on their own values (Veugelers, 2000).

Controversial issues: global, local and culture

A recent important area of research on moral values is on teaching about issues that are controversial in society. They are either part of the curriculum or enter into school through students' own input (Hess, 2007). Controversial issues often pertain to political topics like the Middle East and terrorism (Veugelers, Derriks & De Kat, 2006) or to life questions like evolution theory, abortion and gender-issues (Veugelers & Schuitema, 2010).

It seems that controversial issues are growing in scope and contributing to polarisation, both in schools and in society at large. In particular political and cultural issues are now considered controversial: colonialism, slavery, holocaust, Israel and Palestine, the Iraq war, Islam, terrorism, migration, and so on. And more recently, in many Western countries nationalist movements and nationalist political parties are becoming bigger, also among youngsters, while teachers often find it difficult to talk about such nationalist ideas.

Curriculum documents and textbooks often don't pay much attention to such controversial issues, and teachers often try to avoid them (Klaassen, 2010). However, teachers who take their moral task seriously cannot avoid such controversial issues but need to address them. It is important, for pedagogical and democratic reasons, that teachers show and analyse different perspectives on such issues: different political, cultural, religious, and personal perspectives. And to demonstrate that critical thinking is not only a logical operation of comparing perspectives, but that moral values and political ideas are often at stake when making judgements (Veugelers, 2001). Critical thinking is a normative action.

A pedagogical methodology that pays attention to different perspectives and analyses which moral values are at stake should be the normal way of teaching. It should address all kinds of issues, from daily experiences to various social, cultural, political and academic controversies. If you wait as teacher until an issue is controversial, then it's too late to develop in students the skills and attitudes to think critically. Students have to be educated in thinking from different perspectives.

Research on teaching moral values

There is quite a lot of research on how to educate student-teachers in moral education; see for example the work by Tirri (1999), Campbell (2003), Sanger and Osguthorpe (2013) and the PhD-studies of Claasen (2013), Vloet (2015), De Keijzer and Simonsz. However, there isn't much research on teachers' moral educational practice. It is rather odd for teacher educators to teach what we don't really know. We need more classroom research. In particular we need observational studies to observe what teachers actually do in concrete educational practices. I always try to include classroom observation in the research of my PhD-students. As the PhD-studies by Schuitema (2008), Bartels (2013) and Oostdijk reveal, there are discrepancies between teachers' narratives about their teaching and their actual practice. One of the best examples of such ethnographic research is still the book 'The Moral Life of Schools' by Jackson, Boostrom and Hansen (1993). We need more studies like this.

If teachers really try to influence the moral learning of students, then they need to guide their reflective, dialogical and democratic learning processes. This means challenging students to include different perspectives, moral values as criteria of reflection, engaging students in dialogue, keeping the solution open, respecting other opinions, and

trying to find a consensus that respects contradictions. As you can see, teaching is very complex and normative.

4. School Culture, the Practice of Moral and Civic Learning

So far I have focused on moral values in curriculum activities: on teaching and learning. Now I turn more to relationships in education: to the school culture. As a student in a school, youngsters practice values: they exercise and experience moral and civic learning. In the curriculum students reflect on values, in the school culture they practice values. The school culture is the embodied learning process.

Moral values are interwoven in the formal and informal way of living and learning together in schools. The French sociologist Durkheim (1923) clearly showed how traditional school culture socialises children, in a very adaptive way. Other sociologists of education have also shown these adaptive socialising tendencies in education; see for example the work by Willis (1977) and Apple (1999). But such a socialising reproductive tendency is never absolute; critical studies like those by Willis (1977) and Giroux (1989) show the presence of both reproductive and transformative elements in education and in the moral development of students (Veugelers 2008). Nevertheless, an adaptive orientation is still very strong in the practice of education and its school culture.

Educational thinkers like Rousseau, Steiner and Montessori tried to escape from this authoritarian and adaptive education by developing a more child-centred pedagogy. This kind of pedagogical thinking tends to neglect the context; it reverses the direction of influence by placing not society but the individual student in the centre. This turning around of the educational process is even more difficult to realise in schools than following the tradition of teacher-centred education. Especially in strongly controlled educational systems, there is barely any room for student input.

A more fundamental critique of child-centred pedagogies is that, both in theory and in practice, such an approach fails to balance bottom-up and top-down forces in education (Veugelers, 2004). Child-centred pedagogies tend to neglect the top-down, and they ‘believe’ that they have a child-centred education. Or they live and work in two different parallel worlds: sometimes in the bottom-up, sometimes in the top-down mode. And in contemporary educational reality, in such a parallel system the top-down dominates. The challenge for educational studies and teachers is to develop methodologies that link top-down and bottom-up processes.

The moral psychologist Kohlberg also wanted to change the top-down educational strategy and to overcome the tension between top-down and bottom-up. He suggested that people should not ignore the context – as happens in child-centred pedagogies – but should transform the structure of education (Power, Higgins & Kohlberg, 1989). According to Kohlberg’s philosophy of education, more democratic education can enhance autonomy, social concern and justice. Drawing on the pedagogical work by Dewey, Kohlberg challenged students to become actively engaged in shaping their education. In so called ‘Just community schools’, students could create more democratic learning environments and could develop more democratic values like autonomy and social concern. Oser, Althof and Higgins (2008) continued the research on ‘Just community schools’. We see similar developments in what are called ‘democratic schools’ (Apple & Beane, 1995). And in the ‘student voice’ movement, students are given more possibilities to influence what happens in school, even – as Bron (2018) has demonstrated – in negotiating the curriculum.

Greater student involvement in governance, curriculum design and daily practical activities in schools can stimulate moral development and an engaged and democratic attitude.

The fact that there are not many examples of such democratic schools shows how difficult it is to transform schools into more democratic schools. The hierarchy in the structure of the educational system and of schools, and the strong control of learning by external assessments, strongly inhibit the development of democracy-oriented schools.

In a recent study we performed on request of the European Parliament we investigated how all 28 EU-Member States pay attention to the ‘common values’ of democracy and tolerance (Veugelers, De Groot & Stolk, 2017). The research showed that in most EU Member States there is not only a gap between policy and practice, but also within policy itself: that is, between the general goals and the concrete measures. The Netherlands is a strong example of both gaps.

This is again an important area for research and development: how a more democratic school system can be realised that balances democratic functioning, national goals, school policy, and students’ learning.

Social and cultural segregation

School culture is the living together of people, mainly of students and teachers. School culture is not only a social-psychological interaction; the interaction is constituted by its actors, and specifically by their sociological determinants of social class, gender, ethnicity, and religion or worldview. Part of school culture is therefore shaped by the social and cultural composition of students and teachers. Many schools, in particular in North-Western Europe, have become segregated by social class and ethnicity. And in educational systems with many religious schools, as in the Netherlands, also by religion and world view (Veugelers, De Groot & Stolk, 2017). In many schools there is a lack of diversity among both students and teachers. This lack of diversity is mostly not even recognised. We must wonder what kind of moral example is set by having segregated schools!

Segregated schools differ in terms of experienced school culture. This applies in particular when segregation is the effect of exclusion, and such exclusion can strongly influence the identity development of students. From our democratic and social justice perspective, schools should be as inclusive as possible (Veugelers & Leeman, in press).

Public schools in which all students are welcome are more inclusive than private schools. And public schools are of the whole of society and prepare students for society as a whole. Private schools focus on partial goals and on supporting specific, mostly elite social and cultural groups. The research we have done on public schools in the Netherlands reveals that many schools focus on active participation by students, stimulate diversity, and seek to prepare students for democratic participation (Veugelers & De Kat, 2005). These studies also show that public schools often have trouble dealing with moral and social issues: to draw up policy in this area and to implement this policy. There is however a growing awareness that moral and citizenship education is also a task of public schools.

School culture in a moral perspective is very important and should not only be considered as interaction and organisation but as a social system that includes and excludes, and that sets a moral example in terms of power relations, moral values and lived practices.

Regarding moral learning and moral teaching, we again call for observational studies and more ethnographic work on the learning and living processes of students, the pedagogical activities of teachers, and the interactions of teachers with students and between students: in short, on the practice of moral values in school culture. School culture is both an embedded moral practice and a moral exemplar.

It is not easy to investigate the effects of classroom activities, but one of the results clearly established by the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS, 2010; 2017) is the effect of an open classroom climate. An open classroom climate positively correlates with political and democratic attitudes.

5. Moral Values: Discipline, Autonomy and Social Concern

I speak a lot about moral values. But what kind of moral values are we referring to? In our theoretical and empirical research, three groups of moral values are central: *discipline, autonomy, and social concern*:

- *Discipline* has to do with listening and behaving well. It is at the heart of Durkheim's (1923) sociology of socialisation and in traditional forms of 'character education', as in the work by Lickona (1991). It is about following norms and values: hence, adaptation. It teaches you how you should behave.
- *Autonomy* refers to setting pedagogical goals as personal empowerment and formulating your own opinion. Autonomy is a central concept in Kohlberg's moral development theory, and in moral reasoning and moral identity (Power, Higgins & Kohlberg, 1989). Autonomy is a very important concept in moral psychology. In sociology, Giddens (1990) combined structure with agency. Introducing agency in sociological theory has made societal development more dynamic and it creates room for a personal articulation in identity development, and so contributes to personal empowerment. In the Western world, in modernity, and in humanist philosophy, people's autonomy-development is considered very important.
- The *social* moral dimension is found in a broad range of theories; from a social-psychological emphasis on empathy (Selman, 1975) and care (e.g. Noddings, 2002), the justice approach by Rawls and Kohlberg, to more transformative political articulations in concepts such as solidarity and social justice (e.g. Freire, 1985; Veugelaers, 2017b). The social orientation, in particular in its more political and social justice articulations, can contribute to collective empowerment.

In the moral development of each human being there is a specific combination – ‘bricolage’ – of these three moral values. Also in educational activities, visions and policies these three moral values are embedded in specific combinations.

We can see these moral values even in football. And as many of you know, I have published about this as well (Veugelers, 1983). The Barcelona football team is a good example of moral values. As in society, these three moral values are relevant in football. Football needs adaptation: perform your task – assigned by the coach – in a disciplined way. But also social concern: help each other, play as a team. The combination of adaptation and social concern can lead to quite defensive play, therefore football needs some autonomy: players like Messi who can dribble and can take individual action. But too much autonomy and neglecting the social orientation and adaptation leads to losing the ball and chaos in the team.

The recent successes of Ajax in the Champions League show the importance of these moral values: the collaboration within the team combined with the individual skills of players like De Jong, Ziyech and De Ligt. However, the semi-final with Tottenham Hotspur also showed the relevance of virtues of power, perseverance, and resilience. These are what I would call the positive moral values in character education, in contrast to the more negative adaptation and conformative values of following norms and discipline.

Different types of citizenship

In empirical educational research we constantly find the three clusters of moral values: discipline, autonomy and social orientation. The analyses of a survey among a representative sample of Dutch teachers revealed three different types of citizenship that represent different combinations of the three moral values (Leenders, Veugelers & De Kat, 2008a). An adapted type of citizenship emphasises adaptation

(discipline) and social orientation, in particular with respect to the own community. The second type is the individualised citizenship with a strong focus on autonomy and also to some extent adaptation, but with a weak social orientation. The third type, which we call a critical-democratic citizenship, combines a focus on autonomy and on social concern.

We call this third type democratic because of its search for balance between the person and the other and the attention for the common good and a democratic way of life and politics. We add critical to democracy to stress the dynamic character of democracy and the possibility for individuals to influence societal developments.

I believe that contemporary society and the future of the world need such critical-democratic citizenship, but I am aware of the fact that this is a normative choice. A choice based on political ideas about a good life, a human world and a just society. I would also call it a humanist perspective, because of its linking of autonomy and social orientation. The Dutch humanist organisation has the slogan: ‘think for yourself and live together’.

We found these different types of citizenship in several studies among teachers, students, and parents. We could also distinguish different educational practices related to these types of citizenship and citizenship education (traditional teacher-directed education, individualised education, and cooperative and inquiry-oriented education). However, we also found significant disparities between goals and actual practices. At the level of goals the critical-democratic type is quite strong in the Netherlands, but in educational practice the adaptive dominates.

The individualised citizenship type is partly ‘hidden’, or implicit, in educational practice: in assessing students, in competition and selection, and in child-centred pedagogies. Child-centred pedagogies neglect the influence of society and express what Aloni (2007) called a naturalistic-romantic view of human development. The combination of a market-oriented neo-liberal education strategy and a focus on a

child-centred view on the unique individual strongly emphasises an individualised citizenship.

Given the strong practice of adaptation and the 'hidden' effect of the individualised citizenship, an explicit focus on a critical-democratic citizenship education is desirable.

Moral values and the political

Linking these moral values and citizenship and citizenship education already showed how moral values are tied up with social and political relationships, and how the societal context influences the articulation of moral values. Moral values never occur in a vacuum. Perhaps it does in abstract theoretical thinking, but then moral thinking is more a kind of preaching; the recitation of mantras of nice but rather abstract values. Educational practice, however, is about concrete moral values in concrete contexts.

Our research on citizenship education, but also research by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) and Haste (2004), clearly show how moral values are embedded in societal and political contexts and relationships. Different societal and political orientations emphasise different moral values and give different articulations to moral values. This linking of the moral and the political does not diminish the relevance of moral values; instead and quite conversely, it shows how important moral values are in daily life. Moral values constitute and frame human relationships (see also the work by Lakoff & Wehling, 2012). Research on moral values will increase its validity by analysing moral values in their social, cultural and political contexts.

6. Moral Education and Citizenship Education

In educational policy and in research, attention for citizenship education has been growing in recent decades. Originally the concept of citizenship was strongly linked to a nation state. The use of the concept of citizenship has however changed in the past decades; in theory, policy, and in practice. The concept has been ‘deepened’: it is now not only used at the level of the political but also at the social and cultural level, and it pertains to how to live together (Veugelers, 2010c). The concept has also been ‘broadened’: from the national to regional (e.g. European) level, and to the global level. Many scholars nowadays speak of global citizenship and global citizenship education.

First the deepening of the concept of citizenship. The social and cultural use of citizenship pertains to the kind of behaviour a society expects of its citizens. It is a kind of moral code. You can argue that each society needs a moral code to bind the community and to regulate the political but also social and cultural life.

However, societies can differ and in fact differ in their moral code. In an authoritarian regime the code will be very strict: vertical with not much space for own articulations by its citizens. In open and democratic societies the moral code creates room for diversity, for a living together of different personalities, and for active and collaborative deliberations about the moral code.

It is interesting to see that in many countries across the world, governments are actively engaging with citizenship development and giving an important task to education in preparing youngsters and newcomers for living in the society of their nation. Many governments are taking their socialisation function seriously.

It is perhaps surprising that in an era of neo-liberal dominance, governments, also in the Western world, are so expressly using education to socialise their youngsters. Governments are not saying that

we should leave the education of future citizens to the parents or to the market. No, governments have even increased the role of schools in citizenship development. And given the deepening of the concept, governments are actively involved in the identity development of youngsters, and hence in their moral development.

I think we should take a positive view of this political involvement in moral development. It recognises and values the role of schools in educating youngsters and it makes it possible to engage both schools and youngster in dialogue. In a democratic society this should imply that different groups like parents and civic organisations are involved in setting goals for citizenship education and that they contribute actively to curriculum development and the educational practice itself (Stroetinga, Leeman & Veugelers, 2018; Veugelers, 2019a; 2019b).

7. The Academic Field of Citizenship Education

The academic attention for citizenship and citizenship education has increased enormously in the past decades. Let us focus on the concept of citizenship and how it is used in academic research (this paragraph is quite similar to a passage in Veugelers, 2019a). Many researchers have started theoretical and empirical projects in this field. As research on citizenship education is becoming a solid academic sub-discipline, it is interesting to analyse from which disciplines the researchers derive and what kinds of concepts they are introducing into the field.

We present a short ‘genealogy’ of the academic field of citizenship education over the past five decades. Traditionally, the academic field of citizenship and citizenship education was part of the discipline of political science. In the post-war period, Marshall (1964) in particular shaped the modern academic thinking about political systems, institutions and rights and duties. In the seventies, sociologists like Isin and Turner (2002) and Bourdieu (1984) entered the field, making

the connection between the political arena and society stronger. In that period the focus in the sociology of education was on the reproduction of society, that is, of social and political power relations and positions. Critical pedagogy, based on the educational work of Freire (1985) and extended by Giroux (1989, see also Veugelers, 2017b) into a more comprehensive theory of building democracy through education, made citizenship research more dynamic and transformative. Political psychologists like Torney-Purta (2002) initiated attention for the cognitive and affective processes involved in youngsters' social and political development. Philosophers, for example McLaughlin (1992), Nussbaum (1997) and Crick (1999), entered the debate about what citizenship and in particular democracy and participation means, and how education can or cannot contribute to citizenship development. This has been followed more recently by the more political philosophy of Mouffe (2005), which emphasises that contradictions ('agonism') should be considered as part of a democratic society.

As citizenship education became more central in policy and practice, other disciplines joined as well. Social studies scholars focused on curriculum content (Kerr, 1999), on classroom activities like deliberation (Parker, 2003), and on teaching about controversial issues (Hess, 2009). Multicultural education (Banks, 2004) reinforced attention for diversity and plurality. At the same time, human rights scholars (Osler & Starkey, 2010) focused attention on individual rights and common values. Within the field of educational studies and pedagogy, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) studied learning in service-learning projects while Biesta (2011) explored 'subjectification' in relationship to citizenship education. School effectiveness research resulted in comparative studies like the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS, 2010; 2017).

In research on moral education, Haste (2004) and Oser & Veugelers (2008) linked morality with society and the political domain: moral values are not abstract notions but embedded in societal contexts and political power relations. Post-colonial studies (Andreotti,

2011; Torres, 2017) went beyond a Western perspective on citizenship and citizenship education and emphasised social justice. A specific Asian perspective has been examined by scholars like Kennedy, Lee and Grossman (2010) and Sim (2011). They showed that an 'Asian' perspective has a more positive view on being social and of attachment to local and regional traditions. More recently, the concept of citizenship has been used in countries with strong internal conflicts, for instance by Reilly and Niens (2014) in relation to Northern Ireland and Goren and Yemini (2016) with regard to Israel. The concern for sustainability has also become part of citizenship: the citizen and his surroundings should become not only democratic but also sustainable (Gaudelli, 2016).

All these researchers, with their own knowledge base, specific articulations of concepts and research methods, have contributed to what we now can call the academic sub-discipline of citizenship education studies. It is a dynamic field with different social, moral, cultural and political perspectives. An interesting question is, what are we missing? What remains underexposed? The contribution of two fields can be elaborated. Sociology can reinvigorate the debate about the reproduction and transformation of society, social and political power relations and positions, and about the role of education. Political science can enhance the focus on power relations and on the concept of democracy. Many of the above-mentioned scholars address these issues to a certain extent, but more comprehensive contributions by sociology and political science can enhance the academic field of citizenship education.

8. Global Citizenship Education

Now I shall turn to what I called the ‘broadening’ of the concept of citizenship. The use of the concept of global citizenship is even more diffuse than that of national citizenship (Veugelers, 2011b). Some people use it in the sense of being open to linking different parts of the world with each other, and being open to cultural diversity in the world. Such *open global citizenship* is a neo-liberal market ideology of openness.

A second type of global citizenship is more *moral*; it is about appreciating diversity, enhancing humanity and taking care of the world. It is a moral call, a call for a better world (Nussbaum, Appiah). This moral call is not positioned in political power relations. Accordingly, it doesn’t challenge power relations or privileged positions.

Authors such as Freire (1985b), Mouffe (2005) and post-colonialism studies (Andreotti, 2011) have strongly criticised such moral global citizenship. In these critiques, a call for a more *social-political global citizenship* can be heard. A focus on social justice and equality, and on changing power relationships.

Research among teachers (Veugelers, 2011b) and in educational practices (Schutte, 2018) shows that teachers find it difficult to include such critical-political perspectives in their education. Teachers try to avoid being political, in particular towards social change.

We also constructed some scales to measure the three types of global citizenship. In a small study we compared student teachers in Indonesia and the Netherlands. The two groups do not differ with regard to an open and moral global citizenship. However, the Indonesian student teachers were more socio-politically oriented than a comparative group of Dutch student teachers (Veugelers, in press).

These studies have made clear that researchers and teachers should always analyse moral values in their context: interpersonal, societal,

and in their power relationships. We have stressed that teachers cannot be neutral; neither can researchers. However, we do not advocate any strong political intervention. We ask for analyses from different perspectives. This means a dialogical and investigative process, but with the recognition that power relations are always at stake. These power relations *can* be changed towards more social justice, an inclusive society, recognition of cultural diversity, and a strong and critical democracy. But this is a personal choice and depends on the importance attached to more transformative educational goals and activities in educational policy. And as research shows, for example the study we performed for the European Parliament on Teaching Common Values, most EU countries are not giving now priority to more transformative goals. But policy can change.

9. Democracy

In many ideas about citizenship and citizenship education, in particular in the Western world, the concept of democracy is central. The concept of democracy can be conceptualised in different ways, however. In democracy you can again see the linking of the moral values of autonomy and social orientation, though these concepts can be linked in different ways. The political philosopher Chantal Mouffe (2018, p. 14) clearly shows the two foundations of democracy. “A political regime is characterised by the articulation of two different traditions, a liberal tradition: the rule of law, the separation of power and the defence of individual freedom; on the other hand, the democratic tradition, whose central ideas are equality and popular sovereignty. (...) The first defines the originality of liberal democracy as a *politeia*, a form of political community that guarantees its pluralistic character. The democratic logic of constructing a people and defending egalitarian practices is necessary to define a *demos* and to subvert the tendency of liberal discourse to abstract universalism” (p. 15). Mouffe refers

to an agonistic tension between the liberal and the democratic principles. We need both to keep democracy strong and vigorous (see also the PhD-study of Van Waveren).

Lakoff and Welling (2012) formulate this tension in what they themselves call ‘two oversimplified examples’ (p.29). In a progressive case: “Democracy requires that citizens care about each other and take both personal and social responsibility to act on that care” (p.30). The more conservative version is “Democracy guarantees liberty to all citizens to pursue their own interests freely with limited commitment to the interests of others” (p.30).

Renewing personal and collective empowerment

Moral values such as equality and social justice are crucial to balancing freedom/autonomy and the social orientation. This again brings to mind, the attempt to balance personal and collective empowerment, as the lost promise of the sixties. Why not give it a new chance?

But let us learn from the sixties: by not letting personal empowerment become too inward-directed and too selfish, with hardly any attention for the context. And by not accelerating personal empowerment in a market orientation towards personal gain, and neglecting or even exploiting others.

The collective empowerment needs some updates, too. Collective empowerment should value critiques, dilemmas, plurality and agonistics; and should aim to be dialogical in a permanent process of enquiry.

The future of moral education in a critical-democratic sense depends on striking a good balance between autonomy and social orientation, and on permanently linking personal and collective empowerment.

10. Crucial Topics for Educational Change

So let's conclude and formulate some crucial topics for educational change.

Autonomy and social orientation

We have seen that autonomy and social orientation are two different orientations in pedagogical traditions. However, they should be linked in policy, theory and practice. Both in a humanist and a democratic perspective, the linking is a necessary condition for a more just and inclusive society. At a very basic level, as a human condition, we should see the person as a relational self, a social self, a self that is embedded in social conditions. A pure individual self doesn't exist; it is a product of a liberal and hedonistic illusion.

Situating the self in a social context is not a return to social determinism but is an acknowledgement that autonomy is linked with the social. A linking that is both limiting and open to change: in the words of Giddens, to structure and agency.

Moral and political

Paraphrasing Freire, we can speak of 'making the moral more political and the political more moral'. Moral values never exist in an abstract way, they are always embedded in concrete circumstances that are permeated by political, social and cultural power relations. Also, moral values are not universal. They are human constructs and people can unite in support of certain values. And some moral values are more accommodating of both autonomy and a social orientation. Moral values matter and should be part of dialogues and critical thinking.

The political is not a technical process but the expression of power relations and often contradictions in which ideas about the good life and living together are embedded: ideas that are full of moral values. Dialogues about embedded moral values can make the political more human and show the view points, choices and contradictions. Avoid-

ing the moral in the political and in citizenship education results in a technical rationality that mystifies the political and ideas about living together. Democracy as a combination of freedom and equality tries to link autonomy and a social orientation in a dynamic perspective.

Educational governance

Education is a conscious attempt to influence the development of youngsters. Parents, the community and society have ideas about the kind of influence that is desirable. In the nation state, as representative of society, the educational policy of the government is quite strong. However communities and parents have an influence as well. Particularly in the Netherlands, this influence of civic society and communities is strong.

Maybe even too strong, there is a kind of pacification in which the government doesn't really give freedom to schools and in which the government is caught by communities in particular religious communities and elites that oppose governmental influence in schools. This pacification results in a vague and supposedly neutral curriculum in areas such as moral and citizenship education.

A new balance between society, communities, parents, teachers and students should be sought, as part of a concern for the common good, society at large and an inclusive and democratic society and education.

Educational change

The ideas expressed in this speech are not only relevant for learning and teaching. The same applies for professional development and school development. They are also learning entities, and policy at different levels attempts to influence the development of schools and teachers. Schools should be seen as dynamic, dialogical arenas full of moral values.

Ball (1987) used to speak of micro-politics of schools, meaning that schools function similar to politics with all the usual contradic-

tions, tensions and search for agreements Relations in schools can be very hierarchical and top-down; the so-called professionalism of school principals often contributes to this. Or they can be more democratic and bottom-up. School culture, school leadership and educational change can be more democratic (Veugelers, 2004; Veugelers & Zijlstra, 2004).

Collaboration instead of competition

Schools can be either very isolated and focused on their supposed uniqueness, or schools can work together in networks or in the (diverse) local community (Veugelers & O'Hair, 1985). Dutch schools are very much in the competitive mode and less in a cooperative mode.

I have been coordinating a network of secondary schools in the region of Amsterdam for 31 years. It is an informal cooperation in which principals and teachers exchange experiences and support each other in new initiatives. The network has proven to be sustainable. The network started with the ideas and implementation of the so-called 'studyhouse'. For a while the network included a group that focused on what we called the 'vormingsgericht studiehuis', or the educational studyhouse with a focus on cooperative learning, moral values, linking with society, and active participation in society.

It is a pity that the focus on citizenship in educational policies of the last decade has so far not resulted in similar networks on citizenship education. Unfortunately, the priority given to citizenship education in schools and in policy is not yet strong enough to build such networks of schools.

We already have such a network at the university level, namely EDIC. In the Erasmus Strategic Partnership 'Education for Democratic Intercultural Citizenship', seven universities work together on curriculum development and student and teacher exchange (www.uvh.nl/edic). The work has resulted in a book (Veugelers, 2019) that has been presented at an international seminar. The universities not only work

together in EDIC, but also with schools, NGOs and academics outside Europe.

Learning and teaching

The topics so far have focused on theory and policy, but what is essential is the practice: the learning process of students. Students should be challenged to learn more reflectively, dialogically and democratically, and to develop their citizenship, hopefully a critical-democratic type. Teachers guide these learning processes and intervene dialogically, driven by the purpose and goals of education and their own pedagogical ideals. Research should focus more on the practice of learning and teaching. And we all, citizens and scholars, should appreciate more the moral work of teachers. They can play a crucial role in making society more democratic, just, inclusive and sustainable.

Recognising the context and influencing your context

The social, cultural and political context of education is always very relevant. I have learned from the PhD studies in which the context was very central, for instance from the study by Moree (2008) on teachers in the transition of communism to democracy in the Czech republic, the study by Carpay (2010) on the societal influences of educational change in secondary schools in the Netherlands. I also learned from the study by Stolk (2015) on the history of humanism and education in the Netherlands, the current study by Berkers on the development of theory and practice of social work, and the study of Oostdijk on Humanist Ethical Education (HVO) in Dutch primary public schools.

I have also learned about the context and specific national, cultural and local developments in international activities like the RIAPE-project, on how universities can contribute to equality and social cohesion, especially in Latin America (Teodore & Guilherme, 2014; Veugelaers, De Groot, Llomovatte & Naidorf, 2017). And from my activities in Asia, especially as visiting professor at Yogyakhartha

Negeri University (Veugelers, 2018). Both Latin America and Asia show the positive influences of a more social orientation. Working together with scholars from these regions has challenged my thinking about the relationship between autonomy and social concern.

Future direction

In this valedictory speech I have analysed developments in theory, policy and practice of moral education and citizenship education in the past few decades. I have criticised the strong focus on the individual and its adaptation to society. Instead I argued for a stronger link of autonomy with social concern and social justice, connecting the moral and the political, and a critical and dynamic concept of democracy.

Learning should be considered as a reflective, dialogical and democratic process of meaning giving. In guiding these learning processes, teachers should include different perspectives and introduce moral values as criteria in reflection and critical thinking. Schools should be as democratic and inclusive as possible.

The direction for the future of moral and citizenship education should be a return to the sixties and their combination of personal and collective emancipation, or in more contemporary concepts: the combination of autonomy and social justice.

Acknowledgements

I am very happy with all the work I could do as an academic in the past 43 years, and I hope I have made the world a little bit better. I have had the pleasure and the honour of working with great colleagues, many of whom I am also proud to call my friends. First at the University of Amsterdam, and since 2002 also at the University of Humanistic Studies here in Utrecht; and in many international groups all over the world. There are too many to mention, and I am very happy that many of them are in the audience today.

I hope I can continue with all kinds of activities, but today I end my formal work as professor of education at the University of Humanistic Studies. As chair of humanistic education. I would like to thank the members of the board of the University of Humanistic Studies, in particular our vice-chancellor Gerty Lensvelt, and my colleagues in the chairgroup Education: Yvonne, Gaby, Martien, Isolde, Vincent and Gert, my students and in particular my PhD-students, colleagues of HVO (the Humanist Ethical Education organisation), and other colleagues at this great university.

I am very proud that the University of Humanistic Studies will continue the Education chair with Doret the Ruyter and some new scholars, Elina, Wouter and Bram, who recently joined the education group.

Finally I want to thank my friends, many of them friends since the sixties, and my family, in particular Jane, Ramon and Yvette, for their support and friendship. I hope I managed to balance autonomy and social concern for my friends and family as well, and I hope to continue to do so in the future. And now it's time to start dialogues and to meet people.

References

- Aloni, N. (2002). *Enhancing humanity*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). The political economy of global citizenship. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 307-310.
- Appiah, K. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Apple, M.A. (1999). *Power, meaning and identity*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Apple, M.A., & Beane, J.A. (Eds.) (1995). *Democratic schools*. Alexandria: ASCD.
- Ball, S. (1987). *The micro-politics of the school*. London: Routledge.
- Banks, J. (Ed.) (2004). *Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship education and global migration*. Washington DC: AERA.
- Bartels, R. (2013). *Democratie leren*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.
- Bartels, R., Onstenk, J., & Veugelers, W. (2016). Philosophy for Democracy. *Compare*, 46(5), 681-700.
- Bartels, R. Onstenk, J., & Veugelers, W. (2018). Philosophical Enquiry as Part of Democratic Education. *Curriculum and Teaching*, 33(1), 23-38.
- Bevort A., & Veugelers W. (2016) Active citizenship compared in France and the Netherlands. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 11(3), 315-332.
- Berkowitz, M., Althof, W., Turner, V.D., & Bloch, D. (2008). Discourse, development, and education. In: Oser, F., & Veugelers, W. (2008). *Getting Involved* (189-204). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

- Biesta, G. (2011). *Learning democracy in school and society*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *La distinction*. London: Routledge.
- Bron, J. (2018). *Student voice in curriculum development*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.
- Bron, J., & Veugelers, W. (2014). Why we need to involve our students in curriculum design: Five arguments for student voice. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 16(1), 125-139.
- Bron, J., Bovill, C., & Veugelers, W. (2016). Students experiencing and developing democratic citizenship through curriculum negotiation: the relevance of Garth Boomer's approach. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 36, 15-27.
- Bron, J., Bovill, C., & Veugelers, W. (2018). Distributed curriculum leadership: how negotiation between student and teacher improves the curriculum. *Journal of Ethics in Educational Leadership, special issue 1*, 76-98.
- Bruner, J. (1998). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Campbell, E. (2003). *The ethical teacher*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Carpat, T. (2010). *Anders kijken naar het studiehuis*. Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit. PhD-thesis.
- Carpay, T., Luttenberg, J., Veugelers, W., & Pieters, J. (2013). Harmony and diaharmony in an educational reform concert towards a Parsons' inspired dynamic model of tuning. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 45(6), 814-837.
- Crick, B. (1999). The presuppositions of citizenship education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 33(3), 337-352.
- Claasen, W. (2013). *Pedagogisch handelen van leraren*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.

De Groot, I. (2013). *Adolescents' democratic engagement*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.

De Groot, I., Goodson, I., & Veugelers, W. (2014). Dutch Students' Democratic Narratives: 'I know what democracy means, not what I think of it'. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 44(2), 271-292.

De Groot, I., Goodson, I., & Veugelers, W. (2014). Dutch adolescents' narratives of their citizenship efficacy: "Hypothetically, I could have an Impact". *Educational Review*, 66(2), 148-167.

De Groot, I., & Veugelers, W. (2015). Why we need to question the democratic engagement of adolescents in Europe. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 14(4), 27-38.

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

Diemel, K. (2019). *Kwintessens in het handelen van leraren*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.

Durkheim, E. (1971[1923]). *Moral education*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Freire, P. (1985a). *Reading the world and reading the word*. *Language Arts*, 62(1), 15-21.

Freire, P. (1985b). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Gaudelli, W. (2016). *Global citizenship education: everyday transcendence*. New York: Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Giddens, A. (1998). *The third way*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

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

Goodlad, J. (1979). *Curriculum Inquiry*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2016). Global citizenship education in context: teacher perceptions at an international and a local Israeli school. *Compare*, 46(5), 832-853.
- Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017). Global citizenship redefined: a systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *International journal of educational research*, 82, 170-183.
- Gramsci, A. (2000). *The Gramsci reader*. New York: NYU press.
- Hansen, D. (2011). *The teacher and the world*. New York: Routledge.
- Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen. *Political Psychology*, 25(3), 413-440.
- Hess, D. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hofmeister, J., & Veugelers, W. (1999). Career education in the Netherlands: Learning by experience and values stimulation. *Educational Research Journal*, 14 (2), 279-300.
- Hoskins, B., Abs, H., Han, C., Kerr, D., & Veugelers, W. (2012). *Contextual Analysis Report: Participatory Citizenship in the European Union*. www.ec.europa.eu/citizenship.
- International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (2017). *ICCS 2016 International Report*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Isin, E., & Turner, B. (Eds) (2002). *Handbook of citizenship studies*. London: Sage.
- Johnson, L., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *Curriculum Journal*, 21(1), 77-96.
- Jackson, P., Boostrom, D., & Hansen, D. (1993). *The moral life of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kennedy, K., Lee, W. O., & Grossman, D. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Citizenship pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Kerr, D. (1999). Citizenship education in the curriculum: an international review. *The School Field*, 3-4, 5-31.

Klaassen, C. (2010). Teachers' views and the need for moral courage. In: Klaassen, C., & Maslovaty, N. (Eds.). *Moral courage and the normative professionalism of teachers* (13-26). Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

Lakoff, G., & Wehling, E. (2012). *The little blue book*. New York: Free Press.

Leenders, H., & Veugelers, W. (2009). Different views on values and citizenship education. In: Zajda, J., & Daun, H. (Eds.). *Global values education: teaching democracy and peace* (21-34). Dordrecht: Springer.

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). Moral education and citizenship education at preuniversity schools. In: Oser, F.K., & Veugelers, W. (Eds.) *Getting Involved. Citizenship education and sources of moral values*. (57-74). Rotterdam/Taipeh: SensePublishers.

Leenders, H., Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. de. (2012). Moral Development and Citizenship Education in Vocational Schools. *Education Research International*, vol. 2012, DOI 10.1155/2012/901513

Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character*. New York: Random House.

Lock, A., & Strong, T. (2010). *Social constructionism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, T.H. (1964). *Class, citizenship and social development*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marwick, A. (1998). *The sixties*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- McLaughlin, T. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: a philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235-250.
- Moree, D. (2008). *How teachers cope with social and educational transformation*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.
- Moree, D., Klaassen, C., & Veugelers, W. (2008). Teachers' ideas about multicultural education in a changing society: the case of the Czech Republic. *European Educational Research Journal*, 7, 60-73.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the political*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Mouffe, C. (2018). *For a left populism*. London: Verso.
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nucci, L. (2016). Recovering the role of reasoning in moral education to address inequity and social justice. *Journal of Moral Education*, 45(3), 291-307.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Oser, F.K. (1994). Moral perspectives on teaching. *Review of Research in Education* 20, 57-127.
- Oser, F.K., Althof, W., & Higgins, A. (2008). The Just Community approach to moral education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 37(3), 395-415.
- Oser, F.K., & Veugelers, W. (Eds.) (2008) *Getting Involved. Citizenship education and sources of moral values*. Rotterdam/Taipeh: SensePublishers.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2010). *Teachers and human rights education*. London: IOE press.
- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: a typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 3, 301-325.
- Parker, W. (2003). *Teaching democracy*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Peters, M., Britton, A., & Blee, H. (Eds.). (2008). *Global Citizenship Education*. Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

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

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

Reilly, J., & Niens, U. (2014). Global citizenship education as education for peacebuilding in a divided society. *Compare*, 44(1), 53-76.

Roderik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox*. New York: Norton & Company.

Sanger, M., & Osguthorpe, R. (Eds.) (2013). *The moral work of teaching and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schuitema, J. (2008). *Talking about values*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam. PhD-thesis.

Schuitema, J., Radstake, H., Van de Pol, J., & Veugelers, W. (2018). Guiding Classroom discussions for democratic citizenship. *Educational Studies*, 44(4), 377-407.

Schuitema, J.A., Ten Dam, G., & Veugelers, W. (2008). Teaching Strategies for Moral Education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40, 1. 69-89.

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

Schuitema, J., Veugelers, W., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Dam, G. ten (2009). Two Instructional Designs for Dialogical Citizenship Education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 439-261

Schutte, I. (2018). *Ethical sensitivity and developing global civic engagement in undergraduate honors students*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.

Schutte, I., Kamans, E., Wolfensberger, M., & Veugelers, W. (2018). Effects of an International Undergraduate Honors Course on Awareness of Global

Justice. *Education Sciences*, 8, 82 doi:10.3390/educsci8020082.

Selman, R. (1975). Level of social perspective taking and the development of empathy in children. *Journal of Moral Education*, 5(1). 35-43.

Sim, J. (2011). Social studies and citizenship for participation in Singapore: How one state seeks to influence its citizens. *Oxford Review of Education*, 37 (6), 743-761.

Stolk, V. (2015). *Tussen autonomie en humaniteit*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.

Stolk, V., Los, W., & Veugelers, W. (2012). Physical Education for Citizenship or Humanity? Freethinkers and Natural Education in the Netherlands in the Mid-nineteenth Century. *History of Education*, 41,(6), 733-748

Stolk, V.J., Gasenbeek, B., & Veugelers, W. (2016). Secularisation of Religious Education: Humanism, Religion and Worldview Education in the Netherlands in the 1960s. *Journal of Beliefs and Values: Studies in Religion and Education*, 37, 186-200.

Stroetinga, M., Leeman, Y., Veugelers, W. (2018) Primary school teachers' collaboration with parents on upbringing: a review of the empirical literature. *Educational Review*, Doi.org/10.1080.0013911.1459478.

Teodoro, A., & Guilherme, M. (Eds.). *European and Latin America Higher Education Between Mirrors*. Rotterdam: SensePublishers

Tirri, K. (1999). Teachers' perceptions of moral dilemmas at school. *Journal of Moral Education*, 28(1), 31-47.

Torney-Purta, J. (2002). Patterns in the civic knowledge, engagement, and attitudes of European Adolescents. The IEA Civic Education Study. *European Journal of Education*, 37(2), 129-141.

Torres, C.A. (2017). *Theoretical and empirical foundations of critical global citizenship education*. New York: Routledge.

Veugelers, W. (1983). Alleen voetbalsupporters vallen nog aan. Voetbal als kulturele strijd. *Te Elfder Ure*, 35, 549-572.

Veugelers, W. (1995). Teachers and values regarding labor, *Curriculum Studies*, 3(2), 169-182.

Veugelers, W. (2000). Different ways of teaching values. *Educational Review*, 5(1), 37-46.

Veugelers, W. (2001) Teachers, Values and Critical Thinking. In: Steinberg, S.R. (Eds.) *Multi/Intercultural Conversations* (199-215). New York: Peter Lang.

Veugelers, W. (2003). *Waarden en normen in het onderwijs*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. Oratie.

Veugelers, W. (2004). Between control and autonomy: Restructuring Secondary Education in the Netherlands. *Journal of Educational Change*, 5, 141-160.

Veugelers, W. (2007). Creating critical democratic citizenship education: empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch Education. *Compare*, 37, 1, 105-109.

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: SensePublishers.

Veugelers, W. (2010a). Moral Values in Teacher Education. In: Peterson, P., Baker, E., & McGaw, B. (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Volume 7, 660-665. Oxford: Elsevier.

Veugelers, W. (2010b). Teaching religions and world views in a plural society. In: Klaassen, C., & Maslovy, N. (Eds.). *Moral courage and the normative professionalism of teachers*. Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

Veugelers, W. (Ed.) (2011a). *Education and Humanism. Linking autonomy and humanity*. Rotterdam: SensePublishers

- Veugelers, W. (2011b). The moral and the political in global citizenship. *Globalisation, societies and education*, 9(4), 473-485.
- Veugelers, W. (2011c). Theory and practice of citizenship education. *Revista de educacion*. 209-224.
- Veugelers, W. (2015a). Citizenship education and active student participation: The Netherlands. In: Zajda, J. (Ed.). *Nation-building and history education in a global culture* (103-116). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Veugelers, W. (2015b). Desarrollo de la identidad de los adolescentes y el rol moral de los docentes. *Harvard Deusto: Learning and Pedagogics*, 13-19.
- Veugelers, W. (2017a). Education for Critical-Democratic Citizenship: Autonomy and Social Justice in a Multicultural Society. In: Aloni, N., & Weintrob, L. (Eds.). *Beyond Bystanders* (47-60). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Veugelers, W. (2017b). The moral in Paulo Freire's work: What moral education can learn from Paulo Freire. *Journal of Moral Education*, 46(4), 412-421.
- Veugelers, W. (2018a). Moral and citizenship education in 21st century. In: Retnowatim E. et al. (Eds.). *Character education for 21st century global citizenship* (3-12). London: Routledge.
- Veugelers, W. (2018b). La educacion moral y para la ciudadania en el siglo 21. In: Minquez, R., & Romero, E. (Eds.). *La educacion ciudadana en un mundo en transformacion* (121-140). Barcelona: Octaedro.
- Veugelers, W. (Ed.). (2019). *Education for democratic intercultural citizenship*. Leiden: Brill I Sense.
- Veugelers, W. (in press). Different views on global citizenship. In: Schuguren-sky, D., & Wolhuter, C. (Eds.). *Global citizenship education and teacher education*. London: Routledge.
- Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. de (2002) Student Voice in School Leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(1). 97-108.

Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. de (1998). *Opvoeden in het voortgezet onderwijs*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. de (2003) The Moral task of teachers according to students, parents and teachers. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 9(1), 75-91.

Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. de (2003). Moral and Democratic Education in Secondary Schools (193-214). In: Veugelers, W., & Oser, F.K. (Eds.). *Teaching in Moral and Democratic Education* (193-216). Bern/New York: Peter Lang.

Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. de (2005). *Identiteitsontwikkeling in het openbaar onderwijs*. Apeldoorn: Garant.

Veugelers, W., & Kluvelde, A. (2005). Teens in the Netherlands. In: Steinberg, S.R. (Eds.). *Teens in Europe* (169-184). Boston: Greenwood Press.

Veugelers, W., & Leeman, Y. (in press). Pedagogical possibilities in culturally diverse inclusive education in the Netherlands. In: Claiborne, L., & Balakrishnan, V. (Eds.). *Difference, ethics and inclusive education*. Leiden: Brill I Sense.

Veugelers, W., & O'Hair, M. J. (Eds.) (2005). *Network learning for educational change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Veugelers, W., & Oser, F.K. (Eds.) (2003). *Teaching in Moral and Democratic Education*. Bern/New York: Peter Lang.

Veugelers, W., & Vedder, P. (2003). Values in Teaching. *Teachers and Teaching*. 9, 4, 377-389.

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

Veugelers, W., & Zijlstra, H. (1998). Learning Together in Networks of School and University. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. 1(2), 169-180.

Veugelers, W., & Zijlstra, H. (2004). Networks of Schools and Constructing Citizenship in Secondary Education. In: Hernandez, F., & I.F. Goodson (Eds.) *Social Geographies of Educational Change* (65-78). Kluwer/Springer Publishers

Veugelers, W., Derriks, M., & Kat, E. de (2006). Education and major cultural incidents.11 september and Dutch education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 3, 2. 235-249.

Veugelers, W., Groot, I. de, & Nollet, F. (2014). Higher education and citizenship development. In: Teodoro, A., & Guilherme, M. (Eds.). *European and Latin America Higher Education Between Mirrors* (179-196). Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

Veugelers, W., Groot, I. de, & Stolk, V. (2017). *Teaching Common Values in Europe*. Brussels: European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Politics.

Veugelers, W., Groot, I. de, Lloomovatte, S., & Naidorf, J. (2017). Higher Education, Educational Policy and Citizenship Development. *Education and Society*, 35(1), 27-42.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT press.

Vloet, K. (2015). *Professionele identiteitsontwikkeling van leraren als dialogisch proces*. Utrecht: Universiteit voor Humanistiek. PhD-thesis.

Vloet, K., Jacobs, G., & Veugelers, W. (2013). Dialogic Learning in Teachers' Professional Identities. In: Ligorio, M. & Cesar, M. (Eds.). *Interplays between Dialogical Learning and Dialogical Self*. (419-457). New York: Information Age.

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

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour*. Franborough: Saxon House.

Academic Career Wiel Veugelers

Prof. Dr. Wiel Veugelers has been a professor of education at the University for Humanistic Studies in Utrecht (the Netherlands). He studied developmental psychology at the University of Amsterdam. From 1979 till 2015 he was working at the Graduate School of Teaching and Learning of the University of Amsterdam, recently as associate professor. Since 2002 he had a chair as Professor of Education at the University of Humanistic Studies in Utrecht, in particular in the area of moral and citizenship education with a special focus on a humanist perspective on ethical education.

He is coordinating the network 'Education for Democratic Intercultural Citizenship' (EDIC) in which seven European universities work together in education and research (since 2010). This network is funded by the European Erasmus + Programme (strategic partnership). www.uvh.nl/edic. He was the coordinator of the EU-funded Research Project Teaching Common Values Democracy and Tolerance (2016-2017). All 28 EU member States participated in this study.

He had several tasks in the American Educational Research Association (AERA) SIG Moral Development and Education (programme chair, SIG chair, chair Awards committee). He was co-founder and president of the European Association of Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI) SIG Moral and Democratic Education and was president of the Division Education and Society of the Dutch Educational Research Association (VOR). He was a member of the board of the Association of Dutch Teacher Educators (VELON) (1996-2007).

He is co-editor of the bookseries 'Moral Development and Citizenship Education' of Brill | Sense. He is associate editor of the Journal of Moral Education (since 2012) and member of the editorial boards of the journals Compare, International Journal of Leadership in Education and Pedagogiek.

He was a member of the expert group of indicators for citizenship and citizenship education of the European Commission. And since 2012 a member of the international programme advisory board of the IEA study on citizenship education (ICCS).

In 2012 he received the Maslovaty Award of the SIG Moral and Democratic Education of EARLI for his book 'Education and Humanism'. In 2015 he received of the Association of Moral Education the Kuhmerker Career Award for his contribution to the research on moral and citizenship education.

Colofon

Learning and Teaching in
Critical-Democratic Citizenship Education
Prof. dr. Wiel Veugeliers

ISBN 978 908 253 5884
NUR 715

Graphic design and illustration (cover):
Netty van Haarlem

The text of this valedictory speech can be found online at the
website of the University of Humanistic Studies: www.uvh.nl.