

# Contextual Analysis Report

Participatory Citizenship in the European Union

Institute of Education

---

Bryony Hoskins, Hermann Abs, Christine Han, David Kerr and Wiel Veugelers

Report 1

European Commission, Europe for Citizens Programme

Submitted 10<sup>th</sup> May 2012

**Commissioned by the European Commission, Europe for Citizens Programme, Brussels**  
Tender No. EACEA/2010/02

**Contact information**

Name: Bryony Hoskins  
Address: Southampton Education School, University of Southampton, UK  
Email: [B.Hoskins@soton.ac.uk](mailto:B.Hoskins@soton.ac.uk)

Name: Hermann J. Abs  
Address: University of Giessen, Germany  
Email: [Hermann.J.Abs@erziehung.uni-giessen.de](mailto:Hermann.J.Abs@erziehung.uni-giessen.de)

Name: Christine Han  
Address: Institute of Education, London, UK  
Email: [C.Han@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:C.Han@ioe.ac.uk)

Name: David Kerr  
Address: Citizenship Foundation, London, UK  
Email: [David.Kerr@citizenshipfoundation.org.uk](mailto:David.Kerr@citizenshipfoundation.org.uk)

Name: Wiel Veugelers  
Address: University of Humanistics Studies, Utrecht  
Email: [W.Veugelers@UvH.nl](mailto:W.Veugelers@UvH.nl)

**Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank everyone who has contributed to this report, in particular those who collected data from European countries. A complete list of contributors is in the Appendix.

All the reports for this study are available on the Europe for Citizens website:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm)

Electronic copies may be obtained from Dr Bryony Hoskins ([B.Hoskins@soton.ac.uk](mailto:B.Hoskins@soton.ac.uk)), to whom any queries relating to the copyright of this series should be addressed.

Contextual report: Participatory Citizenship in the European Union  
ISBN 9780854329373

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	4
Introduction and scope.....	6
<b>Chapter 1. Defining citizenship .....</b>	<b>7</b>
The liberal model .....	9
The communitarian model .....	10
The civic republican model .....	11
The critical model .....	11
Impact of models .....	12
Different definitions and conceptions of citizenship .....	13
<b>Chapter 2. Typology of participatory forms of citizenship in the European Union ...</b>	<b>18</b>
Examples of terminology that cover the concept of participatory forms of citizenship .....	18
The current policy emphasis on learning citizenship.....	22
Conclusion .....	23
<b>Chapter 3. Empirical research on Participatory Citizenship .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Research on Participatory forms of Citizenship .....	25
Dimensions of Participatory Citizenship .....	27
Discussion - Quality of participation: Knowledge, skills, attitudes and efficacy.....	30
Community activities .....	31
Discussion.....	32
Political civil society activities.....	33
Discussion.....	33
Values of democracy, human rights, social cohesion and tolerance .....	34
Discussion.....	35
<b>Chapter 4. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>37</b>
Appendix: List of contributors .....	38
References.....	41

## Executive Summary

The concept of citizenship as merely a legal concept has been considered too narrow for modern democratic society for a number of reasons:

- Having legal rights is insufficient to enable equal possibilities for all citizens to activate their rights. Participatory forms of Citizenship require the capability to exercise rights.
- Gaining and maintaining rights requires constant action and vigilance from citizens, and a legal definition does not encompass these processes.
- The legal definition emphasizes rights, and places less emphasis on obligations. Obligations of the state upon the citizen are not always legally framed, but occur as citizens' perceptions of norms. These participatory norms, for example voting, are crucial for the health of democracy.
- The legal definition focuses on the relationship between the state and the individual, and ignores the relationship between citizens and the associations they form, as well as the importance of associative life in the balance of democracy. In this regard, citizens need to participate in civic and political life in order to ensure the accountability of the state, and the legitimation of democracy.

The concept of Participatory Citizenship is broader than that of citizenship because it encompasses these dimensions, and is understood as 'Participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy' (Hoskins 2006). This definition is inclusive to the norms of participation of the different traditions and models of citizenship across Europe including the liberal, communitarian, civic republican and critical citizenship models, comprising a wide range of activities such as volunteering, conventional politics and protest activities. The values that underpin these activities are the values of human rights and democracy.

The concept of European citizenship can widen the notion of Participatory Citizenship by transcending national boundaries, and challenges nationalistic notions of the nation state by emphasizing a common identity between citizens of different countries in Europe. However, the danger is that it also infers a new boundary based on geography, that is, the border of the European Union.

There is a wide range of terminology used in the field of citizenship which is used rather loosely. The report defines the following concepts: citizenship, Participatory or Active Citizenship, Active European Citizenship, passive or inactive citizenship, political participation, global citizenship, cosmopolitan citizenship, civic competence and political literacy.

In terms of policy on Participatory Citizenship in the Netherlands, the UK and Slovenia there appears to be more focus on community activities than political activities, whilst in Italy and Denmark there is a balance, and in France and Germany there is a greater focus on political participation. In France and Denmark there is a clear focus on democratic values. The policy focus in Germany, Denmark, Italy and France is on formal education policies, whilst in the England and the Netherlands the focus is shifting from formal education towards non-formal and community based activities.

Despite variations in policy emphasis, the terms 'Active' or 'Participatory' Citizenship has political resonance in the European countries studied; and so long as the differences in understanding are recognized this term may be continued to be used. The European working definition of Participatory Citizenship could be enhanced by explicitly recognizing the importance of civic knowledge and skills to enhance the quality of participation. In addition, the definition could also be broadened to include economic life, and to encompass value-based participation at work, which would have political relevance to the economic crisis.

With respect to policy, there are two recommendations:

- First, consideration should also be given to providing a clearer conceptual framework underpinning the European dimension of Participatory Citizenship, and how this relates to the term Participatory Citizenship in terms of theory, policy and practice.
- Second, Participatory Citizenship policies tended to be dispersed across government departments, and not joined up. The recommendation is therefore that the European Commission supports countries to develop more coherent policies in this field.

Recent studies help us to understand the situation of Participatory Citizenship across Europe. They show, among other things, that it is the young, unemployed, and least educated who participate to the most restricted extent across Europe.

Analyses of data and future research should therefore focus more on these low scoring groups. Relevant questions include identifying the extent to which there is an overall low participation and negative attitudes on the different areas of Participatory Citizenship, and what contributes to the development of these attitudes.

## Introduction and scope

In the context of developing the new Europe for Citizens Programme 2014–2020, and in light of the upcoming 2013 European Year of Citizens, and the 2014 European Parliament elections, this report:

- Defines citizenship
- Clarifies the concepts close to it in the field
- Begins to map the use of terminology in the member states and its relevance to national policies
- Identifies the state of play of current levels of Participatory Citizenship in Europe from reviewing existing literature.

The report is the first outcome from the study ‘Participatory Citizenship in the European Union’ and, therefore, provides the conceptual underpinning for this study. The study as a whole aims to deepen the understanding of citizenship across European Union countries at a local, national and regional level, and identify barriers and facilitators to encourage more citizen engagement in Europe. The study will attempt to provide answers to the following questions:

- What is the relationship between local, national, regional and European forms of Participatory Citizenship?
- Which are the most effective drivers and approaches to fostering Participatory forms of Citizenship at the different levels?
- How is it possible to overcome the barriers towards Participatory Citizenship at various levels, taking into account the quantity and diversity of European citizens?
- What is the relationship between the concepts of citizenship, Active Citizenship and passive citizenship, responsible citizenship, and other terminology used in the field?
- How does Participatory Citizenship contribute to achieving the EU 2020 goals in the social and economic sphere?
- What is the nature of relationship between individual and collective action?
- What is the nature of the relationship between Participatory Citizenship and education, lifelong learning and intercultural competence?
- What is the relationship between EU citizenship rights and Participatory Citizenship?

Within the context of this study, this report focuses on providing a detailed understanding of citizenship in terms of how it is defined, how it is approached, and the extent of the existing evidence base in Europe. Chapter 1 sets out the case for Participatory Citizenship compared to other terms used in the field, including the legal concept of citizenship. Chapter 2 goes on to examine the relevance and use of the concept of Participatory Citizenship for national policy making in a number of European countries, situating this concept within current national policy agendas. Chapter 3 then explores the literature on current empirical research to identify and give an overview of the current state of play of Participatory Citizenship in Europe. Chapter 4 provides a conclusion to this report, highlighting the concepts and empirical findings that will be used throughout the study.

# Chapter 1. Defining citizenship

Having a clear understanding of the concept of citizenship is vital to ensure that the Europe for Citizens Programme and European Year of Citizens have sound theoretical underpinnings that anchor effective policies and practices within and across European countries. This chapter will begin with a reflection on the concept of legal citizenship and discuss its limitations. Participatory forms of citizenship will then be discussed, and the liberal, civic republican, communitarian, and critical understandings of this concept explored. An umbrella definition is then proposed. Finally, this chapter will reflect on similar concepts and terminology, and on the extent to which these terms are interchangeable.

In legal terms, citizenship refers to the legal rights and obligations bestowed on an individual by the state in which they are citizens, denoted by their nationality. These rights are crucial, and the legal definition highlights the important relationship between the citizen and the state. However, this definition has been considered too narrow in modern democratic society for a number of reasons. First, having legal rights is insufficient to enable equal possibilities for all citizens to exercise their rights. Second, gaining and maintaining rights requires constant action and vigilance from citizens, and a legal definition does not encompass these processes. Third, obligations of the state upon the citizen are not always legally framed, but occur as citizens' perceptions of norms; these may therefore not be expressed within the legal definition. Fourth, the relationship between the citizen and the state ignores the relationship between citizens and the associations they form, as well as the importance of associative life in the balance of democracy. In this regard, citizens need to participate in civic and political life in order to ensure the accountability of the state and the legitimation of democracy. Finally, citizenship as a legal concept does not account for individuals who are not citizens but have rights and responsibilities. The limitation of this thin definition of citizenship will be explored below, and will be followed by a discussion of the broader definition of Participatory Citizenship which seeks to encapsulate a richer conception of citizenship, with all its dimensions.

Important concepts of citizenship are rights and responsibilities of the individual in relationship to the state. Historically, this concept of citizenship is situated within theories that were developed in the nineteenth century and, although challenged by issues of globalization and 'transnational migration' (Stoker et al. 2011, p. 7) are still resonant and used by researchers today. Marshall's (1950) seminal text highlighted the need for three types of rights: civil rights (equal, legal rights offering an individual justice and freedom), political rights (the right to influence decision-making, such as through voting and standing for public office), and social rights (access to opportunities that support the first two rights, such as health care and education). Each of these dimensions is reflected in European Union Law. However, as Marshall noted:

Many of the rights associated with citizenship provide us with opportunities but do not guarantee our ability to take advantage of them. The legal opportunities to associate with others in voluntary organizations and to participate in political life are of utmost importance but insufficient to ensure a flourishing civil society or a system of government in which every citizen's voice is properly heard. (Cited in Westholm et al. 2007, p. 5)

Inequalities in many forms prevent legal rights from being achievable by many people, and therefore Marshall (1950) developed the concept of 'effective citizenship' to refer to the extent to which citizens could actually realize citizenship or the expected social norms regarding civil, political and social rights (Westholm et al. 2007, p. 5). This, as Westholm notes, brings the concept of citizenship from the legal into the sociological domain.

To explore this point, we will examine a European example – the right to stand for office as a Member of the European Parliament in another member state, that applies to all European Union citizens. While the *right* exists, the possibility that a Bulgarian citizen with limited education living in Portugal could actually exercise this right is rather unlikely. Since such individuals lack the capability (knowledge, resources and connections), interest or power to achieve their rights, it is doubtful that such a citizen would even be able to exercise their right to vote in a European election. If this individual then faces discrimination when trying to find work, or is exploited within employment, it is also doubtful the extent to which they are capable of achieving these rights – in fact, over half of Europeans in 2007 said that they felt unable to claim their rights in another European country due to a lack of knowledge of the rules and procedures (European Commission 2009). Hence, a legal understanding of citizenship is insufficient for citizens to activate their rights. Some people are in positions to activate their rights, whilst others not, due to unequal knowledge, resources and power relations.

In the example described above, there are two options that concerned citizens can implement through associations, campaigns, citizen initiatives, and elections. They can either hold local or national governments and European institutions to account for not providing the relevant policies and provisions such as education, information and resources to enable such citizens to achieve their rights, or they can provide these services by organizing their own non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Either way, these citizens can play a crucial role in enabling disadvantaged groups and individuals to achieve and exercise their rights. A legal understanding of citizenship does not take into account the role of fellow citizens either in exercising their own right, or in enabling the rights of disadvantaged groups. Gaining, maintaining and achieving rights require an ongoing and often collective struggle, supported by fellow citizens through civil society organizations across Europe. Historically, gaining the right to vote for women required considerable collective action from associations such as the Women's Movement. A legal definition of citizenship, by itself, is therefore insufficient to encompass these broader aspects of citizenship.

Another drawback of the legal definition of citizenship is that it has led to a focus on citizens' rights **afforded by** the state, as opposed to citizens' **obligations to** the state. The functioning of democratic societies requires the balance in the relationship between the citizen and the state. All countries oblige citizens to pay taxes. However, only in a small number of countries in Europe is it actually a legal requirement to vote – Belgium, Cyprus, Greece and Luxembourg – and even fewer actually enforce this. While enforcements of legal obligations to participate are quite limited, such obligations can be facilitated through the expectations and norms within a country's dominant civic culture (Westholm et al. 2007). Civic culture, in its diverse forms, is developed through education, the family, the media, and political rhetoric and policy, and has been studied and measured by political scientists over the years. The obligations range from expected participation in formal politics, political civil society action, and action to support the community, with the emphasis on each of these

forms varying according to the civic norms of the country. However, for democracy to function – both in terms of the government’s legitimate right to rule, and in order to ensure that the voices of all groups are heard – it is necessary that citizens participate both through the formal political system and through civil society actions.

Perceptions of norms are important for the legitimization of democracy, but the key to the long-term sustainability of democracy is the actual rate of participation. The academic literature on both theory and empirical research has highlighted the fact that legal rights and institutions alone are rarely sufficient for a democracy to flourish (Honohan 2002), and that the quality of democratic governance relies on the civic virtues and engagement of their citizens (Putnam 2000, 1993; Almond and Verba 1963; De Tocqueville 1863). Vibrant democracies require active citizens – both inside and outside the political system – to monitor the process and to be willing and able to act to create or resist change (Crick 2003). Recent research has shown that there has been a steady decline in citizens’ engagement in formal political and civil society activities that can be seen in the decreasing levels of participation in European elections, and the resultant perception of a gulf between citizens and the European policy-making process. The increasing policy focus on participatory forms of citizenship has been developed, in part, to remind citizens of their rights and responsibilities and to encourage them to (re)engage in society in helping to build a stronger, safer, more cohesive, democratic Europe.

Thus the concept of citizenship has been developed to include a focus on citizens’ participation in political processes, and a strong emphasis is now placed on individual ‘action’ with the ‘intent to influence’ (Verba and Nie 1972). The result therefore is a shift in the understanding of citizenship to be more than just a legal concept and now to include one of individual involvement in participatory democracy (Barber 2003), with a greater focus on citizens’ involvement in decision making, particularly policy development. The concept of Active Citizenship or Participatory Citizenship was introduced to highlight this shift: by adding the words that emphasize action, the agency of citizens as actors in relation to policy and the state is emphasized.

The conceptualization of citizenship has taken place in a context of competing ideologies, and this has resulted in the development of four competing models of citizenship:

- the liberal model of citizenship
- the communitarian model of citizenship
- the civic republican model of citizenship, and
- the critical model of citizenship.

These models will now be considered in turn.

### **The liberal model of citizenship**

The liberal model of citizenship is typically considered the least demanding. In its original meaning, liberal democracy is typically considered ‘thin’ democracy. This means that citizens’ involvement in public life is minimal, and is primarily enacted through the vote (Carpini and Keeter 1989). However, even this political activity is not an obligation and, in elections, the choice is often made from a small number of ‘reasonably minded’ parties. The

government within a purely liberal democracy would have a mandate generally limited to the protection of rights and property.

In such an environment, citizens are encouraged, but not obliged, to vote and education for citizenship is focused on creating autonomous citizens, and on enhancing individuals' basic level of political knowledge and skills (Carpini and Keeter 1989). The liberal model does require citizens to conform to the procedural rules of liberal democracy and the value of equality before the law.

Citizenship within the liberal model emphasizes the right of individuals to participate politically, or not, as the case may be. It posits that, if the state is kept to a minimum, civil society will flourish. However, liberal ideals from the notion of the atomized individuals have been re-interpreted in recent years in a way which fuses this model closely with the communitarian citizenship model that will be described in the following section. Recent liberal thinkers have criticized the earlier liberal notions of citizenship as focusing only on the relationship between the individual and the state, and emphasized how such notions miss out on how humans interrelate with each other in groups built on the foundations of trust. Hence, the liberal model in recent years has been influenced by Putnam's theories of social capital. Within the UK, for example, the recent debates regarding the 'Big Society' can be understood as an outcome of such reinterpretations. From the perspective of the 'Big Society', citizens participate in associations not only out of a feeling of obligation, but a feeling of pleasure from enjoying forming relationships, and building a sense of emotional attachment or belonging to a group (Norman 2010). In countries like the Netherlands and UK policies that facilitate community volunteering have become more prevalent, combining the liberal and communitarian citizenship models.

### **The communitarian model of citizenship**

The communitarian model takes communities as its starting point, rather than the nation or city state of the civic republican model, and focuses on how social groups influence values and behaviours. Citizenship in this context focuses on the identity and feelings of belonging to a group, and the need to work towards the collective benefit of this group (Jochum 2010). Communitarian ideas have influenced both Christian theology and moral philosophy, and have led to an emphasis of the responsibility and duties of individuals to others in their community, as well as the need to support structures that undergird and maintain communities and shared values (Etzioni 1993). Elements of the communitarian model have been borrowed by various political ideologies, with the result that the right has used the model to promote 'family values', while the left has used it to support environmental protection and public education. As compared to the liberal and civic republican models, the communitarian model is more associated with more hierarchical and top-down decision making.

The communitarian model of citizenship has fewer direct associations with a specific country than the civic republican or liberal model, as it focuses on communities rather than countries, but has been influential in regards to the liberal model.

## **The civic republican model of citizenship**

Within western democracies, the development of the concept of citizenship is sometimes also derived from civic republican traditions (Crick 2003). This approach places higher demands on the citizen in terms of the maintenance of the democratic processes and institutions that, in turn, assure greater freedoms (Lovett 2010). From this perspective, citizens become the actors of positive laws for social change and the instruments to prevent corruption (Lovett 2010). Based on Greek and Roman philosophical thought, civic republicanism has emphasized the need for citizens to act politically within the public sphere, and to be actively engaged within a political community as equal and free citizens; the notion of civic responsibility developed from this view. Compared to the liberal tradition, this approach places more of an obligation and value in political engagement and involvement in political decision making.

The civic republican approach also highlights the need for citizens to learn civic competences, including the values of public spiritedness, solidarity, and the responsibility to act for the common good (Honohan 2002, p. 147), often referred to as 'civic virtues'. Honohan (2002) emphasizes that, without civic virtues, too much self-interest can lead to corruption. Putnam's (1993) early work on defining the competences necessary for the civic community in Italy also borrows from civic republicanism traditions. Putnam cites Banfield's example of a poverty-stricken village called Montegrano and attributes its economic situation to the fact that the villagers were unable to work together for a common purpose, and unable to transcend beyond their own family interests (Putnam 1993, p. 91). Putnam uses the example to highlight the need for citizens to work towards the common good.

Civic republicanism is typically associated with the French model of citizenship. The French revolution is considered crucial in shifting 'the meaning of *citoyen* from passive membership in the kingdom (subjecthood) to active participation as member of the newly sovereign people' (Preuss 2010, p. 8). In addition, equality in political participation is considered a fundamental aspect of the French Republic and there is much less focus on the community than the liberal model (Preuss 2010, p. 8).

## **The critical model of citizenship**

Critical citizenship has been a 'catch all' title for various new theories that try to frame citizenship in different terms (Abowitz and Harnish 2006), for example, by focusing on critiquing and improving society through social and political action based on the ideas of empowerment and social justice as expressed by Paulo Freire, among others (Johnson and Morris 2010). These models focus on a more dynamic view on democracy that is grounded in critical and engaged citizens. Another term is 'critical democratic citizenship', in which the citizen is actively involved in building a strong and dynamic democracy (Veugelers 2007). There are also critical models of citizenship that focus on equal participation in the power relations of democracy. Westheimer and Kahne (2003), for example, argue for social justice and Mouffe (2005) for the struggle for more equal power relations as part of citizenship.

All these critical forms of citizenship oppose the civic republican and communitarian notions of citizenship in two ways: first, the concept of the common good in the civic republican and communitarian traditions can be seen promoting nationalistic values and as being used by political leaders during difficult circumstances, such as war to promote loyalty whilst

compromising human rights (Abowitz and Harnish 2006). The second major critique of civic republicanism is that the notion of citizenship has historically privileged the dominant group, usually white males, and has neglected the rights or freedom of other groups (Honohan 2002; Abowitz and Harnish 2006). The Crick Report (1998), which developed the concept for citizenship education then introduced in England, has been critiqued for failing to recognize that representative politics is still dominated by white men, and that there is a social justice issue in terms of creating change to greater equality (Arnot 2003). Thus, any conception of citizenship would also need to be critical, in that it would need to critique existing unjust conditions and include the need for greater representation and engagement of women, lower social classes, and minority and immigrant groups, within decision making and representative politics.

Critical citizenship has not been introduced as a philosophy in national level policy making and, although much of the academic debate is new, the policies that have focused on issues of equality and justice were much higher up the policy makers' agenda in the late 1960s and early 70s.

### **Impact of models**

The models of citizenship are concepts that mirror different approaches of doing citizenship, and can be considered in themselves as resulting from policy decisions and historical developments. For example, the liberal model of citizenship in England is connected to liberal policy, while the civic republican model was generated by the French revolution and subsequent policies. As the civic republican and liberal models (with some influence from the communitarian model) have national prototypic examples it is possible, at least to some extent, to address the question of impact – although it should be noted that there are likely to be multiple causes, which has led to existing results. However, critical citizenship model is a concept that has been proposed as possible solution to existing problems, and has not really been implemented on a national level. Thus, in this section the focus will be on the impact of the civic republican and liberal models.

The fact that **countries have developed certain models of citizenship is principally based on three reasons; civic traditions, problems that a society has had to face, and the political leaning of the party in government.** First, civic traditions refer to a country's citizenship regimes and long-standing policies on the responsibility mix between the state and civil society, and the citizens (Jenson 2007). Jenson describes this as:

defining the boundaries of state responsibilities and differentiating them from those of markets, of families and of communities in the 'welfare diamond.' The result is the definition of how to produce well-being, whether via the market, via the reciprocity of kin, via collective support in communities, or via collective and public solidarity, that is state provision and according to the principle of equality among citizens. The latter choice establishes a space for citizenship in the responsibility mix. (Jenson 2007, p. 5)

The **liberal model** of citizenship is emphasized in countries where the state plays less of a role, and citizens are expected to provide welfare through volunteering and community action at the local level (Norman 2010). This model tends to be applied by right-of-centre political parties across the board. As discussed previously, the model is also associated with

a *laissez faire* approach to values that has the consequence of greater diversity of acceptable values (including those which oppose democracy and human rights). There is also a focus on autonomy that enhances individualism. 'Responsibility' for others is seen in terms of being provided individually through volunteering in the local community and donating money. Thus, the expectation is that we will find higher levels on volunteering indicators in liberal countries, and this may be examined in the future data analysis of the analytic report.

The consequences of the **civic republican model** of citizenship may be deduced from the situation in France. The focus of the model is on political and equal citizenship at a national level, and the consequence is a greater emphasis on policies on political participation, and a lesser emphasis on volunteering and community level organizations; this has been the case ever since the French Revolution when these intermediary organizations were considered suspicious (Preuss 2010). In France, there is much greater state provision than the liberal models of citizenship, placing the model more on the left of centre of the political spectrum than the liberal model. There is also a greater normative belief in certain values, e.g. those focusing on the principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, and there is less acceptance of diversity of values than in the liberal model. *Laïcité*, the separation of the state and religion that is also part of the French model of civic republicanism, has comparatively reduced the role and involvement of diverse religious organizations within the public sphere.

### **Different definitions and conceptions of citizenship**

This section will look at the concepts and terminology relating to citizenship. Some terminology of citizenship, such as the legal definition of citizenship, evokes a concept that is essentially passive. This '**passive**' citizenship has, in academic literature, been associated with top-down policy making where the citizen voice is not encouraged or heard, and individuals' lives are conducted in the private as opposed to the public realm (Turner 1997). Top-down policies formed in this way are distant from the citizen, and do not allow for agency or power of citizens within the decision-making process. 'Passive' citizenship policies thus formed could be considered the opposite to participatory democracy where citizens are actively engaged within the policy process and in forming policy decisions.

Alongside the notion of passive citizenship is the modern phenomenon of what is being termed '**inactive**' citizenship. This involves citizens being passive or inactive not because they have not been sufficiently educated and/or the state has limited their spheres of influence and action, but because they lack the time, motivation and inclination. The argument among political scientists is that, in the fast-paced modern world, where time is at a premium and many people lead busy, individualistic and atomized lives, there is not sufficient time and space for people to be active citizens. Even though they may have developed the necessary civic competencies through their education, they do not put these competences into practice on a regular basis. Rather, such citizens remain inactive, rousing themselves individually and collectively only when there is an issue or campaign that requires citizen action, perhaps on a one-off basis, be it at local, national, European or global level. The challenge is how to turn these inactive individuals into citizens who are active and on a more regular basis.

As regards the term '**responsible citizenship**', like many of the terms that we are working with in the field of citizenship there are multiple and contested understandings. Haste (2004, p. 425) highlights three contradictory understandings of the term which reflect quite different actions for citizens:

1. 'duty and obligation' that leads to obedience to the state
2. responsibility for those with whom we have 'ties of affect and interdependence', that can lead individuals to act on the basis of their needs rather than the public good, and
3. a judgement of principle: 'If I perceive an injustice or a harm, I must act upon my moral judgement', that can lead to a person becoming an active citizen.

In the English speaking world, the term 'responsible' citizen is more likely to be understood in terms of duty and obedience, and should be used with caution. However, in the French speaking world, and in Italy, 'responsible' citizenship refers more to the third understanding of responsibility, as a judgement of principle, and is said to relate to the knowledge and exercise of civic rights and responsibilities, and the values of democracy and human rights. These conflicting meanings of the same term highlight the difficulties involved in building a common language in this domain across Europe.

It was earlier seen that different notions of citizenship have different emphases e.g. volunteering in the liberal model (Irish Government Taskforce 2007), political participation in the civic republican model (Preuss 2010), responsibility in the communitarian model (Delanty 2007), and activism in the critical model (Veugelers 2007). This is demonstrated most clearly in a large-scale review carried out by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) of educational programmes seeking to promote democratic citizenship. Westheimer and Kahne concluded that there were three broad conceptions or visions of citizenship that underpinned these programmes. The three were: the 'personally responsible citizen' who acts responsibly, as an individual, in their community; the 'participatory citizen' who goes a step further and engages in collective socially useful activities with other citizens; and the 'justice oriented citizen' who looks to seek out and address issues of social justice/injustice. They also found that aspects of all three conceptions and visions could be present to varying degrees in the programmes. This finding underscores the different degrees of emphasis in notions of citizenship, and the need to take these definitions and emphases into account when exploring the concept of citizenship.

Researchers working with policy at a European level (Hoskins and Mascherini 2009) have taken the above evidence on models of citizenship into account when defining Active Citizenship. They have combined the different models and facets of citizenship, blending the Liberal and Communitarian traditions of volunteering and community engagement, the Civic republican traditions of political engagement, and the critical citizenship emphasis on demanding social justice through protest, into a single European concept of citizenship. They defined Active Citizenship as 'participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy' (Hoskins 2006). Active Citizenship or Participatory Citizenship – the terminology used for this current project – therefore encompasses a range of actions, from involvement in participatory democracy (including actions that hold governments accountable), to representative democracy (including actions such as voting), and to participation in the

everyday life of the community. The definition is inclusive with respect to new forms of civic and political participation such as one-off issue politics and responsible consumption, as well as the more traditional forms of membership in political parties and non-governmental organizations. The limitations provided by this definition of Participatory Citizenship are set by ethical boundaries: activities in which citizens participate should be based on the fundamental principles of human rights and the rule of law. Although Participatory Citizenship is specified and measured at the individual level, in terms of action and values the emphasis is on how these activities contribute to the wider society in ensuring the creation or continuation of democracy and good governance and, as a concept, is not only concerned with the specific benefits for the individual but also the common good.

There are other concepts and terminology relating to citizenship. These typically refer to a single dimension of Participatory Citizenship. For example, **political participation** refers only to political orientated actions that try to change political decisions (Van Deth 2010), leaving out community activities. **Volunteering**, in contrast, focuses on community activities and places less emphasis on involvement in influencing political decision making. In a similar way, **civic engagement** or civic participation focuses on actions within civil society, and places much less emphasis on formal political participation such as voting, whilst **critical citizenship** refers predominantly to protest activities, and much less to formal political participation or community involvement. In addition, it is not always clear which values are involved in these concepts. What is distinctive about the European concept of Active Citizenship is that it highlights the values of human rights and democracy which should be respected within the actions conducted.

There have been attempts to contextualize the concept of Participatory or Active Citizenship within Europe by adding the term 'European' to Active Citizenship, such as '**Active European Citizenship**'. In this section, the European dimension of Participatory Citizenship will be discussed and the consequences examined. In legal terms, Union Citizenship covers the legal notion of citizenship involving dimensions of social, economic and political rights. European Citizenship reflects the rights given to citizens in European Union countries such as:

- the rights enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights
- the rights enshrined in Art. 18–25 TFEU (such as political rights, non-discrimination, freedom of movement and residence, consular protection), and
- social and economic rights as workers.

European citizenship complements the concept of national citizenship by transcending national boundaries, and challenges nationalistic notions of the nation state by emphasizing a common identity between citizens of different countries in Europe. The rights afforded by Union Citizenship in terms of mobility, and the programmes run by the European Commission (such as the Europe for Citizens programme) have enabled citizens to associate with each other and build relationships across borders. The history of European projects such as these are key to the definition of Active European Citizenship. European cooperation has been built on trying to overcome the terrible results of war based on nationalism and racism, and the development of a common set of fundamental human rights. Remembering the dark history of the region, and the process of building cooperation in Europe based on human rights and economic cooperation, form a basis for knowledge and

values in which the definition of Active or Participatory Citizenship rests. The concept of Active or Participatory Citizenship at a European level therefore connects participation with human rights and democracy.

However, researchers such as Delanty (1997) and Keating (2009) have highlighted possible difficulties with the concept of European Citizenship as it could also infer geographical boundaries. If Active European Citizenship only refers to citizens of the European Union, the term can be exclusionary with regard to others who are not citizens and may or may not live inside this area. Thus, it could reduce the notion of a common purpose for all humanity and shared human rights. At the same time, particularly in an era of globalization and mobility, it is necessary to acknowledge that citizens inside the European Union have multiple and complex identities and historical roots, some of which may not be located within Europe. Having said that, it does not prevent all citizens from accepting and supporting shared European values and norms such as democracy and human rights.

A term that attempts to transcend national boundaries, by recognizing that individuals live, work and associate with each beyond their country of citizenship, is the notion of '**global citizenship**'. This concept of citizenship has almost no legal basis beyond the European Union, although citizens of Europe do live outside the borders of the EU, just as individuals from outside the EU do live in Europe. The concept of 'global citizenship' has various connotations: a more economic and liberal-oriented form, and a morally grounded notion of global citizenship which is what Nussbaum calls 'cosmopolitan citizenship'. The latter has generally been defined as encompassing the values of human rights, a common humanity, the protection of the environment, and a concern arising from the non-elected power of global corporations (Veugelers forthcoming). It has also been used to refer to global associations and social movements based on such values. The rise of the internet, mobile phones, and new social media has enabled human relationships and associations to flourish across the world. These global relationships and associations have often been considered to provide stronger bonds than the communities within the local geographical location of the individual. The theory of 'cosmopolitan citizenship' posits that, in the rapidly changing world where the 'global village' is smaller and more connected, it is not feasible to think of citizenship in relation to a citizen's attachment to particular communities, be it at national or supra-national (e.g. European) level (Osler and Starkey 2003). Rather, it is more logical to think of citizenship for people in modern society as made up of attachment to and involvement in a range of simultaneous or 'nested' communities at local, national, regional and international level. According to the concept of '**cosmopolitan citizenship**', for instance, an individual can be Muslim, Parisian, French, European and global, all at the same time, depending on the particular context(s).

Other concepts that are worth discussing in relation to citizenship are those which relate to learning for Participatory Citizenship including: civic competence, political literacy and intercultural competence. **Civic competence** refers to the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that are needed to become an active citizen (Hoskins 2010). Thus civic competence improves the quality and effectiveness of, and the disposition towards, Participatory Citizenship. **Political literacy** is another term for a very similar concept that incorporates knowledge, skills and attitudes for effective political participation. The key difference is that civic competence is broader in the knowledge, skills and attitudes than preparing only for effective political participation. **Intercultural competence** is a more

contested concept and, to certain extent, can be seen to form a part of civic competence in terms of building relationships and cooperation with people from other cultures through mutual respect. The distinction between civic and intercultural competence would arise if intercultural competence is considered to be based on cultural relativism rather than on human rights and democracy. It is very much dependent on the definition of intercultural competence used.

As can be seen, there is a wide variety of concepts relating to citizenship. However, only the terms 'Active' or 'Participatory Citizenship' have the breadth to encompass formal politics and community support, as well as political civil society activities, and at the same time contain a clear reference to the democratic values that should be supported. **Our recommendation is therefore to retain the terminology of either Participatory or Active Citizenship and to maintain the definition:**

Participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy. (Hoskins 2006).

## Chapter 2. Typology of Participatory forms of citizenship in Europe

This chapter examines the terminology used within policy and practice in the European Union countries to cover the concept of participatory forms of citizenship or cover the dimensions within it. It is a first exploration of the information gathered from the country fiches for the Participatory Citizenship in the EU study. The analysis of this data will be developed further within the analytic report for this study. Our initial findings from the member states are that the **use of language and terminology in this domain is quite loose**, and there is a **general lack of coherence in policies and practices**. The conceptual understandings of Participatory forms of Citizenship are often fluid within a country, and appear to change across time and between different actors (due to diverse political opinions, different socio-cultural backgrounds or the issue for political debates). This means that writing any generalizations about a country is difficult, and the analysis should be considered a first step towards understanding the concept and terminology of used for Participatory forms of Citizenship in countries across Europe.

### Examples of terminology that cover the concept of participatory forms of citizenship

In this section we are searching for terminology used in the member states that covers the definition provided in the previous chapter on Participatory Citizenship.

Participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy. (Hoskins 2006)

In **five countries (UK, Portugal, Ireland, Lithuania and Latvia)**, the term **citizenship** alone is used to reflect more or less the above definition.

In the **UK**, the term citizenship is the dominant expression used, and assumes an active and participatory element; it therefore refers to a concept that is quite close to the European working definition. With the introduction of citizenship education in 2002 came the concept of 'citizenship' as an umbrella concept that included the concepts of Active Citizenship (as defined in the EC working definition), political literacy, participation (including youth participation and school councils), global citizenship and volunteering. More recently, under the new Coalition government (2011–present), citizenship and Active Citizenship are considered elements of the Big Society programme that focuses on community activities and local participation, with rather less focus on political forms of participation. There are various new initiatives in this domain, such as the National Citizen Service in England. This is discussed in more detail in the section on policy focus below.

In **Portugal**, like England, the term citizenship '*Cidadania*' is used. It is understood in a similar way to the EC definition and is understood as the fundamentals for a democratic society which is legitimized by political participation and the exercise of rights and duties. In addition, it is also understood as essential for the formation of identity and developing the values, attitudes and behaviours of a 'good citizen' in a 'good society'.

In **Ireland, Lithuania** and **Latvia**, the terms citizenship and **Active Citizenship** are used interchangeably and refer to a similar concept to the European working definition. The term citizenship is more widely used in all these countries and it is defined in **Lithuania** as, ‘an individual’s awareness of his/her rights, responsibilities as well as obligations to a democratic state, acting in the public interest, protecting the rights and freedoms of fellow citizens, protecting democracy and seeking Lithuania’s well-being’ (Long-term Civic and National Education Programme, Lithuania).

In **four countries** in Europe the term ‘**Democratic Citizenship**’ is most frequently used, including in **Romania, Bulgaria, Denmark** and **Italy**, and has a similar meaning to the working definition. This term shares the same emphasis on values as the working definition, but carries less emphasis on engagement.

Another expression used in European countries is ‘**Participation**’ and ‘**Active Civic Participation**’. In **Spain** and **Portugal** people use the term *participation*. In Spain, the main focus of this concept is on social forms of engagement and in Portugal there appears to be a greater balance between the domains of political, social, and cultural forms of participation. Active Civic Participation (*aktivnograjdanskouchastie*) is a term used in **Bulgaria**. However, the difficulty with using the word ‘participation’ by itself or connected with other words is that it has limited association with the values of human rights and democracy and can be understood to be promoting all forms of participation, negative as well as positive.

In **Greece, Slovenia** and the **Czech Republic**, the term ‘**Civil Society**’ (Κοινωνία των πολιτών) is frequently used and covers a wide of the forms of organized and public forms of participation again, but does not really capture the values dimension. In the Czech Republic the definition of civil society is contested by recent government leaders. ‘Havel understands civil society as a space where active citizens stimulate change in society and fulfill their role as societal “watchdogs”. Klaus understands civil society as a society of citizens who are free – and have freedom, where their task is to respect elected representatives as those who stimulate change in society’.

An interesting term used in **Estonia** is ‘**Citizen Action**’ (*Kodanikuaktiivsus*). It is defined as ‘self-initiative and voluntary participation in public life’ and is considered an integral part of a democratic society. Public authorities support it by creating a favourable legislative environment, informing the public about their work, involving citizens and their associations in the planning and implementation of relevant decisions (Source: Estonian Civil Society Development Concept – <http://www.siseministerium.ee/29949/>).

In **Denmark** one of the terms used is ‘**co-citizenship**’ or ‘**with-citizenship**’ (Danish: *Medborgerskab*) that puts a focus on the responsibility of each citizen for the other citizens within the same unit. This concept is open to be interpreted in a more ‘national’ sense: it could be one that promotes solidarity between people of the same national/cultural/ethnic identity, or be interpreted more democratically, by promoting solidarity with respect to the constitutional basis of political life.

In **Italy**, the concept of **responsible citizenship** (*cittadinanza responsabile*) is used in order to highlight the link between activities and constitutional values. The state expects ‘the fulfilment of the duties of political, economic and social solidarity’ (Italian Constitution Art. 3)

by the citizen; in return, citizens who do so can expect the protection of their rights by the state.

In **French-speaking Belgium** the term **active and responsible citizenship** is combined to create '*citoyenneté active et responsable*' and this is the phrase mostly used in official documents in the French-speaking region. This phrase is used in the recent education law from 2007 which contains three actions: 1) the creation of a reference tool ('*Etre et Devenir Citoyen*' – 'To be and to become a citizen'). This was prepared for secondary schools by experts and practitioners and disseminated to support the implementation of the decree's objectives; 2) the development of citizenship-oriented activities: all schools (from pre-school to secondary) are expected to organize at least one interdisciplinary activity related to responsible and active citizenship during each school cycle; 3) the setting up of participative structures for pupils from the fifth year of primary education. This law has stimulated the use of the concept '*citoyenneté active et responsable*' by various stakeholders. Universities have developed courses especially for teachers, educators and education administrators (Catholic University of Louvain) to promote active citizenship. Many associations are using it, related to the Brussels-Wallonia federation: for example the '*Ligue des droits de l'homme*', the '*Ligue des familles*' or the 'Red Cross' (<http://www.enseignement.be/index.php?page=25492&navi%3D2611>).

In **Romania**, two concepts are widely used: '**Active Citizens Participating in Society**' (*participarea cetateneasca activa in societate*) and '**active participation of citizens**' (*participarea activa a cetatenilor*). The first of these concepts, '*participarea cetateneasca activa in societate*' is understood in a similar way to Active Citizenship and was introduced in a new law on education in 2011 (The national education Law no. 1 of 5 January 2011, Title 1 – General Principles, Art. 2 (3) – <http://www.edu.ro/index.php/legaldocs/14847> ). The second concept, '*participarea cetateneasca activa in societate*' refers to the active participation of citizens in administrative decision-making process and drafting normative acts and forms part of a law to increase transparency.

This law aims to:

- a) to increase the accountability of public administration towards the citizen, the beneficiary of the administrative decision
- b) to stimulate active participation of citizens in administrative decision-making process and the drafting of normative acts, and
- c) to increase transparency in the entire public administration.

(Law no. 52/2003 on decisional transparency in public administration – Chapter 1 – General Principles, Art.1 (3) – published in Official Gazette no. 70 of February 3 2003; [http://legislatie.resurse-pentru-democratie.org/52\\_2003.php](http://legislatie.resurse-pentru-democratie.org/52_2003.php)).

### **Use of the term Active Citizenship**

The term 'Active Citizenship' is used across all European countries, but the intensity of use depends on the country. It is most widely used in Cyprus, Greece, Spain, Italy and the Netherlands.

In **Italy**, a literal translation of 'Active Citizenship' (*cittadinanza attiva*) is widely used by volunteer organizations, environmental organizations, associations for peace, schools and

education system, practitioners, health services organizations, and national policy makers. The concept covers the full range of political, civil society and community participation activities. An example of this is that *cittadinanzattiva* is also the name of a foundation for the enhancement of civic participation and the protection of citizens' rights. However, national and local level politicians use the term 'democratic citizenship'.

In **Spain**, the term '*ciudadania activa*' is widely used and understood as, 'each individual's fundamental right to participate in, and exercise an influence on, the development of society. All persons have the right to information and full insight into the activities of the public sector, to express their opinions freely, to get involved in organizations and political parties and to vote in free elections' (<http://www.civilia.es/> <http://adide.org>). The term is used especially by NGOs, volunteer organizations, local authorities, schools and the education system.

In **France**, the concept of 'Active Citizenship' is not widely used at a national level, but it is used at the local level by local authorities and by political parties. In such cases, the concept is used to emphasize political and civil society participation. An example of this is from the local government of the City of Paris (Ville de Paris) which explicitly uses the concept of Active Citizenship, and has created training sessions for enhancing active citizens. Called '*L'université populaire de la citoyenneté active*', this is run by the 'local democracy Mission'. A Parisian Charter for the participation of citizens was adopted in December 2009.

In some countries Active Citizenship is only known in relationship to EU projects, for example in **Slovenia**, the term 'Active Citizenship' (*aktivnodržavljanstvo*) is predominantly used for EU financed projects rather than national policy.

In **Germany** the terminology and concept of active citizenship is less frequently used and the term '*Politische Bildung*' is the preferred term. This term has two meanings at the same time: civic education [process] and political literacy or civic competence [outcome]. '*Politische Bildung*' is the dominant approach within the educational system in both adult and school education. In Germany it has a long and dynamic tradition as a school subject since the period of re-education after the Second World War. In contrast to the political understanding of '*Politische Bildung*', the term 'Active Citizenship' (*aktiveBürgerschaft* or *Bürgerbeteiligung*) is understood in Germany to refer to more the social and civil society aspects of citizenship. It is used by projects run or funded by the European Commission. It is also used by a banking foundation established in 1997. This foundation is mainly active in the social and cultural field. It supports local community activities and service learning in schools, and also provides a network for the social activities of medium-size enterprises. In recent years, it also offers to smaller foundations an award for various forms of local and regional activities.

**Volunteering** is probably the word that is used most consistently across Europe to refer clearly to one dimension of the working definition. In addition to the term volunteering, there are concepts such as '*engagement associatif*' and '*Ehrenamt*' ('honorary' post in German) that cover institutionalized volunteering.

### **Examples for related terms that help frame the working definition**

One aspect that helps to frame the understanding of Participatory forms of Citizenship is the importance given to the notion of civic competence or 'political literacy'<sup>1</sup> in a country. The concept of Active or Participatory Citizenship, although clearly acknowledging a set of shared values, has until now placed less explicit emphasis on the requisite knowledge and skills. The experience of dictatorship in some democracies may have led to a greater awareness that it is not sufficient for a citizenry to behave within the boundaries of democracy and the rule of law, but that it is important for the sustainability of democracies to have a high level of political literacy within the citizenry. This is captured by concepts like 'informed citizenship' (*cittadinanza informata*) in Italy, or 'civic competences' and 'competences to act politically' (*politische Bildung, politische Mündigkeit*) in Germany. The Italian concept, which is constitutionally fixed, emphasizes the knowledge of the people as a necessary basis for the legitimacy of a government, while the German concept emphasizes the capacity and self-responsibility of all humans to critically reflect on policies and politics as well as their own actions within civil society and the political area. In the UK, which has not experienced recent dictatorship, political literacy is encapsulated within the term 'citizenship' and is defined as 'learning about and how to make themselves effective in public life through knowledge, skills and values' (Crick 1998).

### **The current policy emphasis on learning citizenship**

This section will describe the current policy emphasis within different European countries on participatory forms of citizenship. Evaluating the policy emphasis on aspects of citizenship is not a precise science, therefore the country fiches can only provide informed perspectives from experts within the countries. The analysis will draw from these perspectives, and document the change over time within a country and the country-specific policy features.

In **Denmark**, the country fiche reports a major emphasis on **citizenship education** covering all the policy areas that are given in the European definition. The main reason for this broad scope is the new study programmes in education and teacher education that provide modules for citizenship education. In particular, questions of extremism and the integration of immigrants form a new focus for these programmes.

In **France** there is also a major emphasis on **political education**. The specific focus of these activities is on values relating to human rights, democracy, tolerance, and gender equality.

**Italy** has set up a new curriculum area. Under the new heading '**citizenship and constitution**' (*Cittadinanza e Costituzione*), basic rights are connected with everyday practice. For example, in the school year 2011/2012, schools may apply for funds from the Ministry of Labour for financing projects that link the rights of employees to questions of safety at the workplace.

In the **Netherlands** there is a major emphasis not so much on formal political participation, but on **integration and good behaviour in social and public life**, and weight is placed on

---

<sup>1</sup> For further information on this term, confer:

[http://www.confusingconversations.de/mediawiki/index.php/Political\\_literacy](http://www.confusingconversations.de/mediawiki/index.php/Political_literacy)  
<http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/page.php?12>

the experience of the social citizenship dimension. All schools are obliged to teach citizenship, but there is no obligatory curriculum. The aims of citizenship education are formulated as Active Citizenship and social integration. All students in the Netherlands have to complete community activities within their secondary education.

In **Germany**, school and adult education on citizenship issues are well established. This may be considered a major emphasis, but there has been little by way of structural change in recent years. There has, however, been a new major emphasis with respect to the extended support for community and civil society activities. In 2007, a new law for the enhancement of citizenship activities was implemented. The law set new taxation regulations for donations by individuals and non-profit foundations. More than 500 foundations are set up each year. Since this measure focuses on the citizenship activities of tax-paying citizens, it was important to complement it with a policy that applies to all citizens. In 2011, a new law was passed providing subsistence, insurance, and minimal additional support for all citizens who volunteer for one year. A similar earlier regulation had been restricted to younger people.

In **Slovenia**, civil society activities have been enhanced through state funding of student organizations. The work of these organizations not only represents student interests, but promotes civil society activities.

In **England** there has been a policy push in the last 10 years to embed citizenship education in schools, post-16 education and training, and local communities. Citizenship is currently a statutory National Curriculum subject for all 11–16 year olds. However, the recent change of government has seen high priority given to community participation as part of the Big Society policy. The recent emphasis on citizenship service is a central policy of the Big Society and the Coalition's approach to citizenship. This incorporates three components: community empowerment – giving power to neighbourhoods to shape decisions made about their area; social action – encouraging and enabling people to play a more active part in society; and citizen service – encouraging people, particularly young people, to work together on civic learning programmes and projects in their local communities during the summer period. The new civic learning programme, the National Citizen Service (NCS) for 16 year olds, is now in its pilot phase. In addition, there are new volunteer programmes that target the unemployed as part of initiatives to alleviate the economic crisis.

## **Conclusion**

The **concept of Participatory Citizenship is used across European countries with different terminology and emphases**. The concepts in this domain are used rather loosely by most countries. Policies that are carried out in this domain are dispersed across various government departments (interior and social affairs, education, youth, civil society, labour, economics, environment, justice, and developmental cooperation) which makes developing a coherent overview of terminology and concepts challenging.

**Despite using different terminology, the concept of Participatory Citizenship has resonance in all the countries** studied, and in countries like the Netherlands and Italy the term Active Citizenship is used to capture this concept. It is clear that some countries understand the term slightly differently and this, to a certain extent, reflects the policy priorities of the country. There appears to be a growing focus on community activities as

opposed to political activities in the Netherlands, England, and Slovenia, whilst in Italy and Denmark there is a balance, and in France and Germany there is a greater focus on political participation. In France and Denmark, there is a clear focus on democratic values. The policy focus in Germany, Denmark, Italy and France is on formal education policies, whilst in England and the Netherlands the focus is shifting from formal education towards non-formal and community-based activities.

Thus we can conclude that the concept of Participatory Citizenship has political resonance in the European countries studied and, so long as the variations in understanding are recognized, this term may be used. It was suggested that the European working definition could be widened to include the concepts of civic competence or political literacy. This explicit recognition of the cognitive element of Participatory Citizenship would improve the quality of actions. In addition, the definition might also be broadened to include economic life and to encompass value based participation at work, which would have political relevance to the economic crisis.

# Chapter 3. Empirical research on Participatory Citizenship

Chapter 1 of the report analysed the theoretical concept of citizenship. Chapter 2 explored the way different countries refer to Participatory forms of Citizenship and their initiatives to support it. Using empirical research, this third chapter provides an overview of the reality concerning the Participatory forms of Citizenship in the daily lives of Europeans. This will only cover the most relevant research projects. This report relies on the literature on empirical findings. The analytic report will provide fresh analysis and further details in answering the main questions of this study. This chapter will also give an overview of important trends in the research, and formulate questions that will guide research for the analytical report, as well as questions that can be raised in future research projects.

This chapter reviews important empirical research projects on citizenship, including those that aim to identify the **factors that facilitate participatory citizenship**. The projects included have a strong comparative focus, and involve the participation of many European countries.

First, the four most relevant research projects are described, including:

- International Citizenship and Civic Education Study (ICCS)
- European Social Survey
- World Values Survey, and
- Eurobarometer.

In the second part of this chapter, there will be a discussion of the relevant outcomes of these research projects and other studies in the area of citizenship engagement. Each of the four areas ends with a discussion and questions for further analysis and research. The discussion and a selection of the research questions will be taken forward into the analysis stage of this project.

## Research on Participatory forms of Citizenship

### *ICCS 2009: Young students and citizenship*

Twenty-four European countries took part in the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), of 75000 14–15 years old. The survey comprised of an international instrument (cognitive and attitudinal) taken by all students, and regional instruments for Europe, Latin America and Asia. The European instrument (cognitive and attitudinal) focused on specific European related issues, institutions, and politics, and was completed by students in the 24 participating European countries alongside the international instrument.

According to the findings, European students attained higher scores on civic knowledge (on average 514) than the average for all participating countries (500) (Kerr et al. 2010). However, the results showed considerable variation among and within European countries (country average ranged from 453 to 576 points). Knowledge of basic facts about the EU,

the euro and eurozone was widespread among students across most European countries. In nearly all European countries, female students obtained higher civic knowledge scores than male students.

The national curricula in the majority of cases have citizenship as either a specific subject or integrated into other curriculum subjects, with only the Czech Republic and Slovakia not having this in their national curriculum (Kerr et al. 2010). Western European countries mostly had a strong emphasis on school ethos, student participation, and community links. In Eastern Europe the situation is more complex, with Estonia and Slovakia not emphasizing any of these three curriculum areas, and Bulgaria, Poland, Latvia and Lithuania emphasizing all three of them. In contrast, the Czech Republic does not emphasize links with the community or school ethos, and Slovenia does not emphasize links with the community.

A large majority of students had a strong sense of European identity (generally stronger for young men than for their female counterparts) (Kerr et al. 2010). Students with more positive attitudes towards their own country tended also to have a stronger sense of European identity. The same patterns are seen for interest in political issues and in participation in the wider community and at the European level.

The study shows that many European students participate in discussions of political and social issues with friends, and have quite a strong sense of internal political efficacy and citizenship self-efficacy (Kerr et al. 2010). Regarding their expectations of future participation, the expected participation for volunteering is not very high, and there are big differences between European countries. For participation in the area of political civil society, there are not many differences between countries worldwide.

However, a large majority of students report that they intend to vote as adults in local and national elections, but their expectation of voting in European elections is much lower. Students of some countries were more supportive than students in other countries of restrictions of the movement of citizens in Europe. Immigrant students differ from non-immigrant students: they score lower on sense of European identity, but higher on equal rights for ethnic or racial groups.

### ***World Values Survey: Developments in values and citizenship***

The World Values Survey measures all major areas of human concern, from religion to politics, and from economic to social life. Since 1981, five studies have been done. Between 2005 and 2008, the latest survey was implemented in 54 countries among 77,000 respondents ([www.valuessurvey.org](http://www.valuessurvey.org)).

Analysis of the data reveals that many basic values are closely related, and can be depicted in **two major dimensions of cross-cultural variation**: 1. Traditional/Secular and 2. Survival/self-expression (Inglehart and Welzel 2005). In nearly all industrial societies, worldviews have shifted from Traditional toward Secular-Rational values. But with the rise of the knowledge society, cultural change has moved in a new direction - from Survival values toward self-expression values. This means an increasing emphasis on subjective well-being, self-expression, and quality of life.

**Self-expression values** give high priority to environmental protection, tolerance of foreigners, gays and lesbians, and gender equality, and rising demands for participation in decision-making in economic and political life. The high value placed on individual freedom and self-expression creates a culture of activist political orientations – attributes that are crucial for democracy. The ‘global cultural map’ produced by the World Values Survey shows that **most European countries score high on secular-rational values and self-expression values, in particular the northern countries in Europe.**

Giving the fact that younger people more than older people make these shifts, self-expression values have become more widespread in recent years.

### ***European Social Survey***

The European Social Survey is a bi-annual survey to chart changes in social values throughout Europe ([www.europeansocialsurvey.org](http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org)) that began in 2002. The aim is to measure changes in public attitudes and behaviour patterns over time and across nations. The European Social Survey is particularly relevant for Participatory Citizenship in relation to the elements of political participation (see Chapter 1) and values (see Chapter 4). A relevant study that have used the European Social Survey include the Active Citizenship Composite Indicator (Hoskins and Mascherini 2009) that highlighted a two speed Europe in which northern European countries participated the most, followed by western European countries. Southern and Eastern European countries participated significantly less. The characteristics of those who participated the most were shown to be the wealthy, more educated, older persons (Mascherini, Manca and Hoskins 2009).

### ***Eurobarometer: public opinion on social, cultural and political issues***

The Eurobarometer are survey studies that answer questions about social, cultural and political issues in Europe ([http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion)). It published reports on the findings from the data such as the Spring 2011 report on Public Opinion in the European Union. Recent studies also compiled by Eurobarometer which are relevant to Participatory Citizenship were on young Europeans (2007), cultural values (2007), and intercultural dialogue (2007). Also relevant to Participatory Citizenship is the Standard Eurobarometer on the effects of the economic crisis (2009). These studies are large scale surveys among adults in European countries about their opinion on many issues.

The results of these surveys will be discussed in the sections below.

## **Dimensions of Participatory forms of Citizenship**

### ***Political participation***

#### ***Voter turnout***

Comparing the turnout for the different elections in European countries, the general pattern is that the **highest turnout is for the national elections** (around 75 per cent), followed by the local elections (around 60 per cent), and the **lowest for the European elections** (around 45 per cent) (see [www.idea.int](http://www.idea.int)). Data on trends in voting in national elections show that voter turnout in Western Europe has declined only slightly from 1945 to the early 2000s. There are differences between countries in Western Europe. There has been a decline in ‘Portugal, the Netherlands, France, Austria, Finland, Italy, UK and Luxembourg’ (Rose 2004

cited in Stoker 2011, p. 16) and there has been relatively little change in 'Greece, Denmark, Belgium, Spain, Sweden, Germany and Ireland'. After the fall of communism, Central and Eastern Europe experienced a steady rise in turnout during the 1990s indicating that democracy is taking root in this region (Pintor, Gratschew and Sullivan 2003). Yet voter turnout in European Parliament elections has fallen steadily since direct elections began in 1979, despite a steady expansion in the European Parliament's powers on EU legislation which should have increased its salience and visibility (Studlar, Flickinger and Bennett 2003). These diverging trends suggest that citizens remain very much engaged at the national political level, and to a lesser extent at the European level.

### **Age**

Older people vote more (Mascherini, Manca, and Hoskins 2009). There are two hypotheses regarding voting and age effects. The first is a generation effect, in which younger people vote less, and continue with this habit as they age. The second is an age effect, in which people vote more as they get older. The finding was that **older people have a much larger turnout than younger people**. At a single point in time, this is consistent with both hypotheses.

Another finding is that there is an overall decline in turnout over time. The evidence from Putnam (2000) is that those involved in the 1968 protests, the '68 generation', have consistently participated at much higher levels than the subsequent generations. This would support a generation effect.

By contrast, when it comes to **alternative ways of political participation, youngsters tend to be more active than older generations**. Young people are participating in much higher numbers in social movements, demonstrations and boycotts (Inglehart 1997). Data from the 2007 Flash Eurobarometer on people aged 15–30 bear this out: one in four respondents reported having signed a petition, while one in five respondents said they joined a demonstration in the last year (European Commission 2007). These numbers are considerably higher than comparable figures for older adults.

### **Education**

Education is a strong indicator for political participation: **the more education an individual has, the higher the likelihood that she will turn out to vote** (see Hoskins, d'Homber, and Campbell 2008). Other research has indicated that education increases the **quality** rather than the quantity of voting, i.e. it increases the likelihood that citizens will find out information on candidates before they vote (Borgonovi, d'Hombres and Hoskins 2010). An even stronger influence of education may be seen in interest in politics. There is a steady growth from 31 per cent of people with six years of education who are fairly interested in politics, to 70 per cent among people with 17 years or more of education. The results in the ICCS study carried out on students show the same correlation between intended education, on the one hand, and intended voting and interest in politics on the other.

Learning outside the formal school environment has been shown to be very influential on political knowledge and developing positive attitudes towards participation. Learning from parents and peers has been identified as having one of the highest relationships with such knowledge and attitudes (Hoskins, Janmaat and Villalba 2011).

### ***Involvement and interest in politics***

Another aspect of political participation is being involved in a political party and formal political activities. This type of active participation shows the same pattern as for voting, that is, a **lower participation rate for younger people**. For a democracy, the decline in turnout and involvement in political parties is a real concern. The European Union is a political institution in construction. To enhance a democratic European Union, a large turnout and involvement in politics is very important. There are many activities to inform citizens, and to try to get more citizens involved in the political area at the local, national and European levels. One of the tasks of this study is to find, describe and analyse what kind of activities are promising. One conclusion we can already draw is that lack of interest in politics is unlikely to be the reason citizens are not becoming politically engaged; the latest Eurobarometer figures (spring 2011) show that 57 per cent of all EU citizens express a moderate or strong interest in politics (European Commission 2011). In any case, it needs to be noted that the number of politically active citizens has always been low by comparison to the numbers casting their vote in elections, which is not surprising given the demanding and time-consuming nature of active political involvement.

The research shows that there are far more people interested in politics than are actively involved in political participation. However, one can also be concerned about the fact that 43 per cent of the population in Europe is not interested in politics.

### ***Local, national and European level***

It would be interesting to understand whether people are participating politically to the same extent on the national level, the European level, and the local level. The different surveys show that people are often engaged in political activities that directly influence their life, for example, regarding issues at the local level, and the environment and, on the national level, their income and health care. In the framework of Participatory forms of Citizenship, these activities are not only part of political participation, but also relate to the policy dimensions of community activities, political civil society activities, and the values of democracy, human rights, social cohesion and tolerance.

### ***Areas of active participation and political participation***

It would also be interesting to understand whether being involved in the other domains of Participatory Citizenship stimulate formal political participation. Analyses from several surveys support the idea of a correlation between the areas of Participatory Citizenship. People who are involved in political and civil society activities tend also to participate politically. Proving causality is not easy using current research, and requires more longitudinal research designs.

### ***Trust***

The question of trust in politicians and the institutions of democracy is an important issue in discussions concerning Participatory Citizenship. Research using the World and European Values Study (WVS/EVS) shows marked regional differences in long-term trends in confidence in parliament. While this confidence declined precipitously in the English-speaking, German-speaking, and Benelux countries from the early 1980s to the mid 2000s, it showed a small increase in Southern Europe and Scandinavia (Green and Janmaat 2011).

Although data from the European Social Survey (ESS) show a small increase in trust from 2002 to 2006, further sharp declines have been observed in many European countries from 2008 to 2009 (based on a comparison of ESS 2008 and Eurobarometer 2009 data), suggesting that the economic crisis has affected political trust everywhere (Green, Janmaat and Cheng 2011). There is a pattern of relatively high levels of trust in Northern Europe and low trust in Eastern Europe. However, even for the high scoring countries, trust scores achieve only mid-range scores and therefore there is still a lot of trust that can be gained. A similar pattern was found amongst young people in the ICCS study, with greater trust in Northern Europe and lower trust in Eastern Europe. Trust in European institutions was mostly lower than in national institutions, and the highest trust in European institutions was in Italy. Cyprus and England gave the lowest trust scores in European institutions. The latest figures on trust in institutions from the spring 2011 Eurobarometer show that trust in both government and parliament is still low in the majority of EU member states. Only in the Scandinavian countries, Austria, Luxembourg and the Netherlands does more than 50 per cent of the population tend to trust these institutions (European Commission 2011).

### ***Support for democracy***

**Declining trust in the institutions of democracy should not be interpreted as indicating diminishing support for the principle of democracy.** Research using WVS/EVS data shows that people much prefer democracy over any form of authoritarian government in all of Europe's regions (Green and Janmaat 2011). Support for democracy is highest in the Scandinavian countries, the original EU six countries and Southern Europe. It is slightly lower in the English-speaking and post-Communist countries. Thus, citizens critical of the functioning of democratic institutions are likely to be as ardent supporters of democracy as citizens who express unconditional trust in politicians and institutions.

### ***E-participation***

E-participation is a recent form of participation that uses new media. A recent European survey by Panopoulou, Tambouris and Tarabanis (2009) found that there were 255 e-participation initiatives originating from 18 different European countries. The results suggest that the majority of the initiatives operated at the local and national level, and focussed on participation in areas such as information provision, deliberation, and consultation. The results indicate that, as the target audience of e-participation narrows and the initiatives become more specific, they allow more active participation and greater capacity to reach tangible results.

### **Discussion - Quality of participation: Knowledge, skills, attitudes and efficacy**

Besides different concepts of citizenship and different ideological articulations, the **quality of participation is important**. Participatory forms of Citizenship require civic knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values. Often the concept of civic competence is used to encapsulate these aspects. One study supported by the European Commission measured through the development of composite indicators the levels of civic competence of youngsters across European countries. This indicator has been created twice from IEA citizenship data collected in 2009 and 1999 (Hoskins et al. 2010; Hoskins et al. forthcoming). The results of this study have shown that for young people in Eastern and Southern Europe, positive attitudes towards participation and citizenship values are higher than in western Europe, whilst social justice attitudes such as gender equality and knowledge and skills on

democracy tend to be higher in Western Europe (Hoskins et al. 2010; Hoskins et al. forthcoming).

In order to analyse Participatory Citizenship behaviour, the notion of efficacy needs to be highlighted (Haste 2004; Veugelers 2011). The feeling of **efficacy empowers political participation**. Internal efficacy enables the feeling of daring to participate politically, whilst external efficacy refers to the feeling of having the opportunity to participate.

It may be helpful in future research on the quality of Participatory forms of Citizenship to distinguish the different forms of citizenship, in particular political participation. It is not only important to know about democracy, but to have the **capability to act democratically**, to be willing to act democratically, to dare (or have the courage) to act in a democratic way, and to have the belief that one's actions will have some influence on democracy. The ICCS has incorporated some measurements on efficacy and found that students have quite a strong sense of internal political efficacy and citizenship self-efficacy.

### ***Further research questions on political participation***

Emerging from the review of empirical findings on political participation, there are a number of research themes that warrant further attention:

- the relation between local, national, European, and global citizenship;
- social and cultural groups who participate less politically
- the relations between age, generations, and political participation, and
- correlations between the different areas of Participatory forms of Citizenship, in particular the influence of community participation on other areas of political participation.

We will attempt to look at some of these themes within the remainder of this study.

### **Community activities**

Community activities consist of volunteering and different forms of social and cultural activities.

#### ***Cultural activities***

The range of cultural activities in which people can become involved is very broad, and can be characterized by the dimensions of active-passive, individual-social, leisure-political, and social mobilization – cultural mobilization. Cultural activities can take place on the local, national, and international level. Often these levels are interlinked. The Eurobarometer on cultural values (2007) shows that those who have the **highest rate of cultural participation tend to be young, urbanized and highly educated people**. However, the concept of culture within this study is limited to performance and visual arts.

#### ***Volunteering***

A recent review by GHK (2010) on volunteering in the European Union indicates that around 22 per cent of adults in the EU are involved in volunteering. Many people volunteer in sports. Volunteers are also active in social, welfare and health activities, religious organizations, culture, recreation, and education.

However, the level of volunteering differs between member states. For example, over 40% in Austria, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK are involved in volunteering, while less than 10% do so in Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, and Lithuania. Over the past decade, there has been some increase in volunteering in quite a number of countries. For men, overall participation in volunteering is higher than it is for women; this difference can be explained by the fact that more men than woman volunteer in sport. The **highest level of volunteering is found among adults aged 30 to 50 years**. However, the number of older people that volunteer is increasing. There is clear **positive correlation between education levels and volunteering**. Surprisingly, it is employed individuals who are more active in volunteering than the unemployed.

In the ICCS study, students were asked about their expectation of future participation in volunteering. Their expectation is not very high in European countries, and there are big differences between the European countries (Kerr et al. 2010).

Volunteering abroad is promoted through the European Commission European Voluntary Service. The people who volunteer for this programme tend to be highly educated young women from a wealthy background (Barcevičius 2009). According to Barcevičius (2009) there are varying degrees of uptake in European Voluntary Service. In Italy it is quite popular with 339 young persons in 2009 participating whilst in Sweden there were only 65 young persons volunteering in this scheme that same year. These differences may be accounted for by the number of alternative options available for volunteering abroad in these countries.

### ***Effects of volunteering***

The study by GHK (2010, p. 11) concludes that volunteering has a social impact: many voluntary activities involve the promotion of social cohesion and inclusion, and give the individual a sense of self-satisfaction. It also provides education and training, and opportunities for young people to test out potential careers. The study claims that volunteering leads to the direct involvement of citizens in local development, and therefore plays an important role in the fostering of civil society and democracy.

### **Discussion**

In general, there is a common belief in a positive effect of volunteering on society. These social and political effects are, however, are mostly based on stakeholders' opinion rather than empirical research. Some of these effects seem plausible, but empirical research should be carried out to demonstrate these.

### ***Further research questions on community activities***

Possible research questions on community activities include:

- the inclusion of marginalized groups through volunteering, both in terms of volunteering itself and the effects of volunteering to support marginalized groups
- the participation of different age groups in volunteering – for younger people as way of integrating in society, for older people as keeping involved in society

- the distinction between different types of volunteering – e.g. in the areas of leisure, caring for others, and social justice – that contribute in different ways to society and democracy, and
- the correlations between volunteering on social and political outcomes, e.g. if volunteering leads to political participation.

Some of these questions require new in-depth research projects to answer. However, it may be possible to identify relationships between volunteering and social and political outcomes within the analysis phase of this project.

### **Political civil society activities**

Political civil society activities include a broad range of topics, for example, human rights, health, consumers' interest, corporate citizenship, and environmental issues ([www.activecitizenship.net](http://www.activecitizenship.net)). These activities differ significantly, ranging from those that are well-organized to those that are loosely connected, as does the type of person engaged, ranging from the highly educated and wealthy compared to the hard to reach. They also involve different types of engagement, from coordinating activities in a structured NGO, to turning up at a protest or signing a petition. Also, organization of activities can differ with respect to collaboration and connection with other societal organizations, like political parties or religious groups. Finally, organization can be initiated or supported (e.g. financially) by the government, or at grassroots level. This diversity in many ways makes it difficult to get a good overview of active participation in political civil society activities, and how this contributes to Participatory Citizenship.

The ICCS study asked students about their expected participation in legal protest activities. In this, there are not many differences between the countries in Europe. Many students want to participate in legal protest activities, like writing a letter to a newspaper, wearing a badge or t-shirt expressing their opinion, collecting signatures for a petition, and so on. Only a minority of students expected that they would want to participate in illegal protest.

### **Discussion**

The area of active participation in civil society is quite diffuse. Participation can be carried out in many different ways, to different extents, and the aims of the activities can vary greatly.

#### ***Further research questions on political and civil society participation***

Some possible research questions on political and civil society participation include the following:

- It would be helpful to be able to clarify and distinguish between the different topic domains of political civil society activities. This would require more specific questions in upcoming surveys, and would require a longer time frame than this research project.

- Identify the correlation between active political civil society engagement and political participation.
- Political civil society engagement can be aimed at values of democracy, human rights, social cohesion and tolerance. However it can also be addressed against it. A possible interesting – but difficult – research project would be to explore the drivers of political engagement that goes against democracy and human rights.

## **Values of democracy, human rights, social cohesion and tolerance**

### ***Moral values***

As articulated in part one of this chapter, the three areas of Participatory forms of Citizenship so far – political participation, community activities, and political civil society activities – can be ‘coloured’ by the fourth area: the values dimension. The fourth area of values, unlike the previous three domains, focuses on the orientation of action. The concept of Participatory Citizenship, as used in the EC working definition and in this study, is oriented to the values of democracy, human rights, social cohesion, and tolerance. It argues not only for participation as such, but for participation directed towards these values. These moral values influence the aims of participation, and form the criteria to judge the different types of participation. Political participation *per se* is not beneficial if it is not supported by the values of democracy and human rights.

### ***European culture***

In sum, what can be learnt from the different studies? The cultural values study carried out by the Eurobarometer (2007) shows that just over two-thirds of people agree with the idea that, compared to other continents, European countries share a great deal in common culturally. Alternatively, one third agree with the idea that there is no such thing as European culture, only a common Western culture shared with other countries, like the United States. In the process of globalization, European societies should perhaps consider preserving certain key values, e.g. peace, human rights and respect for the environment. The bulk of the Europeans are convinced of the value of culture and cultural exchange: 89% say these should play an important role in the EU in order to help citizens of different member states understand each other, and 88% say that these can develop global understanding and tolerance.

### ***Intercultural dialogue***

The Eurobarometer on Intercultural Dialogue (2007) gives information about attitudes towards people with a ‘different’ background. Two-thirds of respondents have day-to-day interaction with people belonging to different cultures, and about three-quarters of EU citizens believe that people with a different background enrich the cultural life of their country. Many people expressed both a preference towards cultural diversity along with a strong desire towards keeping their own cultural roots alive. This is not only the case for older people, but also for young people too.

### ***Economic development and attitudes towards cultural diversity***

Based on an analysis of European Social Survey data, Meuleman et al. (2009) concluded that surges in opposition to immigration between 2002 and 2006 were closely associated with economic fluctuations. **Good economic conditions make people more accepting of immigration.** A widespread economic downturn is likely to be accompanied by a sharp rise

in opposition to immigrants. More **highly educated people show greater acceptance of all forms of immigration**, even of workers who might well provide competition for their own jobs. This link between education and greater tolerance of immigration arises according to Meuleman et al. (2009) from the impact of education on people's overall values. People who are more educated also tend to express less xenophobia, and feel more sympathy for cultural diversity.

### ***Human rights and social values***

Social values can be articulated in different ways: empathy, care, solidarity, and orientation to social justice (Veugelers 2011). The range of values goes from openness to the Other, through concern for others, to realizing justice for the others. In contemporary society, this social orientation can be adapted to apply to social cohesion and to social change for justice. The European Social Survey shows that about 70% of EU citizens attach importance to solidarity.

Autonomy can be considered as an indicator of an individual's concern for their own human rights, and is highly valued by EU citizens. The European Social Survey reports that more than 80% of EU citizens attach importance to autonomy. In Eastern Europe the figure reaches 90%.

### **Discussion**

The fourth area of Participatory Citizenship – the values dimension – influences the moral direction that the activities take. The discussion is therefore integrated with the discussion of the forms of participation.

### ***Linking autonomy and social orientation***

The World Values Study (as mentioned above) focuses on the moral values that are the foundation of Participatory forms of Citizenship. The study shows that there is a shift towards more autonomy, individual freedom and tolerance, and demands for participation (Inglehart and Welzel 2005). The results, however, pose the question as to whether there is a relationship between autonomous self-expressed individuals, on the one hand, and the social values of concern for others, public life, and democracy as a way of living together, on the other. Veugelers (2007) argues that citizens should connect their autonomy to a social orientation in order to get involved in the kind of moral citizenship expressed by the concept of Active Citizenship. Strong autonomy and a weak social concern create individualized citizens who only have an instrumental view of democracy rather than an understanding of the public good (Veugelers 2007). A strong social orientation without autonomy creates a type of citizenship that under-estimates the need for active engagement in democracy.

The ICCS study shows that in Europe there is strong support for democracy from young people, but that many students are not positive about equal rights for ethnic/racial groups and immigrants (Kerr et al. 2010). In particular, it is Western European countries that score low on these attitudes. Put another way, the social orientations of these students do not include ethnic/racial and immigrant groups.

### ***The non-engaged***

From the above research on Participatory forms of Citizenship we can see that at least 30% of respondents are not interested at all in politics, are negative about immigrants, do not vote or volunteer (in this case the numbers are much larger). Further research is required to establish that this is the same group of persons but we hypothesize that they may well be. By identifying this group we are making a first attempt to establish those who hold anti political views and not simply those who just can not manage to fit politics in their life at the moment. At least 30% is a relevant group, and the risk is that any further loss of support could shrink the majority to a critical point. A democracy needs very strong support and has to be constructed and reconstructed all the time; democracy building is in a continual process.

### ***Personal, social, country and policy variables***

Many research projects show that the higher the educational attainment, the greater is participation in all areas of Participatory Citizenship. Surveys such as the ICCS also show that women score higher than men in civic knowledge and skills. Other variables such as age and cultural groupings, show more diverse effects.

### ***Further research questions on values of democracy, human rights, social cohesion, and tolerance***

Possible research questions on values of democracy, human rights, social cohesion, and tolerance include the following:

- In future analysis, more attention could be focused on individual and social variables, like education, gender, age, cohort effects, cultural group, and social class.
- It is interesting to see that there are many differences between the countries. However, the patterns are complex. More analysis of country profiles in the data needs to be done (see Green, Preston and Janmaat 2006).
- From a research perspective, an important question remains about the drivers of Participatory Citizenship. Education and involvement in at least one area of engagement are seen to be influential factors. An important part of the rest of the current project will be to focus on policy initiatives, and how these contribute to the development of Participatory Citizenship.
- Analyses of data and future research could also focus more on these scoring groups in different areas of Participatory Citizenship. Relevant questions include identifying the extent to which there is an overall low participation and negative attitudes on the different areas of Participatory Citizenship, and the factors that contribute to the development of these attitudes.

Some of the questions would require new studies to answer. However, they raise interesting ideas in terms of the future research, and will be taken into consideration in the analysis conducted for the analytic report.

## Chapter 4. Conclusion

Participatory Citizenship reflects the idea of a healthy democracy based on participation in different domains of life, from formal politics to community activities and protest, and are all underpinned by the values of fundamental human rights and democracy. These types of engagement, if continued, will safeguard democracy in Europe into the future. These ideals are present in all European countries studied.

It is necessary to appreciate that the European ideal of democracy and human rights is being challenged by overtly nationalistic and anti-immigration rhetoric. At the same time, the evidence shows that across Europe, at least 30% are not interested in politics, do not vote, and are negative about immigrants. Such a sizeable minority poses a challenge to democracy in Europe. This demonstrates the need for continued policy action in this domain, and more research on this group would be useful.

The country fiches show that there are different emphases across European countries in the concept of Participatory Citizenship. This is due to a variety of reasons, some reflecting longstanding civic traditions, and others influenced by particular circumstances and events or the different political leanings of governments. In some countries there is a nationalistic element while, across all countries, there is a lack of a clearly formulated European dimension.

The concept and definition of Participatory Citizenship resonate across all European countries studied, with ongoing and new policy initiatives. And, despite variations, there are commonalities in that many European countries see the concept as a useful avenue to promote values of human rights and democracy in Europe.

The definition of Participatory Citizenship needs to be both robust and flexible enough to withstand, and respond to, rapid changes in society – political, social, and economic – so that it is seen as part of the solution for strengthening society, and helping it to respond positively to the challenges. The suggestion is therefore the continued use of the concept of Participatory Citizenship, with two recommendations:

- first, reflect further on the knowledge and skills required to achieve Participatory Citizenship, and
- second, reflect as to whether there is an economic dimension to Participatory Citizenship. For example, the need for the skills for maintaining accountability of banks and public finances.

With respect to policy, there are two recommendations:

- First, as was seen, many countries did not have a European dimension in their Participatory Citizenship initiatives. The recommendation is therefore that this dimension be more strongly promoted.
- Second, Participatory Citizenship policies tended to be dispersed across government departments, and not joined up. The recommendation is therefore that national governments work to develop more coherent policies within their country on this aspect.

## Appendix: Contributors to the Country Fiches and Good Practices

### **Austria**

Georg Heller, BA, Assistant at the Centre for Democracy Vienna (Demokratiezentrum Wien) and Werner Wintersteiner, Professor at the University of Klagenfurt and Founding Director of the Centre for Peace Research and Peace Education.

### **Belgium**

#### *French speaking region*

France Clément, Alain Michel and Luce Pepin, European Institute for Education and Social Policy (EIESP), France

#### *Flemish speaking region*

FeProf Dr Wiel Veugelers, University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, Netherlands, Dr Anton Derks, Flemish Ministry of Education and Training and Dr Dimokritos Kavadias , Vrije Universiteit, Brussels

### **Bulgaria**

Dr Svetla Petrova, Head of Department 'Analyses and International Projects', Centre for Control and Assessment of the Quality in School Education Ministry of Education, Youth and Science

### **Cyprus**

Bruno Losito, Associate Professor and Paola Mirti, Researcher, Roma Tre University

### **Czech Republic**

Dr Dana Moree, Assistant Professor, Charles University of Prague, Faculty of Humanities

### **Denmark**

Hans Dorf, Associate Professor, Department of Education, Aarhus University, Denmark

### **Estonia**

Einar Värä. Chief Expert, Department of General Education, Ministry of Education and Research

### **Finland**

Tom Gullberg, Ph.D and Senior Lecturer in didactics of history and civics, Abo Akademi University

### **France and European interviews**

Jean Gordon European Institute for Education and Social Policy (EIESP), France  
Antoine Bevort, National Academy for Arts and Crafts (CNAM), France, and  
Alain Michel, European Institute for Education and Social Policy (EIESP), France

**Germany**

Hermann J. Abs, Professor of Education Research. Institute for School Pedagogy and Citizenship Education, University of Giessen, Germany

Tilmann Kammler, Research Assistant at the Institute for School Pedagogy and Citizenship Education, University of Giessen, Germany

**Greece**

Eleni Kostelidou, MA Education and Human Rights, Institute of Education, University of London & National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece; Bruno Losito, Associate professor, and Paola Mirti, Researcher, Roma Tre University, Italy

**Hungary**

Eniko Pap, Programme Manager, Active Citizenship Foundation, Hungary and Zsuzsanna Szelényi, Foundation Chair; in consultation with Judit Lannert and Annamária Gáti, TÁRKI-TUDOK Educational Research Ltd and Rita Galambos, Foundation for Democratic Youth

**Ireland**

David Kerr, NFER Research Associate and Professor of Citizenship Education, Birkbeck College, University of London

**Italy**

Bruno Losito, Associate Professor, Roma Tre University

**Latvia**

Dr Paed. Liesma Ose, Associate Professor at the Higher School of Management and Social Work, Attistiba, Riga

**Lithuania**

Hans Dorf, Associate Professor, Aarhus University, Department of Education, Denmark

**Luxembourg**

Prof Dr Wiel Veugelers, University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, Netherlands

**Malta**

Bruno Losito, Associate Professor and Paola Mirti, Researcher, Roma Tre University, Italy

**Netherlands**

Prof Dr Wiel Veugelers and Dr. I. de Groot, Researcher, University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, Netherlands

**Poland**

Prof Marek Kwiek, Centre for Public Policy Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences. Poznan University, Poland.

**Portugal**

Bruno Losito, Associate Professor, and Paola Mirti, Researcher, Roma Tre University, Italy

**Romania**

Monica Maria Dvorski, Executive President of the Foundation Centre of Education 2000+. Romania

**Slovakia**

Marian Kisdurka, Project Manager, Slovak Governance Institute, Slovakia

**Slovenia**

Janez Krek, Associate Professor, and Mateja Peršak, Research Assistant, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Education

**Spain**

Bruno Losito, Associate Professor, and Paola Mirti, Researcher, Roma Tre University, Italy

**Sweden**

Emily Rainsford, PhD student, Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Southampton, England

**United Kingdom**

David Kerr, NFER Research Associate and Professor of Citizenship Education, Birkbeck College, University of London and Lisa Nash, NFER Research Associate

## References

Abowitz, K. and Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, 76 (4), 653–690.

Abs H.J. and Gerecht, M. (2011, under review). How to increase students' participation in the context of schooling? Paper presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Symposium on Moral and Democratic Education, 30 August–2 September, Israel.

Abs, H.J. and Veldhuis, R. (2006). Indicators on active citizenship for democracy – The social, cultural, and economic domain. Paper for the CRELL-Network on Active Citizenship for Democracy at the European Commission's Joint Research Centre. Ispra, Italy.

Almond, Gabriel and Verba, Sidney (1963). *Civic culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Barber, B. (2003). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. University of California: California Press.

Borgonovi, F., d'Hombres, B. and Hoskins, B. (2010). Voter turnout, information acquisition and education: Evidence from 15 European countries. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 10: Iss. 1. DOI: 10.2202/1935-1682.2463

Crick, B. (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools: final report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship 22 September*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Crick, B. (2003). The English Citizenship Order 1999: Context, content and presuppositions, in A. Lockyer, B. Crick and J. Annette (Eds), *Education for democratic citizenship*, pp. 5–29. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Delanty, G. (2007): Models of citizenship: Defining European identity and citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 1 (3), 285–303.

Gallop (2007). Youth survey among people aged between 15 and 30 in the European Union. Flash Eurobarometer series #202. Brussels: European Commission.

Enjolras, B. (2008). Two hypotheses about the emergence of a post-national European model of citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 12 (5), 495–505.

Etzioni, A. (1993) *The spirit of community: Rights, responsibilities and the communitarian agenda*. New York: Crown.

Green, A., Preston, J. and Janmaat, G. (2006). *Education, equality and social cohesion: A comparative analysis*. London: Palgrave.

Honohan, I. (2002). *Civic republicanism*. London: Routledge.

Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, J. and Warner, U. (2010). Measuring ethnicity in cross national comparative survey research. *GESIS-Series*, 4. Mannheim (GESIS).

Hoskins, B. (2006). Draft framework on indicators for Active Citizenship. Ispra: CRELL.

Hoskins, B., Barber, C., Van Nijlen, D. and Villalba, E. (2011). Comparing civic competence among European youth: Composite and domain-specific indicators using IEA Civic Education study data. *Comparative Education Review* 55 , 1.  
<http://www.jstor.org/pss/10.1086/656620>

Hoskins, B. d'Homber, B. and Campbell, J. (2008) The Impact of Education on Active Citizenship *European Education Research Journal*, 7 (3), 386–402.  
[http://www.wwords.co.uk/pdf/freetoview.asp?j=eerj&vol=7&issue=3&year=2008&article=11\\_Hoskins\\_SECOND\\_EERJ\\_7\\_3\\_web](http://www.wwords.co.uk/pdf/freetoview.asp?j=eerj&vol=7&issue=3&year=2008&article=11_Hoskins_SECOND_EERJ_7_3_web)

Hoskins, B., Janmaat, G. and Villalba, E. (2011). Learning citizenship through social practice outside and inside school: Multilevel analysis of the learning of citizenship. *British Education Research Journal* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.550271>

Hoskins, B. and Mascherini, M. (2009.) Measuring active citizenship through the development of a composite indicator. *Social Indicator Research*, 90, 459–488.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9271-2>.

Hoskins, B., Villalba, E., Van Nijlen, D. and Barber, C. (2008). *Measuring civic competence in Europe: A composite indicator based on IEA Civic Education Study 1999 for 14 years old in school*. CRELL research paper, EUR 23210, Ispra: European Commission.

Inglehart, R. and Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change and democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Irish Taskforce on Active Citizenship (2007). *The concept of active citizenship*. Dublin: Secretariat of the Taskforce on Active Citizenship.

Ivančič, A., Novak, D., Chioncel, N. and Jansen, T. (2003). Active citizenship and governance in the Central and Eastern European context report on critical review of the national literature and policy analysis.

Johnson, L. and Morris, P (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education, *Curriculum Journal*, 21: 1, 77–96.

Kerr, D., Sturman, L., Schulz, W. and Burge, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 European Report. Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower-secondary students in 24 European countries*. Amsterdam: IEA.

Levine, P (2007). *The future of democracy: Developing the next generation of American citizens*. New England: University Press of New England.

- Lipset, S. M. (1959) Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 53 (1), 69–105.
- Marshall, T. (1950). *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mascherini, M., Manca, A. and Hoskins, B. (2009). *The characterization of active citizenship. CRELL research paper, EUR 54065 EN*. Ispra: European Commission.
- Meuleman, B., Davidov, E. and Billiet, J. (2009). Changing attitudes toward immigration in Europe, 2002–2007: A dynamic group conflict theory approach. *Social Science Research*, 38, 352–365
- Milligan, C. and Fyfe, N. (2005). Preserving space for volunteers: Exploring the links between voluntary welfare organisations, volunteering and citizenship. *Urban Studies*, 42, 417.
- Ministry of National Resources, Hungary (2011). Summary of the Presidency Informal Meeting of Education Ministers of the European Union 28–29 March, Gödöllő.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the political*. London: Routledge.
- Muench, I. V. (2007). *Die deutsche Staatsangehörigkeit. Vergangenheit – Gegenwart – Zukunft*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Mutz, D. (2006). *Hearing the other side deliberative versus participatory democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norman, J. (2010). *The big society: The anatomy of the new politics*. Buckingham: The University of Buckingham Press.
- Osler, O. and Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review* 55 (3), 243–254.
- Panapolou, E., Tambouris, E. and Tarabanis, K. (2009). eParticipation initiatives: How is Europe progressing? *European Journal of ePractice*, 7 March 2009.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Illinois: The Free Press.
- Preuss, U., Everson, M., Koenig-Archibugi, M. and Lefebvre, E (2003). Traditions of citizenship in the European Union. *Citizenship Studies*, 7 (1), 3–14.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Reviewing Education and Training for Governance and Active Citizenship in Europe — A Central and Eastern European Perspective (RE-ETGACE). Netherlands: University of Nijmegen.

Stoker, G. (2011). *Prospects for citizenship*. London: Bloomsbury.

de Tocqueville, A. (1863). *Democracy in America*. Cambridge: Sever & Francis.

TNS Opinion & Social (2011). Public opinion in the European Union. *Standard Eurobarometer 75*, Spring. Brussels: European Commission.

Turner, B. (1997). *Citizenship studies: A general theory*. *Citizenship Studies*, 1 (1), 5–18.

Van Deth, J. (2010). Is creative participation good for democracy? In M. Micheletti and A. McFarland, *Creative participation responsibility taking in the political world*, pp 148–172. London: Paradigm.

Verba, S. and Nie, H. (1972). *Participation in America: Political democracy and social equality*. New York: Harper and Row.

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

Veugelers, W. (Ed.) (2011). *Education and humanism: Linking autonomy and humanity*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipeh: Sense Publishers.

Veugelers, W. (in press). The moral and the political in global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*.

de Weerd, M., Gemmeke, M., Rigter, J. and van Rij, C. (2005). *Indicators for monitoring Active citizenship and citizenship education*. Amsterdam: Regioplan Beleidsonderzoek.

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

Westholm, A., Montero, J. and Van Deth, J. (2007). Introduction: Citizenship, involvement and democracy in Europe. In J. Van Deth, J. Montero and A. Westholm (Eds), *Citizenship and involvement in European democracies: A comparative analysis* (pp. 1–32). London: Routledge. <http://nationranking.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/2011-rankings1.png>

## Organisation of Participatory Citizenship in the European Union study

This study was commissioned by the European Commission, **Europe for Citizens Programme**. It was led by the Institute of Education, University of London

**Project leader, Bryony Hoskins, School of Education, University of Southampton**  
**Co-leader, David Kerr, Citizenship Foundation, London**

The consortium partners:

**Denmark: Aarhus University, Department of Education**  
Hans Dorf

**France: European Institute for Education and Social Policy (EIESP)**  
Jean Gordon  
Antoine Bevort  
Alain Michel

**Germany: Institute for School Pedagogy and Citizenship Education, University of Giessen**  
Hermann J. Abs  
Tilman Kammler

**Italy: Roma Tre University**  
Bruno Losito  
Paola Mirti

**Slovenia: Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana**  
Janez Krek  
Mateja Peršak

**Netherlands: University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht**  
Wiel Veugelers

**UK: Institute of Education, University of London**  
Germ J. Janmaat  
Christine Han  
Andy Green  
Yvette Ankrah

**National Foundation of Education Research**  
Juliet Sizmur  
Jo Morrison

**Southampton Education School, University of Southampton**  
Rebecca Ridley

## Other reports from this study

Hoskins, B et al. (2012) **Contextual Report: Participatory Citizenship in the European Union**, Institute of Education report for EU. Southampton: Southampton University, ISBN 9780854329373.

Hoskins, B et al. (2012) **Analytic Report: Participatory Citizenship in the European Union**, Institute of Education report for EU. Southampton: Southampton University. ISBN 9780854329380.

Krek, J. et al. (2012) **Good Practice Report: Participatory Citizenship in the European Union**, Institute of Education report for EU. Southampton: Southampton University. ISBN 9780854329397.

Hoskins, B and Kerr, D. (2012) **Final Study Summary and Policy Recommendations report: Participatory Citizenship in the European Union**, Institute of Education report for EU. Southampton: Southampton University, ISBN 9780854329403.

All the reports for this study are available on the Europe for Citizens website:

[http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm)

Electronic copies may also be obtained from Dr Bryony Hoskins (B.Hoskins@soton.ac.uk), to whom any queries relating to the copyright of this series should be addressed.