Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama (EKU)
Journal of Theory and Practice in Education
ISSN: 1304-9496

2023, 19(1), 51-59

Immigrants and Citizenship Education in the Netherlands

Ozlem Erden-Basaran

TED University, Ankara, Türkiye, ozlemrdn@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Ozlem Erden-Basaran

Article Type: Discussion Article

To Cite This Article: Erden-Başaran, Ö. (2023). Hollanda'da göçmenler ve vatandaşlık eğitimi. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 19*(1), 51-59. doi: 10.17244/eku.1247626

Ethical Note: Publication ethics was provided for this study. Ethical approval was not proceeded in this study as it was used with open access source.

Hollanda'da Göçmenler ve Vatandaşlık Eğitimi

Özlem Erden-Başaran

TED Üniversitesi, Ankara, Türkiye, ozlemrdn@gmail.com

Sorumlu Yazar: Özlem Erden-Başaran

Makale Türü: Tartışma Makalesi

Kaynak Gösterimi: Erden-Başaran, Ö. (2023). Hollanda'da göçmenler ve vatandaşlık eğitimi. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 19*(1), 51-59. doi: 10.17244/eku.1247626

Etik Not: Araştırma ve yayın etiğine uyulmuştur. Bu çalışmada açık erişimli kaynaklar kullanıldığı için etik onay süreci işletilmemiştir.

Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama (EKU)
Journal of Theory and Practice in Education
ISSN: 1304-9496

2023, 19(1), 51-59

Immigrants and Citizenship Education in the Netherlands

Özlem Erden-Başaran

TED University, Ankara, Türkiye,
ozlemrdn@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-0374-1942

Abstract

The Netherlands is a significant example of citizenship education for other countries because of its distinctive citizenship politics based on immigration, and sexuality politics. This critical review focuses citizenship education curriculum in the Netherlands and highlights an understanding of how politically constructed educational objectives might endanger or support social cohesion and the integration of immigrants. This review, which is based on relevant literature, concentrates on secondary-level citizenship education because that level places the most emphasis on teaching civic principles based on citizenship policies, which have an emphasis on sexuality politics, Dutch nationality, and the assimilation of non-Western immigrants into Dutch society. The critical review of the current practices shows that there are two reasons for the failure to teach civic values to immigrant children and to create a harmonious relationship between locals and immigrants: 1) There is an inadequate explanation of how sexuality politics is connected to Dutch nationality in the school curriculum. 2) The political structure does not acknowledge that immigrant youth have a positive perception of understanding that sexuality politics is a component of Dutch nationality because of their political interests. Given the arguments, this discussion suggests that citizenship education curricula should give enough coverage to terms and concepts that are used to teach civic values and should have boundaries between politics and civic values to support the inclusion of immigrant communities.

Article Info

Keywords: Citizenship education, immigration, curriculum analysis, nationality, Netherlands

Article History:
Received: 4 February 2023
Revised: 29 April 2023
Accepted: 29 April 2023

Article Type: Discussion Article

Hollanda'da Göçmenler ve Vatandaşlık Eğitimi

Öz

Hollanda, göç ve cinsellik politikalarına dayalı kendine özgü vatandaşlık politikaları nedeniyle diğer ülkeler için önemli bir vatandaşlık eğitiminin örneğidir. Bu eleştiri makalesi, Hollanda'daki vatandaşlık eğitimi müfredatına odaklanmakta ve politik olarak oluşturulmuş eğitim hedeflerinin göçmenlerin sosyal uyumunu ve entegrasyonunu nasıl tehlikeye atabileceği veya destekleyeceğini vurgulamaktadır. İlgili literatüre dayalı bu eleştiri çalışması, orta öğretim vatandaşlık eğitimi programına odaklanılmıştır, çünkü en çok bu düzeyde cinsellik politikaları, Hollanda uyruğu ve Batılı olmayan göçmenlerin Hollanda toplumuna asimilasyonuna vurgu yapan vatandaşlık politikalarına dayalı yurttaşlık ilkelerini öğretmeye odaklanılmıştır. Mevcut uygulamalar incelendiğinde, göçmen çocuklara yurttaşlık değerlerinin öğretilememesinin ve yerel halk ve göçmenler arasında uyumlu bir ilişki kurulamamasının iki nedeni olduğunu gösteriyor: 1) Okul müfredatında cinsellik politikasının Hollanda uyruğuyla nasıl bağlantılı olduğuna dair açıklamalar yetersizdir. 2) Siyasi yapı, politik çıkarları nedeniyle göçmen gençlerin cinsellik politikasının Hollanda vatandaşlığının bir bileşeni olduğuna dair olumlu bir anlayışa sahip olduklarını kabul etmemektedir. Argümanlar göz önüne alındığında, bu çalışma, vatandaşlık eğitimi programının yurttaşlık değerlerini öğretmek için kullanılan terim ve kavramlara yeterince yer vermesi ve göçmen topluluğun topluma dâhil edilmesini desteklemesi için siyaset ve yurttaşlık değerleri arasında sınırlar olması gerektiğini önermektedir.

Makale Bilgisi

Anahtar Kelimeler:
Vatandaşlık eğitimi, göç, program analizi, vatandaşlık, Hollanda

Makale Geçmişi:
Geliş: 4 Şubat 2023
Düzeltme: 29 Nisan 2023
Kabul: 29 Nisan 2023

Makale Türü: Tartışma Makalesi

İletişim/Contact: ozlemrdn@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.17244/eku.1247626

Introduction

The Netherlands, with a total population of 17,831,759 (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2023) is known as a multicultural country because of its policies aimed at integrating immigrants (Mattei & Broeks, 2018). Before the Second World War, the immigrants were mainly from colonized and European countries such as the Antilles and Aruba, Germany, Suriname, and Indonesia (van Amersfoort & van Niekerk, 2006). However, following the end of the Second World War, the demographics of the immigrant community changed because of the arrival of immigrants from non-colonized countries such as Morocco and Turkey as a response to meeting the increasing need for the workforce (Bjornson, 2007). As a result of the colonial past and changes in migration trend, 1.3 million Dutch citizens owned one or more additional nationalities. One-fourth additionally possessed a Moroccan passport, while another one-fourth possessed a Turkish passport. The remaining of the population with more than one nationalities represents a variety of nationalities (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2015).

Until the end of the 1990s, Dutch schools taught immigrants in their native languages, established a separate, state-funded school system, and organized housing projects to accommodate their religious practices (Mattei & Broeks, 2018). However, the Netherlands has shifted its specialized services for specific immigrant groups to new integration policies as the demographic change of the immigrant population and the increasing number of immigrants fuel debates about citizenship and citizen identity (Slootman & Duyvendak, 2015). Therefore, the notion of citizenship education in the Netherlands has been ascended as a fundamental policy concept and is associated with a discourse on "integration" (Jansen et al., 2006; Schinkel, 2010).

Today, the Netherlands is also known as an open and tolerant society for its liberal position on homosexuality and gay emancipation (Bujis et al., 2011; Ilzina, 2010). People were allowed to freely express their sexual identity. As a result, sexuality politics has also become part of Dutch society, and tolerance for homosexuality, as well as tolerance for cultural differences, were recognized as part of Dutch identity (van den Berg & Duyvendak, 2012). Considering the economic benefits and returns of sexuality politics, most of the native Dutch welcomed homosexuality as part of their national etiquette of tolerance. The extent of secularization in Dutch society is also a remarkable factor in furnishing sexual freedom (Mepschen et al., 2010). However, the Populist Party's policy, which highlights the cultural and religious differences of new immigrants, resurrected the xenophobic sentiments among the Dutch by claiming that new immigrants do not fit into Dutch society because they have homophobic reactions, and are conservative (Mattei & Broeks, 2018; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007)

Nowadays, the current situation in the Netherlands problematizes the ethnic heterogeneity of society and inflames moral, cultural, and political debates. Extreme individualism, unacceptable social behaviors of immigrant youth, urban violence, tensions between native Dutch citizens and non-western immigrants (Leeman & Reid, 2006), Islamic fundamentalism, homophobia, and political terror, such as the murders of politician Pim Fortuyn and film director Vincent Van Gogh (Bujis et al., 2011; Mepschen et al., 2010; Yilmaz & Aykac, 2012) fueled debates about who is Dutch and who is an outsider. As Schinkel (2010) mentions, Dutch people believe that immigrants and their children do not fully understand Dutch culture so that it is only natural for native Dutch people to cut them off from citizenship and community membership.

The changes in the immigrant profile, the acceptance of sexual freedom as a component of Dutch nationalism, and the rise of xenophobic sentiments among native Dutch prompted the government to prioritize citizenship education in schools. In 2006, citizenship education, which was embedded in moral, cultural, and political discourses, became part of the school curriculum to educate 'active citizens, promote citizenship values, and create social integration' (Jansen et al., 2006; Veugelers, 2007). However, even though citizenship education addresses that ethnicity or cultural background should not be a handicap for citizenship (Leeman & Pels, 2006; Veugelers, 2007), the school system in the Netherlands seems to promote the protection of political ideologies and create boundaries between the Dutch and immigrants (Van Koeven & Leeman, 2011).

Given the political climate and new changes in citizenship education curriculum in the Netherlands, this critical review examines secondary-level citizenship education curriculum in the Netherlands as a way of understanding how politically constructed educational objectives might endanger or support social cohesion and the integration of immigrants. This study also discuss the relationship between the ideological discourses embedded in the curriculum and educational practices, such as the integration of non-Western immigrants into Dutch society, sexual politics, and the conceptualization of Dutch nationality in parallel to civilization and modernity discussions.

Organization of the Study

A critical review is a document that presents and discusses ideas, opinions, and proposals on a particular topic or issue based on the studies conducted by different scholars (Wallace & Gray, 2006). It is usually drafted to provide insights about how a particular topic or issue situates itself in frameworks that are more complex (Northey, 2005). The arguments that relate to the rest of the literature address and discuss chosen themes or topics in more depth.

This study aims to present a series of key issues related to the factors affecting the citizenship education curriculum in the Netherlands. It portrays citizenship concerns and challenges for immigrants in Dutch society as a way to create transferable knowledge for countries sharing similar migration trends. Utilizing scholarly research and studies, theories, and best practices that shaped the Dutch citizenship concept, this study introduced ongoing citizenship policies and education and presented factors such as sexuality politics, immigration and secularism that affect Dutch citizenship and immigrants' social cohesion. The discussion points generated in this paper elicit debate, reflection, and input from the Dutch citizenship education and curriculum and suggest perspectives about how to create inclusive and non-discriminatory citizenship education policies for locals and newcomers.

Citizenship education curriculum and practices in the Netherlands present an exemplary case for countries with immigrant and refugee populations because the Netherlands has a unique citizenship politics blended with secularization, immigration, and sexual freedom and uses these discourses to decide how to integrate immigrant populations in their community. Secondary-level citizenship education is chosen as the focus of this study because the emphasis on teaching civic values is primarily given at the secondary level and because it is a highly accepted belief among teachers that civic values can be explained after the student reaches a certain degree of maturity (Veugelers, 2011). This critical review began by examining immigrant and citizenship themes in the education system and then narrowed its focus to the arguments developed after the changes in the citizenship education curriculum in 2006. After carefully examining the literature, this critical review defined themes as factors of the avoidance of diversity in the Dutch education system, continuity and changes in migration and citizenship policy, and sexuality politics and Dutch identity. The critical review of citizenship education curriculum based on literature in the Netherlands provides insight into how an implicit and explicit educational agenda can threaten or promote social cohesion and integration in the end and what kinds of practices can constitute an effective citizenship education model. This discussion paper argues that sexuality politics as the core of the Dutch citizenship model should be clearly explained to the students with migration backgrounds, and the political structure should acknowledge that immigrant youth could develop a positive understanding if a sufficient explanation about the importance of sexuality, secularism, and Dutch citizenship is provided to them.

The Dutch Education System and Factors of the Avoidance of Diversity

Compulsory education in the Netherlands begins at the age of five and finishes when the child reaches sixteen. The duration of the elementary level is seven years. Secondary education has three different tracks. Thus, the duration of each secondary-level track varies. These tracks are preparatory vocational education, higher general secondary education, and pre-university education (NCDO, 2012). Students attend one of the tracks based on their achievement level and choice. In principle, high school students are allowed to move among the tracks (Gijsberts & Hartgers, 2005), but, in reality, children of immigrants are mainly in the lower tracks, such as vocational schools; study in their ethnic schools isolated from Dutch society; or drop out of school before they finish their degree (Leeman & Pels, 2006; OECD, 2010). Therefore, they are less likely to graduate from high school or leave high school without having adequate information about Dutch citizenship and civic values. The system works as if it keeps immigrant youth studying in low-performing schools.

Citizenship education has become a compulsory subject in the Netherlands since 2006 (Leeman & Pels, 2006; Veugelers, 2007; Veugelers, 2011; Willems et al. 2012). However, the government does not oblige schools to follow a national guideline in teaching citizenship values (Bron & Thijs, 2011; Veugelers, 2010), but encourages them to focus on "active participation and social integration" (Jansen et al., 2006; Veugelers, 2011; Willems et al. 2012) based on three civic virtues such as justice, tolerance, and solidarity (Guerin et al. 2014; ten Dam et al. 2011; Willems et al. 2012). This statement means that each school has its own autonomy in deciding its citizenship education based on its ideology and value system (Bron & Thijs, 2011; Leeman & Pels, 2006; Willems et al. 2012). It also indicates that citizenship education is not only affected by political decisions but also shaped by the cultural and social values of particular groups. As a result, the lack of a standardized or institutionalized curriculum results in the acculturalization of citizenship rather than cultivating the civic virtues for social integration (Guerin et al. 2014). Students who graduate from different schools, therefore, have a different conception of citizenship.

Secondary-level public schools are not only classified based on students' success but also classified based on religion and ideology. Christian schools such as Roman Catholic and Protestant schools exist, as do a few Islamic schools (Miedema & Bertram-Troost, 2006; Veugelers, 2004). As not all schools are obliged to promote certain democratic values, these schools are also free to develop their own citizenship education model. As a result, teachers in these schools, on the one hand, exclude values that are unrelated to their faith and ideology from citizenship education; refrain from discussing contentious issues; and avoid discussions about differences that do not have definitive answers (van Koeven & Leeman, 2011). On the other hand, they favor course materials that support their ideological position and suppress the dilemmas associated with living in a pluralistic society (Willems et al. 2012). Members of these school

communities and Dutch society are aware of differences and other sensitive issues such as gay emancipation and multiculturalism, but tolerance of minority groups' culture and values is not on the educational agenda of the liberal majority (van Koeven & Leeman, 2011).

Maintaining a balance between curriculum policy and archetypal identities in society is a challenging task. The Dutch government attempts to address cultural and political constraints while also employing a discriminatory agenda to control minorities and promote Dutch nationalism (Veugelers 2004). Accordingly, students with migration backgrounds tend to identify themselves as victims and isolate themselves from the rest of society (Veugelers, 2011). Current migration and citizenship policies also increase victim discourse among immigrant youth.

Teachers' perceptions and attitudes about citizenship are another reason for the unsuccessful citizenship education policy. Teachers are also the producers of anti-immigrant sentiments among the young. First, teachers, in general, do not believe that youth groups in Dutch society are mature enough to comprehend the complexity of the identity problems in their society and give an informed decision about what kinds of behaviors indicate ideal and active citizenship characteristics (Veugelers, 2011). Second, teachers believe that teaching politically and culturally correct opinions is not possible and ethical. Therefore, they support that students should develop their own opinions (Veugelers, 2011). However, they also think that explaining their perception of who is an ideal citizen is part of their educational agenda. Additionally, the joint perception among the teachers is that current citizenship values promoted in the curriculum give so much emphasis on cultural differences. However, according to them, the major difference between Dutch and immigrant youth is the economic difference. They believe that having lived in a Third World country causes a difference in learning civic values (van Amersfoort & van Niekerk, 2006; Willems et al. 2012). In summary, teachers' perceptions rely on deficiency discourse. The youth groups cannot learn civic values because they are not mature, need guidance, or have a different social status.

The reluctance of the Dutch government to standardize citizenship education gathers all these discussions and problems regarding the lack of coordination among schools under a single roof. Therefore, schools are segregated based on religion, ethnicity, and political ideology (Miedema & Bertram-Troost, 2006; Veugelers, 2004); citizenship education is shaped by teachers' perceptions and the boundaries created between the immigrant and native Dutch youth. According to van Amersfoort and van Niekerk (2006), this situation is connected to the Dutch colonial history and immigration policy.

Migration and Citizenship Policy: Continuity and Change

Since 2006, all schools in the Netherlands are required to help immigrant students learn the basic values of being Dutch citizens and contribute to the integration of immigrant children (Leeman & Pels, 2006; Mattei & Broeks, 2015; Doppen, 2010). The Dutch immigration and citizenship policy was constructed based on two premises: continuity of past colonial perceptions and changes because of new immigrant flows, particularly outside of its former colonies (Entzinger, 2003; Jennissen et al., 2022). As part of changes in citizenship policy, the Dutch government placed emphasis on defining immigrants' status. Therefore, the immigrants were exposed to a series of label changes, such as repatriates, guest workers, and allochthones, depending on their former relationship with the Netherlands, their country of origin, religion, and culture (Joppke, 2007). This labeling process influenced the educational response of the government in dealing with the increasing cultural diversity in schools. Therefore, citizenship education paid attention to diverse cultures and cultivated the idea of creating a separate space for immigrant youth for the sake of protecting their cultural identity (Schinkel, 2010). However, the idea of separate schools and curricula for immigrant youth originated from the notion of a "they and we" boundary between the native Dutch and immigrants.

Avoidance of Colonial Past

Immigration is a colonial inheritance of Dutch society. However, the Netherlands perceived itself as a country of emigration rather than immigration, as most of the immigrants came from colonial countries. As a result, Dutch authorities denied the existence of immigrant groups for a long time because of the common perception that they would return to their homes (Bjornson, 2007). The denial of immigrants caused some symbolic measures. First, the government avoided using the term "*immigrants"* to describe migrants. Second, the word "*repatriates"* was used for the people of former colonies (van Amersfoort and van Niekerk, 2006). However, repatriates did not refer to other immigrant groups. Finally, immigration history was excluded from the school curriculum, and citizenship education, accordingly, aimed to assimilate migrants. The authorities did not either notice or do anything about the resistance of minorities to assimilation.

The government's reluctance to recognize immigrants as part of Dutch society changed in 1983. At the beginning of the 1980s, the Netherlands resigned itself to a social inclusion policy and became the new face of multiculturalism (Romeyn, 2014). First, the government acknowledged the history of immigration flows from the former colonies of Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles, and Aruba. Then, guest workers from Turkey and Morocco acquired

immigration status. In the meantime, the increasing number of immigrants, particularly from Islamic states, has deepened cultural differences and tensions in the Netherlands. Debates on integration concentrated on cultural concerns. Immigrants with Muslim identities were considered a threat to Dutch nationality and multicultural citizenship (Bujis et al., 2011; Mepschen et al., 2010; Romeyn, 2014; Veugelers, 2011).

Before the 2006 citizenship education reform, a stricter policy of integration, which was meant to control immigrant groups, was introduced and paradoxically accentuated cultural assimilation in the Netherlands (Glastra & Schedler, 2004; Romeyn, 2014). According to this policy, all citizens should participate in society based on mutual acceptance and equality. In a deeper sense, mutual acceptance meant that individuals should accept Dutch civic values. As part of Dutch civic values, the Dutch government required parents to collaborate with the schools to educate, teach, and promote solely the civic values of Dutch society (van den Berg & Duyvendak, 2012). The result of this strict policy failed to change the attitudes of Muslim youth. The criteria for citizenship were focused on civic integration, but the result was cultural isolation (Spring, 2004) because parents were not informed about Dutch society and what they should instruct their children. Additionally, as a reaction to this oppressive and assimilative approach, many immigrant groups, who are familiar with Dutch values, perceived this approach as voluntary assimilation and preferred social isolation. Cultural isolation primarily affected secondary-level immigrant students because they were not only barred from attending native Dutch-populated schools but were also treated as potential workers because their parents were guest workers or repatriates (Gries et al., 2021).

Immigration from non-Western countries and Dutch Autochthony

Unlike many countries, the immigration policy in the Netherlands is not organized based on nationality or country of birth. The government considers ethnicity when keeping the statistics on immigration. Citizenship is facilitated by a terminological distinction between Dutch natives and all other forms of ethnic origin as a result of years of assimilationist approaches and colonial attitudes toward outsiders (van Amersfoort & Niekerk, 2006). Therefore, according to the Allochthones Policy, the term "ethnic minority" is replaced with "allochthone," which contrasts with the Autochthones (Dutch natives). The minority groups become the opposition group of autochthons. Additionally, a further distinction is made between Western and non-Western *allochthones*. Western *allochthones* refer to the people from Europe (excluding Turkey), North America, Oceania, Indonesia, and Japan; non-Western *allochthones* are defined as the people from Turkey, Africa, Latin America, and the rest of Asia. The fact that there are Western allochthones and Non-Western allochthones shows that the Netherlands routinely leaves some people, particularly those with Islamic or non-Western backgrounds, out in building a community.

It can also be argued that global events like 9/11 and the murder of film director Theo van Gogh, who directed films about the treatment of women in Islam, accelerated anti-immigrant and anti-Islamic sentiments in the Netherlands. These events were also included in citizenship education (Boomkens, 2010; Veugelers et al., 2006), and the inclusion of these events was acknowledged as a useful nation-building strategy as it promoted avoidance and cultural isolation (Spring, 2004). Interestingly, these policies not only passivated the allochthone youth but also decreased the political involvement of the Dutch youth after graduation from high school. It was because the increasing gap between elite Dutch and middle-class Dutch increased that political, social, and cultural communication among the autochthones decreased. In other words, the elite and middle-class Dutch maintained different attitudes toward immigration issues and citizenship requirements. All these changes in the cultural, social, and political platforms made the Dutch authorities revise their citizenship education and educational approaches (Veugelers 2011; Romeyn, 2014) because they also wanted middle-class Dutch people to adopt similar political perspectives on the integration of new immigrants. This situation urges a change in the Dutch citizenship model because the Dutch integration policy practically rules out the possibility of integrating 'others' (Geschiere, 2009), and the civic practices in school settings are different from what is suggested in the actual curricular text. This citizenship education model is not more than a state-controlled mechanism of exclusion of particular groups from Dutch society (Schinkel, 2010; Van Koeven & Leeman, 2011). The emphasis on citizenship education in the Netherlands is cultural purism rather than cultural integration or social cohesion. The notion of respecting others becomes a differentialist regulatory tool. Romeyn (2014) says that the current policy on citizenship education promotes "racism under the guise of a social Darwinian model" (p. 85).

Sexuality Politics and Dutch Identity

In addition to the discussions about developing integrative citizenship education, the concept of citizenship enjoys widespread popularity in sexuality and gender politics in the Netherlands. Tolerance of different sexual orientations becomes a normative concept for a good citizen. Although respecting the gay community is not explicitly stated in the second-level citizenship curriculum, the Dutch authorities expect the immigrant youth to acknowledge gay-friendly politics (Boomkens, 2010). Therefore, immigrant-populated schools are monitored to see whether there is a homophobic creed in their environment. However, this expectation is not imposed on the denominational schools run by the Dutch

because these schools are perceived as more liberal and secular than the other religious schools (Mepschen et al., 2010). This situation is related to Dutch society's transformation from the most religious to the most secular after accepting tolerance for homosexuality as part of the Dutch national identity (Bujis et al., 2011).

The Dutch government considers sexuality and gender politics an important task to create a modern, progressive, and civic Dutch nationality, so that the new immigration policy has an *inburgering* or integration study kit. According to Bjornson (2007), the *inburgering* kit is the Trojan horse of integration because it "introduc(e) the necessity for Dutch language skills into an integration regime that has become the basis for a new politics of exclusion under the current neo-conservative administration" (p.65). This kit measures new immigrants' knowledge of Dutch society. It also includes nude images of gay couples holding hands and kissing each other, as well as questions about whether all people are allowed to marry with any person that they choose (www.naarnederland.nl), to indicate that gay rights and emancipation are part of Dutch society. According to the Dutch authorities, sexual politics is part of Dutch tolerance and freedom. Therefore, they believe that appreciating Dutch tolerance and freedom is as important as teaching the Dutch language and should be at the center of citizenship education (Romeyn, 2014).

As the idea of gender equality is at the center of Dutch nationality (Wecker, 2004), the integration policy of immigrants focuses on introducing Dutch gender norms to the immigrant community, particularly to Muslim women. The government believes that women's emancipation is the key to immigrants' integration; therefore, Muslim women should be emancipated from wearing headscarves, early marriages, and subordination to their husbands to protect the Dutch progressive image (Van den Berg & Duyvendak, 2013). This conceptualization of citizenship inevitably influences the school curriculum. As a result, gender emancipation becomes part of the curriculum, and it is taught as the touchstone of secularization as part of citizenship education. However, what was taught in the class created identity problems for Muslim students because their home environment was entirely different from the native Dutch-populated environment (Van den Berg & Duyvendak, 2013; Yilmaz & Aykac, 2012).

There is zero tolerance for intolerance in the Netherlands to protect the Dutch integration policy, limit immigrants' ability to express their cultural differences, and exclude those who cannot adapt as required in the integration policy. The result of a poll also drew parallels with this statement: 91 percent of the participants agreed "newcomers should tolerate our tolerance or should leave" (Mepschen et al., 2010, p. 967). Intolerance between newcomers and native Dutch is the result of the culturalization of citizenship and is fueled by the populist anti-immigrant and (homo) sexualized speeches of political parties (Bujis et al., 2011; Van der Veer, 2006). The target of these speeches is Muslim youth (Yilmaz & Aykac, 2012). For example, even though the police records indicate that the demographics of perpetrators vary, the leader of the populist right-wing party declared in his speech "the perpetrators of anti-gay violence in big cities are almost always Muslims, almost always Moroccans." (Bujis et al., 2011, p. 634). Political rhetoric in the Netherlands is a combination of anti-immigration and pro-sexuality discourses. Dutch politicians support the isolation of immigrant youth from civic participation to gain more political power and control the immigrant population. Therefore, the educational authorities use citizenship education to actualize the political agenda of controlling migrants.

Conclusions

Secondary-level citizenship education in the Netherlands was examined in relation to the ideological, secular, and immigration discourses embedded in the curriculum and practice, such as the integration of non-Western immigrants into Dutch society, sexual politics, and the conceptualization of Dutch nationality in parallel to civilization and modernity discussions. The literature on citizenship education, Dutch colonial history, and current politics showed that citizenship education in the Netherlands focused on the acculturalization of citizenship. This led to a lot of problems in society, like cultural isolation between immigrants and native Dutch, anti-immigrant and anti-Islamic feelings, and arguments about who is a good Dutch citizen and what values should be taught in official citizenship education. The underlying reasons for the above-mentioned issues were the assimilative approaches used in Dutch colonies, increasing numbers of non-western immigrants, differences between Autochthones' and Allochthones' cultures, teachers' perception of the Dutch and immigrant youth's maturity in understanding civic discourses, ethnic and religious segregation of the schools, unstandardized citizenship education, and the widespread popularity of sexuality and gender politics as a way of creating modern and progressive Dutch society.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Courses and programs in citizenship education provide refugee and immigrant youth with a sense of structural integration and political efficacy within their host countries, as well as helping them develop civic participation skills and reflective cultural, national, and global identities (Bank, 2017). However, citizenship education for these groups is highly contested in countries with immigrant populations because it links citizenship education to the political domain of the host countries (Veuglers, 2021). As a result of this politicization and globalization of citizenship concept, people's

lives have been deeply affected, and it has shaped the type of identity that people prefer and demand for those joining in their societies (Goren & Yemini, 2017; Veuglers, 2021). Not surprisingly, citizenship education is highly politicized in the Netherlands. However, the Dutch government showed improvements in addressing issues related to citizenship education. First, their immigration status was recognized, even though they do not fully gain minority rights. In 2006, citizenship education became a compulsory subject because the government figured that the Allochthone policy had failed to integrate immigrants into society. Finally, sexuality and gender politics have become part of the social fabric. However, these policies only made it harder for the Dutch and the immigrants to get along with each other.

The Dutch citizenship education policy is an example for many immigrant-receiving countries because it changes its dominant Allochthone policy, but it is required to address the ongoing discussions about how immigrant youth feel isolated from being part of the society. In an attempt to create social cohesion, it is necessary to abandon the acculturalization of citizenship education and adopt critical-democratic citizenship education, which stimulates humanitarian, social, and democratic values (Veugelers, 2007). In other words, Dutch tolerance should transform itself into acceptance of the others rather than imposing them to become Dutch and rejecting their cultural identity. Otherwise, each culture continues to cultivate its own values, and the pillarization of society remains the same.

The literature suggests that the citizenship education curriculum should be institutionalized, and the educational authorities should clarify the criteria of being a good citizen to eliminate teachers,' parents', and educational authorities' misconceptions about the Dutch citizenship concept. The most essential aspect of standardization is paying attention to the needs of immigrants. However, the voices of the native Dutch and the immigrants should have equal power. More importantly, students' views should be included in the decision-making process. If they perceive themselves to be a part of society rather than a small community, their political participation in addressing larger civic and social issues may increase in the future (de Groot et al., 2014).

The authorities in the Netherlands excluded the history of immigration from the school curriculum. The history of immigration should be included in the curriculum to engage students in discussions about the historical development of citizenship education and how the current citizenship policies have become inclusive and embracing for immigrant communities. This practice, as it addresses the changing perspective of Dutch society towards non-Western immigrants, could ensure student engagement and voluntary participation in Dutch societies. Additionally, the inadequate explanation of sexual freedom in the school curriculum is one reason for portraying immigrant youth as having anti-sexuality politics. The negative public image of immigrant youth is mainly the result of Dutch politicians' political propaganda. Bujis et al.'s (2011) study showed that immigrant youth have a positive attitude towards understanding why sexual freedom is part of Dutch nationality, even if it contradicts their cultural beliefs and norms. Citizenship education in the Netherlands is, therefore, required to focus on educational needs, students' expectations, and humanitarian values, instead of being a control mechanism of hegemony, politics, and discrimination.

As stated previously, the Netherlands' experience is beneficial for nations whose immigrant population is growing rapidly and whose leaders are concerned about how immigrants will be integrated into the existing social structure. This critical review illustrates that politics and policy-driven discourses are largely effective in integrating immigrants into society and educating them about the issue of citizenship. Therefore, in order to increase the social adaptation of both immigrant youth and adult groups, it is essential to improve the current political discourse of immigration, integration and citizenship. Turkey, a leader in hosting refugee and immigrant populations, has recently been subjected to similar anti-refugee and anti-immigrant discourses. To support the social cohesion process of the refugees who arrived in Turkey in 2011 and to resolve existing integration issues, it is necessary to examine the citizenship and integration policies of countries such as the Netherlands that have received significant migration. Taking into account geographical and social sensitivity, the results of similar citizenship policy examinations can be transferred to countries with immigrant integration issues, such as Turkey, in an effort to improve existing integration issues.

Contribution Rate of the Researchers

This study was prepared by a single author.

Financial Support and Acknowledgment

The authors declared that this research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have disclosed no conflict of interest.

References

Banks, J. A. (2017). Citizenship education and global migration: Implications for theory, research, and teaching. *Citizenship Education and Global Migration*, 1-572.

Bjornson, M. (2007). Speaking of citizenship: Language ideologies in Dutch citizenship regimes. *Focaal*, *2007*(49), 65-80.

Boomkens, R. (2010). Cultural citizenship and real politics: the Dutch case. *Citizenship Studies*, *14*(3), 307-316.

Bron, J., & Thijs, A. (2011). Leaving it to the schools: citizenship, diversity and human rights education in the Netherlands. *Educational Research*, *53*(2), 123-136.

Bujis, L. Hekma, G., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2011). 'As long as they keep away from me': The paradox of antigay violence in a gay-friendly country. *Sexualities, 14*(6), 632-652.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2023). *Population counter.* Retrieved February 4, 2023 from https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/visualisations/dashboard-population/population-counter

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

Doppen, F. H. (2010). Citizenship education and the Dutch national identity debate. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *5*(2), 131-143.

Entzinger, H. (2003). The rise and fall of multiculturalism: The case of the Netherlands. *Toward assimilation and citizenship: Immigrants in liberal nation-states*, 59-86.

Gries, T., Redlin, M., & Zehra, M. (2021). Educational assimilation of first-generation and second-generation immigrants in Germany. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 1-31.

Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017). Global citizenship education redefined–A systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *82*, 170-183.

Guérin, L. J. F. van der Ploeg, P. A., & Sins, P. H. M. (2013). Citizenship education: the feasibility of a participative approach. *Educational Research, 55*(4), 427-440.

Ilzina, L. (2010). Immigrant Children and Globalization: Formal education in producing new citizens. *Macalester International*, *25*(1), 8.

Jansen, T. Chioncel, N., & Dekkers, H. (2006). Social cohesion and integration: learning active citizenship. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 27*(2), 189-205.

Jennissen, R., Bovens, M., Engbersen, G., & Bokhorst, M. (2022). Successive National Policy Models. In *Migration Diversity and Social Cohesion: Reassessing the Dutch Policy Agenda* (pp. 59-78). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Joppke, C. (2007). Transformation of citizenship: status, rights, identity. *Citizenship studies*, *11*(1), 37-48.

Leeman, Y., & Pels, T. (2006). Citizenship Education in the Dutch Multiethnic Context. *European Education, 38*(2), 64-75.

Leeman, Y., & Reid, C. (2006). Multi/intercultural education in Australia and the Netherlands. *Compare, 36(*1), 57–72.

Mattei, P., & Broeks, M. (2018). From multiculturalism to civic integration: Citizenship education and integration policies in the Netherlands and England since the 2000s. *Ethnicities*, *18*(1), 23-42.

Mepschen, P. Duyvendak, J. W., & Tonkens, E. H. (2010). Sexual politics, orientalism and multicultural citizenship in the Netherlands. *Sociology, 44*(5), 962-978.

Miedema, S., & Bertram-Troost, G. (2008). Democratic citizenship and religious education: challenges and perspectives for schools in the Netherlands. *British Journal of Religious Education, 30*(2), 123-132.

NCDO (2012). *Global citizenship in primary and secondary education in the Netherlands.* Retrieved from http://www.ncdo.nl/sites/default/files/NCDO%20Teachers%20Global%20Citizenship.pdf

Northey, M. (2005). Making sense: A student's guide to research and writing (4th ed.). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

OECD (2010). *Migrant Education in the Netherlands: Pointers for policy development.* Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/45053539.pdf

Romeyn, E. (2014). Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia: Spectropolitics and Immigration. *Theory, Culture & Society, 31*(6), 77-101.

Schinkel, W. (2010). The Virtualization of Citizenship. *Critical Sociology. Sage Publications, Ltd, 36*(2), 265-283.

Slootman, M., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2015). Feeling Dutch: the culturalization and emotionalization of citizenship and second-generation belonging in the Netherlands. *Fear, anxiety, and national identity: Immigration and belonging in North America and Western Europe*, 147-168.

ten Dam, G. Geijsel, F. Reumerman, R., & Ledoux, G. (2011). Measuring Young People's Citizenship Competences. *European Journal of Education, 46*(3), 354-372.

van Amersfoort, H., & van Niekerk, M. (2006). Immigration as a Colonial Inheritance: Post-Colonial Immigrants in the Netherlands, 1945–2002. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies, 32*(3), 323-346.

van den Berg, M., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2012). Paternalizing mothers: Feminist repertoires in contemporary Dutch civilizing offensives. *Critical Social Policy, 32*(4), 556-576.

van Koeven, E., & Leeman, Y. (2011). Citizenship education for a pluralistic world: the selection of children's literature in Dutch Protestant primary schools. *Intercultural Education, 22*(5), 395-410.

Veugelers, W. (2004). Between autonomy and control, *Journal of Educational Change*, *5*(2), 141–160.

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

Veugelers, W. (2011). The moral and the political in global citizenship: appreciating differences in education. *Globalization, Societies & Education, 9*(3/4), 473-485.

Veugelers, W. M. Derriks, and E. de Kat (2006). Education and major cultural incidents in society: September 11 and Dutch education. *Journal of Peace Education, 3*(2), 235-250.

Veugelers, W. (2021). How globalisation influences perspectives on citizenship education: from the social and political to the cultural and moral. *Compare: a journal of comparative and international education*, *51*(8), 1174-1189.

Wallace, M. & Wray, A. (2006). Critical reading and writing for postgraduates. London: Sage Publications.

Willems, F. Denessen, E. Hermans, C., & Vermeer, P. (2012). 'Silent Citizenship Educators' in Dutch Catholic Schools: Exploring Teachers' Moral Beliefs About Citizenship in Relation to Their Conduct of Citizenship Education. *Journal of Empirical Theology, 25*(1), 77-98.

Yilmaz, H., & Aykac, C. E. (2012). *Perception of Islam in Europe.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.