Citizenship Norms Among Native and Immigrant Students from a European Perspective

Maria Magdalena Isac, Ellen Claes, and Andrés Sandoval-Hernández

Abstract The unprecedented diversity in student populations in Europe resulting from the recent rapid influx of migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers is an important challenge to implementing inclusive citizenship education across Europe. Current European policy frameworks in education stress that citizenship education needs to promote common attitudes and values in the entire student population while respecting cultural diversity. Nevertheless, existing research on citizenship education tends to give only a fragmented picture. More research is needed to systematically address potential attitudinal differences between groups of students defined by migration background. To this end, this chapter analyzes potential differences in citizenship norms between 36,197 grade 8 immigrant and native-born students across nine European countries participating in IEA's International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2016. More specifically, using multiple group multinomial logistic regression analyses, it investigates the relationship between immigration status and citizenship norms in the nine European countries, while taking into account other individual level characteristics, such as gender, socioeconomic status, and civic knowledge. The study reveals that in most of the countries native-born and immigrant students tend to endorse similar configurations of citizenship norms. When differences in adherence exist (in four out of the nine European countries), the most solid finding indicates that immigrant students are more likely to hold comprehensive citizenship norms when compared to their native-born peers. The findings contribute toward identifying potential differences in citizenship norms among native-born and

M. M. Isac (✉) · E. Claes
KU Leuven, Centre for Political Science Research, Leuven, Belgium
e-mail: mariamagdalena.isac@kuleuven.be

E. Claes
e-mail: ellen.claes@kuleuven.be

M. M. Isac
INVALSI (Istituto Nazionale per la Valutazione del Sistema dell'Istruzione), Rome, Italy

A. Sandoval-Hernández
Department of Education, University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom
e-mail: A.Sandoval@bath.ac.uk

immigrant students in several European countries. The results may be used to inform future studies and initiatives aimed at identifying and understanding the motivations behind endorsing different configurations of citizenship norms among different groups of students.

Keywords Citizenship norms · Immigrant students · European students · International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS)

1 Introduction

The recent rapid influx of migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers has led to unprecedented diversity in student populations in Europe (European Commission 2018; OECD 2019; Scholten 2015). To address this challenge, education policy frameworks and initiatives in European countries aim to promote common attitudes and values by means of inclusive citizenship education programs that consider differences in student populations defined by migration background (Council of the European Union 2016, 2017; European Council 2015; European Education and Training Expert Panel 2019). Of particular importance is understanding how young people relate to different forms of political and civic engagement (citizenship norms) and whether these norms are predictive of their future participatory citizenry. Extant research findings show that young people have different views on citizenship as they are developing their identity in adolescence (Banks 2011, 2017; Berry and Sam 2014; Hooghe et al. 2016; Reichert 2017; Sherrod et al. 2010). Nevertheless, more research is needed to understand potential attitudinal differences between groups of students defined by migration background living in diverse European countries.

2 Literature Review

In the European context, the body of comparative analysis based on data from the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) civic and citizenship education studies has grown considerably. For example, a recent summary of research (Knowles et al. 2018) identified over 100 published articles reporting secondary analysis of the Civic Education Study (CIVED) 1999 and the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2009 data. A large proportion of these publications are international comparative analyses that focus on defining and comparing citizenship competences such as civic knowledge and critical understanding, skills for active participation, and common attitudes and values in European youth. Among these, studies focused on citizenship norms have illustrated cross-country differences in students' attitudes, as well as the importance of student background and school variables related to such outcomes. For example, some studies show differences according to immigration status, with students from

an immigrant background more likely to endorse conventional citizenship behaviors compared to their native-born peers (Isac et al. 2014). Yet, this research involved average country comparisons and variable-centered analyses. Only recent work on citizenship norms has demonstrated the value of person-centered approaches for the study of citizenship norms among youth (Hooghe and Oser 2015; Hooghe et al. 2016; Oser and Hooghe 2013). This line of inquiry has provided substantial input for the theoretical and analytical approaches presented in this book (see Chaps. 1, 2, and 3), and is also informative for the work presented in this chapter.

This research (Hooghe and Oser 2015; Hooghe et al. 2016; Oser and Hooghe 2013) was largely guided by theory related to civic duty norms (Dalton 2008), and was applied to data from CIVED 1999 and ICCS 2009. It aimed to ascertain whether distinct groups of young people, expressing either “engaged” or “duty-based” citizenship norms, can be found in a range of democracies, and identified individual and country-level determinants of these different citizenship norms. A number of important findings emerged from these studies, while opening avenues for further research.

First, confirming Dalton’s distinction, the results indicate that a large proportion of young people in various countries express either “engaged” (highly endorsing the protection of human rights and community involvement, while downplaying the importance of traditional duty-based political participation) or “duty-based” (displaying the opposite normative emphases) citizenship norms. Yet, it became apparent that these two groups represent only about half of the student population in each country, and that the other half tends to adhere to other citizenship norms. Current work further confirmed this distinction with International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2016 data by identifying five types of citizenship norms (comprehensive, socially engaged, duty-based, monitorial, and anomic) that are roughly equivalent to the groups identified by Hooghe and colleagues (see Chap. 3). Based on previous research and current findings (see Chap. 3), the comprehensive group seems to be prevalent in a large number of countries. Further research is necessary to understand these additional types of citizenship norms and their determinants.

Second, the studies (see Hooghe and Oser 2015; Hooghe et al. 2016; Oser and Hooghe 2013) confirm theoretical expectations (Dalton 2008) regarding the overall emergence of engaged citizenship norms and the decline in duty-based citizenship over time and across countries. In this vein, Ingelhart and Welzel (2005) show that engaged citizenship norms are not prevalent only in advanced societies and established democracies (e.g., Nordic European countries) but that their emergence is more of a global phenomenon. Focusing on younger age groups and the geographical distribution of citizenship norms in the literature it is moreover apparent that the rise of engaged citizenry appears to be a phenomenon in more recent democracies (e.g., Central and Eastern Europe). In contrast, higher shares of young people in established democracies (Northern Europe) tend to be more supportive of duty-based norms, hinting at the possibility that issues such as human rights or protecting the environment (commonly associated with engaged citizenship norms) are more

salient in contexts in which they are challenged. This issue certainly deserves further attention.

Third, this research (see Hooghe and Oser 2015; Hooghe et al. 2016; Oser and Hooghe 2013) shows the importance of individual background characteristics as determinants of citizenship norms. More specifically, results indicate that in most countries, engaged citizenship norms are more likely to be found among girls and students of higher socioeconomic status, while duty-based norms are more prevalent among male adolescents. Nevertheless, with few exceptions (Oser and Hooghe 2013), other relevant background characteristics, such as political sophistication (civic knowledge) or immigration status, were not the object of investigation. Regarding the latter (the main focus in this chapter), only one study (Oser and Hooghe 2013) looked at the potential impact of immigration status on different profiles of citizenship norms in Nordic European countries. This study shows that native-born students are more likely to hold both engaged and duty-based norms in comparison to students with an immigrant background. Moreover, it indicated that students from an immigrant background tend to be concentrated in the comprehensive or “all-around” profile, showing that this group of students tend to rate highly all aspects of good citizenship due to a tendency to give socially desirable answers. This finding regarding immigrant students also emerged in recent research conducted in Australia (Reichert 2017).

In this chapter, we try to build upon extant research and shed more light on potential differences in citizenship norms between immigrant and native-born students in nine European countries participating in ICCS 2016. To this end, we investigate the relationship between immigration status and citizenship norms in each country, while taking into account other important individual level factors such as gender, socioeconomic status, and civic knowledge.

3 Method

This section briefly explains the data, variables, and methods used for the analysis presented in this chapter.

The data used for the analyses were from ICCS 2016 (Schulz et al. 2018a). We used the data for nine out of the 14 European countries that participated in the European Module of ICCS 2016 (Losito et al. 2018; Schulz et al. 2016, 2018a, b). The following (groups of) countries were included: (a) Central and Eastern European ($N = 2$): Estonia, Slovenia; (b) Nordic European ($N = 3$): Denmark, Norway, Sweden; (c) Southern European ($N = 2$): Italy, Malta; and (d) Western European ($N = 2$): Belgium (Flemish), the Netherlands. In each country, the sample of students is representative of the population of grade 8 students. In order to ensure reliable results, we selected only countries where the number of immigrant students was higher than $N = 200$. The analysis was applied to 36,197 students clustered in nine countries. Sample sizes for all students varied from 2773 to 7848 students across countries while for

the subsample of students with an immigration background, the range was between 229 and 692 students (see Appendix B, Table 3).

The students’ profiles of “good citizenship” are the outcome variable of this chapter. Here, we investigated the student background variables (with a focus on immigration status) that increase the odds of students endorsing citizenship norms in a particular way. Following the results of the latent class homogenous model across countries (Kankaraš and Vermunt 2015), we used the most likely latent group for each student as a manifest variable. The generated model identifies the probability of agreeing to each citizenship norm item in a common way across countries, while allowing the probability of membership to each pattern of response to be specific for each country. Thus, with this approach, we can carry out comparisons between countries and determine whether students of different backgrounds endorse citizenship norms in a different manner. In particular, if immigrant students are more likely to be (a) comprehensive, (b) socially-engaged, (c) duty-based, (d) monitorial, or (e) anomic citizens. These different groups of students consist of distinct patterns in which students endorse citizenship norms across countries. For the description of the outcome variable, we refer to Chap. 3. As background factors of students, we include student gender, socioeconomic status, civic knowledge, and immigrant background (see Table 1).

Table 1 Explanatory variables from ICCS 2016

Explanatory variables	Type	Description
Student gender	Dummy	Female = 1, male = 0
Socioeconomic status	Continuous Standardized within countries	National index of socioeconomic background
Civic knowledge	Continuous Standardized within countries	Student scores on the civic knowledge test. Five plausible values
Immigrant status	Dummy	Students with immigrant background (first and second generation = 1, native-born = 0)

Source ICCS 2016 technical report (Schulz et al. 2018b)

For the estimation of the relationship between student background variables that predict the odds of being classified into one of the five citizenship profiles, we used a multinomial logistic model. The outcome variable in this model is a nominal variable indicating the student’s classification in one of the five profiles of “good citizenship”: socially engaged, duty-based, monitorial, anomic, and comprehensive as the reference category. In order to ensure model convergence and stability of results, for this analysis we maintain the profiles produced in Chap. 3 (i.e., probabilities for cluster membership are not allowed to vary as a function of the explanatory variables). The explanatory variable that predicts the odds of being in a specific profile is immigrant status. We controlled for students’ gender, socioeconomic status, and civic knowledge. We used a multiple group model in order to obtain estimates for each of the

nine units, including eight European countries and the Flemish region of Belgium. The general model for each country can be expressed as follows (see Eq. 1):

$$\ln \left[\frac{\Pr(y_{ij} = k - 1 | X_{ij})}{\Pr(y_{ij} = k | X_{ij})} \right] = \beta_{0,k-1} + \beta_{1,k-1}sex_{ij} + \beta_{2,k-1}ses_{ij} + \beta_{3,k-1}civ_{ij} + \beta_{4,k-1}imm_{ij} \quad (1)$$

All estimates produced in this chapter take into account the sampling design of ICCS 2016. Taylor Series Linearization (Stapleton 2013) was used for sampling variance estimation, including school clustering and stratification of observations. This method yields similar results to the Jackknife variance estimation with large samples (Stapleton 2008). Countries were equally weighted with survey weights scaled up to 500 cases (Gonzalez 2012). Moreover, the civic knowledge five plausible values were treated as imputation data (Rutkowski et al. 2010). Data preparation was carried out using the IEA IDB Analyzer (IEA 2017) and IBM SPSS (IBM Corp. 2015). All analyses were performed in Mplus 8.2 (Muthén and Muthén 2017).

4 Results

We carried out an analysis of the distribution of the five different profiles across the nine European countries included in this analysis for all the students in the sample and for the subsample of students with and without an immigrant background (see Appendix B, Table 4). We can observe that the majority of students in these countries (between 60 and 90% of the sample) can be described as comprehensive and socially engaged with the highest scores in Italy (over 80%). With the exception of Denmark (above 40%) and, to a lesser extent the Netherlands (above 25%), considerably fewer young people can be described as dutiful citizens in the nine European countries. Moreover, the same analysis applied to the subsample of native-born students shows highly similar results to the ones observed in the entire population. Furthermore, when looking at the subsample of immigrant students in the nine European countries, the results suggest that in the majority of countries, students with an immigrant background tend to follow the patterns observed in the general population and tend to be concentrated in the comprehensive (mostly) and socially-engaged groups. Therefore, the choice of using the comprehensive group as a reference category seems adequate in this context.

In a subsequent step we estimated a multiple group multinomial model which predicts the probability of being classified in one of the four profiles in contrast with the comprehensive profile, with a focus on the differences between native-born and immigrant students over and above the other covariates (gender, socioeconomic status, and civic knowledge) by country (see Table 2 and Appendix B, Table 5).

The following section provides an explanation of the results for each of the profiles included in the table, with a focus on the relationship between immigration status and group membership over and above the other covariates (see Table 2).

Table 2 Multinomial estimates for immigrant status and citizenship norms endorsement

	C1: Socially engaged			C2: Duty-based			C3: Monitorial			C4: Anomic		
	E	OR		E	OR		E	OR		E	OR	
<i>Central & Eastern</i>												
Estonia	-0.03	0.97		0.25	1.29		0.17	1.18		0.36	1.43	
Slovenia	-0.20	0.82		0.14	1.15		0.04	1.04		-0.08	0.93	
<i>Nordic</i>												
Denmark	-0.45	0.64	**	-0.25	0.78		-0.52	0.60		-0.79	0.45	
Norway	0.18	1.20	+	-0.08	0.92		-0.05	0.95		-0.11	0.89	
Sweden	-0.36	0.70	**	-0.82	0.44	***	-0.38	0.68	+	-0.77	0.46	+
<i>Southern</i>												
Italy	0.24	1.27		0.10	1.10		0.20	1.23		-0.63	0.53	
Malta	-0.41	0.66	**	-0.28	0.76		-0.47	0.62	**	-0.12	0.89	
<i>Western</i>												
Belgium (Flemish)	-0.73	0.48	***	-0.64	0.53	**	-0.41	0.66		-0.65	0.52	
The Netherlands	-0.19	0.83		0.04	1.04		0.29	1.33		0.02	1.02	

Notes C5: Comprehensive is the reference category. E = estimated coefficients, OR = odds ratio, *** = $p < 0.001$, ** = $p < 0.01$, * = $p < 0.05$, + = $p < 0.10$

Comparing socially-engaged and comprehensive young citizens, no significant differences are found between native-born and immigrant students in Estonia, Slovenia, Norway, Italy, and the Netherlands. However, those who are native-born are more likely to be socially engaged in countries such as Denmark, Sweden, Malta, and Belgium (Flemish).

Comparing duty-based and comprehensive young citizens, it appears that native-born students are more likely to hold to dutiful citizenship norms only in Sweden, and Belgium (Flemish). The differences between these two groups are not statistically significant in the other countries.

In addition, a comparison between comprehensive and monitorial young citizens shows that the latter are more likely to be native-born in Malta. No statistically significant differences are recorded in the rest of the European countries.

Finally, looking at the comparison between anomic and comprehensive young citizens no statistically significant differences are found.

A synthetic perspective on the results, with a focus on the comparison between immigrant and native-born students, reveals the following patterns:

- (a) Holding constant the other background characteristics, immigrant students are less likely to be socially engaged (as compared to comprehensive students) in Denmark, Sweden, Malta, and Belgium (Flemish), with odds of 36%, 30%, 34%, and 52% respectively¹;
- (b) For all other groups, immigrant students were less likely to be duty-based, in countries such as Sweden, and Belgium (Flemish) with odds of 56% and 47% when comparing membership in the comprehensive and duty-based groups. In Malta, immigrant students were less likely to be monitorial with the odds decreasing by 38% when comparing membership in the comprehensive and monitorial groups.

Regarding the control student background variables, and the likelihood of students being classified in one of the four profiles (as compared to the comprehensive group), the findings show the overall following patterns (see Appendix B): (a) in the majority of countries, male students are more likely to be classified in the monitorial and anomic groups while female students are more likely to be socially engaged in some countries (e.g., Slovenia, the Netherlands); (b) in the majority of countries, membership in the socially-engaged, duty-based, monitorial, and (to a lesser extent) anomic groups tends to be more likely for students of a lower socioeconomic background; (c) in the majority of countries (especially in the Nordic countries) socially-engaged students tend to have higher levels of civic knowledge, while students in the monitorial and anomic groups tend to have lower levels of civic knowledge.

5 Conclusion

This chapter shows that students in the nine different European countries participating in ICCS 2016 express different configurations of citizenship norms that can be categorized into five profiles: comprehensive, socially engaged, duty-based, monitorial, and anomic. In most of these European countries, the majority of students can be described as comprehensive and socially engaged, and to a lesser extent as duty-based, monitorial, and anomic. This holds true also for students from an immigrant background that tend to be concentrated in the comprehensive and socially-engaged groups in most countries.

The main aim of this chapter is to investigate the relationship between immigration status and citizenship norms in different European countries, while taking into account other important individual level characteristics, such as gender, socioeconomic status, and civic knowledge. In this respect, two main patterns emerge from the analysis. First, immigrant students are less likely to be socially engaged and hold more comprehensive norms in four out of the nine European countries (Denmark,

¹ The formula $(\text{odds}-1) * 100$ was applied to data to obtain the percentages reported in this section (see Table 2).

Sweden, Malta, and Belgium (Flemish)). Second, in two countries (Sweden and Belgium (Flemish)) students from an immigrant background are less likely to express duty-based norms while in Malta they are less likely to classify as monitorial.

These findings are aligned with insights from previous research (Oser and Hooghe 2013; Reichert 2017) that show that immigrant students tend to be supportive of all citizenship norms, and, therefore, be classified mostly in the comprehensive group. One may only speculate about the potential explanations of this pattern, especially since it seems to apply to European national contexts that are rather diverse regarding several aspects (e.g., democratic tradition, immigration patterns, integration policies, and attitudes towards immigration in the general population). In previous work, Oser and Hooghe (2013) concluded that immigrant students may be more prone to social desirability and may tend to give the “right” answer that all of the citizenship norms are important. Nevertheless, this is only an assumption that cannot be verified in the current research but should be the object of further investigation.

To conclude, this chapter sheds some light on potential differences in citizenship norms among native-born and immigrant students. Overall, we find that in most of the countries, native-born and immigrant students tend to endorse similar configurations of norms. When differences in adherence exist, the most solid finding indicates that immigrant students are more likely to hold comprehensive citizenship norms. Further research is certainly needed in order to understand the motivations behind endorsing different configurations of citizenship norms among different groups of students in European countries. Possibly, comprehensive citizenship norms are more salient to students out of a desire to be compliant or behave in a socially desirable way. Yet, given the large proportions of native-born and immigrant students supporting these norms in many countries, this explanation is most likely not the only one. Both quantitative and qualitative research could shed more light on the current findings. More specifically, future quantitative studies could look more closely at the characteristics of immigrant students endorsing each set of citizenship norms while qualitative research (e.g., cognitive interviews) could further investigate the motivations behind endorsing the questionnaire items that were used to measure the different profiles of citizenship norms and potential differences in interpretation related to student immigration background. To that end, we must acknowledge a number of limitations encountered by the current research and we caution the reader to keep them in mind when interpreting our findings. First, we must acknowledge that the immigrant students in the nine countries are a heterogeneous group and are likely to differ regarding their background, their beliefs system, and the ways they are willing and able to relate to political and social life in each country. Due to the lack of detailed information regarding student immigration background in ICCS, we were unable to pick up these potential differences in this study, but they should be acknowledged as a constraint of the current work and tackled in further research. Second, a related and very important issue is the size of the immigrant student groups captured by

ICCS 2016. For the analyses reported here, the samples sizes for the subsample of immigrant students in each country were rather low (ranging from 229 students in the Netherlands to 692 students in Norway). This limitation may have affected the results, potentially underestimating the relationships to be detected and explored. This is particularly true regarding the group of anomic immigrant students that was extremely low for the current research. Although we acknowledge the logistic and financial burden associated with such an initiative, an oversampling of immigrant students in future ICCS studies could provide further and rich analytical opportunities that would shed further light on the characteristics of this group including a better understanding of their citizenship norms and their determinants.

Appendix B

Further information about the analysis reported in this chapter regarding: the sample sizes by country and immigration status (Table 3), the distribution of citizenship norms profiles by country and immigration status (Table 4), and the multinomial estimates for all explanatory variables (gender, socioeconomic status, civic knowledge, and immigration status) and citizenship norms endorsement for each country and geographic region (Tables 5, 6, 7, 8).

Table 3 Sample sizes by country and immigration status

	All students	Native-born	Immigrants
	N	N	N
Denmark	7848	7354	494
Estonia	2841	2587	254
Italy	3435	3098	337
Malta	3670	3404	266
The Netherlands	2773	2544	229
Norway	6129	5437	692
Slovenia	2831	2437	394
Sweden	3191	2620	571
Belgium (Flemish)	2917	2512	405

Note N sample size

Table 4 Distribution of profiles by country and immigration status

Profile	All students			Native-born			Immigration status		
	N	E (%)	SE	N	E (%)	SE	N	E (%)	SE
<i>Denmark</i>									
Socially engaged	1621	27.2	0.84	1458	27.78	0.92	121	22.59	1.59
Duty-based	2808	47.56	0.91	2506	47.7	0.95	228	46.85	2.61
Monitorial	135	2.03	0.21	114	1.91	0.21	14	2.86	0.87
Anomic	110	1.84	0.24	95	1.8	0.23	10	1.73	0.68
Comprehensive	1312	21.37	0.76	1144	20.81	0.81	121	25.97	2.63
<i>Estonia</i>									
Socially engaged	1293	45.54	1.01	1179	46.43	1.03	102	38.9	3.11
Duty-based	394	13.85	0.67	353	13.62	0.73	37	16.97	3.11
Monitorial	537	18.64	0.87	469	18.17	0.92	57	22.36	2.99
Anomic	107	3.53	0.43	86	3.26	0.38	18	5.87	1.78
Comprehensive	510	18.43	1.09	460	18.53	1.16	40	15.91	2.37
<i>Italy</i>									
Socially engaged	403	11.66	0.58	327	11.25	0.59	49	14.08	1.71
Duty-based	301	8.71	0.51	242	8.22	0.57	33	10.42	2.01
Monitorial	263	7.76	0.54	207	7.21	0.55	36	10.71	1.76
Anomic	22	0.64	0.16	18	0.62	0.16	2		
Comprehensive	2446	71.22	0.9	2102	72.7	0.95	217	64.17	2.57
<i>Malta</i>									
Socially engaged	1479	40.12	0.69	1341	41.45	0.73	92	34.33	2.68
Duty-based	304	8.32	0.48	270	8.4	0.52	21	8.03	1.9
Monitorial	588	16.23	0.71	496	15.57	0.75	34	13	2.27
Anomic	149	4.14	0.31	123	3.89	0.36	12	4.49	1.46
Comprehensive	1150	31.19	0.74	994	30.69	0.81	107	40.15	3.9
<i>The Netherlands</i>									
Socially engaged	901	31.73	0.96	839	32.49	0.98	55	23.39	3.03
Duty-based	818	28.54	1.16	748	28.78	1.24	66	27.7	2.83
Monitorial	476	18.03	0.97	413	17.1	0.9	55	26.9	4.48
Anomic	169	6.19	0.6	151	6.12	0.64	16	6.51	1.79
Comprehensive	409	15.51	1.05	368	15.52	1.09	37	15.51	2.59

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

	All students			Native-born			Immigration status		
Profile	N	E (%)	SE	N	E (%)	SE	N	E (%)	SE
<i>Norway</i>									
Socially engaged	2075	33.7	0.76	1781	33.85	0.79	240	34.86	1.97
Duty-based	1010	16.24	0.65	888	16.5	0.62	87	13.24	1.65
Monitorial	416	6.68	0.31	337	6.28	0.32	56	7.91	1.14
Anomic	217	3.48	0.29	174	3.26	0.3	30	4.46	0.77
Comprehensive	2411	39.9	0.71	2053	40.1	0.81	279	39.53	1.94
<i>Slovenia</i>									
Socially engaged	1316	47.2	1.06	1154	48.87	1.12	146	38.2	2.55
Duty-based	255	8.86	0.59	208	8.55	0.63	44	10.69	1.97
Monitorial	486	16.88	0.8	386	15.89	0.89	90	21.87	2.31
Anomic	123	4.29	0.43	100	4.08	0.41	21	5.57	1.46
Comprehensive	651	22.77	1.04	549	22.61	0.99	93	23.67	2.51
<i>Sweden</i>									
Socially engaged	1282	39.42	0.82	999	40.24	1.04	219	37.15	2.15
Duty-based	505	15.93	0.73	410	16.79	0.82	62	11.05	1.41
Monitorial	249	7.41	0.63	174	6.79	0.68	53	8.96	1.45
Anomic	134	4.57	0.58	94	4.46	0.77	31	4.9	1.17
Comprehensive	1021	32.67	0.96	759	31.72	1.03	206	37.95	2.3
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>									
Socially engaged	1627	55.59	1.16	1404	58.24	1.27	181	42.48	2.42
Duty-based	534	17.91	0.86	454	18.18	0.88	66	16.52	1.94
Monitorial	186	6.37	0.59	144	5.95	0.59	37	8.59	1.81
Anomic	88	3.06	0.4	68	2.89	0.42	16	3.25	0.96
Comprehensive	482	17.08	0.98	358	14.74	0.78	105	29.16	3.23

Notes N = Sample size, E (%) = Estimated coefficients in percentages, SE = Standard error. To provide a measure of accuracy for all reported coefficients, the coefficient of variation (CV) was calculated for each of them. The CV tests the precision of the estimates and is computed by dividing the estimate by its standard error and multiplying the resulting ratio by 100. A CV = 0.0 or < 16.5% is considered acceptable. A CV > 16% and < 33.3% should be interpreted with caution due to high sampling variability associated with the estimates. A CV > 33.3% should not be interpreted. Therefore, when estimates are unreliable, they are not reported. When they should be interpreted with caution, table cells with such cases are shaded in grey

Table 5 Multinomial estimates for all explanatory variables and citizenship norms endorsement for Central and Eastern countries

	C1: Socially engaged			C2: Duty-based			C3: Monitorial			C4: Anomic		
	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR
<i>Central & Eastern</i>												
<i>Estonia</i>												
Females	0.04	0.12	1.04		0.12	1.13	-0.19	0.15	0.83	-0.92	0.31	0.40
SES	-0.20	0.07	0.82	**	-0.11	0.07	-0.24	0.07	0.79	-0.26	0.12	0.77
Civ. know.	0.04	0.07	1.04		-0.29	0.09	**	0.10	0.67	-0.86	0.16	0.42
Immigrant	-0.03	0.18	0.97		0.25	0.28		0.17	1.18	0.36	0.35	1.43
<i>Slovenia</i>												
Females	0.34	0.12	1.41	**	0.05	1.05	-0.28	0.15	0.76	-0.26	0.23	0.77
SES	-0.07	0.07	0.93		-0.09	0.09	0.01	0.07	1.01	0.03	0.12	1.03
Civ. know.	0.28	0.07	1.32	***	0.03	1.03	-0.51	0.09	0.60	***	-0.79	0.46
Immigrant	-0.20	0.13	0.82		0.14	1.15	0.04	0.20	1.04	-0.08	0.33	0.93

Notes C5: Comprehensive is the reference category. SES = Socioeconomic status, Civ. know. = Civic knowledge, E = Estimated coefficients, SE = Standard errors, OR = Odds ratio, *** = $p < 0.001$, ** = $p < 0.01$, * = $p < 0.05$, + = $p < 0.10$

Table 6 Multinomial estimates for all explanatory variables and citizenship norms endorsement for Nordic countries

C1: Socially engaged			C2: Duty-based			C3: Monitorial			C4: Anomic								
E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR						
Nordic																	
Denmark																	
Females	0.15	0.11	1.16			−0.05	0.09	0.96		−0.50	0.23	0.61	**	−1.24	0.25	0.29	***
SES	−0.20	0.05	0.82	***		−0.18	0.05	0.84	***	−0.42	0.11	0.66	***	−0.19	0.13	0.83	
Civ. know.	0.25	0.06	1.28	***		0.23	0.05	1.26	***	−0.45	0.13	0.64	***	−0.51	0.15	0.60	**
Immigrant	−0.45	0.17	0.64	**		−0.25	0.17	0.78		−0.52	0.35	0.60		−0.79	0.50	0.45	
Norway																	
Females	−0.10	0.08	0.91			−0.30	0.08	0.75	***	−0.60	0.13	0.55	***	−1.11	0.20	0.33	***
SES	−0.12	0.03	0.88	***		−0.06	0.05	0.94		−0.15	0.05	0.87	**	−0.15	0.07	0.86	**
Civ. know.	0.35	0.05	1.41	***		0.23	0.06	1.26	***	−0.38	0.07	0.68	***	−0.58	0.10	0.56	***
Immigrant	0.18	0.11	1.20	+		−0.08	0.16	0.92		−0.05	0.19	0.95		−0.11	0.22	0.89	
Sweden																	
Females	−0.07	0.10	0.94			−0.22	0.11	0.80	**	−0.67	0.18	0.51	***	−0.25	0.45	0.78	
SES	−0.27	0.05	0.76	***		−0.29	0.08	0.75	***	−0.37	0.10	0.69	***	−0.38	0.11	0.69	**
Civ. know.	0.17	0.06	1.19	**		−0.02	0.09	0.98		−0.36	0.10	0.70	***	−0.60	0.16	0.55	***
Immigrant	−0.36	0.11	0.70	**		−0.82	0.20	0.44	***	−0.38	0.23	0.68	+	−0.77	0.40	0.46	+

Notes C5: Comprehensive is the reference category. SES = Socioeconomic status, Civ. know. = Civic knowledge, E = Estimated coefficients, SE = Standard errors, OR = Odds ratio, *** = $p < 0.001$, ** = $p < 0.01$, * = $p < 0.05$, + = $p < 0.10$

Table 7 Multinomial estimates for all explanatory variables and citizenship norms endorsement for Southern countries

	C1: Socially engaged			C2: Duty-based			C3: Monitorial			C4: Anomic		
	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR
<i>Southern</i>												
<i>Italy</i>												
Females	0.01	0.12	1.01		0.03	1.03		0.14	0.51	***	0.41	0.47
SES	-0.11	0.07	0.89	+	-0.04	0.96		0.01	0.08		-0.11	0.20
Civ. know.	0.04	0.07	1.05		-0.35	0.09	***	-0.62	0.08	***	-1.24	0.23
Immigrant	0.24	0.15	1.27		0.10	1.10		0.20	0.21		-0.63	0.83
<i>Malta</i>												
Females	0.09	0.11	1.10		0.25	1.28	+	-0.26	0.14	+	-0.11	0.24
SES	-0.06	0.06	0.94		-0.15	0.07	**	-0.17	0.06	**	-0.22	0.11
Civ. know.	0.30	0.05	1.35	***	-0.29	0.08	***	-0.63	0.08	***	-0.88	0.11
Immigrant	-0.41	0.17	0.66	**	-0.28	0.23		-0.47	0.20	**	-0.12	0.35

Notes C5: Comprehensive is the reference category. SES = Socioeconomic status, Civ. know. = Civic knowledge, E = Estimated coefficients, SE = Standard errors, OR = Odds ratio, *** = $p < 0.001$, ** = $p < 0.01$, * = $p < 0.05$, + = $p < 0.10$

Table 8 Multinomial estimates for all explanatory variables and citizenship norms endorsement for Western countries

C1: Socially engaged			C2: Duty-based			C3: Monitorial			C4: Anomic						
E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR	E	SE	OR				
Western															
Belgium (Flemish)															
Females	0.05	0.12	1.05		0.14	0.85		0.24	0.37	***	-0.70	0.29	0.50	**	
SES	-0.06	0.06	0.94		-0.12	0.08	0.89		-0.08	0.11	0.92		0.16	0.89	
Civ. know.	0.46	0.08	1.59	***	0.29	0.09	1.34	**	-0.30	0.12	0.74	**	0.15	0.84	
Immigrant	-0.73	0.14	0.48	***	-0.64	0.19	0.53	**	-0.41	0.29	0.66		0.42	0.52	
The Netherlands															
Females	0.41	0.13	1.51	**	0.32	0.13	1.38	**	-0.16	0.13	0.85		0.21	0.59	**
SES	-0.12	0.07	0.88	+	-0.17	0.07	0.84	**	-0.29	0.07	0.75	***	0.12	0.79	+
Civ. know.	0.57	0.08	1.77	***	0.45	0.09	1.58	***	-0.11	0.10	0.90		0.14	0.78	+
Immigrant	-0.19	0.25	0.83		0.04	0.23	1.04		0.29	0.29	1.33		0.38	1.02	

Notes C5: Comprehensive is the reference category. SES = Socioeconomic status, Civ. know. = Civic knowledge, E = Estimated coefficients, SE = Standard errors, OR = Odds ratio, *** = $p < 0.001$, ** = $p < 0.01$, * = $p < 0.05$, + = $p < 0.10$

References

- Banks, J. A. (2011). Educating citizens in diverse societies. *Intercultural Education*, 22(4), 243–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2011.617417>.
- Banks, J. A. (2017). Failed citizenship and transformative civic education. *Educational Researcher*, 46(7), 366–377. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17726741>.
- Berry, J. W., & Sam, D. L. (2014). Multicultural societies. In V. Benet-Martínez, & Y.-Y. Hong (Eds.), *Oxford library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of multicultural identity* (pp. 97–117). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Council of the European Union. (2016). Competences for democratic culture. Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Council of the European Union. (2017). *Conclusions of the Council and of the representatives of the governments of the member states, meeting within the Council, on inclusion in diversity to achieve a high-quality education for all*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Dalton, R. J. (2008). Citizenship norms and the expansion of political participation. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 76–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00718.x>.
- European Commission. (2018). Special Eurobarometer 469: Integration of immigrants in the European Union. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- European Council. (2015). Declaration on Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- European Education and Training Expert Panel. (2019). *Issue paper—Inclusion and citizenship*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- Gonzalez, E. J. (2012). Rescaling sampling weights and selecting mini-samples from large-scale assessment databases. *IERI Monograph Series Issues and Methodologies in Large-Scale Assessments*, 5, 115–134.
- Hooghe, M., & Oser, J. (2015). The rise of engaged citizenship: The evolution of citizenship norms among adolescents in 21 countries between 1999 and 2009. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 56(1), 29–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715215578488>.
- Hooghe, M., Oser, J., & Marien, S. (2016). A comparative analysis of ‘good citizenship’: A latent class analysis of adolescents’ citizenship norms in 38 countries. *International Political Science Review*, 37(1), 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512114541562>.
- IBM Corp. (2015). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
- IEA. (2017). IDB Analyzer. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). <http://www.iea.nl/data.html>.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy : The human development sequence*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Isac, M. M., Maslowski, R., Creemers, B., & van der Werf, G. (2014). The contribution of schooling to secondary-school students’ citizenship outcomes across countries. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, 25(January 2015), 29–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2012.751035>.
- Kankaraš, M., & Vermunt, J. K. (2015). Simultaneous latent-class analysis across groups. *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*, 1974, 5969–5974. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2711.
- Knowles, R. T., Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. (2018). Enhancing citizenship learning with international comparative research: Analyses of IEA civic education datasets. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 13(1), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1386/ctl.13.1.7>.
- Losito, B., Agrusti, G., Damiani, V., & Schulz, W. (2018). *Young people’s perceptions of Europe in a time of change*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. (2017). *Mplus user’s guide* (8th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- OECD. (2019). *International migration outlook 2019*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c3e35eec-en>.

- Oser, J., & Hooghe, M. (2013). The evolution of citizenship norms among Scandinavian adolescents, 1999–2009. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 36(4), 320–346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9477.12009>.
- Reichert, F. (2017). Young adults' conceptions of 'good' citizenship behaviours: A latent class analysis. *Journal of Civil Society*, 13(1), 90–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2016.1270959>.
- Rutkowski, L., Gonzalez, E., Joncas, M., & von Davier, M. (2010). International large-scale assessment data: Issues in secondary analysis and reporting. *Educational Researcher*, 39(2), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X10363170>.
- Scholten, P. (2015). *Integrating immigrants in Europe*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16256-0>.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2016). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 assessment framework*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., & Friedman, T. (2018a). *ICCS 2016 international report: Becoming citizens in a changing world*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Schulz, W., Carstens, R., Losito, B., & Fraillon, J. (Eds.). (2018b). *ICCS 2016 Technical Report*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Sherrod, L. R., Torney-purta, J., & Flanagan, C. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Stapleton, L. M. (2008). Variance estimation using replication methods in structural equation modeling with complex sample data. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 15(2), 183–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510801922316>.
- Stapleton, L. M. (2013). Incorporating sampling weights into single- and multilevel analyses. In L. Rutkowski, M. von Davier, & D. Rutkowski (Eds.), *Handbook of international large scale assessment: background, technical issues, and methods of data analysis* (pp. 363–388). Boca Raton, FL: Chapman and Hall/CRC.

Maria Magdalena Isac is a Researcher at the Catholic University of Leuven (KU Leuven) and at INVALSI. Prior to these assignments, she held research positions at the University of Groningen and the European Commission. Magda's research is focused in the area of comparative evaluation of educational systems, with special emphasis on understanding how different formal and informal educational approaches contribute to young people's citizenship learning.

Prof. Dr. Ellen Claes is Associate Professor at the faculty of Social Sciences of the KU Leuven, Belgium. She is part of the Centre for Political Science Research since 2005 and responsible for the Master in Social Science Education since 2013. In her work, Ellen takes a didactic perspective on political science, exploring the effects secondary schools have in shaping democratic knowledge, skills, and attitudes of young people. Recent studies focus on the civic and intercultural competencies of (student) teachers.

Dr. Andrés Sandoval-Hernández is the Head of the Department of Education at the University of Bath in the UK. Previously, he worked as Head of the Research and Analysis Unit at the IEA and held various academic positions at the Universidad Iberoamericana and FLACSO. His research interests include comparative analysis of education systems using large-scale assessment data with a focus on educational inequalities and civic education.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.