



Bachelor year 2017-2018

**Citizenship in a Turbulent Society**

Examiner: Dr. F. Bredewold

Author(s): Dr. F. Bredewold  
Prof. dr. E. Tonkens  
Dr. T. Kampen

1<sup>th</sup> edition, September 2017

Title            Citizenship in a turbulent society

Author(s)        Dr. Femmianne Bredewold  
                      Prof. dr. Evelien Tonkens

Edition           first edition

Publisher        University for Humanistic Studies  
                      Kromme Nieuwegracht 29  
                      3512 HD UTRECHT

Series            course books Bachelor Humanistic Studies 2017/2018

© UvH 2017

## **Table of contents**

FOREWORD .....	4
COURSE CONTENT .....	6
1.1 General Information.....	6
1.2. Examination fraud and plagiarism.....	7
1.3. Aims and learning outcomes.....	7
1.4. Format and Weekly Study Load .....	7
1.5. Examination .....	9
1.6 Literature.....	12
1.7 Quality assurance.....	12
1.8 Recording educational activities.....	12
1.10 Intellectual property educational materials.....	13
1.11 Student Counsellor.....	13
2. COURSE MANUAL .....	14
2.1 Course overview .....	14
2.2 DESCRIPTION OF SESSIONS.....	15
3. APPENDIX 1 LEARNING OUTCOMES BACHELOR OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES .....	25

## FOREWORD

Citizenship is a core ideal in modern societies today, that has a firm rooting in humanistic ideals and practices. Citizenship is a pillar of humanism, as it articulates how relatively free, autonomous individuals give shape to their lives in relation to other individuals as well as to communities. In that sense, citizenship articulates relations between individuals and collectives, when these are not dictated by fixed hierarchical relations between for example masters and slaves or authoritarian leaders and their subjects. The notion of ‘citizenship’ integrates community membership with individual rights and duties/ responsibilities and thereby appeals to ideals of social justice.

To claim citizenship, is to claim the rights to co-determine your rights as well as your responsibilities, and to co-determine which communities these rights and responsibilities are to be claimed, under what conditions. Citizenship is therefore also about participation: to be a citizen implies rights to co-determine and therefore to participate in decision-making. Full participation is not just a matter of being able to raise your voice; in order to raise your voice, you need to feel entitled to do so. This means you need to feel recognized and respected as a full citizen who belongs to the community to which you want to address yourself. So citizenship is about rights and duties but also about participation, recognition and belonging.

Citizenship additionally reconciles two other contradictory demands, for equality and difference. To demand citizenship is the demand to equal treatment, just like any other citizen. As a citizen, you are entitled to the rights that are granted to any other citizens- provided that you also accept the responsibilities that come with these rights- whose exact characteristic, of course, are debatable. However, marginalized groups, such as women, gay people and people with handicaps, argued that stress on equality in fact excluded them from full citizenship, since they did not conform to the implicit norms of for example physical health or breadwinner-status. They therefore claimed the right to be recognized as full citizens while being different. Nowadays, to claim citizenship can be both an appeal to equality as an appeal to difference.

Notions and practices of citizenship, however, are not fixed, but they change over time, in response to social developments. When society changes, what counts as rights and duties changes, and so do communities, and practices of participation, belonging and recognition.

In this course, we will try to understand changing notions of citizenship as influenced by but also in turn influencing processes that characterize modern societies today. Some of these processes seem to be constitutive of citizenship namely: democratization, individualization and meritocratization. Some of these processes have a high impact on citizenship, namely responsabilization, globalization, digitalization, commercialization. Every week we will reflect on a different process and we will investigate how it is constitutive or influences citizenship. Besides we will weekly discuss what the specific process means for citizens responsibilities and rights and what it means for the inclusion and exclusion of citizens.

In the first part of this course (week 1, 2, 3 and 4) we will talk about the meaning of citizenship and constitutive trends of citizenship like democratization, individualization and meritocratization. Trends which seem to be constitutive but which are also still raising questions about its meaning and implications for how we interact as citizens. While these trends can shed light on the rising interest in citizenship, we can also note social developments that have a major impact on how we understand and practice citizenship. In the

second part of this course we will have a look at some of these developments: responsabilization, globalization, commercialization and digitalization (week 5, 6, 7 and 8).

This course supports the academic development of students, by teaching them to formulate academic questions and to argue academically. Also, the knowledge on broad social changes for citizenship (and vice versa) prepare students for positions in political-administrative and policy functions and/or positions in education, consultancy and research, educational and research institutions, government agencies and social organizations.

This course constitutes another important step in the humanization ‘stream’ of the bachelor. On the vertical plane, this module is in alignment with the H1 and H3 courses. While students explore theories on humanistic theory and micro-level practices in H1, this course (H2) connects these practices to developments at the macro level. This course (H2) prepares for H3 in which students integrate knowledge acquired through H1 and H2. Moreover, in this course students practice in building a clear argumentation, also to prepare them for writing their thesis.

On the horizontal plane knowledge about the development of institutions and organizations that students gain in H2 prepares for the Z3 courses *History of humanism* and *Humanitarian practices*. H2 also builds on the important insights that students gained through participating in *Z2-B1 Ethics* and *Z1-B1 Philosophy in humanistics* especially when it comes to reflection on the criteria that a humane society must meet, up-to-date knowledge of philosophy and ethics very important.

# COURSE CONTENT

## 1.1 General Information

Course title: Citizenship in a turbulent society  
Course code: H2-A2  
Academic Year: 2017/2018  
Period: 2  
Credits: 7.5 EC  
Study load: 210 hours  
Part of: Bachelor Humanistic Studies  
Level: Bachelor 2<sup>nd</sup> year  
Mandatory: Yes  
Language: English

Examiner/ Room: Dr. F. Bredewold  
2.17 / f.bredewold@uvh.nl  
Tel./ e-mail: 0302390172  
Consulting hours: by appointment

Lecturer: Prof. dr. E. Tonkens  
Room: 2.15  
Tel./ e-mail: 030-2390183/ e.tonkens@uvh.nl  
Consulting hours: by appointment

Lecturer: Dr. T. Kampen  
Room: 2.16  
Tel./ e-mail: 030-2390116/ t.kampen@uvh.nl.  
Consulting hours: by appointment

Teaching Assistant: Daniel Blondelle  
Tel./ e-mail: Daniel.blondelle@uvh.nl  
Consulting hours: by appointment

## 1.2. Examination fraud and plagiarism

The UvH is much concerned to prevent fraud and plagiarism. A finished paper or assignment must be submitted via [mijn.uvh.nl](http://mijn.uvh.nl) using a specific Ephorus submission code (see 1.1. General Information). The text will be screened automatically and placed in the personal file of the examiner. Plagiarism is the use of quotes, texts, illustrations and opinions of others without referring to the original source, making it appear as your own work. These matters are viewed as a serious breach of good academic practice, as it makes the fair grading of your own efforts impossible. Fraud and plagiarism are also considered an unjust act against your fellow students and other scholars. Matters of fraud and plagiarism will not be taken lightly. Sanctions can be as harsh as the complete exclusion from UvH degree programmes.

For more information see: <http://mijn.uvh.nl/onderwijs/examencommissie/tentamenfraude-en-plagiaat>. (Dutch only). More information on how to write a paper is available at: <http://mijn.uvh.nl/onderwijs/master> (Dutch only)

## 1.3. Aims and learning outcomes

After completing the course *Citizenship in a turbulent society* in accordance with all requirements (active study of literature and participation in class, handing in weekly assignments and the final paper on time and with sufficient academic quality), the student will have attained the following learning outcomes:

1. Able to understand why and how citizenship is a core humanistic concept;
2. Able to analyse links between macro and micro sociological developments in contemporary society (in H1 students have already reflected on these macro level phenomena on micro level, by making observations. H2 connects these micro level experiences to macro-sociological processes, thereby preparing the students for participating in evaluative consultancy in H3);
3. Able to differentiate between various public and private organizations and institutions;
4. Able to situate themselves in their institutional era;
5. Able to anticipate on major trends of public institutions and organizations in contemporary society and the changing role of citizens in them;

*The course Citizenship in a turbulent society* contributes to the following general learning objectives (end terms) of the Bachelor of Humanistic Studies (see appendix 1):

- Nr. 1: Knowledge and insight regarding humanistics
- Nr. 2: Application of knowledge about humanistics
- Nr. 3: Knowledge and vision regarding philosophy
- Nr. 6: Literature Skills
- Nr. 9: Attitude
- Nr. 10: Knowledge for follow-up courses

## 1.4. Format and Weekly Study Load

*Aims & format:*

The Tuesday lectures provide, where possible supported by audiovisual materials, an introduction to the themes and reading material. In the wednesdays workshops these themes

and reading material is discussed more in-depth. Students have an active role in these workshops: student will be presenting on issues related to the central themes, discuss the literature, and provide each other with feedback on their writing in progress.

*Total Study Load (SBU):*

Activity:	Hours:
Class activities (lecture, other activities)	60
Reading preparation	107 (reading required literature & preparing questions, writing assignments)
Preparation group presentation	4
Preparation essay	28
Preparation exam	11
Total SBU	210

*Calculation of reading load*

The reading load can vary. The texts vary in terms of difficulty. For an approximate calculation of the reading load, see the table below.

Amount of pages and literature for preparation per hour <sup>1</sup>					
Aims	Language Scientific journals	Articles chapters scientific journals books	Articles chapters professional journals books	Popularising articles books	Novels
<b>Light (general knowledge)</b>	8	9	13	16	20
<b>Average (knowledge of concepts)</b>	6	7	10	12	15
<b>Heavy (profound knowledge)</b>	4	5	7	8	10

For a calculation of the total study load see ‘Guidelines calculation study load of a course’ (Dutch only) <http://www.uvh.nl/mijnuvh/faciliteiten/onderwijs-en-studentenzaken/productie-onderwijsmateriaal>

<sup>1</sup> For the calculation of study load consult the “Richtlijn berekening studielast van een cursus”. See <http://www.uvh.nl/mijnuvh/faciliteiten/onderwijs-en-studentenzaken/productie-onderwijsmateriaal>

## 1.5. Examination

### *Prerequisites*

We will finish this course with an written exam. It is an exam with open answers that should be answered in essay form. This means a clear and coherent story that is well-argued (also by rejecting reasonably-expected counter arguments), which demonstrates its own mindset and distinguishes main issues and causes. Terms used should be explained and explicit reference should be made to literature. The answers should be given in correct English. The student will receive a grade on the scale of 1 to 10.

Exam	written exam
Exam Content:	assessment of the learning outcomes through essay questions aimed at both knowledge, comprehension and application
Exam Date:	7 <sup>th</sup> of February 10.00 till 13.00
Resit Exam:	11 <sup>th</sup> of April 10.00 till 13.00
Grading:	grade on scale from 1 to 10; counts for 40% of the final grade
Result Date:	3 weeks after the exam
Feedback Date:	feedback on appointment

### **1) Written exam (40%)**

A written open book exam is taken to show proof of understanding (part of) the course literature. The questions should be answered in essay form: a clear and coherent story that is well-argued (also by rejecting reasonably-expected counter arguments) and which demonstrates an independent perspective. The used concepts should be explained and explicit reference should be made to literature. The student receives a grade on the scale 1 to 10.

The exam can only be taken if the following requirements are met:

- when the student has been present by the workgroups. You are only allowed to miss one workgroup (but please always report to the workgroup lecturer in advance and make sure that you submit the KAVV assignment of that week);
- when the paper has been submitted;
- the entire KAVV portfolio has been submitted;
- the presentation has been given.

Only when these conditions are met the student can participate in the exam.

The recurrence can only be taken if the student participated in the test (first chance). This applies to both the written exam and other tests. If a student has not been able to take part in a test under severe personal circumstances, the Examination Board may, after consulting the study-adviser, give the student access to the reset of that test.

### **2) Paper (40%)**

Students are assigned to write a written paper wherein they show proof of understanding the course literature and in which they show their academic writing skills. Students may choose between writing a scientific paper and a research proposal. Students may choose a

topic of their own interest which allows them to critically discuss tendencies constitutive and/or influencing citizenship.

It is the explicit intention that the course literature will be used intensively for this writing assignment. In addition, you have to find new sources for further study in your topic and answering or editing your research question. For this you can, among other things, use the recommended literature. The scientific article or research proposal must be written in English, and should be at least 1500 and certainly no longer than 2000 words (excluding source list), 2000 is the absolute upper limit.

The paper or research proposal must be submitted hard copy and by email to your workgroup lecturer, and ephorus, and will be assessed according to academic standards (on a scale of 1 to 10).

### Grading criteria for the paper:

<b>The paper must at least entail the following ingredients:</b>	+ / -
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It must discuss a topic or problem related to citizenship and constitutive or influencing tendencies;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connects the course handbook, and minimally 5 others texts of the course literature to self-sought literature that is specifically centred on one's topic;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal 1500 and maximum 2000 words (including notes and figures, excluding references).</li> </ul>	
<b>General writing skills for papers are:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The object of research must be clearly formulated and properly delimited</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The argument must be logic and clear</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions must follow from the argument</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical reflection about the subject of research must be explicit</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concepts and language must be clear</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference system used is APA</li> </ul>	
<b>Specific criteria for the paper related to the course aims:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relevance of the subject of research is clear and addressed from the beginning</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The paper shows an adequate understanding of the issue or literature</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subject of research is adequately embedded in the course literature</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different perspectives are addressed in a clarifying way</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The students develops his/her own independent perspective</li> </ul>	

### 3) Portfolio of KAVV's (20%)

Weekly, each student submits a KAVV (a Dutch abbreviation for Kerncitaat, Argument, Vraag, Verband) about an article or chapter from the mandatory literature. Writing a KAVV

encourages you to think about and reflect on the studied material. It also teaches you to recognize and formulate arguments. A KAVV covers up to one A4 (line spacing 1.5).

A KAVV consists of the following components:

1. **Main quote (Kern citaat).**  
Quote a sentence (or two linked sentences) from the text that form the core of the writer's explicit or implicit argument. Always state the page.
2. **Argument (Argument)**  
Summarize the writer's argument in a few sentences. List both the defended standpoint and the rejection of this idea.
3. **Question. (Vraag)**  
Formulate a question about the meaning or the consistency of the argument. That is, a question about the argument or a question about an issue that does not seem to be adequately addressed in the text.
4. **Connection (Verband)**  
What does the article or paper build on, to what does it contribute and what does it suppose? Connect the argument of the chosen text with the argument of another text that you read for this course, by giving (1) from this other text a citation (mention the page!) And (2) explain how the argument of the chosen text adds or contradicts the argument of the other text. You can also take a broader view and make a connection with a particular theory or own observation.

The students bring their weekly written KAVV's to the workshops. There we will discuss the KAVV's classically or in groups. Students are assessed individually for the KAVV portfolio with a grade on the scale of 1 to 10. The deadline for the complete KAVV portfolio is the 7<sup>th</sup> of February 2018. Hardcopy and by e-mail to the workgroup lecturer, and via Ephorus.

The written exam, paper and KAVV must be both completed with at least 5.5 out of 10 points.

#### **4) Presentation**

On a weekly basis, students are responsible to give a presentation. In this presentation students address a particular topic/theme related to the theme and literature of the specific week. Students are assigned to critically review literature and compare different authors and viewpoints in relation to an overriding question. Students find additional materials needed to address this particular theme, for example newspaper articles, videos, policy papers or a scientific article. They take a standpoint in answering their question, after which they invite students to engage in the debate. The students lead the debate and round off the discussion with a final reflection. The presentation and discussion last altogether 40 minutes, which at least 15 minutes debate. Directly following the presentation, students give oral feedback to the presenters on the quality of the presentation, after which the workgroup lecturer judges the presentation as sufficient or insufficient.

#### **Re-sit of previous academic year**

For those students who have to do a re-sit the following applies:

- Satisfactory grades for last year's assignments are kept
- If you attended enough classes last year, you don't have to attend this year.

## 1.6 Literature

### Mandatory reading:

#### *Books*

Hurenkamp, M., Tonkens, E., Duyvendak, J.W. (2012). *Crafting Citizenship. Negotiating tensions in modern society*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.  
ISBN 978 0 230 24154 1

#### *Articles*

All literature can be found on ELO or the reading material shelf. Look at the course manual which articles must be read.

## 1.7 Quality assurance

The UvH seeks to continually enhance the quality of student's learning experiences (in individual courses as well as in its overall education programme). For this purpose, all courses are evaluated in a series of complementary ways:

- An oral evaluation midway through each course; by students and staff (see schedule)
- A written evaluation at the conclusion of the course; during its final class meeting or after the exam
- A final evaluation of the entire quarterly period; dialogue with student cohort representatives (StuF) and the Director of Education, Anja Machielse.

Four weeks after students hand in their written course evaluations, a comprehensive report is submitted to the office of Student Affairs. A summary of quantitative data of each course evaluation is published on the intranet for students. A full evaluation report, including responses to open ended questions, is sent to all involved academic staff, the Director of Education, the Academic Programme Committee and the involved Head of Department. The combined feedback serves as a basis to improve the quality of the course as taught in the following academic year. Student feedback is also considered in the performance appraisal of academic staff.

Quality assurance encompasses much more, including alumni reports, comprehensive evaluations of degree programmes/academic year programmes, as well as the National Student Survey. For more information, see the intranet or contact Quality Assurance Officer Sophie Wils (room 0.07, s.wils@uvh.nl, Mon-Tues-Thurs).

## 1.8 Recording educational activities

The recording (audio and/or visual) of lectures and other educational activities is only permitted following the explicit approval by involved academic staff or the Director of Education. The academic staff/Director of Education may also impose certain conditions or refuse permission to use these recordings. Sharing any recordings with others is not permitted,

except with the prior explicit permission of the involved academic staff and/or the Director of Education.

### **1.10 Intellectual property educational materials**

The intellectual property of all educational materials used in lectures, tutorials and other educational activities, also as displayed using a beamer or posted on the Electronic Learning Environment, rests with the University.

### **1.11 Student Counsellor**

Students can make an appointment with Student Counsellor Hielke Bosma to confidentially discuss personal and/or study-related matters. Hielke Bosma is available on Mondays and Thursdays between 09.00 and 17.00 in room 0.09. On both days he is also available without a prior appointment, between 12.00 and 14.00. You can schedule an appointment by email to [\*\*h.bosma@uvh.nl\*\*](mailto:h.bosma@uvh.nl), or by telephone: 030-2390161.

## 2. COURSE MANUAL

### 2.1 Course overview

Week	Date	Time	Subject	Staff
1	21-11-2017	12.30-15.15	Introduction citizenship in a turbulent society	E. Tonkens F. Bredewold
	22-11-2017	12.30 – 15.15	Workshop	F. Bredewold D. Blondelle
2	28-11-2017	12.30-15.15	Democratization	E. Tonkens M.Hurenkamp
	29-11-2017	12.30-15.15	Workshop	F. Bredewold D. Blondelle
3	5-12-2017	12.30 – 15.15	Individualization	E. Tonkens
	6-12-2017	12.30-15.15	Workshop	F. Bredewold D.Blondelle
4	12-12-2017	12.30-15.15	<b>Meritocratization</b>	T. Kampen
	13-12-2017	12.30 – 15.15	Workshop	F. Bredewold D.Blondelle
5	19-12-2017	12.30-15.15	<b>Responsibilization</b>	F. Bredewold
	20-12-2017	12.30-15.15	Workshop	F. Bredewold D. Blondelle
6	09-01-2017	12.30-15.15	<b>Globalization</b>	F. Bredewold G. Kroese
	10-01-2017	12.30 – 15.15	Workshop	F. Bredewold D.Blondelle
7	16-01-2017	12.30-15.15	Commercialization	E.Tonkens
	17-01-2017	12.30-15.15	Workshop	F. Bredewold D.Blondelle
8	23-01-2017	12.30-15.15	Digitalization	R. Van Est E.Tonkens
	24-01-2017	12.30-15.15	Workshop	F. Bredewold D. Blondelle
NB	24-01-2017		<b>Deliver KAVV portfolio</b>	D. Blondelle F. Bredewold
NB	07-02-2017		<b>Written Exam</b>	
NB	11-02-2017		<b>Resit Exam</b>	

## **2.2 DESCRIPTION OF SESSIONS**

### **WEEK 1: Introduction citizenship in a turbulent society**

**Tuesday 21 November 2017 12.30-15.15**

**E. Tonkens and F. Bredewold**

This lecture can be seen as an introduction in the concept of citizenship. We will place citizenship in an historic context, or in other words will explain when and why the notion of citizenship came up. We will give an introduction in the various ways of thinking about citizenship; liberal, communitarian and republican theories on citizenship and we will discuss how citizenship is related to humanistic studies. Besides we explain how citizenship is related to discussions about belonging, inclusion/exclusion and fulfilling rights and duties. We will also take some time for some practical issues like how is this course constructed, set up of each week, how the exams are taken etc.

#### **Mandatory reading:**

##### **Main course book:**

- Hurenkamp et al., (2012). Society as a constructive space. (Chapter 1) In: Crafting citizenship. Negotiating tensions in modern society. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 1-19 (19 p.)

##### **Other mandatory reading:**

- Heater (2004). The Origins. (Chapter 1). In: Citizenship the civic ideal in world history, politics and education, pp. 3-37 (35 p.)
- Marshall, (1950) Citizenship and social class. 1950. pp.148-154. In: Inequality and Society. (1992) by Jeff Manza and Michael Sauder. W.W. Norton and co.; New York. (7 p.)
- Isin, E.F. and Turner, B.S. (2002). Citizenship studies: An introduction. In: Isin, E.F. And Turner, B. S. eds. Handbook of citizenship studies. London, UK: Sage, pp.1–10.(10.p.)
- Jonathan Franzen (2012). Farther away. New York: Farrar, Strous and Giroux, pp. 5-14. (6 p.)

Total 77 p.

#### **Recommended reading:**

- Van Gunsteren, H.R. (1998). Theories of citizenship, old and new. pp. 11-30 (Chapter 2). In: A theory of citizenship. Organizing plurality in contemporary democracies. (19 p.)
- Lister & Pia (2008). Theories of citizenship. (Chapter 1). pp 8-32. In: Citizenship in contemporary Europe. (24p.)
- Lister et al. (2007). Vocabularies of citizenship since the 1970's. pp. 47-73. In: Citizenship in a contemporary Europe. (27p).

#### **Workshop 1**

**Wednesday 22 November 2017 12.30 – 15.15**

**F.Bredewold and Daniel Blondelle**

A schedule is made for the weekly presentations. The course outline and literature will be

further discussed.

## **WEEK 2: Democratization**

**Tuesday 28 November 2017 12.30-15.15**

### **E. Tonkens and Guestlecture by M. Hurenkamp**

In this lecture, we will have a look at the relationship between democracy and citizenship. It will be clear from the introduction that these two are closely related. Since citizenship is a status of relatively free people who own and steer themselves, these free people have to find ways to organise participation of all in order to give shape to their communities. Democracy is a necessary pillar of citizenship. Democratization has put the authority of traditional institutions under fire and stirred demands for more democracy. Not just in politics but also in society more broadly, seen in the declining social distance between parents and children, teachers and pupils, doctors and patients, and politicians and citizens. What does it mean to be a citizen in a democratic society? What kinds of rights and duties are necessary for a flourishing democracy? How can citizens really have a say in social and political life? Under what conditions do they want that? And what happens when people have the feeling nobody is listening? What does democracy demand from citizens and rulers, in terms of responsibilities and virtues? Why are so many people dissatisfied with democracy today? And how do new democratic practices, online, face to face or otherwise, give rise to new meanings of citizenship?

Our **guestlecturer** is dr. **Menno Hurenkamp**, publisher and researcher. Summer 2017 he defended his thesis 'With your head held high, social citizenship in the twenty first century'. ('Met Opgeheven Hoofd. Sociaal burgerschap in de 21<sup>e</sup> eeuw') and first author of our main handbook of this course *Crafting Citizenship*. He wrote various books and articles about citizenship and is working at the Wiardi Beckman Stichting where he is editor-in chief of the Dutch political monthly *S&D (Socialisme en Democratie)*.

### **Mandatory reading:**

#### **Main course book:**

- Hurenkamp et al., (2012). The construction of citizenship in public debate. (chapter 2) In: *Crafting citizenship. Negotiating tensions in modern society*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.19-42. (23 p.)
- Hurenkamp et al., (2012). The deligitimation of political authority. (chapter 3) In: *Crafting citizenship. Negotiating tensions in modern society*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.42-64. (24 p.)

#### **Other mandatory reading:**

- Warren, M.E. (2017). A problem based approach to democratic theory. In: *American Political Science Review*, 111,1, pp. 39–53. (14 p.)
- Isin and Turner (2007). Investigating citizenship. An agenda for citizenship studies. *Citizenship studies*, 11 (1), 5-17. (12 p.)

Total 73 p.

#### **Recommended reading:**

- Sommerville, P. (2011). Democracy and participation. In: *Policy and Politics*, 39, 3, pp 417-427. (20 p.)

- Eliasoph, N. (1997). Close to home. The work of avoiding politics. In: *Theory and Society*. 26, pp. 605-647. (42 p.)
- Wildekamp, M. (2015). Practices of animosity. How autochthonous volunteers feel 'lost in familiar places'. (chapter 7) In: *Brave new Neighbourhood. Affective citizenship in territorial governance*. Enschede: Ipskamps drukkers, pp.153-179. (23 p.)

## **Workshop 2**

**Wednesday 29 November 2017 12.30 – 15.15**

**F.Bredewold and Daniel Blondelle**

Nextly to the weekly literature and the presentation, students will discuss about the topic of their paper.

## **WEEK 3: Individualization**

**Tuesday 5 December 2017 12.30 – 15.15**

**E. Tonkens**

*Individualization* concerns the increased freedom but also responsibility of individuals to choose and create their own lives. It concerns the 'right to exit' from traditional social bonds and the chances to create and maintain your own bonds and communities. In response to individualization, citizenship both reaffirms that individuals all have their own status and rights, while it simultaneously offers the basis of social bonds and solidarity between them. What does individualization mean in our daily lives? Do we experience free choice as a right or (also) an obligation? How do we create new communities and solidarities that respect our individuality and freedom? Is it possible to create communities based on free choice? Aren't they based on some chosen solidarities and what does that mean for the social inclusion and exclusion of people who are 'different'?

### **Mandatory reading:**

- Beck, U. (2000). Living your own world in a run a way world: individualisation, globalisation and politics. In: Hutton, W. and Giddens, A. (eds). *On the Edge. Living with global capitalism*. NewYork: Vintage, pp. 164-174. (10 p.)
- Hurenkamp et al., (2012). Individualization and the public interest. (H4) In: *Crafting citizenship. Negotiating tensions in modern society*. NewYork: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 64-88. (24 p.)
- Schwartz, B. (2009). New choices. Pp. 23-47. (H2) In: *The paradox of choice*. Harper Collins Ebooks. (24 p.)
- Schwartz, B. (2009). What to do about choice. (H11). In: *The paradox of choice*. Harper Collins Ebooks. (p. 221-237). (26 p.)

Total 84 p.

### **Recommended reading:**

- Ossewaarde, R. (2007). Citizenship in civil society. *Journal of civil society*, 2, 3, pp. 199-215.
- Hurenkamp, M., Tonkens, E., Duyvendak, J.W. (2011). Citizenship in the Netherlands. Locally produced, nationally contested. *Citizenship studies*, 15, 2, pp. 205-225.

- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Touchstone.
- Beck, U. & Beck, Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Individualization: institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. London: Sage.
- De Beer, P. (2007). How individualized are the Dutch. *Current Sociology*, 55, 3, pp. 389-412.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). *Liquid life*. Cambridge: polity press.

### **Workshop 3**

**Wednesday 6 December 2017**

**F. Bredewold and D. Blondelle**

Literature will be discussed, a presentation is given by a student group and writing tips are given for the paper.

### **WEEK 4: Meritocratization**

**Tuesday 12 December 2017 12.30 – 15.15**

**T. Kampen**

Meritocratization –the tendency to award social positions are awarded according to merit- also has serious implications for citizenship. In a meritocracy, everyone has equal opportunities to compete for educational opportunities and jobs, regardless of origin, ethnicity, age and gender. Citizens must be judged by their own merits and no longer subordinated to or identified with their ethnic, class-, gender- or ideological background. But next to equal opportunities, meritocracy also creates new forms of exclusion and insecurity. Increased numbers of workers' burnout as well as children diagnosed with ADHD, autism and/or dyslexia have also been related to meritocracy. Do these developments indeed relate to meritocratization, and if so, how? What impact does the meritocratic ideal have on people with disabilities, people who fail at school or fail to find a job? And how sure can we all be of our position in the permanent rat race that meritocracy generates?

#### **Mandatory reading:**

- Beckett, A.E. (2006) *Reconsidering Citizenship in the light of the concerns of the UK disability movement*. *Citizenship Studies*, 9:4, 405-421 (16 pg's)
- Wendell, S, (1996) 'The flight from the rejected body'. In: *The Rejected Body. Feminist Philosophical Reflections on Disability*. New York: Taylor and Francis. (Chapter 4, pp. 85-116) (31 pg's)
- Kampen, T., Elshout, J., & Tonkens, E. (2013). The fragility of self-respect: emotional labour of workfare volunteering. *Social policy and society*, 12(03), 427-438. (11 p.)
- Fuller, S., Kershaw, P., & Pulkingham, J. (2008). Constructing 'active citizenship': Single mothers, welfare, and the logics of voluntarism. *Citizenship studies*, 12(2), 157-176. (19 p.)

Total 77 pages

#### **Recommended reading:**

- Sandell, M.J. (2012). The case for equality. John Rawls. In: *justice. What is the right thing to do?* Utrecht: Ten Have pp. 140 -166 (26 p.)
- Carter, Ian. (2011) *Respect and the basis of equality*. *Ethics*, 121, 3, 538-571. Via Google scholar (33 p.)

- Dillion, R.S. (1997). Self-respect: moral, emotional, political. *Ethics* 10(2): 226-249 (22 p.)

#### **Workshop 4**

**Wednesday 13 December 2017**

**F. Bredewold and D. Blondelle**

Literature will be discussed, a presentation is given by a student group. Every student brings a A4 to the class with the idea and set up of the individual paper, including problem analysis, aim(s), literature you wish to seek and or use. Students present their idea and set up of their paper.

Part 2: Major impact on what citizenship means today- both as status (formally) and as practice (also more informally)

While the former trends can shed light on the rising interest in citizenship, they also influence how we understand citizenship, we can also note social developments that have a major impact on how we understand and practice citizenship. We will have a look at some of these developments: responsabilization, globalization, commercialization and digitalization.

#### **WEEK 5: Responsibilization**

**Tuesday 19 December 2017**

**F. Bredewold**

Another trend which highly affects citizenship today is the ideal of responsabilization. This policy ideal is coming up in various Western countries, including the Netherlands and asks citizens to become more and more responsible. Instead of a social and health care system which takes care of its citizens, governments encourage citizens to take care of themselves. Citizens ought to take responsibility for their own lives and support each other, instead of 'passively' consume services. Several sociologists have framed this development as the 'responsibilization' of our society. But is this ideal of responsabilization a good idea? The welfare state itself can be seen as constitutive of citizenship. It gives shape to citizen's rights to social services – including health care, education, social security and housing- which are necessary for citizens in order to participate in society on an equal footing, and be recognized as full citizens. But on the other hand, over the last decades welfare states have been criticized as ineffective and at odds with social justice. Ineffective because they would make citizens passive recipients of services and consumerist claimants of services. And at odds with social justice because it might widen the gap between the active contributors to the welfare state and the passive vulnerable consumers. In response to this criticism a more activating approach is chosen. What are the impacts of these reforms on citizenship, both in terms of active engagement and in terms of equality? And what does this activating policy mean for more vulnerable people in society like people with disabilities?

#### **Mandatory reading:**

- Ilcan, S. and Basok, Y. (2004). Community government: voluntary agencies, social justice, and the responsabilization of citizens. *Citizenship Studies*, 8(2), 129-144. (15 p.)
- Trappenburg, M. (2013). Active solidarity and its discontents. *Health Care Analysis*.

pp. 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-013-0260-5> (13 p.)

- Schmitz, D. (1998). Taking responsibility (chapter 2). In; D. Schmitz and R. Goodin, Social welfare and individual responsibility. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (20 p.)
- Goodin, R. (1998). Social welfare as a collective social responsibility (chapter 2). In: D. Schmitz and R. Goodin. Social welfare and individual responsibility. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (17 p.)
- Bredewold, F., Tonkens, E., Trappenburg, M. (2015). Urban encounters limited. The importance of built-in boundaries in contacts between people with intellectual and psychiatric disabilities and their neighbours. *Urban Studies*, 53, (16), pp. 3371-33387 (17 p.)

Total: 82 p.

### **Recommended reading:**

- Johnson, C. (2010). The politics of affective citizenship: from Blair to Obama. *Citizenship studies*, 14, 5, pp. 495-509.
- Doheny, S. (2007). Responsibility and the deliberative citizen: theorizing the acceptance of individual and citizenship responsibilities. *Citizenship studies*, 11, 4, pp. 405-420.
- Rose, N. (1996). The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government. *Economy and society*, 25, 3, pp. 327-356.
- Clarke. (2011). Enrolling ordinary people: governmental strategies and the avoidance of politics. *Citizenship studies*, 14(6), pp. 637-650. (13 p.)

### **Workshop 5**

**Wednesday 20 December 2017**

**F. Bredewold and D. Blondelle**

Literature will be discussed, a presentation is given by a student group and you can ask feedback on your paper.

### **WEEK 6: Globalization**

**Tuesday 9 January 2018**

**F. Bredewold and guest lecture by G. Kroese**

Globalization is another macro-sociological trend that has placed citizenship firmly on the societal agenda. Citizenship can on the one hand be used to demand inclusion and belonging: no matter where we come from, we are all citizens with concomitant rights (and responsibilities). On the other hand, globalization raises the question what citizens share in a globalizing society. Do they, or should they, have a shared identity and loyalty? Globalization has introduced cultural tensions into our urban neighborhoods and political debates. Blaming liberal multiculturalism as a failed political strategy that didn't bring 'integration', fuelled a new search for cultural cohesion. How can different ethnic and religious groups within nations, cities and neighborhoods shape the public domain and its democratic values? Do we need to ground citizenship in the nation, or could the local or transnational sphere be a better scale for identification and collaboration? And how do we draw the line between those who

are and who are not recognized as citizens? How do we treat rising numbers of ‘denizens’ on our societies? How can we make sure that people are recognized as equals, even though they are different in terms of ethnicity, religion or other group differences? How can we promote dialogue and understanding?

Our **guestlecturer** this week is **G. Kroese**. He is an anthropologist and works as a researcher for the project *Ongekend Bijzonder*, which means Specially Unknown (or Unknown Special) in English. Specially Unknown is an innovative community-based refugee oral history project of Stichting BMP (Foundation for the Promotion of Social Participation), which collects and creates a record of individual refugees life histories and makes them accessible for the general public. He will relate the stories of the refugees to our topic of this week ‘globalization and citizenship’. Take a look at the website of Ongekend Bijzonder:

<https://ongekendbijzonder.nl/english/>

### **Mandatory reading:**

#### **Main course book:**

- Hurenkamp et al., (2012). Globalization and the culturalization of citizenship. (Chapter 5). In: *Crafting citizenship. Negotiating tensions in modern society*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 89-122 (33 p.)
- Hurenkamp et al., (2012). The three freedoms of the Dutch: the culturalization of citizenship in the Netherlands put into an international perspective (Chapter 6). In: *Crafting citizenship. Negotiating tensions in modern society*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.122-135 (13 p.)

#### **Other mandatory reading:**

- Van Gunsteren, H.R. (1998). Deep groups under a multicultural surface. (chapter 5). In: *A theory of citizenship. Organizing plurality in contemporary democracies*. Oxford: westview press, pp 59-67(8 p.)
- Merolli, J. (2016). Manufacturing desire & producing (non)citizens: integration exams in Canada, The UK and the Netherlands. *Citizenship Studies*, 20, 8, pp. 957-972. (8 p.).

Total: 62 p.

### **Recommended reading:**

- Dean, H. (2013). The translation of needs into rights: reconceptualising social citizenship as a global phenomenon. *International journal of social welfare*, 22, pp. 32-49.
- Kymlicka, W. (2015). Solidarity in diverse societies: beyond neo-liberal multiculturalism and welfare chauvinism. *Comparative migration studies*, 3, 17, pp. 3-19.
- Brodie, J. (2004). Introduction: globalization and citizenship beyond the national state. *Citizenship Studies*, 8, 4, pp. 323-332.
- Lee, R. (2010). On the margins of belonging. *Confronting cosmopolitanism in the late modern age*. In: *Journal of Sociology*, 46, 2, pp. 169-186.
- Beck, U. (2000). *What is globalization?* London: polity press.
- Lichterman, P. (2005). Doing things together: lessons from religious community service groups. Pp. 247-264. In: *Elusive Togetherness*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (17 p.)

- Lichterman, P. (2005). *Elusive Togetherness*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 40-41. (2 p.)

## **Workshop 6**

**Wednesday 10 January 2018**

**F. Bredewold and D. Blondelle**

Literature will be discussed, a presentation is given by a student group and feedback is given on your paper.

## **WEEK 7: Commercialization**

**Tuesday 16 January 2018 12.30 – 15.15**

**E. Tonkens**

Another trend with huge impact on citizenship is commercialization of human interactions that has taken place over the last 20 years. A clear form of commercialization of human interaction is of course slavery. We can argue that commercialization in this sense has been abolished since it became forbidden in most countries from the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards. Slavery and citizenship are clear oppositions: slaves cannot be citizens. Citizens are free to determine their own fate. However, new forms of slavery have arisen over the last two decades, with the rise of human trafficking. Additionally, milder forms of commercialization of human interaction have arisen with the rise of marketization of public life and human services. Nowadays, you can buy a baby from a surrogate mother from a poor country, rent a mom for your child's birthday party. As a prisoner in the US, you can upgrade your prison cell for 82 dollars per night, or rent out a space on your forehead for advertisement. And unofficially, you buy yourself into a prestigious university. You can also buy yourself homehelp for your care dependent (grand)parent, disabled brother or small care dependent child. This week, we focus on these milder but nevertheless influential forms of commercialization: what is their impact on citizenship? We particularly ask ourselves two questions:

Meaning: what does commercialization do with what we hold dear, with how we view ourselves and how we look at other people and other lives?

Civicness: what does commercialization do to what we understand our to be our rights and duties, responsibilities and feelings of belonging? Do we distinguish a civic sphere that is different from the market? What aspects of humanness can and cannot be sold?

### **Mandatory reading:**

- Hochschild, A.R. (2013). Villager and Outsourcer pp. 1-17 (introduction). In: *The outsourced self. What happens when we pay others to live our lives for us.* (17 p.)
- Hochschild, A.R. (2013). Anything you pay for is better. (Chapter 12) In: *The outsourced self. What happens when we pay others to live our lives for us.* (16 p.)
- Sandell, M. (2012). How markets crowd out morals. Pp. 93-130. (Chapter 3). *What money can't buy. The moral limits of markets.* London: penguin books. (27p.)
- Hochschild, A.R. (2000). The nanny chain. *The American prospect*, 11, pp. 104 (4p.)
- Hurenkamp et al., (2012). Crafting citizenship. (Chapter 7). In: *Crafting citizenship. Negotiating tensions in modern society.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.135-149 (14 p.)

Total: 78 p.

**Recommended reading:**

- Hochschild, A.R. (2003). Love and gold. (chapter 4). pp. 185-198. In: The commercialization of intimate life. Notes from home and work. California: University of California press. (14 p.)
- Yeates, N. (2004). The global care chain. International feminist journal of politics, 6, 3, pp. 369-391. (22 p.)

**Workshop 7**

**Wednesday 17 January 2018**

**F. Bredewold and D. Blondelle**

Literature will be discussed, a presentation is given by a student group and bring the draft version of your paper to the workshop.

**WEEK 8: Digitalization**

**Tuesday 23 January 2018 12.30-15.15**

**E. Tonkens and R. van Est**

Digitalization are the latest developments that certainly affect the meaning and practices of citizenship today. We will look at a few practices of digitalization that certainly influence citizenship: digital selves, smart cities and robots. First, as to digital selves: what does our rising participation in the digital world do to our rights and responsibilities, and to our sense of belonging and participation? Is participation in facebook a right and or a duty? What are the civic rules of digital communities? How are people in- and excluded? What voice as citizens do we have to how our data are stored and used? Second, as to Smart Cities: governments and business today are trying to develop 'smart' systems that gather 'big data' to for example adapt the supply of energy of street lights to our use. The promise of efficiency and service comes with the use of numerous data of our everyday behavior. Again, what influence do we have on the use of our personal data? What are our rights and duties here, and (how) can we escape from the communities that are set up this way? What digital communities do we in fact want to be engaged in? And thirdly, we also notice a trend of robotization. is robot love real love? Can a robot be discriminated or insulted? Do robots deserve recognition and respect?

This week we may welcome dr. **R. van Est** as our **guest lecturer**. He is working as a researcher at the Rathenau Institute. The Rathenau Institute stimulates public and political opinion forming on social aspects of science and technology. They perform research and organize debate relating to science, innovation and new technologies. Dr. van Est works at the institute since 1997. He is responsible for identifying new developments at the convergence of science, technology, politics and society. He will give an introduction in what digitalization means for citizenship.

**Mandatory reading:**

- Van Est, R. & Gerritsen, B.J.A. (2017). Human rights in the robot age: challenges arising from the use of robotics, artificial intelligence and virtual and augmented reality. Chapter 3 and 4 (pp. 17-49) The Hague: Rathenau institute. (32 p.)

- Mort, M., Roberts, C., Pols, J., Domenech, M., Mosen, J., (2013). The ethical implications of home telecare for older people. A framework derived from a multi-sited participative study. *Health expectations*, pp. 1-12. (12 p).
- Mossberger, K. Tolbert, C.J., McReal, R. (2008). Defining digital citizenship. Pp. 1-21. (Chapter 1). In: *Digital Citizenship. The internet, society and participation.* (21 p.)

Total 65 pages

**Recommended reading:**

- Mossberger, K. Tolbert, C.J., McReal, R. (2008). The benefits of society online. Civic engagement. Pp. 47-67 chapter 3.. In: *Digital Citizenship. The internet, society and participation.* (20 p.)
- D'Haenens, Koeman, L., Saeys, F. (2007). Digital citizenship among ethnic minority youth in the Netherlands and Flanders. *New Media and Society*, 9, 2, pp. 278-299.
- Vandemeulebroucke, T., Dierckx, T., Gastmans, C. (2017). How do older adults experience and perceive socially assistive robots in aged care: a systematic review of qualitative evidence. *Ageing and mental health*, pp. 1-19.
- Oyedemi, T. (2015). Internet access as a citizens right? *Citizenship in the digital age. Citizenship studies*, 19, 4, pp. 450-464.

**Workshop 8**

**Wednesday 24 January 2018**

**F. Bredewold and D. Blondelle**

Literature will be discussed, a presentation is given by a studentgroup. We will organise a feedback session to discuss the final versions of the papers.

**WEEK 9 STUDY WEEK**

Preparation for exam

**WEEK 10 EXAMINATION**

Exam: 7<sup>th</sup> of February 10.00 till 13.00

### **3. APPENDIX 1 LEARNING OUTCOMES BACHELOR OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES**

The aims and objectives of the programme are:

1. *Knowledge and understanding of humanistic studies*

The bachelor has knowledge on theories, methodological view points and the context concerning philosophy of science of humanistic studies, of the relation to constituent and affiliated scientific disciplines, and demonstrates an open attitude towards the paradigmatic pluriformity of contemporary academic practice;

2. *Application of knowledge on humanistic studies*

The bachelor is able to creatively and systematically conceptualise, analyse and present processes of meaning making and humanisation, using knowledge and insights from the multidisciplinary domains of knowledge of humanistic studies;

3. *Knowledge and vision concerning worldviews*

The bachelor has knowledge and understanding of theories and practices of worldviews in general and specifically of humanistic traditions, is able to place these in cultural and historical contexts, and is able to formulate and scientifically substantiate a personal vision on humanism as a worldview;

4. *Application and judgement concerning diversity and global perspective*

The bachelor is able to formulate and substantiate a position concerning questions of meanings of life and humanisation in the local and global society;

5. *Research skills*

The bachelor is able to, under supervision, design and carry out a scientifically sound elementary research project and communicate orally and written on this research project;

6. *Literature skills*

The bachelor is able to trace, interpret and judge the quality of scientific literature that is relevant to humanistic studies;

7. *Project skills and organizational skills*

The bachelor is able to, within a team, systematically design a project in relation to a customer, is able to report written and to perform a presentation on the findings, and in doing so relate this to the development of a personal normative professional attitude;

8. *Communication skills*

The bachelor is able to analyse interaction and communication processes between individuals, in groups and in organisations, and has reflective and dialogical skills which enable him/her to participate in such a way that the quality of the processes improves;

9. *Attitude*

The bachelor demonstrates an authentic and open life stance and is able to position himself/herself in the field of worldview traditions, thereby also referring to personal sources of inspiration;

10. *Equipment for continuing education*

The bachelor has mastered learning skills, self-knowledge and ways of self-care that enable him/her to pursue a follow-up educational programme that presumes a high degree of autonomy and is able to name his or her qualities and preferences regarding further study and future career or job market.

Learning outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 specify the academic education in the field of humanistic studies. Learning outcomes 3, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are related to the special nature of the field of humanistics and specify what bachelors attain regarding worldviews, humanism and general and job market skills.