2. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 The Notion of Citizenship

When we study the notion of citizenship, it is important to realise that it is impossible to know what citizenship is. The interpretations and practices of citizenship are not static, but constantly in flux. Citizenship is a typical example of what scholars have called an ‘essentially contested concept’ (Gallie 1956). Essentially contested concepts are complex and multidimensional. Since their interpretations and definitions are variable, it is impossible to reach agreement over the definition of the concept (Van Craen, Vancluysen, and Ackaert 2011, 103). It is therefore not my aim to close the debate by proposing a final definition of citizenship, but to look for different ways we can interpret the notion:

The ambiguities of citizenship should not be defined away, but rather be conceived as keys, signs to be deciphered, that enable us to get in view real conflicts and problems between a plurality of people whom history has brought together in relations of interdependence and dominance, and who thus have common business to attend to. (Van Gunsteren 1978, 10)

This book does not limit itself to the formal aspects of citizenship. The emphasis is not on citizenship as membership of a legal and political order, but on the normative and extra-juridical interpretations of what a good citizen is (Schinkel 2010). As has been said:

We should expect a theory of the good citizen to be relatively independent of the legal question of what it is to be a citizen, just as a theory of the good person is distinct from the metaphysical (or legal) question of what it is to be a person. (Kymlicka and Norman 1994, 353)

When we come to question the compatibility of religion and contemporary Dutch citizenship, it is the normative interpretation of citizenship that must be addressed. The terms ‘citizenship’ and ‘good citizenship’ will be used interchangeably throughout this book and both will refer to this normative interpretation of citizenship, unless otherwise indicated. Furthermore, this book uses the term ‘citizenship’ in a wide sense. I use the term to refer to status and participation in the broad social sphere, instead of using it in a strict sense to refer solely to the status of political equality that citizens hold (Van Gunsteren 1998, 12).
Lastly, this book focuses on the level of the nation-state. Although it is evident that citizenship plays a role at different levels, the national level is an important dimension when it comes to citizenship (Heater 2004; Hurenkamp, Tonkens, and Duyvendak 2012). Cosmopolitan thinkers have argued that citizenship rights ought to transcend national boundaries, as state borders are constantly crossed by flows of capital and people (Castles and Davidson 2000; Vertovec 2004). However, nationalistic and patriotic interpretations of citizenship have become more prominent in contemporary debates, both in political philosophy and in government policies. These interpretations of citizenship claim that individual rights are best guaranteed within the nation-state (Bosniak 2006; Calhoun 2007). Moreover, these interpretations put forward the idea that social solidarity is only possible in the context of a shared national identity (Calhoun 2007; Miller 2000, 31–33). On the practical level, citizenship is a national matter: institutions such as courts and policing apparatuses act primarily within the national sphere (Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakul 2008). The national paradigms of citizenship that I study in this book can thus be seen as a reflection of the predominance of the national level in policies and in political and academic discourse on citizenship.

2.2 The Big Five Model of Citizenship

Citizenship consists of different dimensions. In order to map and evaluate the different perspectives regarding the dimensions of the concept, I have developed what I shall refer to as the Big Five model of Dutch citizenship, which is presented in Figure 2.1. In this model, Dutch citizenship consists of five dimensions: social engagement, political engagement, law-abidingness, tolerance and Dutch identity. The model will serve as a framework throughout the book. Across and within the various perspectives on citizenship, there is disagreement in various respects about these dimensions, which shows us the difficulties that must be reckoned with. To begin with, there is no agreement concerning exact definitions and interpretations of the dimensions. Nor is there agreement about the relative importance of the different dimensions. To complicate matters, the relationships between the dimensions themselves are not unequivocally understood.

Despite the disagreement over the interpretations of the dimensions, there are good reasons to use the Big Five model of Dutch citizenship. The model is based on previous empirical studies and on theoretical interpretations of citizenship. Consequently, it suits the current Dutch situation rather well.

---

2 The equal distribution of the dimensions in the model should not be interpreted as reflecting equal importance of all dimensions. Within various theories and conceptions of citizenship, the dimensions are interpreted differently; their relative importance also varies. The labels of the dimensions refer to the fundamental notions that belong to the dimension. There are obviously many derivative notions related to the dimensions as well, which will be discussed in the following Parts (especially in Part Two, where the dimensions are operationalised in order to develop an online survey).
Furthermore, the model has empirical validity, as will be shown in Part Two. In previous research, scholars have suggested different divisions of characteristics of good citizenship. For example, Derek Heater argued that, on a normative level, four things are expected from citizens in modern liberal democratic states. First of all, citizens must be helpful to each other; secondly, they must participate in public affairs; thirdly, citizens must have integrity and honesty; and lastly, they must be law-abiding (Heater 2004, 203). These requirements largely match the interpretations of citizenship that several authors have given, both within the Netherlands and internationally. The four dimensions are often labelled as such: citizenship as juridical status; citizenship as the rights and duties belonging to this status; citizenship as participation in the (political) community; and citizenship as identification or sense of belonging to this community (Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakul 2008; Bosniak 2006).

As the juridical status of citizenship is not that important for this book, I have decided not to treat it as a separate dimension in my model. Rather, I follow the division of (among others) Kymlicka and Norman (2000, 30–31), Cohen (1999) and Fermin (2000), all who expand the legal aspect by focusing on civil and social rights. They discern the following three dimensions:

1. Citizenship as a legal status, involving a set of civil, political and social rights.
2. Citizenship as a political principle of democracy that involves participation in politics.
3. Citizenship as a form of membership, constitutive of identity.

We also find similar legal and political dimensions of citizenship reflected in empirical studies. A study on the notion of Dutch citizenship from the perspective of Dutch citizens revealed four characteristics of a good citizen; a good citizen needs to be law-abiding, politically engaged, socially engaged and decent (Dekker and De Hart 2002). The first two of these characteristics reflect the first two dimensions from Kymlicka and Norman (2000) as presented above, and are the most straightforward. I thus decided to include these in my Big Five model. The first dimension, law-abidingness, focuses on the rights and duties of citizens. The state guarantees certain basic rights to all citizens and in return, individual citizens have certain obligations, such as paying taxes and obeying the laws (Janoski 1998).

The second dimension, political engagement, has a long history in citizenship theory, as being one of the main principles of citizenship (Heater 2004; Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakul 2008). Although Dekker and De Hart’s study showed that Dutch citizens do acknowledge an element of political engagement, it also revealed that they hardly consider it essential for a good citizen (Dekker and De Hart 2002, 7–8). The emphasis that several political theorists have placed upon this element therefore invites critical comment and evaluation, which will be explored later, in the Synthesis.

The third dimension in the study by Dekker and De Hart, social engagement, is related to, but not identical with, the membership dimension of citizenship
described above. In political philosophy, citizenship as membership of a community often focuses on shared history and identity, whereas the focus on social engagement in the study of Dekker and De Hart (2002, 11) is concerned with participation in society and pro-social behaviour. It therefore seems reasonable to distinguish between the dimensions of social engagement and shared identity (Heater 2004, 326). I follow Dekker and De Hart in their interpretation of social engagement, which states that a good citizen adapts to (and is active in) society, helps his or her fellow citizens and takes the perspectives and needs of other people into account (Dekker and De Hart 2002, 11). Note that this interpretation of social engagement matches Heater’s first two expectations of a good citizen already described.

Furthermore, this focus on social engagement and active participation is also prominent in contemporary integration policies, as we will see in Part One. The Dutch government has increasingly focused on active participation as a condition for good citizenship. This participation consists of both pro-social behaviour and contribution to society; for instance, by having a job (Rijkschroeff, Duyvendak and Pels 2003; Boshuizen 2006). This trend was recently highlighted in the Troonrede (King’s Speech) of 2013, in which the government called for a transition from the traditional welfare state to a so-called ‘participation society’. The government expects from ‘all who can, to take responsibility for his or her own life and their surroundings’ (Troonrede 2013).

The fourth dimension of shared or civic identity is what Heater refers to as belonging to a community which bridges other social identities (Heater 2004, 188). The subjective sense of belonging to a community can be seen as the psychological dimension of citizenship (Carens 2000, 166). Indeed, it has been a topic of social and political (philosophical) discussions of the past decades. In these discussions, we have seen two major responses to the concept of belonging to a community. On the one hand, communitarian theories have focused on the importance of shared morality and membership of and engagement in tight-knit communities, such as religious communities (Fermin 2009, 14; MacIntyre 1981). This communitarian focus on the ‘self embedded in community’ (Claassen 2011, 469) came up as a response to the perceived rise of

---

3 Since the study by Dekker and De Hart (2002) can be seen as the pioneering study in the field, in which citizens were most directly asked to indicate the essential characteristics of a good citizen, it was also initially the idea to include the fourth element of decency in my model of Dutch citizenship. However, the results of the present study showed that the element of decency was not recognised as a separate category, but was mainly seen as part of social engagement. In Part Two, I discuss the empirical study with which I tested my model of Dutch citizenship. Possible explanations for the exclusion of the element of decency will be provided there.

4 See above, page 17.

5 The Troonrede (King’s Speech) is an annual address to the nation and takes place on Prinsjesdag, which is celebrated on the third Tuesday of September. On Prinsjesdag, the government presents its year’s budget and the monarch outlines the government policy for the coming year in a speech written by the government.
individualism and self-centredness that has characterised contemporary Dutch society (Ester, Halman, and De Moor 1993, 165; Hurenkamp, Tonkens, and Duyvendak 2011, 206). On the other hand, in response to growing diversity in society, the Dutch government has focused on shared identity in a ‘neo-nationalist’ manner (Hurenkamp, Tonkens, and Duyvendak 2011, 206–207). As a result, integration policies have shifted from multicultural approaches to assimilation strategies (Entzinger 2006). Dutch newspapers are clearly following this trend in their interpretations of the notion and this ‘cultural’ interpretation of citizenship has gained prominence with notable key issues such as integration and the role of religion in society (Hurenkamp and Tonkens 2011, 64).

Related to the dimension of shared identity, is the fifth and final dimension in my model: tolerance. According to Heater, tolerance is ‘the willingness to allow people to hold and express views and to take actions of which one disapproves’ (Heater 2004, 208). This is the interpretation of tolerance that I will use throughout this book. The Netherlands has long been famous for its tolerance and lack of nationalism (Van der Veer 2006; Smeekes, Verkuyten, and Poppe 2012). The focus on national identity that has become increasingly apparent in the past decades is undoubtedly accompanied by a decrease in tolerance. An international survey showed, for instance, that negative attitudes towards Muslims are nowhere stronger than in the Netherlands (Pew Research Center 2005, 4). Furthermore, tolerance has become a contentious notion in the past years and Dutch citizens themselves are sharply divided over the issue. According to a recent study by Hurenkamp and Tonkens (2011), there are basically two viewpoints on tolerance nowadays. One viewpoint argues that tolerance is one of the most essential characteristics of Dutch identity. The other viewpoint, however, thinks that the ‘traditional’ Dutch tolerance is overrated. The latter group further argues that the Dutch should become less tolerant, because their tolerance has been abused by intolerant others (Hurenkamp and Tonkens 2011, 173–174). As tolerance is often seen as one of the conditions for citizenship and democracy, especially in culturally diverse countries (Sullivan
and Transue 1999) and because of the controversy over the notion in Dutch society, I include it as a separate dimension in my model of Dutch citizenship.

2.3 The Relation Between Religion and Citizenship

One of the crucial problems of citizenship, perhaps even the problem that summarises the complexity contained in a concept of good citizenship, is the question of how a citizen’s religious affiliation relates to his/her interpretation and experience of citizenship. This question has received surprisingly little attention in academic political theory, but has become a topic of a heated public and popular debate in the Netherlands. While several politicians and scholars have argued that religion creates bonds through which society can flourish (Bocken 2007, 48, see also Van Stokkom 2004; Stevaert 2005), others have argued that religion has had a disruptive effect on society (Cliteur 2004).

Contemporary political actors often claim that religion must be a purely private matter and that the government should act in a neutral way towards religion. Two members of the LPF (Lijst Pim Fortuyn, a populist, anti-immigrant party), for instance, argued in a newspaper article in 2004 that the right for a neutral state should be taken up in the constitution (NRC, March 3, 2004). By referring to the importance of government neutrality, the Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie (VVD, the main liberal right-wing/conservative party) proposed in its 2012 election programme that that the government would no longer subsidise religious institutions, dialogues or activities (VVD 2012).

The recent debates that have touched upon religion are some of the most highly polarised, ranging from euthanasia to circumcision and ritual slaughtering; from the position of women in various religious communities to the wearing of headscarves in public spaces or offices. These debates all show that Dutch citizens, religious and non-religious, are divided over issues surrounding the influence of religion in personal and public affairs. Especially with regard to the latter, it appears that there are changes in the way in which the Dutch government approaches religion. Different governments have different strategies in approaching religion in the public domain. If we place these strategies on a continuum, in which the two opposing approaches are laïcité and religious pluralism (Loenen 2006; Klop 1999, 248), we would see that the Netherlands is indeed moving away from the second approach of

---

6 An important exception in this respect is a PhD thesis by Pieter Dronkers (2012), who looked at theories of moral motivation to keep a community together and analysed the conceptualisation of civic loyalty from a political theological point of view.

7 Admittedly, various arguments are used in these debates, because different rights are at play (e.g. religious freedom is opposed to animal rights in the debate on ritual slaughtering, but opposed to the right on bodily integrity in the debate on circumcision), and they play at different levels (e.g. the debate on the position of women mostly regards internal debates in specific communities whereas the debate on headscarves in buses for example concerns public space for citizens). Nonetheless, in all these discussions, the influence of religion in personal or public issues is at stake.
religious pluralism, towards the laïcité approach (Loenen 2006; Sunier 2000, 54; Loose 2007; Rasor 2013).\(^8\)

More general questions exist concerning the compatibility of religion and contemporary society, often implicit in the arguments against the public role of religion. In the debates on the ban on ritual slaughter, for example, it is often argued that these religious practices do not fit modern society, nor do they fit Western, or European society (Rouvoet 2012; Casanova 2009, 141).\(^9\) Similar arguments have been made in public discussions concerning the position of women in the SGP, who were excluded from political functions. In this respect, the SGP has been heavily criticised.\(^10\) In the debate on the ban on burqas, people argue that the burqa is an extremist symbol of a certain religious conviction and therefore incompatible with fundamental principles of Dutch society. Furthermore, the social impact of confrontations with this extremist symbol is used as an argument in favour of the ban on burqas (Vermeulen 2006, 14). For whatever reason, it is clearly evident that the (unrestricted) expression of religion in the public domain has become subject to an increasing amount of critique.

Although these debates do not specifically address the notion of citizenship, there is a close connection between the discussions on the public role of religion and the compatibility of religion within Dutch citizenship. In every normative theory, concepts of good citizenship deal with the question of how citizens should behave and how they should relate themselves to others and to the state. Citizenship is thus positioned in the public domain. By problematising the public role of religion in Dutch society, the issue of the relation between religion and citizenship is extremely relevant and provokes many questions. Is a good citizen allowed to be inspired by his or her religious conviction? Are religious arguments permissible in public discussions? Do citizens have to keep

---

\(^8\) The French model of laïcité entails a sharp separation between the private and public domain. Within the private domain, every individual is free to act according to his or her own conviction, but in public life, uniform and neutral norms have to be accepted. Within the approach of religious pluralism, on the other hand, the state offers freedom and space for religious expressions, not only in the private domain, but also in public life. Here the state interacts with religious groups and the state may support religious institutions (Rasor 2013).

\(^9\) These arguments, however, are not new. In the 19th century, the debate on ritual slaughtering has also been held in the Netherlands, with the difference that ritual slaughtering was a specifically Jewish rite and that in the past decades, sentiments regarding the rise of Islam have also played a role in the debate (Havinga 2008, 212). In the 19th century, Enlightenment thinkers considered ritual slaughtering illustrative of past times and an old civilisation that did not fit the then-modern morals (Wallet 2012, 167).

\(^10\) Obviously, the equality of men and women is one of the principles in Dutch society and according to article one of the Dutch constitution, one is not allowed to discriminate on the basis of sex (http://www.denederlandsegrondwet.nl). According to the SGP, however, there is no solid argument why this equality should be preferred over the right of religious freedom and the right of association (Van Berkum 2009).
their public and private selves separate? Is this possible at all? In other words: is citizenship secular?

Religion may serve as a source of inspiration upon which citizens can base and build their relation to other people and to the state. In psychological literature the assumption is made that the interpretation of what it means to be a good citizen is dependent on the virtues and values that someone deems important (Sluis and Van Oudenhoven 2009). Religion is also seen as a source for the development and evaluation of virtues and values (Bernts, Dekker and De Hart 2007; Van Oudenhoven, Sluis and Pomp 2010). Combining these assumptions leads to an entanglement between religion and (interpretations and expressions of) citizenship: religious persons of group A might hold different moral views than religious persons from group B or non-religious persons, which could be reflected in their opinions on (and expressions of) citizenship. Since religion is said to provide a basis for morality, religion might also offer a positive contribution to citizenship, both through religious institutions and through religiously inspired individuals (Weithman 2002).

Thus, we find a trend in Dutch society, which is increasingly negative about the public role of religion. Meanwhile, religion is seen as a source of inspiration in fostering good citizenship. It seems imperative that a fuller account of the relation between religion and citizenship be given, especially in light of the polarised and heated public debates of late. This study is intended to fill this gap and as such, investigates the implications of different interpretations of citizenship for the role of religion within contemporary Dutch society. In doing so, my book specifically addresses the question: to what extent does the level and content of religiosity influences opinions on citizenship?

As has become clear in this section, I do not want to linger in the never-ending debates concerning the definition of religion. I do not think it fruitful to engage in debating in an essentialist way about which beliefs and elements constitute religion(s) and which ones do not belong to it. Accordingly, I will not limit my research to one specific interpretation of religion, but will instead discuss the public role of religion in a broad sense. It has often been assumed that religion would lose its importance in contemporary Western societies and that the modernisation of society would be accompanied by a decrease in the level of religiosity. This secularist bias of contemporary public and political discourses fails to understand the role that religion still plays in modern Western societies (Wilson 2012; Jedan 2013). My approach aligns with post-secular theorists, who aim to understand the role and position of religion in contemporary societies and to invalidate the perceived rivalry between religion and secular reason in the public domain (Molendijk, Beaumont, and Jedan 2010).

Within this post-secular approach, it has been argued that modernisation and individualisation have not made religion redundant, neither in the public sphere nor in people’s private lives (Casanova 1994). Rather, modern Western states have experienced a shift from a position in which religious belief was omnipresent and where non-belief was almost impossible, to a position in which believing is just one option among many (Taylor 2007, 2–3). Religious groups and individuals thus remain present in modern Western societies. The
philosopher Jürgen Habermas has therefore suggested that European societies should understand themselves as being ‘post-secular’, in the sense that they have to ‘adjust [themselves] to the continued existence of religious communities in an increasingly secularised environment’ (Habermas 2008, 19). In order to achieve this adjustment, Habermas argues that one of the main issues of modern democracies is to find a ‘post-secular balance between shared citizenship and cultural differences’ (Habermas 2008, 27). It is precisely this type of balance that is addressed in this book: the position of religious affiliations of citizens within the boundaries of (national) citizenship.

2.4 Looking From Different Angles: Structure of the Book

By using the model of Dutch citizenship as a framework throughout this book, different perspectives of the notion of citizenship and their accompanying implications for religion will be evaluated. Following Van Gunsteren (1978, 11–12), I distinguish between three different, but interrelated levels from which the notion of citizenship can be studied. The first level treats citizenship as a theoretically constituted object of political thought. The second level is that of institutions and the third level pertains to practices of citizenship. Although these levels seem distinct, it is reasonable to expect that they mutually influence each other:

All citizen activities, however concrete they may seem, are loaded with ideology and theory, and ... they take place in institutional settings that are also shot through with ideology and theory. (Van Gunsteren 1978, 11)

It is quite possible that a citizen’s activities or opinions influence the institutional level, in the sense that policies are not only based on ideology and theory, but also on the *vox populi* — the voice of the people — which seems increasingly the case in Dutch politics. Examples of these are the 100-days ‘talking to the people’ tour by the fourth cabinet Balkenende when it started its government period in 2007, the rise of populist parties in the Netherlands claiming to bridge the existing gap between policy makers and ‘the people’ by turning their back to the political establishment and articulating the intuitions and frustrations of the population. These activities all show that the level of institutions is not only influenced by ideology and theory, but also by the practical level of social reality (Scholten 2011, 86–87; Houtman and Achterberg 2010).

Although he himself suggests this tripartite division, Van Gunsteren admits that he does not live up to his own methodological requirements (Van Gunsteren 1978, 11). Nor is he the only scholar who points to the fact that there is a blind spot in the study of citizenship in the Netherlands. Van den Brink has also observed that many scientific articles on the issue of citizenship in the Netherlands focus on either the first or the second level, but tend to overlook social reality (Van den Brink 2009, 7–8). Moreover, the existing Dutch
empirical studies on the notion of citizenship often focus either solely on the citizen’s perspective on citizenship or on the relation between policy and social practice. This book will act as a bridge between these different types of scientific studies, by investigating the interpretations of the notion of citizenship from three levels, which correspond to those suggested by Van Gunsteren. The unique approach of this study lies in the fact that a comparison of the three levels is made within one analytical framework: the Big Five model. I begin by analysing political philosophical theories, government policies and the accompanying rhetoric that the government applies when talking about citizenship. I continue this investigation on a practical level with empirical studies designed to gain insight into how Dutch citizens approach the topic of citizenship.

To this end, I have employed a contextual approach (Carens 2004). This implies that examples from actual social and political practices will be used and empirical material will complement theoretical parts in order to provide a critical perspective on the theories on citizenship. Throughout the book, I will move back and forth between political theories concerning the notion of citizenship and actual examples or empirical data. Following Carens, ‘the idea is to engage in an ongoing dialectic that involves mutual challenging of theory by practice and of practice by theory’ (2004, 123). This book should thus be seen as the result of ongoing hermeneutical loops, in which the development of the empirical studies is based upon the insights gained from the theoretical and policy levels. At the same time, my choices for specific theories have been informed by the actual Dutch situation. With the different levels and this contextual approach in mind, we continue now to their analysis.

2.4.1 Philosophical and Political Interpretations of Citizenship: Part One

The first two levels — that of political philosophical theories and government policies — will be discussed in Part One of the book. My aim is to show how various traditions in political philosophy have debated the notion of citizenship and to relate current trends in Dutch integration policies to these philosophical debates. In this part, I thus make a comparison between these two levels, analysing the main trends and lines of reasoning. For both levels, I analyse the ways in which each frames its notion of citizenship, how philosophers and policy makers have argued for their interpretation of citizenship, and how the debates on citizenship and religious diversity are connected. A comparison of actual policy documents with the main ideas in political philosophical traditions will show the changing trends and focus over time.

In order to understand the various theories in political philosophical thinking about citizenship and their implications for religious involvement, I begin Part One with a literature review that has a particular focus on contemporary citizenship literature. Although several modern authors refer to classical and pre-modern philosophers and build their interpretations upon older traditions, in the context of this book it makes sense to concentrate on theories of citizenship that are developed with an eye to contemporary multicultural democracies.
Based on the criteria of dominance in these contemporary debates and relevance within the specific focus of the relation between religion and citizenship, I have decided to concentrate on four traditions: liberalism, communitarianism, neo-republicanism and liberal nationalism.

The four traditions primarily address the normative aspects when debating the notion of citizenship. These aspects concern the rights and responsibilities, the virtues, and acts of citizenship. What does it mean to be a good citizen? What acts and behaviours are required for good citizenship? Which virtues and values should be embraced? In Part One, I discuss how the notion of citizenship is involved in these philosophical debates and which virtues, values, and norms are particularly stressed. Integral to this analysis is the study of how different approaches to citizenship lead to different approaches towards the public role of religion.

After the discussion of political philosophies, I shall turn to the level of government policies. In government policies, the question of good citizenship is especially applied to people who want to become formal Dutch citizens. Since 1994, citizenship has been a central notion in Dutch integration policies (Hortulanus and Machielse 2002; Odinot 2010). Migrants are expected to show that they can meet the expectations the government has of the good citizen. Only when they are able to prove that they meet the standards of moral citizenship, can they become formal citizens (Schinkel 2010). Due to the centrality of the notion of citizenship in integration policies, I limit my study to this policy domain.

I study the level by analysing policy documents, advisory reports concerning integration policy and the integration film, *Coming to the Netherlands*. I analyse the rhetoric that the government uses when discussing integration and citizenship in order to distil its interpretation of citizenship. In doing so, I use the four political philosophical theories and the acculturation theory of John Berry as a methodological framework. This enables me to position the policy documents in a broader scheme and help me to understand the larger-scale movements in thinking about citizenship and integration. By studying government rhetoric in integration policies, my aim is not to evaluate government statements as right or wrong or as true or false. My focus will be on exploring patterns in and across the documents. The intent is therefore to understand how the debates on citizenship and integration have become intermingled and how this influences the interpretation and acceptance of religion in contemporary Dutch society.

Part One consists of four chapters. In Chapter 3, I lay the philosophical foundations of my book by outlining the background of the debates in contemporary thinking about citizenship. This leads to a division into four approaches, based on these debates. Chapter 4 gives an overview of the four approaches in their respective political philosophical traditions and serves as a theoretical map for the ensuing chapters. Here it will become clear that the various interpretations of citizenship have implications for conceptualising the role of religion in society. In Chapter 5, Dutch government rhetoric regarding the policy domain of integration is discussed. I analyse the interpretation of
citizenship as held by the Dutch government and connect it to the approaches outlined in Chapter 4. Part One ends with a comparison of the first two perspectives (Chapter 6) in which the main lines of reasoning as well as the similarities and differences between philosophical and practical political interpretations of citizenship are discussed. This conclusion serves as a stepping stone to Part Two, the empirical component of the book.

2.4.2 The Views of Dutch Citizens: Part Two

After considering political theories and government policy, we come to the third level; that of the Dutch citizen. How do ‘lay-persons’ interpret the notion of citizenship? How do they experience or evaluate the relation between religion and citizenship? Part Two is designed to answer these questions and contains the empirical sections of the book. Two different methods are used here; survey and interviews. A large-scale online survey was developed in order to obtain a general impression of how Dutch citizens from different (religious) backgrounds interpret the notion of citizenship and how they view the role of religion in Dutch society. Although several empirical studies have previously been carried out to investigate the notion of citizenship from the perspective of Dutch citizens, these studies are often one-dimensional. These studies occasionally leave the interpretation of the notion completely open to the subjects (see e.g. Dekker and De Hart 2002, 2006; Hurenkamp and Tonkens 2008; Sluis and Van Oudenhoven 2009). Some of these empirical studies found differences between religious and non-religious persons in their interpretations of citizenship (Dekker and De Hart 2002; Hurenkamp and Tonkens 2008), whereas others found striking similarities between various religious groups and non-religious persons (Van Oudenhoven, Sluis, and Pomp 2010). However, the interpretations of these differences and similarities are unsatisfactory, which I believe is (at least partially) due to the underdeveloped notion of citizenship that lies at the core of these studies.

What seems to be missing in empirical studies on religion and citizenship so far, is a combination of different insights from different perspectives and a thorough understanding of the various possible interpretations of good citizenship. Precisely this combination of different perspectives and insights is used in my online survey; all dimensions of the Big Five model of citizenship are included. Furthermore, in this survey, I investigate both the interpretations of the notion of citizenship and the opinions about the role of religion in society. This enables me to form connections between conceptions about religion and citizenship. Since the aim of this study is to obtain a general impression of how Dutch citizens think about the notion of citizenship, an online survey is a promising method as it allows the possibility to collect a large sample of respondents with different backgrounds. In addition, the survey also functions

11 In the Dutch context, the notion of good citizenship is often measured by looking at participation in voluntary service work or donating to charity, which are only operationalisations of the dimension of social engagement.
as an empirical check on the division of dimensions in the Big Five model suggested above.

I investigate the relation between religion and citizenship in more detail by interviewing two groups of religiously highly committed citizens. My intention has been to give a voice to religious minorities in the Netherlands that seem to be misrepresented in Dutch politics and media. As Van den Bos (2013) observed, there has not been ‘a proper debate’ in Dutch society and politics concerning the role of religion in Dutch society. On the contrary, he claims that merely trivial matters have been discussed, while the important question over the public role and the possibly positive contribution of religion to contemporary society has been largely ignored. The voices of religious people and religious traditions are often overlooked and I agree with Van den Bos that these traditions might hold valuable insights for society, when it comes to democratic values and ideas about how different citizens and groups of citizens relate to each other and to the state. It is imperative therefore to fill this gap through a detailed investigation of the relation between religion and citizenship from the perspective of citizens, whose belief is an important and constitutive element of their identity. As such, I conduct interviews with religiously highly committed Turkish Muslims and religiously highly committed Protestants. The interview method affords me the opportunity to ask the respondents about motivations and underlying convictions or beliefs, which offers valuable contributions to the results of the online survey.

The construction of both empirical studies is based on a combination of previous studies and insights gained in Part One. These I present in Chapter 7. In Chapters 8 and 9, I give the methodological justifications of the two studies. Chapter 10 contains the statistical results of the first study. The technical and statistical explanations of the applied analyses and results are presented in this chapter. As some of my readers are less familiar with statistics, I have included a glossary of statistical and psychometrical terms in Appendix C. Readers not familiar with social-scientific technicalities are invited to have a look at this appendix before starting with Chapter 10, or otherwise, they can skip this rather technical chapter and continue reading Chapters 11 and 12, where I give the interpretation of the results in language understandable to an educated audience.

The interpretations of the online survey results are supplemented by the interview results, in order to provide a more comprehensive analysis of how religiously highly committed citizens perceive the notion of citizenship (in Chapter 11) and the appreciation of religion (in Chapter 12). The results of the interviews extend the insights gained from the quantitative data by adding content to the numbers. Excerpts from the interviews give a lively impression of how several highly religiously committed citizens treat both the notion of citizenship and the appreciation of religion in the Netherlands. In Chapter 13, two case studies from the interviews are selected and subjected to a detailed analysis. These case studies shed new light on the interrelatedness of religion and citizenship for certain religiously highly committed citizens and reveal the elaborate considerations they make in discussing these topics.
I conclude my book with a final comparison of the three perspectives. In this comparison, I focus explicitly on interpretations of the notion of citizenship and the accompanying implications for (the public role of) religion. By combining theoretical and empirical perspectives, quantitative and qualitative research, confirmative and exploratory research, this book aims to give a fuller account of the relation between religion and citizenship than has been done so far. The hermeneutical loops, in which theory and practice critically evaluate each other, will give pluralism its due: pluralism of different perspectives, of different loci of discourse and of different world views. It is in this manner that I hope to contribute something challenging to the existing (philosophical and political) debates on diversity, integration and the role of religion within contemporary Western society.
PART ONE

Philosophical and Political Thinking on Citizenship