
ON THE MORAL REQUIREMENT OF A TEACHING SERVICE

Contributing to civic education as a means to constitute democracy

“Consciously, we teach what we know; unconsciously, we teach who we are”

(Hamachek 1999, 209).

Abstract

A teaching service offers citizens the opportunity to contribute to civic education. Two arguments are provided to support the thesis statement. The first section defends a teaching service by arguing that civic education is a public good. The principle of fairness requires contribution to the good from which one benefits. Subsequently, a liberal objection is considered, which requires justification of government involvement to secure a citizen's freedom. Eventually, two academic perspectives are presented to defend that contribution to civic education via a teaching service is more valuable than taxation. The second section of this thesis defends a teaching service by arguing that contribution to civic education is a civic duty. The republican political tradition emphasizes that democratic governments should mandate a teaching service as a means to live in a democratic society as a free citizen. Furthermore, citizens have a duty to contribute to civic education not to be dominated by the producers of the good. Finally, the third section considers two objections to a teaching service. In sum, democratic governments are morally required to mandate a teaching service.

Name: B.N.M. van der Laan

Student number: 6623263

Faculty: Humanities

Master: Applied Ethics

Supervisor: S. Harb

Second reader: dr. J. P. M. Philips

Date: June 27, 2020

Word count: 9535

Table of Contents

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	3
PRELIMINARIES	5
<u>PUBLIC GOODS</u>	6
CONTRIBUTING TO CIVIC EDUCATION	7
CIVIC EDUCATION IS A PUBLIC GOOD	7
THE PRINCIPLE OF FAIRNESS	8
BENEFITS TO SOCIETY	9
LIBERAL OBJECTION	9
CONTRIBUTION VIA TEACHING	11
TAXATION	11
THEORY OF COPRODUCTION	13
PUBLIC GOOD EXPERIMENTS	14
CONCLUSION	15
<u>CIVIC DUTIES</u>	16
CLASSICAL REPUBLICANS	17
CONTEMPORARY CIVIC REPUBLICANIS	18
CONCLUSION	21
<u>OBJECTIONS TO A TEACHING SERVICE</u>	22
A MILITARY SERVICE	22
CONCERNS ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHING	24
DIVERSITY	26
SOCIAL COHESION	26
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	27
<u>LITERATURE</u>	30

Introduction

Civic education is a thoroughly discussed topic in political theory. Since Plato and Aristotle first considered the matter, it has been clear that civic education is relative to regime type (Galston 2007). Democracies require democratic citizens, whose specific knowledge, competences, and character fits democratic politics. How we think about developing citizens with these skills is a matter of considerable debate. In the broadest sense, civic education means all the processes that affect people's beliefs, commitments, capabilities, and actions as members or prospective members of communities. Civic education therefore does not need to be intentional. Institutions and communities transmit values and norms without meaning to (Crittenden and Levine 2018). Nevertheless, much debate has been on the intentional aspect of civic education: whether members need to be educated into a good society (Callan 1997; Dudley and Gitelson 2002; Frímannsson 2001; David and Neufield 2007). In accordance with these debates, this thesis is motivated by the assumption that a good society does not come about organically and requires institutions and practices.

However, in the literature on the constitution of a good society, the focus when it comes to civic education has been on the receiving end (White 1996; Moore 2012; Baehr 2013). The political philosophical literature is foremost devoted to students and argues for changes in civic educational programs. Research on the education for civic engagement in democracy addresses the problem of disengagement of students in public affairs and politics (Mann and Patrick 2000; Galston 2004; Putnam 2000). This focus on the receiving end is troubling because improving the civic education of students is only one way of educating citizens into a good society.

In this thesis I therefore suggest an approach that is not on the receiving end (students) but about how one of those institutions (teaching) can be reformed. Therefore, I defend the following thesis: are democratic societies morally required to mandate a teaching service?

In a teaching service citizens share their relation towards society with students. A teaching service means contributing to civic education. It consists of individuals that teach students how they contribute to society, by means of elaborating on one's work; on the communities one belongs to; on the volunteer work or; on other communities one is participating in. Consequently, a teaching service is not about transmitting certain pre-defined knowledge, yet about what different ways people can contribute to society, about beliefs and commitments. The service is for citizens older than 18 and could consist of half a year or longer. There are no restrictions on what time in someone's life or at what age one should serve.

This thesis is divided in three sections and presents two arguments in favor of governments to mandate a teaching service. The first section defends a teaching service by arguing that civic education is a public good. Furthermore, arguing that every citizen should contribute to the public good of civic education because the principle of fairness requires this. In response to this, a liberal objection will be discussed. The liberal perspective requires that governmental intervention need to be justified because any political authority or law limit the freedom of citizens. Nevertheless, since there has been argued that civic education is a public good, the end of the first section discusses in what way to contribute to the public good of civic education. The second section defends a teaching service by arguing that contribution to civic education is a civic duty. The republican political tradition emphasizes that civic duties are instrumental in nature; civic duties need to be developed as a means to protect a citizen's freedom. Furthermore, contribution to civic education is a civic duty to avoid domination of those who produce the good. Therefore, the republican political tradition justifies that democratic governments are morally required to mandate a teaching service to secure a citizen's freedom. The third section raises and responds to the following two critiques: a first concern is whether education is the only scheme to develop civic virtues and a second concern is on the quality of teaching in a teaching service.

Preliminaries

Before proceeding, it is worth taking some time to set out the general character of three concepts that are necessary for better understanding the teaching service: 1) civic virtue, 2) civic education 3) a good society.

Civic virtue is the development of durable habits that are important for the success of the community (Crittenden and Levine 2018). In this thesis, my aim is to argue for citizens that transmit civic virtues to students via a teaching service. In this thesis the concept of civic virtue is used to refer to gaining societal competences, developing durable habits, values, knowledge and skills relevant to membership in communities (Crittenden and Levine 2018, 1). These societal competences are important for individuals to be able to make it in life and indispensable for a vital, democratic society (Munniksmä et al. 2017, 9). A teaching service aims to develop students with civic virtues. The annual report of the Dutch Inspectorate of Education helps to clarify how civic virtues can be understood (Onderwijsinspectie 2019). The non-cognitive skills that define civic virtues include: citizenship, motivation, creativity, problem-solving capacity and intercultural communication skills (Onderwijsinspectie 2019, 20).

The thesis statement is situated in an academic debate that focuses on the intentional aspect of civic education. In this thesis the concept civic education is used to emphasize that civic education structures society. This thesis does not defend the claim that civic education per se, is something that enhances democracy. Whatever kind of education the authorities argue for, this cannot and will not be neutral. For example there is multicultural education, where students is educated that a good person need to be aware of the perspectives of others and the effects their decisions have on others (Crittenden and Levine 2018, 5).

Therefore, closely related to civic education, is the idea of a good society. Since civic education enhances citizens to live in a political community, the question of how to structure that community remains unanswered. Although the introduction refers to the notion of 'a good society', this thesis makes no attempt

in determining the specific characteristics of that good society. Even so, this thesis does not interpret the definition of 'good civic education'. Nevertheless, it is with purpose to defend a thesis that claims that specifically *democratic* governments should mandate a teaching service. I mean that it is not just me but every citizen that will be put in a position to structure a 'good' society. I believe that a democratic society requires a civic educational aim that is inclusive.

Public goods

This section defends a teaching service by arguing that civic education is a public good. The concept of a public good is used to argue for engagement and participation of citizens with society. This section consists of three paragraphs. The first paragraph argues why we should all contribute to civic education. Three premises support the conclusion that all citizens should contribute to producing the public good of civic education. First, civic education is argued for as a public good. Second, the principle of fairness requires that those who benefit from a public good should contribute to it. Third, every citizen benefits from civic education because of its advantages for society. Therefore, we should all participate in a teaching service and thereby contribute to civic education.

The second paragraph discusses a liberal objection to a teaching service. This objection is raised in addition to the claim that all citizens should contribute to civic education. Mandating a teaching service shall impact the liberty of citizens. Consequently, liberals require justification of any restrictions of freedom. Moreover, also the subsequent section, which presents the second argument, will respond to this liberal objection. The second argument will thereby present further justification for the requirement of governments to mandate a teaching service.

The third paragraph defends that contribution via a teaching service is more valuable than contribution via taxation. First, discussing taxation as the often-used way to secure public goods. Second, after establishing an important

disadvantage of taxation, two academic perspectives are given to support active contribution to civic education. In conclusion, participation in a teaching service appeals to be preferable to secure civic education.

Contributing to civic education

Civic education is a public good

With help of the definition of a public good provided by economists, this section argues that civic education is a public good. According to economists a public good has two key characteristics: it is non-excludable and non-rival (Russell 2013, 2). Non-excludability means that everyone receives the benefit of the public good that is provided. For example, think of national defense as a public good, as a member of the community one cannot withdraw from this public good and not be protected. Non-rivalry means that if somebody benefits from the good, it does not reduce the amount available for others. An example of something that is non-rival is street lightning. If someone is outside benefitting street lightning the amount of streetlight available for others does not reduce.

The problem posed by a public good is that the optimal course of action for each individual, is not to contribute to the provision of the good, even though everyone would be better off if they all did so (Hussain 2018, 4). This problem is often referred to as the free rider problem. The free rider problem can be defined according to the following example. Think of a student household that consists of four roommates. These roommates wish to decorate their house with all kinds of houseplants. One of the four roommates prefers not to pay for these plants and tells the others that she will not contribute. Finally, the three other students spend money to buy the plants and decorate the house with it. In the end, the fourth girl does enjoy the house being cheered up and so free rides on the costs the other girls made. Someone who enjoys a free ride secures the benefits of a good without contributing toward the costs. Thus, the free rider problem exists in the absence of an incentive to invest in something because, being non-excludable, one can enjoy the benefits of a public good without contributing to its

costs. Therefore, in order to eliminate the free rider problem everyone has to contribute to the good.

A considerable amount of literature underlines the idea of education as a public good (Pusser 2006; Marginson 2011). Due to the central role of civic education in democracy, I assume civic education to be a derivative form of education in general. Henceforth, this thesis argues for civic education as a public good and uses these terms interchangeably. Civic education is a public good because it both meets the requirement of being non-excludable and non-rival. The non-excludable feature implies that there are no children excluded from education. Generally, for any country that aims for compulsory and universal education, children are not excluded from education. The non-rival aspect of education can be explained in succession of the obligation for education. Education is non-rival because there is enough capacity to educate all children in the Netherlands. There are no children who do not get the possibility to go to school in the Netherlands. Nevertheless, not all literature is consistent in establishing civic education as a public good. Though the cases that I found could be responded. For example DeAngelis concludes that it is difficult to argue for education as a public good (2018). DeAngelis states that for example the non-excludability feature is not demonstrated in education. He argues if one student occupies a seat in a classroom, another child is prevented from sitting in the same seat. However, the perspective of DeAngelis is too narrow because he only discusses individual cases within one classroom. As a consequence, DeAngelis does not counter the argument that education is a public good.

The principle of fairness

The principle of fairness requires that those who benefit from a public good contribute to it. Both John Rawls and H. L. A. Hart have discussed the principle of fairness and describe the principle as follows: we ought not to gain from the cooperative labors of others without doing our fair share (Hart 1955, 185; Rawls 1971, section 18, 52; Rawls 1964). Arneson states that cooperation is required when adhering to both the principle of fairness and public goods (1982). Arneson defends the basic idea that we owe a fair return for services rendered to

those who supply the services (Anderson 1982, 633). So, the principle of fairness requires that citizens who benefit from civic education contribute to civic education. Consequently, the following section emphasizes that citizens benefit from civic education.

Benefits to society

Civic education encourages the societal competences of students, which is in the interest of the students and for society at large. These competences contribute to individual development, increasing chances for the labour market and enhancing participation in society (Lochner 2011, 61). Research shows that civic education has a positive impact on students when it comes to values of citizenship, political participation and democracy. Much political science research underlines a strong correlation between education and political participation, voting and civic awareness (Galston 2004, 265; Nie et al 1996; Hunter and Brisbin 2000). Furthermore, benefits of civic education can be extended to society in general. These societal benefits of education in general contribute to economic prosperity and wellbeing of a country in the sense that social participation, societal trust or political participation increases (Dijkstra 2012; Van de Werfhorst et al. 2015; Ten Dam et al. 2016). Consequently, civic education benefits both to students and to society in general because it strengthens democracy.

In sum, this section defends that civic education is a public good. Subsequently, the principle of fairness requires that those who benefit from the good should contribute to it. Therefore, since society benefits from civic education, all citizens should contribute to civic education.

Liberal objection

The following section describes a concern on the motivation to contribute to civic education by raising a liberal objection. Consequently, a policy or law is only possible providing that it is justified. Subsequently, the rest of this thesis provides justification that mandating a teaching service protects the liberty of citizens in a society.

The critique that could be raised by liberals is: why would individuals be willing to contribute to civic education? Liberals agree on the Fundamental Liberal Principle, which entails that freedom is normatively fundamental and therefore the onus of justification is on those who would use coercion to limit freedom (Locke 1960 [1689], 287; Mill 1963, 262; Feinberg 1984, 9; Rawls 2001, 44). Consequently, political authority and law must be justified, as they limit the freedom of citizens. A central question to liberals is whether political authority can be justified, and if so, how (Gaus et al. 2018, 1). Although the liberal thought starts with a state of nature in which humans are free and equal, any limitation of this freedom and equality is justified differently by diverse liberal streams. For example, classical liberals agree on the fundamental importance of private property to a free society. However, within this tradition a spectrum of views is present (Gaus et al. 2018, 2.1). Towards the extreme ‘libertarian’ end of the classical liberal spectrum, taxation, for example, is considered legitimate if necessary and sufficient for effective protection of liberty and property (Gaus et al. 2018, 2.1). More to the left side of the spectrum there are classical liberal views that allow taxation for public education in particular, and more generally for public goods and social infrastructure (Gaus et al. 2018, 2.1). Another example within the liberal tradition that recently has resurfaced is republican liberty. That is to say a person is free when not being subject to the arbitrary power of another (Pettit 1996, 576). The ideal liberty-protecting government, then, ensures that no agent has arbitrary power over any other citizen (Pettit 1997, 67). On the republican view of liberty, public laws or policy interventions need not always count as reductions in freedom. Provided that law or policy is adopted and implemented in an appropriately non-arbitrary manner, the citizens’ freedom remains untouched (Lovett 2018, 3.2). The second argument in favor of a teaching service, as presented later in this thesis, will stem from the republican political perspective and will be discussed more comprehensively. To return to the subject, referring to the Fundamental Liberal Principle, liberals emphasize that the burden of proof is supposed to be with those who are against liberty.

As argued earlier, all citizens should contribute to civic education. However, since mandating a teaching service seriously impacts the citizen's freedom, liberals could object the requirement to contribute to civic education. Furthermore, considering the liberal objection means that all government intervening (public laws or policy interventions such as a teaching service) is considered legitimate if it can be justified to secure the freedom of citizens. Therefore, the rest of the thesis defends that it is justified that governments mandate a teaching service to live in freedom in democratic societies. The second argument in favor of a teaching service, regarding the republican political tradition, responds particularly to this liberal objection.

Contribution via teaching

As previously stated, we all benefit from civic education. The principle of fairness therefore requires that we should contribute to it. The following section considers an active contribution via a teaching service and opposes this to contribution via taxation. Intuitively, taxation is a way of contribution that seems to fit the liberal tradition better since it is less imposing on someone's freedom. However, the following section defends contribution to civic education via a teaching service as more valuable than contribution via taxation.

Taxation

Taxation primarily seems to be most efficient manner to secure public goods (Buchanan 1968; Clarke 1971). In order to prevent individuals from free riding, the costs for a public good need to be shared. In the academic literature considerable attention is devoted to efficiencies of taxation to fund public goods (Ostrom and Ostrom 1977; Bergstrom et al. 1985; Atkinson and Stern 1974; Boadway and Keen 1993). The free rider problem can be eliminated if all members of society are forced to pay for the service indirectly through taxes. For example Stiglitz argues that in order to eliminate the free rider problem, the provision must be supported by compulsory taxation (Stiglitz 1999, 320). In this view, organization of collective consumption, arrangements must be made for taxes. Authority to levy taxes or assessments is necessary to avert holdouts and

to supply funds for jointly used goods or services (Ostrom and Ostrom 1977, 12). Primarily, it seems that taxation is more efficient than actively contributing to public goods. Imagine for example, someone who helps building roads instead of using taxation to contribute to the public good of streets. Consequently, due to his active contribution, the person is limited in his freedom to do other things he prefers.

The example of the person who contributes by building roads primarily seems to underline the need for taxation. Especially when thinking from a liberal perspective to impose as less a person's freedom. As argued earlier, classical liberals consider taxation legitimate. Taxation is for example considered legitimate – from a more conservative strand – if necessary and sufficient for effective protection of liberty. From a less conservative strand, taxation is likewise allowed, even if used for public education. However, specifically within the case of civic education, taxation offers a negative aspect. Therefore, the following part is devoted to demonstrate a negative effect for civic education that taxation brings forth. In other words: taxation might be, from a liberal perspective, a legitimate way to contribute to civic education. However, the negative aspect of taxation therefore distinguishes between the example of someone that contributes by building roads and someone that contributes to civic education by means of a teaching service.

A disadvantage of taxation is that it does not tell the contributor what public good one is supporting, which in turn eliminates any involvement with a specific public good. This lack of involvement forms for a lot of public goods no immediate issue. However, due to the nature of civic education there is a purpose in contributing to civic education. The purpose is that contributing to civic education is contributing to structure society. In order to support the suggestion that contributing to civic education makes sense two academic perspectives will be discussed. The two views will emphasize that active contribution is more valuable than that taxation to contribute to civic education.

Theory of coproduction

First, the theory of coproduction emphasizes that participation enhances the quality of goods. Marschall states that without active citizen involvement the capacity of government to provide public goods and services is severely compromised (2004, 232). Marschall examines citizen participation in the neighborhood context and states that governments need active citizen participation to provide public goods and services (2004, 232). This theory of coproduction helps to formulate the role of citizen involvement in the provision of local public goods and the ways in which institutional arrangements foster this participation. According to Marschall the concept of citizen participation is a combination of political participation and citizen action (2004). First, political participation can be defined as: “an activity that has the intent or effect of influencing government action – either directly by affecting the making or the implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people who make those policies” (Verba et al. 1995, 38). Second, citizen action associated with the provision of local public goods often requires ongoing involvement and activities that assist governmental efforts. Therefore, coproduction depends on both the voluntary actions of citizens and the existence of meaningful opportunities and arrangements for their participation (2004, 232).

In a teaching service citizens are mandated to actively contribute to civic education, that is, citizens participate in the good of civic education. Consequently, the theory of coproduction also applies to civic education. When democratic governments mandate a teaching service, the result is that every citizen is participating. The theory of coproduction emphasizes that the actual action of citizens associated with producing a good, enhances that good. Specifically the association with producing a good is a characteristic that is missing when taxation is used to contribute to civic education. Therefore, when citizens participate in a teaching service (contribute to civic education), then the quality of civic education is enhanced.

Public good experiments

Second, public good experiments are a well-known method of research used by economists, political scientists, psychologists, sociologists and others who wondered how individuals resolve conflicting motivations. Many have investigated the tension between self-interest and efficiency by experimentally examining behavior when individual interest and group interest conflict. Public good experiments show contributions to a public good, where those contributions are not the same as paying taxes. The literature on empirical public good experiments discusses different ways of voluntary contributions to a public good (Andreoni 1988; Chaudhuri and Paichayontvijit 2006; Keser & Van Winden 2000). These experiments show the practical effects of the concept of free riding. A typical public good experiment consists of subjects who are organized into different groups. Each subject is endowed with tokens and is asked to spend these tokens between a public and a private account. Investing a token in the public good has a lower return than investing in a private good. Hence, the most efficient conditions are only met when all subjects invest all tokens in the public good. However, since the individual return from the private goods exceeds the revenues from the public good, the rationale is to free ride (Andreoni 1988, 292-293; Bardsley and Sausgruber 2005, 667). Furthermore, public good experiments show that a majority of subjects in these experiments are “conditional cooperators”. Researchers define conditional cooperators in terms of subjects that tend to contribute more to a public good the more the others contribute (Bardsley 2000, Fischbacher et al. 2001; Keser & Van Winden 2000). This pattern, known as crowding-in, is a replicated result in public good experiments and means that contributions of other members of a subject’s group exert a strong impact on their personal contribution (Bardsley and Sausgruber 2005, 672).

These experiments can be illustrated in the case of education as follows. Imagine a class of children that need civic education. Due to a teacher shortage there is not enough capacity to educate this class with civic lessons. The most efficient conditions for civic education are met when all parents contribute to secure the

civic education of all children in the class. The public good experiments show that individual return on investment exceeds investing in the public good. In the case of education this results in parents who are more willing to invest time in the education of their own children, than putting effort in the public good of civic education (the complete class). Put differently, when not every parent wants to spend time educating all children in the class, they eventually end up spending their spare time solely to help in the education of their own child which is a suboptimal outcome.

In a teaching service, citizens are mandated to actively contribute to civic education. In public good experiments contributions to a public good are shown. These experiments investigate individuals' conflicting motivations to contribute, where those contributions are not the same as taxation. Consequently, the public good experiments apply to describe the most efficient conditions in the public good of civic education. Referring the public good experiments, the optimum outcome would be when all citizens contribute to civic education. If democratic governments mandate a teaching service, then all citizens contribute to civic education. Therefore, a teaching service results in the most efficient conditions for the public good of education.

In sum, the two academic examples emphasize there is enough reason to believe that active participation forms an added value and thereby is preferable over taxation in the case of civic education. The theory of coproduction illustrates that a teaching service enhances the quality of civic education. Furthermore, public good experiments highlight that the most efficient conditions for civic education are met when all citizens contribute.

Conclusion

This section defends a teaching service based on the comparison between civic education and a public good. There have been established the following three things: first, the principle of fairness requires that all citizens should contribute to produce the public good of civic education. In the second paragraph, the liberal objection was raised. The objection acknowledges that a teaching service

imposes restrictions towards someone's freedom. Therefore, the second argument in this thesis will show that mandating a teaching service protects a citizen's freedom. Consequently, the third paragraph establishes that contribution to civic education via a teaching service is preferable over contribution via taxation. The pitfall of taxation is the absence of any involvement with a specific public good. Furthermore, two academic perspectives highlight that specifically in the case of civic education active contribution is preferable over taxation. First, active contribution enhances the quality of the good and second, the most efficient conditions are met when all citizens contribute.

Civic duties

The previous section defends a teaching service by arguing that civic education is a public good. Additionally, the following section defends a teaching service by arguing that contribution to civic education is a civic duty. This section starts with introducing the concept of civic virtue as originated in the republican political tradition. Within this tradition, the concept of liberty distinguishes between different strands. Subsequently, the classical republican strand and the contemporary civic strand will be discussed. The republican tradition justifies that democratic societies are morally required to mandate a teaching service to secure a citizen's freedom.

A teaching service mandates every citizen to contribute to civic education for a certain period of time. It is with this service that citizens who have taken a position in society, go back to school and educate or share their position and contributions to society with students. The aim of the teaching service is to offer a civic education for students by transmitting civic virtues. The concept of virtue refers to a particular role that a person may occupy – namely, the role of a citizen. The importance of civic virtue is most salient in the political tradition of republicanism. While there are different strands within republican tradition, for republicans, the citizen is in general someone who rules and is ruled in turn (Maynor 2003). The political tradition of republicanism puts emphasis on the

value of liberty. Moreover, it is the concept of liberty that marks a contrast between two related, yet distinct versions of republicanism (Maynor 2003, 10). In order to make the argument for a teaching service based on a civic duty, elements from both strands in the political tradition are required.

Classical republicans

The classical republican strand defends a teaching service by arguing for the civic duty one has to participate in a political community. Consequently, this argument responds to the suggestion that participation in civic education (via a teaching service) is more valuable than taxation. Moreover, this argument further eliminates the free rider problem, which was discussed in the first part of the thesis.

The classical type of republicanism inspired by Aristotle and civic humanism, which holds that individuals are social or political animals “whose essential nature is most fully realized in a democratic society in which there is widespread and vigorous participation in political life” (Rawls 1996, 206). This classical republicanism maintains that political participation is an intrinsic good in a certain version of human flourishing. This stand of thought is often associated with communitarianism and is written on by writers such as Arendt (1958) and MacIntyre (1981). In this classical version of republicanism democratic participation was fostered by a rich sense of civic virtue and strong versions of citizenship (Maynor 2003, 10). Central to this version is the emphasis placed on the formation of a certain ideal type or character that is highly skilled in the arts of democratic self-government. In this classical republicanism, the virtuous citizen must be free, not simply free to go his or her own way, instead, the citizen is free when he or she participates in the government of his or her community. Because as part of the community, the citizen will recognize that the government of common affairs is more or less directly self-government (Dagger 1997, 15).

In sum, the classical republican strand emphasizes that a citizen is free when he or she participates in the political community. Considering a civic duty from the

classical republican strand implies that a citizen should participate in the politics of his or her community. Mandating a teaching service implies that citizens participate in civic education. As argued before, civic education aims to structure society and is about transmitting civic virtues that are necessary for democracy. Previously has been made the point that civic education aims to develop students with knowledge that helps to realize the student how democracy works. Since democracy is based on the idea that citizens elect their representatives. The student learns that participation in the political community is more or less directly self-government. Therefore, participation in civic education may be compared to participation in the political community. Consequently, it is fair to say that there is no difference between citizens that participate in a teaching service and citizens that participate in the political community. Therefore, a teaching service implies the protection of citizen's freedom. Moreover, as argued in the section on public goods, contributing to civic education ensures elimination of the free rider problem. Thus, considered from the classical republican strand, democratic governments are morally required to mandate a teaching service in order that citizens are free and to further eliminate the free rider problem.

Contemporary civic republicans

The contemporary civic republican strand provides a slightly other argument to defend a teaching service. From a contemporary civic republican perspective the comparison between civic virtues and non-domination is emphasized. Considering a civic duty from this contemporary perspective implies to contribute to the production of the good in order to dispense with domination by those who produce it. As it turns out, this argument also further eliminates the free rider problem.

The following part argues that we have a duty towards others to contribute to goods, in order to ensure that the production of the good is not vulnerable to objectionable domination. For contemporary civic republicans, the question is not necessarily the quantity of liberty, but rather the quality of liberty and how

the powers of non-domination form a system of freedom that allows them to pursue their chosen choices free from arbitrary interference (Maynor 2003, 59). Critics of classical republicanism often fear that civic virtue implies extensive self-sacrifice and frugality, a renunciation of individuality and self-identification with the community. Contrary to this classical republicanism are versions of republicanism that are discussed by many theorists in contemporary debates. Central to the contemporary civic republican program is the conception of political liberty as non-domination or independence from arbitrary power (Lovett 2018, 1).

Pettit has written a lot on the concept of non-domination and states that a person or group enjoys freedom to the extent that no other person or group has “the capacity to interfere in their affairs on an arbitrary basis” (1999, 165). On a plausible rendering of the term ‘domination’ is referred to arbitrary or uncontrolled power. This arbitrary power can be understood as a sort of structural relationship that exists between persons or groups, rather than as a contingent outcome (Lovett 2018, 1.2). The civic republicanism conception of political liberty aims to capture this insight of structural relations. These structural relations can for example be found in laws, institutions, and norms. In many respects, civic republicanism remains a still underdeveloped political doctrine. Among other things the following subjects are topics in the dynamic and growing field of civic republicanism: intergenerational justice, education policy and multiculturalism. An elaboration of the following classic example illustrates the concept of domination. The relation between the good master and the slave exemplifies that the effects of domination in certain cases does not outweighs the structure of their relation. So, the structure wherein the master dominates matters more than the contingent fact of the master’s good or bad disposition. Regardless the master’s good or bad tendencies, the relation between him and his slave imply a hierarchical order (Gauss and D’Agostino 2012, 257). Another example of a society characterized by domination is that one master may die while domination stays present in the social structures. This example underlines the structural relations that might be present between persons or groups, or generations, that impose restrictions to other people’s

freedom. Thus, civic republicanism aims to promote freedom, understood as independence from arbitrary power.

According to contemporary civic republicans, civic virtues are instrumental goods, which need to be cultivated in individuals by the republican state. Civic virtues are instrumental in nature because they enforce citizens to be conscious about structures of domination. The contemporary civic republicanism tradition states that certain civic virtues will be cultivated in individuals by the republican state, such as the ability to reflect critically on their own actions and how the expression of these actions might interfere arbitrarily with others (Maynor 2003, 56). The thought is that being a good citizen helps individuals to fulfill their obligations to social justice, which in turn brings about a more complete system of liberty based on the ideal of non-domination. Instrumental goods like civic virtue and citizenship, together with properly constituted laws and institutions, are components of republican citizens' freedom and represent the realization of non-domination in their lives. In other words, republican versions of citizenship promote the necessary substantive virtues that help individuals not to dominate others, which means that they must learn to account for and track the interests of their fellow citizens so that they can respond appropriately to their demands without dominating them (Maynor 2003, 85).

With help of the research of Harb the following part establishes why the state has to inculcate these civic virtues. Harb demonstrates that there is a call on those who benefit from the good to contribute to the good in order to avoid domination of the small group that produces the good (2020). This supports the argument that we have a duty towards others to contribute to civic education in order to avoid domination. In her article Harb expresses a concern on the potential discrepancy between those who benefit from and those who contribute to a public good (Harb, 2020, 1). This concern is discussed in the debate of English as a global lingua franca and thereby seen as a global public good. Harb: "the absence or the limited contribution of some might render the provision of the good unsustainable. The availability of free riding as an option may reduce

the number of contributors, thereby standing in the way of reaching the critical number needed to produce and maintain the good” (2020, 1-2).

The above-mentioned argument establishes a relation between republicanism and free riding. Harb argues that if mandatory goods, such as education, are goods that everyone should have access to as a matter of justice, then a corollary is that everyone has a duty to contribute to making that good available to others (2020, 18). The fact that civic education is a mandatory good does not only mean that everyone ought to have access to civic education but also means that everyone has a duty to contribute to its production. The duty is meant to ensure that a particular outcome comes about, not that the duty bearers take up the cost. If the public good of civic education is left open to a small group of contributors, it seems that those contributors are in the position to dominate the ones who do not contribute. The duty to contribute to the good is to ensure that the production of the mandatory good is not vulnerable to objectionable domination.

Therefore, the link between a teaching service and contributing to civic education can be explained as follows. The call on society to contribute to civic education is important because the option to free ride may reduce the amount of contributors to civic education, thereby standing in the way of reaching a critical number needed to produce the good. Therefore, the duty to participate in a teaching service is to ensure that the production of civic education is not vulnerable to domination.

Conclusion

This section defends a teaching service by arguing that contribution to civic education is a civic duty. Contribution is a civic duty because it is a means to be a free citizen in a society. Furthermore, contribution to civic education is structuring society and eliminating domination of those who produce civic education. To come to this conclusion, two strands within republican political tradition emphasize the civic duty to contribute to civic education by means of a teaching service. The classical republican strand highlights the instrumental

value of a civic duty. Namely, that contribution to civic education secures the freedom of a citizen. The contemporary civic strand highlights the instrumental value of a civic duty as a means to contribute to civic education, as we otherwise may be open to domination by those who produce the good. Therefore, this argument also further eliminates the free rider problem. In sum, this section upholds that in order to secure citizen's freedom in a democratic society, citizens have a duty to participate in a teaching service. Hence, democratic governments should mandate a teaching service as a means to protect a citizen's freedom in society.

Objections to a teaching service

Thus far, this thesis only responds to a liberal objection for a teaching service. To ensure a better understanding of a teaching service, the following section considers two other criticisms. The first has to do with a concern on the acquiring of civic virtues. If we care about developing civic virtues, is education the only scheme by which civic virtues can be advanced. The second asks how the quality of teaching in the service can be secured.

A military service

Assuming that we care about civic virtues, is the educational system the only strategy to develop them? Or could it also be possible to develop civic virtues through other schemes? The following section discusses whether the military could also fulfill a function to develop citizens with civic virtues. However, the virtues that are developed through a military service appear to differ substantially, so that the military scheme seems to be inappropriate to develop civic virtues.

There seems to be an interesting similarity between a military education and a civic education. As discussed in the core of this thesis, we need to contribute to civic education and civic education is a means to live as a free citizen in society. The development of civic virtues, which proceeds in civic education, seems also

to be present in a military education. This claim is supported by Cohen who argues that the military service can take the role as an inculcator of civic virtue and as a means of civic education (Cohen 2019, 19). Statesmen and educators have seen military service as instrumental not only of protecting the community, but of fostering its moral strength (Cohen 2019, 33). Initially, the military forms an institution to protect the public good of national security. Subsequently, military organizations must inculcate virtues such as loyalty, self-sacrifice, and obedience to duly constituted authority. Consequently, the role of peacetime military service functions as an inculcator of civic virtue and as a means of civic education (Cohen 2019; 19). There is much literature that suggests that those who went through the military came away with surprising approbation for its good qualities and tolerance of its bad. Many Americans believe that military service fosters habits of discipline, self-sacrifice and collective action, which are vital to the collective health of a free society (Cohen 2019, 35). Olsthoorn emphasizes that in military ethics military virtues are now more in the spotlight than they used to be (2010, 4).

Although developing civic virtues exists in the military service, the virtues that are developed in civic education differ significant from the military. Military service means participation in a total institution, where every minute of the individual's waking hours and every facet of his/her behavior are controlled. This total institution differs greatly from living in a liberal democratic society. Society is a place where diversity of dress and behavior is tolerated, while in the armed forces there must be uniformity of both. Another difference is that society prohibits violence and killing, while a military organization must prepare men and women for war. Lastly, free societies tell their members that one citizen is equal of any other, however the military must insist on rank, order and deference.

A teaching service is uniquely placed to advance certain virtues in order to live in freedom in a democratic society. The second argument in favor of a teaching service emphasizes that a classical republican strand highlights the duty to contribute to government in order to be free. Furthermore, the civic republican

strand advocated a teaching service because contribution to the public good of civic education eliminates any domination of those who produce the good. As established in this section, some of the most important virtues in the military, such as recognizing authority and being obedient to authority, contrast the values that are developed in a teaching service. Granting that a teaching service develops citizens with virtues that ensure non-domination and secures the valuable situation that citizens can live in a democratic society. Consequently, the military service seems to be an inadequate scheme to develop civic virtues. Moreover, due to its uniquely function to develop citizens with virtues that enables them to live in non-domination in a democratic society, the requirement of a teaching service might possibly be necessary in a democratic society.

Concerns on the quality of teaching

A serious weakness of requiring a teaching service is how to ensure the quality of teachers. A teaching service implies that every citizen contributes to civic education. Although there will be exceptions for citizens who are for example physically or mentally not able to perform in a teaching service, there will be - from all levels of society- citizens that provide some sort of civic education for students. Before criticizing the quality of teaching in a teaching service, we first need to have a discussion in what are the qualities that matter with professionally trained teachers. This section is set up as follows: first, establishing important qualities of professional teachers. Second, defending that some loss in quality can be compensated by gains in other aspects that are central to civic education. Consequently, arguing for the importance of diversity and social cohesion.

Professional teachers often go to a lot of training and need to provide high standards. Academic literature renders some of these standards for professional teachers (Serafini 2002; Mulcahy 2011). First, teachers are committed to students and their learning. Second, teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects. Third, teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning. Fourth, teachers think systematically about their

practice and learn from experience. Fifth, teachers are members of learning communities (Serafini 2002, 317). An Australian report supports this claim and presents the following requirements: professional knowledge, professional practice and professional engagement (Mulcahy 2011, 97).

A decrease in the quality of teaching can have detrimental impacts. However, as will be argued teachers from a teaching service are engaged particularly in civic education. Consequently, a loss in the quality of teaching in civic education can be compensated. Teach For All is a project particularly in the US and UK where teachers are educated and certified via alternative routes, and are now an established part of the teacher education landscape (McConney et al. 2012). TFA schemes are known for short (5- to 6-week) periods of intensive initial training, and subsequent on-the-job mentoring and/or support during which candidates have full responsibility for their students (McConney et al. 2012, iv). However, literature on the TFA scheme raises concerns on the quality of teaching on teachers who did the TFA training (McConney et al. 2012). Although this concern is valid for teachers from the TFA program, this critique does hold to a less extent for a teaching service.

The comparison between a teaching service and the TFA program is the fact that both teachers did not receive a full teacher education. However, a distinction can be made on the subject that is addressed in their lessons. Teachers from the TFA program provide education in any subject, while teachers in a teaching service are particularly concerned with the civic education of students. Furthermore, this thesis does not argue for a teaching service in order to replace professional teachers. This difference in subject of education makes sure that some loss in quality can be 'compensated' by gains in other aspects that are central in civic education. Therefore, the following section defends the importance of diversity and social cohesion for society. Two values that respectively benefit students and society in general.

Diversity

Several contemporary philosophers discuss the lack of diversity in education (Gurin et al. 2004; Valentín 2006). They argue for the relatively demanding role that society should take in the education of its children, because they will grow up to be democratic citizens (Gutmann 1987). Gutmann argues that social diversity enriches our lives by expanding our understanding of differing ways of life: “to reap the benefits of social diversity, children must be exposed to ways of life different from their parents and must embrace certain values, such as mutual respect among persons” (1987, 32-33). Furthermore, these different background characteristics may have a differential impact on the education of students. Nieto underlines this claim, writing on the sociopolitical context of multicultural education (1994). Her work challenges educators to make multicultural education a force for social justice in our society. Moreover, many studies hypothesized that participation in a multicultural program would help students learn sentiments and skills that will be needed in a plural democracy (Gurin et al 2004; Valentín 2006; Banks 2015). These studies provide examination of the potential impact, and promise, of diversity experiences through curricular and co-curricular activities for democratic citizenship.

A teaching service assures that different occupations, social statuses and different cultural backgrounds are included in the civic education of students. That is, because all citizens are required to contribute to civic education via a teaching service. Therefore, a possible loss in quality of teaching in civic education can be compensated by the gains that diversity brings about.

Social cohesion

In academic literature there have been concerns for the decrease of social cohesion (Murphy 2012, 8; Goff 2004). An example of this decrease is mentioned: the individualization of society, the increasing polarization and hardening of the social climate (Munniksmá et al 2017, 10). Another example of a decrease in social cohesion is the generational gap (Bengston and Oyama 2007). The generational gap can be explained as the perceived distance between

generations that has therefore led to an interest in intergenerational practice. Intergenerational practice can be explained to secure interference between generations. Historically, intergenerational learning took place within the family and ensured a “systematic transfer of knowledge, skills, competencies, norms and values between generations [...]” (Hoff 2007). However, the shift from an industrial to a knowledge society has resulted in differences in experiences of life between younger and older people (Murphy 2012, 8). The explosion of changes for example in the way we communicate together with increased mobility has resulted in a perceived disconnection between generations. Evidence from studies of age segregations in society emphasize the potential for expanding intergenerational projects that encourage participation to transfer knowledge and skills and highlight the potential for increased community tolerance, harmony and participation (Murphy 2012, 183; Goff 2004).

A teaching service ensures the transfer of knowledge and skills between generations. One of the features of a teaching service is that everyone, at any age, can decide to serve in the teaching service. Consequently, all different ages are engaged with civic education. A benefit for society that stems from a teaching service is the transfer of knowledge of those civic virtues that are important for increasing social cohesion within society. Consequently, a teaching service can function as an intergenerational project and thereby contribute to social cohesion. Therefore, a possible loss in quality of teaching in civic education can be compensated by the gains that social cohesion brings about. In sum, the concerns on the quality of teaching are compensated by arguing for the positive effects of a teaching service for diversity and social cohesion.

Conclusion

This thesis advocates a mandatory teaching service for democratic societies. A teaching service is a way to contribute to civic education. I show how an emphasis on reforming the institution of teaching could benefit society in general.

A reform in the institution of teaching for civic education has been supported with two arguments. The first argument establishes a teaching service by defending civic education as a public good. The principle of fairness requires that all citizens should contribute to civic education, which is a public good from which all citizens benefit. Furthermore, I realize that mandating a teaching service alters the idea of liberals that aim for little government involvement in every day life. I noted criticisms that stem from a liberal perspective on the motivation to participate in a teaching service. Consequently, establishing that in accordance with the liberal tradition, any governmental mandate, such as a teaching service, needs to be justified by protecting a citizen's freedom. Subsequently the rest of the thesis was concerned with justifying a teaching service in order to protect the freedom of citizens. The end of this first section focuses on how to contribute to public goods. Two academic theories indicate that active participation in civic education is more valuable than taxation. Active contribution via a teaching service seems to be preferable because it enhances the quality of civic education.

The second argument establishes that we have a civic duty to actively contribute to civic education. The republican tradition -both the classical strand and the contemporary civic strand- highlights this civic duty. Civic duties are instrumental in nature: we need to acquire civic virtues as a means to be a free citizen in a democratic society. Therefore this argument, stemming from a classical republican political tradition, responds to the liberal objection and justifies that democratic governments are morally required to mandate a teaching service. Moreover, the contemporary civic republicans emphasize that goods required by justice ought to be produced co-operatively to protect beneficiaries from domination by producers. I acknowledge civic education to be a good required by justice and therefore all citizens have a duty to set up a cooperative scheme to produce civic education. Hence, democratic governments should mandate a teaching service.

In sum, I have carefully considered two arguments in a body of scholarship critical of any government involvement. Furthermore, going beyond the

superficial objections on the precise scheme to develop civic virtues and on the quality of teaching, the liberal argument still fails to undermine the moral requirements for democratic governments to mandate a teaching service. A limitation of this research however, is the assumption that a good society does not come organically. This thesis therefore, relies to a certain extent both on virtue-ethics and on duty-based ethics. In other words, within this domain of moral theories virtue ethics guide and assess what kind of person we are and should be. Furthermore, duty-based ethics guide and assess our choices of what we ought to do. Therefore, this thesis emphasizes on the one hand that we should be persons that develop civic virtues and contribute to public goods and on the other hand that we ought to contribute to society, based on a duty. Another ethical framework to defend this thesis would to argue from the moral theory of consequentialism. This theory embodies that an act is morally right only when depending on the consequences of that act or of something related to that act, such as the motive behind the act. However, I believe that consequences cannot be known and moreover, immense political philosophical debate on the 'good society' demonstrates the absence of any unambiguous definition of this concept. Therefore, I believe that all citizens have a duty to develop civic virtues to be able to live in a democratic society, even more to structure the good society.

Further research on improving civic education, needs to examine more closely the objections of liberals on a teaching service. How and in what way is it possible to establish the curriculum of civic education? I mean to challenge liberals to demonstrate how the aspect of non-domination can be secured in a democratic society, one that is identified with profound discussions on racism and discrimination. How to develop civic virtues that prepare citizens to live in a society that convincingly considers diversity and inclusivity? Notwithstanding these limitations, the main point was to illustrate that the civic education of students is something that applies to all citizens in a democratic society. Put differently: even if one disagrees with the assumption that a good society does not come about organically and disagrees with too much government

involvement, I still defend that democratic governments are morally required to mandate a teaching service.

Literature

Andreoni, J. (1988). Why free ride? Strategies and learning in public goods experiments. *Journal of public Economics*, 37(3), 291-304.

Arendt, Hannah, 1958. *The Human Condition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Atkinson, A.B., Stern, N., 1974. Pigou, taxation and public goods. *Review of Economic Studies* 41, 119–128.

Banks, J. A. (2015). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching*. Routledge.

Baehr, J. (2013). Educating for intellectual virtues: From theory to practice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 47(2), 248-262.

Bardsley, N., & Sausgruber, R. (2005). Conformity and reciprocity in public good provision. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 26(5), 664-681.

Bengtson, V. L., and Oyama, P. S. (2007). *Intergenerational solidarity: Strengthening economic and social ties*. New York: United Nations Headquarters.

Bergstrom, T., Varian, H. R., & Blume, L. (1986). On the private provision of public goods. *Journal of Public Economics*, 29, 25-49.

Boadway, R., Keen, M., 1993. Public goods, self-selection and optimal income taxation. *International Economic Review* 34, 463–478.

Buchanan, J. M. (1968). *The demand and supply of public goods* 5. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Callan, E. (1997). *Creating Citizens: Political Education and Liberal Democracy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chaudhuri, A., & Paichayontvijit, T. (2006). Conditional cooperation and voluntary contributions to a public good. *Economics Bulletin* 3(8), 1-14.

Clarke, E. H. (1971). Multipart pricing of public goods. *Public choice*, 17-33.

Cohen, E. A. (2019). *Citizens and soldiers: The dilemmas of military service*. Cornell University Press.

Crittenden, J. and Levine, P. (2018). Civic Education. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/civic-education/> retrieved on April 13, 2020.

Dagger, R. (1997). *Civic Virtues: Rights, Citizenship, and Republican Liberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dam, G. ten, Dijkstra, A.B., & Janmaat, G. (2016). De maatschappelijke opdracht van de school: burgerschapsonderwijs in ontwikkeling. In: B. Eidhof, M. Van Houtte & M. Vermeulen (Red.), *Sociologen over onderwijs. Inzichten, praktijken en kritieken*. Antwerpen- Apeldoorn: Garant.

Dijkstra, A.B. (2012). *Sociale opbrengsten van onderwijs*. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UvA.

Dudley, R.L., and Gitelson, A. R. (2002). Political Literacy, Civic Education, and Civic Engagement: A Return to Political Socialization?. *Applied Developmental Science* 6 (4), 175–182.

Feinberg, J. (1984). *Harm to Others*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fischbacher, U., Gächter, S., & Fehr, E. (2001). Are people conditionally cooperative? Evidence from a public goods experiment. *Economics letters* 71(3), 397-404.

Frímansson H. (2001). Civic education and the Good. *Studies in philosophy and Education* 20 (4), 303-315.

Galston, W. A. (2004). Civic education and political participation. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 37(2), 263-266.

Galston, W. A. (2007). Civic knowledge, civic education, and civic engagement: A summary of recent research. *International Journal of Public Administration* 30(6-7), 623-642.

Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual review of political science* 4(1), 217-234.

Gaus, G., Courtland, S. D. and Schmidtz, D. (2018). Liberalism. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/liberalism/> retrieved on June 24, 2020.

Gaus, G. F., and D'Agostino, F. (Eds.). (2012). *The Routledge companion to social and political philosophy*. Routledge.

Goff, K. (2004) "Senior to senior: living lessons". *Educational Gerontology* 30, 205-217.

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). The benefits of diversity in education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of social issues* 60(1), 17-34.

Gutmann, A., 1987, *Democratic Education*, Princeton University Press.

Hamachek, D. (1999). Effective teachers: What they do, how they do it, and the importance of self-knowledge. In R. P. Lipka, & T. M. Brinthaupt (eds.), *The role of self in teacher development*. State University of New York Press.

Harb, S. (2020). On the Permissibility of Free-Riding on the Global Lingua Franca. As forthcoming in: *Res Publica*.

Hart, H. L. A. (1955). Are there any natural rights?. *The Philosophical Review* 64(2), 175-191.

Hunter, S., & Brisbin, R. A. (2000). The impact of service learning on democratic and civic values. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33(3), 623-626.

Hussain, W. (2018) The Common Good. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/common-good/> retrieved on June 18, 2020.

Keser, C., & Van Winden, F. (2000). Conditional cooperation and voluntary contributions to public goods. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 102(1), 23-39.

Lochner, L. (2011). Non-production benefits of education: Crime, health, and good citizenship. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Locke, J. (1960 [1689]). *The Second Treatise of Government in Two Treatises of Government*. P. Laslett (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 283–446.

Lovett, F., Republicanism (2018). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/republicanism/> retrieved on May 12, 2020.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theology*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Mann, S., and Patrick, J. J. (2000). Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices. ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education and public good. *Higher education quarterly* 65(4), 411-433.

Marschall, M. J. (2004). Citizen participation and the neighborhood context: A new look at the coproduction of local public goods. *Political Research Quarterly* 57(2), 231-244.

Maynor, J. W. (2003). *Republicanism in the modern world*. Policy Press.

McConney, A., Woods-McConney, A., & Price, A. (2012). Fast track teacher education: A review of the research literature on Teach For All schemes.

Mill, J. S. (1963). *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*. J. M. Robson (ed.), Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Moore, J. (2012). A challenge for social studies educators: Increasing civility in schools and society by modeling civic virtues. *The Social Studies* 103(4), 140-148.

Mulcahy, D. (2011). Assembling the 'accomplished' teacher: The performativity and politics of professional teaching standards. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 43, 94-113.

Munnikma, A., Dijkstra, A.B., Veen, I. van der, Ledoux, G., Werfhorst, H. van de, & Dam, G. ten (2017). *Burgerschap in het voortgezet onderwijs. Nederland in vergelijkend perspectief*. Amsterdam University Press.

Murphy, C. (2012). Transferring knowledge and life experience between generations: The potential of community based intergenerational projects. Technological university Dublin.

Nie, N. H., Junn, J., & Stehlik-Barry, K. (1996). Education and democratic citizenship in America. University of Chicago Press.

Nieto, S. (1994). Affirming diversity: the sociopolitical context of multicultural education. *Harvard Educational Review* 64(1), 112–112.

Olsthoorn, P. (2010). Military ethics and virtues: An interdisciplinary approach for the 21st century. Routledge.

Onderwijsinspectie (2019). De staat van het onderwijs 2019. <https://www.onderwijsinspectie.nl/documenten/rapporten/2019/04/10/rapport-de-staat-van-het-onderwijs-2019> retrieved on April 20, 2020.

Ostrom, V., Ostrom, E. (1977). Public Goods and Public Choices. In: D. H. Cole and M. D. McGinnis (eds.) *Elinor Ostrom and the Bloomington School of Political Economy*, 7-49.

Pettit, P. (1996). Freedom as Antipower. *Ethics* 106, 576–604.

Pettit, P. (1997). *Republicanism: A theory of freedom and government*. Clarendon Press.

Pettit, P. (1999). Republican Freedom and Contestatory Democratization. In: I. Shapiro & C. Hacker-Cordon (eds.) *Democracy's Value*. Cambridge University Press, 163-190.

Pusser, B. (2006). Reconsidering higher education and the public good. *Governance and the public good*, 11-28.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Touchstone.

Rawls, J. (1964). Legal Obligation and the Duty of Fair Play, in: S. Hood (ed.) *Law and Philosophy*. New York University Press, 3-18.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press, sections 18 and 52.

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. E. Kelly (ed.), New York: Columbia University Press.

Russell, H. (2013). The Free Rider Problem, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/free-rider/> retrieved on April 30, 2020.

Stiglitz, J. E. (1999). Knowledge as a global public good. *Global public goods* 1(9), 308-326.

Serafini, F. (2002). Possibilities and challenges: The national board for professional teaching standards. *Journal of Teacher Education* 53(4), 316-327.

Valentín, S. (2006). Addressing diversity in teacher education programs. *Education* 127(2), 196-202.

Verba, S., K. Lehman Schlozman and H. E. Brady. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press.

Werfhorst, van de, H., Elffers, L., & Karsten, S. (2015). *Onderwijsstelsels vergeleken: leren, werken en burgerschap*. Amsterdam: Didactief Onderzoek.

White, P. (1996). *Civic virtues and public schooling: educating citizens for a democratic society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

