

---

# Ethical sensitivity and developing global civic engagement in undergraduate honors students

---

Ingrid Schutte



Ethical sensitivity and developing  
global civic engagement in  
undergraduate honors students

Ingrid Schutte

## **Colofon**

Ethical sensitivity and developing global civic engagement in undergraduate honors students

Copyright © 2017 Ingrid Schutte

All rights reserved. No part of this thesis may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any way or by any means without the prior permission of the author, or when applicable, of the publishers of the scientific papers.

Layout and design by Robbert de Vries, [persoonlijkproefschrift.nl](http://persoonlijkproefschrift.nl).

Printed by Ipskamp Printing, [proefschriften.net](http://proefschriften.net).

# Ethical sensitivity and developing global civic engagement in undergraduate honors students

*Ethische sensitiviteit en het bevorderen van betrokken wereldburgerschap  
bij bachelor honors studenten*

(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor  
aan de Universiteit voor Humanistiek te Utrecht  
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus, prof. Dr. G.J.L.M. Lensvelt-Mulders  
ingevolge het besluit van het College voor Promoties  
in het openbaar te verdedigen  
op 14 februari 2018 's middags om 16:15 uur

door

Ingrid Wilhelmina Schutte  
geboren op 30 september 1957, te Enschede

**Promotoren**

Prof. dr. Wiel Veugelers, Universiteit voor Humanistiek

Prof. dr. Kirsi Tirri, University of Helsinki, Finland

**Copromotor**

Dr. Marca Wolfensberger, Hanzehogeschool Groningen en Universiteit Utrecht

**Beoordelingscommissie**

Prof. dr. Maria Rosa Buxarrais, University of Barcelona, Spain

Dr. Yvonne Leeman, Universiteit voor Humanistiek

Prof. dr. Gerty Lensvelt-Mulders, Universiteit voor Humanistiek

Prof. dr. Fritz Oser, University of Fribourg, Switzerland

Prof. dr. Rob van der Vaart, Universiteit Utrecht

# Contents

1. Introduction	9
<i>Problem description and context</i>	
<i>Honors students</i>	
<i>Talent, giftedness and high ability</i>	
<i>High ability and morality</i>	
<i>Ethical sensitivity</i>	
<i>Global citizenship education</i>	
<i>Educating honors students for global citizenship</i>	
<i>Overview of the thesis</i>	
2. The relationship between ethical sensitivity, high ability and gender in higher education students	29
<i>Abstract</i>	
<i>Introduction</i>	
<i>High ability and ethical sensitivity</i>	
<i>Gender and ethical sensitivity</i>	
<i>Methods</i>	
<i>Results</i>	
<i>Conclusions</i>	
<i>Discussion</i>	

3. Effects of an international undergraduate honors course on awareness of global justice	49
<i>Abstract</i>	
<i>Introduction</i>	
<i>From theory to curriculum</i>	
<i>Design</i>	
<i>Results</i>	
<i>Conclusions</i>	
<i>Discussion</i>	
4. Building and implementing a global citizenship course for undergraduate honors students	85
<i>Abstract</i>	
<i>Introduction</i>	
<i>Methodology</i>	
<i>Results</i>	
<i>Conclusions, discussion and limitations</i>	
5. Preparing students for global citizenship: the effects of a Dutch undergraduate honors course	111
<i>Abstract</i>	
<i>Introduction</i>	
<i>Methods</i>	
<i>Results</i>	
<i>Discussion and limitations</i>	

6. Conclusions and discussion	145
<i>Summary of the empirical chapters</i>	
<i>Discussion</i>	
- <i>Limitations</i>	
- <i>Practical implications and further research</i>	
<i>Final conclusions</i>	
<i>Final remarks</i>	
References	165
Summary	181
Nederlandse samenvatting (Summary in Dutch)	193
Dankwoord	205
Curriculum Vitae	211





# Chapter 1

## Introduction

By law, Dutch higher education is obliged to pay attention to the personal development and societal responsibility of students (WHW art. 1.3, paragraph 5). However, attention to moral development and educating students for citizenship is not widespread in higher education. This lack of attention also applies to programs for high-ability or gifted students. Influenced by the perspectives of politicians and the business community, excellence in higher education is often steered by the requirements of the market and knowledge economy (e.g. Persson, 2011).

This thesis aims to contribute empirical knowledge concerning honors education in the moral and civic area by examining the ethical sensitivity (an aspect of moral development) of undergraduate honors students and investigating how education can help prepare these students for a role as engaged global citizens. This article-based thesis consists of four empirical chapters. The first empirical chapter, Chapter 2, details a comparative study about a possible characteristic of honors students in the moral domain, namely ethical sensitivity. The following three chapters, Chapters 3, 4, and 5 concern case studies on development, delivery, and learning outcomes of honors education for global justice citizenship.

### **Problem description and context**

Several authors observe that little attention is paid in higher education to moral and civic education, nor to preparing students to cope with pressing social issues, both in the Netherlands (Aben & Rutgers, 2009; Keestra, 2007) and in the USA (Gibson, 2012). In the USA, 17 research universities want to change this practice and collectively “better reflect the original purpose of higher education: to serve as civically engaged and active leader in preserving, promoting and educating for a democratic society” (Gibson, 2012, p.238). At Dutch research universities, there is also little focus given to preparing students to address pressing social issues (Aben & Rutgers, 2009)

or to educate them for citizenship (Keestra, 2007). At Dutch universities of applied sciences the focus is on visible behavior (the demonstration of required competencies). As a consequence, for instance in teacher education, there is little scope for the role of values and personal beliefs (Korthagen, 2004).

Attention to moral and civic development seems to be of specific importance in Dutch education. First, in comparison to adolescents in other countries of the global North, Dutch youth score low on civic skills and on positive attitudes towards foreigners (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr & Losito, 2009; Veugelers, 2011a). This may be connected to the dominance of technical-instrumental thinking about education since the 1980s, with little explicit attention paid to values in education (Veugelers, 2011b). Second, the Dutch education system is characterized by early tracking and socioeconomic segregation between schools (Schmidt, Burroughs, Zoido & Houang, 2015). As a result of this social and cultural segregation, at school Dutch youth mainly comes across peers with similar social and cultural backgrounds. This segregation is neither helpful for developing a broader view of society nor for attaining the goal of an inclusive society.

However, some renewed attention to personal development has become observable in the Netherlands and other countries in Europe (De Wit & Verhoeven, 2001; Dohmen, 2015). In addition, the public role of higher education and its contribution to social cohesion and democracy has been stressed in a recent European Union project (Teodoro & Guilherme, 2014; Veugelers, De Groot & Nollet, 2014). Hence, although there is yet little opportunity in higher education for moral and civic development, it appears that attention to this aspect is increasing.

Undergraduate honors education provides opportunities to develop education with morality- and citizenship-related aims. Since 1993, honors programs in Dutch higher education have been developed to serve students

with above average abilities and motivation (Wolfensberger, 2015). The development of honors programs in universities for applied sciences began around 2010. Offering honors programs is in line with a longer tradition of attention for to high ability and excellence in the USA. In 1922, Frank Aydelotte established the first honors program in Swarthmore, Pennsylvania (Rudolph, 1977; Cambia & Engel, 2004). Although Aydelotte emphasized the importance of developing students' moral responsibility, since then little attention in programs for high-ability students in the USA has been devoted to social involvement, moral development and future orientation (Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue & Weimholt, 2008; Matthews, 2004; Passow & Schiff, 1989). In the same vein, an inventory of mission statements for university programs targeted toward gifted/high-ability students in the USA revealed that while some of these statements refer to ethics, such wording is not widespread (Bartelds, Drayer & Wolfensberger, 2012).

In the Netherlands, societal engagement emerges as a theme in honors education (Wolfensberger & Pilot, 2014). For instance, at the Hanze Honours College, part of the Hanze University of Applied Sciences, societal engagement is included in the Honours Talent Program. However, in educational research, this theme does not yet appear to be visible. For instance, special issues of *Tijdschrift voor Hoger Onderwijs* [Journal for Higher Education] on excellence and honors education in 2014 and 2016 hardly pay attention to moral development or societal engagement.

If high-ability students can contribute to the knowledge economy, why could they not help to find solutions to global challenges faced today regarding for example climate change and social justice (Gibson, Rimmington & Landwehr-Brown, 2008)? They could even become leaders for change (Ford & Whiting, 2008). Furthermore, education could support students in discovering their role as citizens in today's world. Explicit attention to moral

and civic development in higher education can support the realization of such citizenship aims (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont & Stephens, 2003).

Research on the effects of honors programs in higher education is scarce (Achterberg, 2005; Allan, 2011; Wolfensberger, 2012). This is also the case with empirical research on the effects of undergraduate courses with moral and civic-related aims. This empirical research mostly relates to service learning in the USA (Colby et al., 2003). Furthermore, there is little empirical research on the effects of service learning specific to gifted students (Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue & Weimholt, 2008).

This thesis aims to contribute to empirical knowledge which could further support the development of undergraduate honors education in moral and civic areas. First, this is accomplished by contributing knowledge on possible characteristics of undergraduate honors students in the moral domain. This is relevant for educational policy as such insights can better allow honors education to align with the characteristics of students. Second, this is accomplished by investigating how education could help prepare honors students for their role as citizens of the world.

This introduction continues with a brief theoretical overview of the main concepts of this thesis, namely honors students; giftedness, high ability and morality; ethical sensitivity; global citizenship education, and educating honors students for global justice citizenship.

## **Honors students**

Honors students are students who participate in a special honors program. Within the USA and the Netherlands, honors programs are selective study programs linked to higher education institutions, designed for students who are both willing and able to go beyond the regular program (Clark & Zubizaretta, 2008; Hébert & McBee, 2007; Wolfensberger, 2012;

Wolfensberger, 2015). These programs have clear admission criteria and clear goals (Wolfensberger, 2015). In Dutch higher education, these programs can either replace a part of the regular curriculum or be extra-curricular.

However, honors students in higher education do not comprise a homogeneous group (Achterberg, 2005; Rinn & Plucker, 2004) as admission requirements for honors programs can differ between and within institutions of higher education. Requirements may, for instance, relate to motivation and high performance as proven by specific grades, recommendations, a letter of application, and an interview (Wolfensberger, 2012).

In other words, it is not yet clear which characteristics apply to all honors students. In a comparative study at the Utrecht University, the desire to learn, the drive to excel, and creativity were found to be the strongest distinguishing factors between honors and non-honors students (Scager et al., 2012). This study found little difference regarding intelligence and persistence between honors students and students who did not participate in an honors program.

An exploration of literature and empirical research on the teaching of honors students by Wolfensberger (2012) yields that the following three elements in honors pedagogies are often used and seem successful: 'community', which relates to the importance of a safe learning community for these students; 'academic competence', which entails the importance of academic challenge and deeper learning; and 'bounded freedom', which relates to the need for autonomy and self-regulation in learning.

### **Talent, giftedness and high ability**

Different theories and models have been developed concerning 'being talented', either from the perspective of talent as something someone possesses and is innate, or from the viewpoint that talent is something that can be developed. Sternberg, Jarvin, and Grigorenko (2011) emphasize that

giftedness is a social construction, and thus its meaning can vary from one time and place to another. In conceptions of giftedness and the identification of gifted persons, IQ has played a very important role (Sternberg et al., 2011, p.17). More recently, several authors have proposed models that include IQ in addition to other qualities (Sternberg et al., 2011). For instance, Renzulli & Reis (1986) have proposed a 'three-ring' conception of giftedness according to which giftedness occurs at the intersection of above-average ability, task commitment, and creativity (see also Renzulli, 2005). Sternberg, unlike others, includes wisdom in his so-called WICS-model with regard to talent (Sternberg, 2003). He rationalizes this choice with the finding that in identifying gifted children, schools often focus on school achievement in a certain domain and the ability to learn more quickly or thoroughly than other individuals. Whereas gifted adults are usually identified not in relation to how quickly they learn about their fields, but in terms of the leadership roles they take (Sternberg et al, 2011, p. 34). According to Sternberg, a wise person takes other people's interests into account and is committed to society as a whole. In other words, his wisdom approach to talent also includes morality and societal commitment. The current study relates to this particular approach to talent, as it focuses on the moral and civic development of undergraduate honors students. The study further connects to a developmental view of giftedness, according to which giftedness refers to a potential that can be further developed.

This study uses the terms 'high ability' and 'honors'. An honors student participates in a special honors program, designed for students who show above average abilities as well as motivation. High ability, in this study, refers to a wider group of higher education students; it is operationalized as undergraduate students that participate in honors programs or other special talent programs such as a University College, and students with a grade point average (GPA)  $\geq 8$  who do not choose to participate in an honors program.



## **High ability and morality**

In focusing on the moral domain, a large body of research literature demonstrates the advanced position of gifted individuals in the maturation of moral reasoning skills (e.g., Alnabhan, 2011; Clark, 2008; Lee & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2006; Silverman, 1994; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2003). In these studies, the concept of giftedness relates to high or very high IQ (Terry & Bohnenberger, 2003) and other ability related tests, such as SAT or ACT (readiness for college; Lee et al., 2006), Raven's progressive matrices test, and Torrance creative verbal test (Alnabhan, 2011). Research also shows that high academic ability does not always lead to strength in moral judgment (Narvaez, 1993; Ruf & Radosevich, 2009, Roeper & Silverman, 2009) and that there is no necessary relationship between intelligence and morality (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011). In the words of Roeper and Silverman (2009, p. 251), gifted children are *at promise* for high moral development in adult life.

Moreover, gifted children tend to have developed more concern with global issues and sensitivity to others compared to their non-gifted peers (e.g. Silverman, 1994; Lovecky, 2009; Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue & Weimholt, 2008). Lee et al. (2008) relate this advanced position of gifted children to rapid cognitive growth, which includes the acquisition of advanced knowledge of moral standards (Kohlberg, 1969).

Most of these studies on moral development in gifted individuals have been completed with children and adolescents, whereas knowledge on the 18+ age-group appears to be limited (see Chapter 2). The first study included in this thesis investigates whether such an advanced level of development in the moral domain is also a characteristic of undergraduate, high-ability students in the Netherlands, by focusing on ethical sensitivity.

## Ethical sensitivity

Morality can be defined as the active process of constructing meaning and understanding related to social interactions (McCadden, 1998). Moral values refer to opinions based on an idea what is good and bad (Veugelers, 2011b). Moral development is broader than simply a cognitive process of reasoning and judgment (Strain, 2005). Often, moral development is divided into four components: moral sensitivity (being aware of a moral problem, if it exists); moral motivation (giving moral values higher priority than personal values); moral decision making (determining which action is the best from a moral standpoint); and moral character (how a person acts when confronted with a moral dilemma) (Rest, 1983; Bebeau, Rest & Narvaez, 1999) (see Chapter 2).

It is argued that of these four moral divisions, ethical sensitivity is the most important component as it is conditional for the other three (Tirri, 2011b; Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011). This study therefore focuses on the ethical sensitivity of undergraduate honors students. An ethically sensitive person recognizes moral aspects—involving questions of right and wrong—of a situation and is able to identify with the role of another person (Bebeau et al., 1999). In this thesis, the concept of *ethical* sensitivity is utilized as a general aspect of moral sensitivities (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011).

Ethical sensitivity is a multi-dimensional construct. Narvaez (2001) developed a theory about care-oriented ethical sensitivity involving the following seven dimensions (see Chapter 2): (1) Reading and expressing emotions involves identifying the needs and feelings of the self as well as of others. These skills are necessary for communication, particularly for the resolution of problems and conflicts. (2) Taking the perspectives of others. This aspect involves exploring multiple perspectives of situations or events. (3) Caring by connecting to others; the process of expanding a sense of self-concern to include others. It also involves developing a sense of connectedness

to other people, both globally and locally. (4) Working with interpersonal and group differences. This dimension involves understanding how and why differences, for instance cultural differences, can lead to conflicts and misunderstandings. (5) Preventing social bias. This dimension involves understanding, identifying, and actively countering bias. (6) Generating interpretations and options. This aspect entails the development of creative skills used to generate multiple interpretations of a situation and multiple alternatives to approaching it. (7) Identifying the consequences of actions and options. This dimension concerns understanding the relationships between events and their consequences and then using this understanding to predict possible consequences of the considered actions.

Based upon this theory by Narvaez (2001), Tirri and Nokelainen (2007, 2011) developed the Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ), a self-rating instrument that measures the seven dimensions of ethical sensitivity as described above. Unlike most other instruments concerning ethical sensitivity, the ESSQ is content independent (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011). For this reason, this instrument was chosen for use in the current study. Although the psychometric properties of ESSQ have been proven to be scientifically valid (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011), it still requires modification to increase its model fit (Gholami & Tirri, 2012). Its psychometric properties are further explored by investigating the cultural dependency of the ESSQ.

The ESSQ was used in three of the four chapters of this thesis. Chapter 2 compares the ethical sensitivity of high-ability and average-ability university students. In Chapter 3 and 5, the ESSQ was used in a pre-post design to measure possible effects of a global citizenship course. The case study in chapter 3 investigates effects of the course Searchers in Society (SIS), and the case study in chapter 5 investigates effects of the course Society 2.0.

## **Global citizenship education**

(Global) citizenship education is a broad concept that has been defined in different ways and from different viewpoints given the aims and related pedagogical approaches and contents. Citizenship education can be nationally or globally oriented. For instance, according to Killick (2007), higher education students should be encouraged to recognize and evaluate their own values, beliefs, and behaviors and those of their professional field. Veugelers (2011b) also notes an explicit focus on values, together with the recognition of cultural diversity in identities, as important elements in current citizenship education.

Regarding the aims of citizenship education, Veugelers distinguishes three approaches found in Dutch secondary education, namely: adaptive-oriented citizenship (combining discipline with social involvement); individualistic-oriented citizenship (combining autonomy with discipline); and critical democratic citizenship (combining autonomy and social involvement) (Veugelers, 2007; Leenders, Veugelers, & De Kat, 2008). A similar typology is constructed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) based on different perspectives they found in programs for democratic citizenship education in the USA. Their framework concerns different types of citizens: the personally responsible citizen (focus on good character, honest; responsible); the participatory citizen (focus on active participation and leadership); and the justice-oriented citizen (focus on change of established systems that reproduce injustice). For the latter, gaining insight into structural causes of social injustice is necessary.

For the purposes of this thesis, global citizenship education is defined as: Social justice oriented education, aimed at preparing students for their role as engaged citizens of the global world. Two elements, the justice- and the global orientation, are of specific importance. Justice orientation is an orientation that includes a desire to improve society (Johnson & Morris, 2010). Justice-

oriented global citizenship education aims to promote knowledge and insight into the root causes of injustice and sustainability issues and possibilities for change. Global orientation is included, because in a globalized world, justice and sustainability issues unmistakably contain a global dimension. This global dimension is connected to Nussbaum's moral cosmopolitanism (Nussbaum 1997; 2002), especially regarding the ability to think as a citizen of the world and to imagine what it would be like to be in the position of someone quite different from yourself.

### **Educating honors students for global citizenship**

The current study concerns the preparation of undergraduate honors students for global citizenship. Regarding the education of high ability students, the importance of a holistic approach concerning the development of the whole student is emphasized (Tolppanen & Tirri, 2014). In addition, an ideal learning environment acknowledges the needs of gifted students by combining elements from cognitive, moral and social arenas (Tirri, 2011b; Tolppanen & Tirri, 2014).

A literature search was conducted regarding theory and empirical studies in global citizenship education (Schutte, 2011). From the findings of this research, curriculum guidelines for Global Justice Citizenship Education (GJCE) were formulated. The following section explains the three domains of the curriculum guidelines and the choice for experiential learning in civic contexts that were extracted from this literature.

#### ***Knowledge domain***

To understand global issues, a complex web of cultural and material, as well as global and local processes needs to be unraveled (Andreotti, 2006). Given this complexity, focusing on one global justice issue allows for a better grasp of the social, political, and economic structures that underlie injustice and

power differences (see Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005, on exploring issues). In addition, historical insight into the societal context in which an issue develops better allows for an understanding of the root causes of injustice issues (Andreotti, 2006; Davies et al., 2005; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Moreover, students should understand the global dimension of their own actions and the interdependence of places in the world (Oxfam GB, 2006). In the knowledge domain, the curriculum guidelines are: (1) gaining historical insights (in root causes of injustice) (2) seeing local-global connections; and (3) focus on one global-justice issue (see Chapter 4).

### ***Moral domain***

Ethical sensitivity relates to the ability to take the perspective of ‘the other,’ to pay attention to the welfare of others, and to recognize ethical dilemmas. When encountering individuals with other cultural backgrounds, students need intercultural sensitivity, namely the ability to notice and experience cultural difference (Hammer, Bennet & Wiseman, 2003; Holm, 2012). Ethical and intercultural sensitivity relates to one of the guiding aims of Nussbaum’s view on world citizenship: being able to understand the world “from the point of view of the other” (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 11). The first curriculum guideline in the moral domain concerns developing ethical and intercultural sensitivity (Holm, Nokelainen & Tirri, 2009; Hammer, Bennet & Wiseman, 2003; Holm, 2012).

Students should be challenged to recognize and evaluate own values, beliefs, and behavior to explore worldwide horizons (Andreotti, 2006; Killick, 2007). This entails recognizing values behind statements, ideas, and perspectives, and evaluating how they relate to students’ personal values. This can be taught by exposing students to different perspectives. Additionally, in the global North, neoliberal ideology impacts all aspects of education with the imposition of market principles and economy-related

assumptions about, for instance, ‘progress’ (Kliewer 2013). The second curriculum guideline in the moral domain is therefore to recognize own values and critically reflect on mainstream thinking.

### ***Social domain***

Regarding the social domain, contact people with different socioeconomic positions, cultural backgrounds, and life chances can yield new insight into oneself and personal biases (Garland Reed, 2011; Strain, 2005). For students from middle- and upper-class families, such encounters allow them to look beyond their ‘privileged lives’ (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker & Donahue, 2003). Such contact may be of special importance in the Dutch educational context because the high degree of social segregation between schools (Schmidt et al., 2015). As a consequence, Dutch students might be less familiar with interacting with individuals from different socio-economic or cultural backgrounds.

Further, becoming familiar with positive role models can strengthen students’ belief that change promoting justice is not only possible but worth aiming for and committing to (Colby et al., 2003). In this case, positive role models means active and socially engaged people with both courage and persistence to contribute to a better world based upon non-mainstream values. The following curriculum guidelines can be derived from theories discussed regarding the social domain: (1) contacting people with different socioeconomic positions, cultural backgrounds and life chances; (2) getting to know positive role models: active and socially engaged people.

### ***Experiential learning in civic contexts***

Regarding pedagogy—how students can best learn about their role as global citizen—Colby et al. (2003) emphasize the value of student-centered learning and pedagogies that actively and emotionally involve students in the learning

process. Also, students' practicing what teachers hope for them to learn—in this case global/societal commitment—can lead to intrinsically interesting tasks for students. Experiential learning in civic contexts can provide these possibilities (Veugelers, 2007). For this reason, experiential learning in civic contexts is added to the guidelines.

These curriculum guidelines for GJCE are used in three empirical chapters focusing on educating undergraduate honors students for global citizenship (Chapters 3 - 5).

## **Overview of the empirical chapters**

**Chapter 2** investigates whether undergraduate, high-ability students in the Netherlands separate themselves regarding ethical sensitivity from their average-ability university peers. This study aims to contribute to knowledge about possible characteristics of undergraduate high-ability students including honors students, in the moral domain. The main research question is: "Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between academically average and high-ability students?" To make this comparison, data was collected from Utrecht University (392 students) and the Hanze University of Applied Sciences (334 students). Of all the students, 338 were enrolled in a special talent program, 261 of whom took part in an honors program. The sample of high-ability students consisted of students in a special talent program supplemented with students with a GPA of 8 or higher who did not participate in such a program. All students filled out the self-rating instrument for ethical sensitivity—the ESSQ (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011).



The next three studies focus on educating undergraduate honors students for global citizenship. The research shifts from “What is?”—regarding characteristics of undergraduate honors students—to “What can be reached with education in this area?” More concretely, how can honors education enhance students’ moral development? Moreover, the scope becomes broader, namely from moral to global and civic. We already underpinned the practical and theoretical relevance of investigating global citizenship in undergraduate higher education. It should further be kept in mind that the concepts of moral and civic development are intertwined (Colby et al., 2003; Veugelers, 2011b). Veugelers (2011b) argues that moral values are important for active and lived citizenship, while Colby et al. (2003) point out that morality involves judgements about how to act towards others. They also note that core democratic rules are based on moral principles such as tolerance, respect, and concern for the rights of individuals and groups. Finally, they argue that problems that confront engaged citizens always include strong moral themes, such as environmental issues and responsibility towards future generations.

Regarding the ways in which education can help prepare undergraduate honors students for their role as global citizens, Chapters 3 - 5 of this thesis use the curriculum guidelines for GJCE to (a) analyze the program characteristics of an online international honors course about globalization, *Searchers in Society (SIS)*; (b) build and deliver an undergraduate honors course aimed at justice oriented global citizenship, *Society 2.0*; and (c) investigate what and how students learned from these courses (case study 1: course *SIS*; case study 2: course *Society 2.0*).

**Chapter 3** investigates the effects of the global citizen course *SIS* on the participating students. *SIS* is a course in which 22 undergraduate honors

students from the USA and the Netherlands collaborate online to explore what it means to be a member of the global community. As this thesis demonstrates specific interest in justice-oriented global citizenship education, the course's program was first analyzed in relation to the curriculum guidelines for GJCE through a comparison. Moreover, chapter 3 investigates what and how students learned from the course, making use of a mixed methods approach. A pre- and posttest design with control groups was used to measure ethical sensitivity (ESSQ, Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011), intercultural sensitivity using the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ, Holm, Nokelainen & Tirri, 2009; Holm, 2012), and students' thoughts and experiences on various civic, social, cultural, and global issues using the Shared Futures Survey (SFS) from the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U). Finally, the study investigated what the course meant for students and what participants learned from the course by analyzing their written answers to open-ended questions concerning the impact of the course on participating students.

**Chapter 4** investigates the development and delivery of the undergraduate honors global citizenship course 'Society 2.0', based on the curriculum guidelines GJCE. A curriculum development team, consisting of two teachers, two students, and the principal investigator of the research built the course. The case study examined the development process and both the formal curriculum (the course as it was developed) and the operationalized curriculum (the course as it was delivered). This was completed by investigating (1) the added value of curriculum development with a team including teachers, students, and a researcher; (2) how the curriculum guidelines for GJCE shaped the formal and operationalized curriculum; and (3) how pedagogical elements important for honors students, namely 'community', 'academic competence,' and 'bounded freedom' were

incorporated in this course. To answer the research questions, content analyses of documents (such as reports from meetings and products from the development team) and four teacher interviews were conducted.

**Chapter 5** examines the effects of the course Society 2.0 on participating students ( $N = 25$ ). The aim was to discover more about what and how students learn from a justice-oriented global citizenship approach. The case study focused on learning outcomes regarding knowledge and ethics, as well as students' ideas and intentions regarding their role as global citizens after taking the course. A pre- and post-test design was used to measure ethical sensitivity (ESSQ; Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007; 2011), as well as 'social responsibility,' 'global competence,' and 'global civic engagement' with the GCS. The Global Citizenship Scale (GCS; Morais & Ogden, 2010; Lang, 2013) was used in this study because its three dimensions relate to the curriculum guidelines GJCE. Moreover, qualitative data was collected from blogs that students wrote during the course to provide deeper insight into the content of students' learning and the possible impact of the course on their attitudes and behavior. Content analyses was completed by means of deductively determined codes from curriculum guidelines for GJCE. The study also investigated possible effects half a year after the course ended given that some effects may fade or occur later (Colby et al., 2003).

**Chapter 6** provides the conclusions and discussion.





# Chapter 2

The relationship between ethical sensitivity, high ability and gender in higher education students

This chapter is based on Schutte, I. W., Wolfensberger, M. V. C., & Tirri, K. (2014). The Relationship between ethical sensitivity, high ability and gender in higher education students. *Gifted and Talented International*, 29 (1/2), 39-48. doi: 10.1080/15332276.2014.11678428

### **Abstract**

This study examines the ethical sensitivity of high-ability undergraduate students ( $n=731$ ) in the Netherlands who completed the 28-item Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ) developed by Tirri & Nokelainen (2007; 2011). The ESSQ is based on Narvaez' (2001) operationalization of ethical sensitivity in seven dimensions. The following research question was explored and subjected to a Mann-Whitney  $U$  Test: Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between (1) academically average and high-ability students, and (2) male and female students? The self-assessed ethical sensitivity of high-ability students was higher than that of their average-ability peers. Furthermore, female students scored higher on 'caring by connecting to others'. These results imply that programs for high-ability students incorporating ethical issues could build upon characteristics of this group.

## Introduction

The field of higher education is increasingly concerned with high-ability students and the cultivation of their talents. Special honors programs are developed for students who are both able and motivated to do more than the regular curriculum offers (Wolfensberger, van Eijl & Pilot, 2012). From the perspective of politicians and the business community in Europe, the importance of evoking excellence in higher education lies in the requirements of the market and knowledge economy (e.g. Robertson, 2008).

From a different angle, it has been posed that high-ability students could help find solutions to the global challenges we face today, like climate change and poverty (Gibson, Rimmington & Landwehr-Brown, 2008), and could become leaders for change (Ford & Whiting, 2008). Since these students might achieve powerful positions in their professional life, they should be prepared to address the ethical aspects of the decisions they will face (Jacobsen, 2009). The banking crisis of the past decade is a case in point, suggesting the wisdom of devoting more attention to ethics in education.

However, the idea that educating high-ability students should entail more than building academic skills is not new. From the outset of honors education, scholars have emphasized the role of ethics and moral development. Frank Aydelotte, who established the first honors program in 1922, felt that “the essence of liberal education is the development of mental power and moral responsibility in each individual” (Rudolph, 1977, as cited in Cambia & Engel, 2004, p.122). This view has been endorsed by others, such as Passow & Schiff (1989), who suggest that gifted children should be encouraged to think about the moral and ethical dimensions of the subjects they study. Sternberg, Jarvin & Grigorenko (2011) emphasize the importance of teaching for wisdom, through which students learn to use their abilities and experience for a common good.



According to Tirri (2011b, p.59), “skills in moral judgment and especially moral sensitivity are necessary, when excellence and ethics are combined”. Moral development refers to what we consider right and wrong; it comes down to developing values and norms. Values guide a person’s opinions and give meaning to one’s actions (Leenders & Veugelers, 2004). Theories of moral development often use a classification in four components (Rest, 1983): moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral motivation and moral character. A morally sensitive person recognizes a situation as a moral one and is able to identify with the role of another person (Bebeau, Rest & Narvaez, 1999). To make a moral judgment, one must determine which action is the best from a moral standpoint. Moral motivation is about giving moral values higher priority than personal ones. Moral character comes down to how a person acts when confronted with a moral dilemma. Moral or ethical sensitivity is the most important, since it is conditional for the other three components of moral development.

Despite such appeals, so far little attention has been devoted to social involvement, moral development, future orientation and leadership in programs for high-ability students (Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue & Weimholt, 2008; Passow & Schiff, 1989; Matthews, 2004). A recent inventory of mission statements for university programs targeted to gifted / high-ability students in the USA revealed that while these statements do refer to ethics, such wording is not widespread (Bartelds, Drayer & Wolfensberger, 2012). It is not only the special programs for high-ability students that seem to ignore ethics. Recently, 17 research universities in the USA collectively resolved to “better reflect the original purpose of higher education: to serve as civically engaged and active leader in preserving, promoting and educating for a democratic society” (Gibson, 2012, p.238). At Dutch research universities, there is also little focus on preparing students to cope with pressing social issues (Aben & Rutgers, 2009) or to educate them for citizenship (Keestra,

2007). At Dutch universities of applied sciences, where the focus is on overt behavior, there is little scope for values in education (Korthagen, 2004).

In the above we have presented a case for incorporating the 'moral aspect' in honors programs in higher education. But in so doing, would these programs match up with a strength specific to high-ability students? While evidence of advanced moral development among gifted children and adolescents abounds (e.g. Lovecky, 2009), little is known about the ethical sensitivity of the high-ability students (18+ years old) in higher education.

This paper presents the results of an empirical study on the relationship between self-rated ethical sensitivity, high ability and gender among Dutch undergraduates in higher education (n=731). The subjects were asked to fill out the Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ) (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011), which is based on Narvaez' (2001) concept of ethical sensitivity. This instrument is not context specific, meaning that it is not related to specific sectors or issues. Furthermore, according to Tirri & Nokelainen (2007), the operationalization of the Ethical Sensitivity model is satisfactory, in that the psychometric properties of ESSQ are scientifically valid.

Two aspects of the research question are addressed in this study: (1) Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between academically average and high-ability students? and (2) Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between male and female students?

As noted above, students in honors programs generally have above-average ability and motivation compared to their peers. They do not comprise a homogeneous group, though (Achterberg, 2005; Rinn & Plucker, 2004). For instance, Utrecht University has higher admission requirements than the Hanze University of Applied Sciences, so students in their respective honors programs could differ from each other. In addition, University Colleges and honors programs might attract different students. For that reason, this study

also checked for possible differences in ethical sensitivity between these groups.

### **High ability and ethical sensitivity**

There is a large body of research literature demonstrating the privileged position of gifted individuals in the maturation of moral reasoning skills (e.g. Silverman, 1994; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2003; Lee & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2006; Clark, 2008; Alnabhan, 2011). Their advanced level of moral reasoning is associated with their rapid cognitive growth, i.e. the development of intelligence, conscious thought and problem-solving ability. Also, other associated characteristics are mentioned with regard to most gifted children, such as global concerns and sensitivity to others (e.g. Silverman, 1994).

Yet high academic ability does not always lead to strength in moral judgment (Narvaez, 1993; Ruf & Radosevich, 2009). As the study by Narvaez (1993) indicates, “high achievers may have average to high moral judgment scores, whereas low achievers cannot be high scorers in moral judgment” (as cited in Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, p.589). Ruf & Radosevich (2009) found that a highly intelligent and highly educated study group (aged 40+) scored higher on the DIT (Defining Issues Test) than the general public (average score for American adults), although some participants scored below the national mean. According to Ruf & Radosevich, personality type and gender also play a role in a person’s attitude towards the needs of others.

Most studies on aspects of moral development have been conducted among children and adolescents. As Nokelainen & Tirri (2010) mention, the majority of the studies that used DIT and general intelligence measures (e.g., WAIS, WISC) found a positive correlation between intelligence and moral judgment in adolescents. Three other studies among adolescents, varying in age from 14 to 17 years, also indicate that gifted students are more ethically sensitive and morally developed than their peers (Howard-Hamilton, 1994;

Lee & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2006; and Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007). However, research on this relationship in the age group of 18 years and older is scarce. Conceivably, by age 18+, the peers will catch up with the advanced level of moral development found among high-ability children and adolescents. The aim of this study is to provide evidence to help fill this knowledge gap.

### **Gender and ethical sensitivity**

Several researchers have commented on gender-related orientations towards ethics. Gilligan (1982), one of the leaders in moral development theory, argues that men are justice oriented while women are oriented towards caring. Justice-oriented moral reasoning is often described as applying general principles to individual cases. It is about following rules, about universal moral judgment and duty. Care-oriented moral reasoning, in contrast, focuses on interpersonal relationships. According to Björklund (2003), men see themselves as individuals regulated by rights and duties, whereas women see themselves as a part of a social network. As Tirri (2003) found in her research among Finnish sixth and ninth graders, girls are more care-oriented than boys. Ruf & Radosevich (2009) also found gender differences in their survey on how people say they feel about different global issues and how they tend to act when confronted with issues that are important to them. The females in their study sample expressed emotional feelings to a greater extent than the males, but they also indicated a stronger propensity to support their convictions with potentially helpful actions.

In the context of accountancy, Ameen, Guffey & McMillan (1996) found that female students exhibited higher levels of ethical sensitivity than male students. The participants in this study were asked to make value judgments concerning activities in the university context. Roxas & Stoneback (2004) on the other hand, found mixed results with regard to gender differences on

ethical attitudes and behavior in a literature review focused on studies with business students and managers.

Tirri & Nokelainen (2007) indicate that most of the items of the ESSQ focus on caring ethics. One outcome of their study applying the ESSQ among Finnish adolescents was that self-estimates of ethical sensitivity were significantly higher among the female than the male students. In the present study, we consider whether this would also be the case for the group of 18+ undergraduate students.

## **Methods**

### ***Sample***

Data were collected at Utrecht University and Hanze University of Applied Sciences in April/May 2011 (n=731). Utrecht University (>30,000 students) is a research university located in Utrecht, a town with about 300,000 inhabitants in an urban area centrally situated in the Netherlands. The Hanze University of Applied Sciences (25,000 students) is in the Dutch northern town of Groningen, with approximately 200,000 inhabitants.

Both universities offer honors programs for high-ability and above-average motivated students. Utrecht University has also two University Colleges dedicated to liberal arts and sciences. Utrecht University and Hanze University are both leading institutions in Dutch higher education for high-ability students. Specific conditions to participate might differ, depending on the particular program or University College. In general, above average motivation and ability must be proven by certain grades, recommendations, a letter of application and an interview. Sometimes a specific level of English proficiency is required and for instance social engagement and interest in contributing to campus life (especially University College).

At the Hanze University, 191 students participated in an honors program in 2011; at Utrecht University, 496 took part. Our aim was to study an equally large sample at both universities. For every honors and University-College class participating in this research, one or two classes in the regular curriculum took part. Those classes were chosen at random, by asking the program coordinator which classes had lessons on a specific day. The students filled in a paper version of the questionnaire during one of their lectures. They were asked to assess their attitude towards the statements measuring seven dimensions of ethical sensitivity. More than 95% of the students in attendance did actually participate.

The sample (n=731) consists of 392 Utrecht University undergraduates and 334 Hanze University undergraduates, while information about the university was missing for five participants. Of the 392 Utrecht University students, 187 (48%) were enrolled in a special talent program, 110 (28%) in an honors program and 76 (19%) in a University College. Of the 334 Hanze University students, 151 (45%) were in an honors program. The distribution across the disciplines for the whole sample is as follows: social, pedagogical and societal studies 28.3%; technical studies and science 24.6%; economics 26%; humanities 8.3%; health studies 3.6%; and liberal arts and sciences 9.1%. The sample consists of first-year (36%), second-year (40%) and senior (24%) students. Of the sample, 374 (51.3%) were female and 355 (48.7%) male, while gender information was missing for two participants (0.3%). The mean age was 20.7 years (SD 2.9).

The group of high-ability students in this study includes students participating in an honors program and also students with a self-reported GPA  $\geq 8$  who were not in such a program. In the Netherlands, most institutions grade on a scale from 1 (very poor) till 10 (outstanding). 'High ability' was defined in this way, because not all very talented students take part in a talent

program; some choose other ways to find the challenge they need. Also, the way students are selected for these kinds of programs differs.

Respondents were asked to give their grade-point average (GPA) over the current academic year on a six-point scale. We recoded a new two-class variable with a cut-off point at 8. This was done because in the Netherlands special talent programs in higher education aim at the best 5 to 10% percent of their students, and in making these two groups we came as close as possible to 10%. There were only 21 students with a GPA  $\geq 8$  who were not in a talent program. A new group, called 'high-ability students', was created by combining the students participating in a talent program with these 21 students.

### ***Questionnaire***

The Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ) used in this study was formulated by Tirri & Nokelainen (2007) on the basis of Narvaez' (2001) operationalization of ethical sensitivity. It measures the following seven dimensions of ethical sensitivity: (1) Reading and expressing emotions. These skills are necessary for communication, particularly for the resolution of problems and conflicts; (2) Taking the perspectives of others. This aspect involves exploring multiple perspectives on situations or events; (3) Caring by connecting to others. The process of expending sense of self-concern to include others. It also involves developing a sense of connectedness to other people, both globally and locally; (4) Working with interpersonal and group differences. This dimension involves understanding how and why differences, for instance cultural differences, can lead to conflicts and misunderstandings; (5) Preventing social bias. This dimension involves understanding, identifying and actively countering bias; (6) Generating interpretations and options. Involves the development of creative skills used in generating multiple interpretations of a situation and multiple alternatives

in dealing with it; and (7) Identifying the consequences of actions and options. This dimension is about understanding the relationships between events and their consequences and then using this understanding to predict the possible consequences of actions being considered. Each dimension was operationalized in the questionnaire with four statements. The instrument consists of 28 Likert-scale items with response options ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

The original Finnish questionnaire was translated into Dutch by a qualified interpreter and into English by a university-level English native speaker to ensure that the translated versions accurately reflect the wording of the original instrument. The English version was made available to international students. A linguistic validation was performed by having the English and Dutch versions translated back into Finnish and then comparing those back-translations with the original Finnish document.

Two minor changes were made to the original questionnaire: “I care about the well-being of people immediate environment and try to improve it” was changed into “I care about the well-being of people in my immediate environment”, because it was a double question. “When solving ethical dilemmas, I try to project myself outside my social position” was changed into “When solving ethical dilemmas, I try to take my social position into account”, because the latter formulation was considered to be more concrete.

Both versions of the questionnaire were pre-tested in a pilot with 25 respondents. There were three comments on the breadth of the concepts ‘ethical problems’ and ‘ethical issues’, which according to the respondents might prompt different interpretations. Nonetheless, for the sake of comparability with the original Finnish research, it was decided to retain the original wording.



## Results

The technique selected for the analysis is the parametric Cronbach's alpha, which estimates how well the items correlate with each dimension. The data collected with the ESSQ have a reliability of 0.81. In light of the very low reliability of the data in the subscales (1) and (5), these were omitted from further calculations. While the other alpha values were not high, they were satisfactory (see Table 1 for details). According to Tuckman (1972), a lower bound of 0.5 is acceptable when measuring attitudes. Multidimensional scales yield lower alpha reliability coefficients (Helms, Henze, Sass & Mifsud, 2006). Furthermore, the difficulty of operationalizing concepts with a high level of abstraction into intuitive items will have a negative effect on reliability (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011).

Table 2.1. Dimensions (subscales) of the Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ), descriptive statistics and internal consistency values.

Dimension	<i>M (SD)</i>	$\alpha$
(1) Reading and expressing emotions	3.8 (.43)	.40
(2) Taking the perspectives of others	3.9 (.51)	.66
(3) Caring by connecting to others	3.9 (.54)	.64
(4) Working with interpersonal and group differences	3.7 (.58)	.67
(5) Preventing social bias	3.5 (.48)	.40
(6) Generating interpretations and options	3.8 (.47)	.57
(7) Identifying the consequences of actions and options	3.1 (.66)	.68

### ***Ability-related differences in ethical sensitivity***

We wanted to know whether academically average and above-average students differ in their self-estimated ethical sensitivity. To that end we compared the group of high-ability students with all the other students on the five dimensions of the ESSQ.

A Mann-Whitney *U* Test revealed significantly higher scores in the self-estimated ethical sensitivity of high-ability students on all five dimensions (see Table 2 for details).

The Bonferroni correction to the alpha level was applied to avoid an increased risk of a Type 1 error. Therefore, the significance level was divided by the number of comparisons. For the five dimensions of ESSQ, the adjusted alpha level became 0.01. All the results remained statistically significant at the .05 level, clearly indicating an ability-related difference: high-ability students have a higher estimation of their ethical sensitivity than their average-ability peers do.

Table 2.2. Ability-related differences in students' responses to the ethical sensitivity scale questionnaire (ESSQ).

Dimension	HA	AA	<i>Z</i> ( <i>p</i> )	<i>r</i>
	( <i>n</i> =343)	( <i>n</i> =353)		
	<i>Md</i>	<i>Md</i>		
(2) taking perspectives	4.0	3.75	-3.366 (.001)	.13
(3) caring by connecting	4.0	4.0	-3.676 (<.001)	.14
(4) working with differences	3.8	3.7	-4.577 (<.001)	.17
(6) generating interpretations	4.0	3.8	-4.389 (<.001)	.17
(7) identifying consequences	3.3	3.0	-4.452 (<.001)	.17

*Note.* HA = High ability; AA = Average Ability

The effects would be considered small, using Cohen's (1988) criteria for a small (.1), medium (.3) and large (.5) effect.

**Gender-related differences in ethical sensitivity**

The second aspect of the research question, “Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between male and female students?” was also examined with the Mann-Whitney *U* Test<sup>1</sup>.

Table 2.3. Gender-related differences in students’ responses to the ethical sensitivity scale questionnaire (ESSQ).

Dimension	Female (n=373)	Male (n=355)	<i>Z</i> ( <i>p</i> )	<i>r</i>
	<i>Md</i>	<i>Md</i>		
(2) taking perspectives	4.0	4.0	-0.775 (.438)	
(3) caring by connecting	4.0	4.0	-2.832 (.005)	.10
(4) working with differences	3.8	3.8	-1.950 (.051)	
(6) generating interpretations	3.8	3.8	-0.262 (.793)	
(7) identifying consequences	3.0	3.0	-0.295 (.768)	

The female students reported a significantly higher ethical sensitivity on dimension 2, ‘caring by connecting to others’. A Mann-Whitney *U* Test revealed a significant difference at a Bonferroni-corrected .05 level in the self-estimated ethical sensitivity for the dimension ‘caring by connecting to others’ between females ( $Md = 4.0$ ,  $M(SD) = 4.0(.521)$ ,  $n = 343$ ) and males ( $Md = 4.0$ ,  $M(SD) = 3.8(.556)$ ,  $n = 355$ ),  $U = 58268$ ,  $z = -2.832$ ,  $p = .005$ ,  $r = .10$ ). The higher score for females cannot be explained by high ability because the percentages of high-ability students in the female group (50%) and in the male group (48%) are nearly equal. The effect size (.10) is low, however. No significant gender differences were found on the other four dimensions of ethical sensitivity (see Table 3 for details).

1 The use of t-tests in this study for the calculation of differences between groups revealed similar results

### ***Differences in ethical sensitivity related to the university and type of talent program***

We also checked for possible differences in self-estimated levels of ethical sensitivity between students from Utrecht University and Hanze University of Applied Sciences and between students in an honors program and University College students. In both cases, no significant differences were found at a Bonferroni-corrected .05 level. (see Tables 4 and 5 for details).

Table 2.4. University-related differences in students' responses to the ethical sensitivity scale questionnaire (ESSQ).

Dimension	UU (n=392)	HU (n=334)	Z (p)
	<i>Md</i>	<i>Md</i>	
(2) taking perspectives	4.0	4.0	-0.882 (.411)
(3) caring by connecting	4.0	4.0	-2.331 (.021)
(4) working with differences	3.8	3.8	-0.939 (.053)
(6) generating interpretations	3.8	3.8	-0.220 (.826)
(7) identifying consequences	3.0	3.0	-1.109 (.267)

Note. UU = Utrecht University; HU = Hanze University of Applied Sciences.

Table 2.5. Type of talent program-related differences in students' responses to the ethical sensitivity scale questionnaire (ESSQ).

Dimension	UC (n=76)	HP (n=241)	Z (p)
	<i>Md</i>	<i>Md</i>	
(2) taking perspectives	4.1	4.0	-2.107 (.035)
(3) caring by connecting	4.0	4.0	-2.433 (.015)
(4) working with differences	3.9	3.8	-0.853 (.394)
(6) generating interpretations	4.0	4.0	-0.021 (.983)
(7) identifying consequences	3.4	3.3	-2.220 (.026)

Note. UC = University College; HP = Honors Program.

## **Conclusions**

In this paper we presented the empirical data on self-assessed ethical sensitivity for 731 students in Dutch higher education (median age 20 years). The data were collected by administering a 28-item ESSQ (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007) that is based on the theory of ethical sensitivity formulated by Narvaez (2001). Tirri & Nokelainen used the instrument for their research among Finnish secondary school students in 2006 (n=249).

The calculation of possible differences between groups was made with five of the seven subscales of ESSQ. Two were omitted due to low alpha scores on the subscales 'reading and expressing emotions' and 'preventing social bias'. Those two subscales were not included in the further calculations.

We answered the following two aspects of the research question with statistical analyses: (1) Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between academically average and high-ability students? (2) Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between male and female students?

The results on the first aspect show that high-ability students have a higher self-estimated ethical sensitivity than their peers. That finding corresponds with the results of prior research among the age group of 14-17 years, in that high-ability students show advanced moral reasoning (Howard-Hamilton, 1994), moral judgment (Lee, et al., 2006) and a higher self-reported ethical sensitivity (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007) compared to their average-ability peers. The results indicate that the privileged position in the maturation of moral thinking still seems to exist at the age of around 20 years.

The results regarding the second aspect of the question show that female students have a higher estimation of their ethical sensitivity than male students on the dimension 'caring by connecting to others'. No significant differences between the genders were found on the other four dimensions, namely 'taking the perspectives of others', 'working with interpersonal and

group differences', 'generating interpretations and options' and 'identifying the consequences of actions and options'. This finding is partly consistent with the literature (Gilligan, 1982; Björklund, 2003; Tirri, 2003; Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007), which suggests that girls are more care oriented in their moral orientation and boys more justice oriented.

## Discussion

### *Limitations*

This study was conducted among undergraduate students in higher education. One-third of the Dutch population is either enrolled in or holds a degree from an institution of higher education. So one could argue that the respondents already belong to the top third of the country. The average-ability students in this research are in fact 'above-average ability' compared to the entire Dutch population. In that light, the results of this study are even more striking.

The low internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha values) of the subscales 'reading and expressing emotions' and 'preventing social bias' in this research prompted the decision to exclude these from further calculations. Both reading and expressing emotions are necessary for communication, particularly to resolve conflicts and problems. Although they are related, reading and expressing emotions are presumably different skills.

Furthermore, the breadth of concepts like 'ethical problems' and 'ethical issues' may lead to different interpretations. This point had already been raised by respondents in the pilot phase. Especially for items of subscale 6 (generating interpretations and options, for example item "I believe that there are different suitable solutions for ethical problems"), the specific issue a respondent has in mind might affect his score. This might have had a negative influence on the reliability.

***Practical implications***

All students could benefit from incorporating ethics and reflection on values in higher education. The current attention for high-ability students and the consequent development of special programs for this group offer a chance to include ethical issues from the start. Furthermore, honors students in higher education could, given their above-average motivation and abilities, contribute to the solution of global issues. The results of this research suggest an advanced ethical sensitivity of this group, which might be an additional reason to devote attention to ethical and social issues in programs for high-ability students.







# Chapter 3

## Effects of an international undergraduate honors course on awareness of global justice

This chapter has been submitted for publication as: Schutte, I., Kamans, E., Wolfensberger, M. V. C., & Veugelers, W. (2017). Effects of an international undergraduate honors course on global justice awareness.

## **Abstract**

How can undergraduate students be prepared for global citizenship? This question was investigated in a mixed-methods case study of an international, blended one-semester course. Undergraduate honors students ( $N = 22$ ) from the USA and the Netherlands collaborated to explore what it means to be a member of the global community. Curriculum guidelines from the social justice oriented education for global citizenship were used to analyze the course's program and focus the case study. The research questions were as follows: 1. How did the course relate to the curriculum guidelines?

2. What and how did students learn from the course? Analyses of the program showed that the course partly reflects the social justice oriented global citizenship education, in particular by addressing intercultural sensitivity and experiential learning. Quantitative measures in a pre-post design with control groups ( $N = 40$ ) showed some growth in ethical sensitivity and social awareness. Qualitative measures indicated that participants developed a broader view on society and demonstrated a more open and active attitude towards others after the course. Experiential learning was considered a powerful aspect of the pedagogical approach. The results are discussed in relation to a developmental process whereby students gain awareness of global justice issues.

## Introduction

Appeals to provide civic education and develop societal commitment in higher education have been made in many parts of the global North (Gibson, 2012; Keestra, 2007; Nussbaum, 1997). Ultimately, preparing students for their future role in society and giving them opportunities to reflect on who they want to be may make of them citizens who are socially concerned and engaged (i.e. effective citizens in a diverse democracy) (Gibson, 2012). Their engagement is imperative, given the severity of global issues such as climate change, racism and poverty. Several theories have been advanced on how to prepare students for global citizenship (Veugelers, 2011c). Yet few studies have looked into the effects on undergraduates or what works for which students (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont & Stephens, 2003).

The present study illustrates how undergraduate honors students can be prepared for global citizenship. In the autumn of 2011, two universities, one in the USA and the other in the Netherlands, were invited by the State University of New York, Collaborative International Online Learning (SUNY COIL) to develop a Global Networked Community (GNC) course. The two universities used this opportunity to set up a parallel research project on how such a course would foster students' insights and motivation to address issues of global justice.

In the undergraduate honors course *Searchers in Society (SIS)*,<sup>1</sup> students from the two countries worked together in a common program and collaborative online class to find out what it means to be member of the global community. They learned about the complexity of globalization processes and the influence of globalization on local communities (DeWitt & Damhof, 2012).

The course was targeted at undergraduate honors students, as they are deemed to be both able and motivated to take on more than the regular

---

1 A pseudonym is used to ensure confidentiality.

curriculum offers (Wolfensberger, van Eijl & Pilot, 2004). In the Netherlands, societal engagement is considered an important aspect of honors education (Wolfensberger & Pilot, 2014). For instance, at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences, honors students are to focus generally on societal themes and learn to use their abilities for the common good (Faber & Tiesinga, 2010).

In this study, we apply the justice-oriented approach of global citizenship, which includes a desire to improve society (Johnson & Morris, 2010). After reviewing the literature on the subject, we built the curriculum guidelines global justice citizenship education (GJCE) to guide the way to work on societal engagement (see Schutte, 2011 for methods and results of this review). Two key principles ground the guidelines: First, undergraduate students should get the opportunity to prepare for their roles as a global citizens; second, in doing so, they should critically examine the causes of global justice issues.

The curriculum guidelines GJCE were used to analyze the characteristics of the SIS course and students' experiences and learning outcomes. Since the guidelines and the course were developed simultaneously but largely independently, the first research question concerns how the course relates to the GJCE principles. The second question concerns what and how students gained from the course with regard to the intended learning aims specified in the curriculum guidelines.

### **From theory to curriculum**

#### ***Justice, ethics and honors***

Justice is a component of critical citizenship education, meaning that it includes a desire to improve society (Johnson & Morris, 2010). The focus is on gaining insight in the root causes of injustice and envisioning changes in the

systems that reproduce it. Such insight allows informed action (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004; Veugelers, 2007).

When citizenship education deals with global issues, justice and equality, civic development involves moral aspects (Colby et al. 2003; Veugelers, 2011c). In turn, according to Rest (1983), moral development entails ethical sensitivity, moral motivation, moral judgment and moral character. Of these four, ethical sensitivity is said to be the most important, as it is conditional for the other three (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011). Ethical sensitivity implies recognizing a situation as a moral one and identifying with the role of another person (Bebeau, Rest & Narvaez, 1999).

Various studies emphasize the importance of ethics, especially for high-ability students (Schutte, Wolfensberger & Tirri, 2014). First, they show an above-average interest in moral issues and the wider world at an early age (e.g., Roeper & Silverman, 2009; Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue & Weimholt, 2008). Second, they could use their abilities to help address today's global challenges (Gibson, Rimmington & Landwehr-Brown, 2008). Finally, the possibility of obtaining powerful positions in one's professional life makes it important to take a broader perspective on society and on ethical decisions in particular (e.g., Jacobsen, 2009).

### ***Global citizenship***

The global dimension of citizenship captures the international markets merging and becoming interdependent (Plater, 2011), as well as the global crises the world faces, such as poverty and the environmental crisis (Hartman, 2008). The global dimension of citizenship education is further connected to Nussbaum's moral cosmopolitanism (Nussbaum 1997, 2002), especially regarding one's ability to think as a citizen of the world and to imagine inhabiting the position of someone quite different from oneself.

***Curriculum guidelines for global justice citizenship education (GJCE)***

In this section, we explain the curriculum guidelines GJCE (see Table 3.1). While these elements are discussed sequentially, they are notably intertwined; content can be distinguished from approach, but not separated from it. For instance, experiential learning can enhance intercultural awareness and also motivate the student to take action. Furthermore, when students discover possibilities to act for change towards a more just society, their motivation can be positively influenced. As Colby et al. (2003) note, motivation is multifaceted and involves a sense of efficacy or empowerment. They also note that courses directed at civic and moral development can boost motivation.

Table 3.1. Curriculum guidelines global justice citizenship education (GJCE)

Domains	Curriculum guidelines
Knowledge	- Gain historical (root causes of injustice) insights and see local–global connections - Focus on one global-justice issue
Attitude and values	- Develop ethical and intercultural sensitivity - Recognize own values and critically reflect on mainstream thinking - Contact people with different socio-economic positions, cultural backgrounds and life chances
Pedagogical approach	- Spend at least 15 hours in civic contexts (Mabry, 1998)

Based on Schutte (2011)

***Knowledge***

Knowledge provides the basis for insight into global justice issues and their root causes. The focus is on justice- and sustainability-oriented issues like poverty, racism and climate change. Colby et al. (2003) discuss the role that deep knowledge plays in effective action; three elements of deep knowledge

are considered important: a focus on one global issue, historical insight and the relationship between local and global.

First, depth can be achieved by examining one *global issue* rather than learning more superficially about different places and current challenges. Narrowing the focus allows one to grasp the social, political and economic structures that underlie injustice and power differences. Second, the *historic dimension* offers insight into the societal context in which the issue developed (Andreotti, 2006; Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005). As a case in point, without insight into the interdependence between the global North and South, one might suppose that there are no alternatives to current power elites and that poor countries suffer from a 'lack of development' (Heater, 1980; Spivak, 1988; Andreotti, 2006). Finally, students should understand the *global dimension* of their own actions and the interdependence between places in the world (Oxfam GB, 2006).

#### *Attitude and Values*

The second content-related aspect concerns attitude and values. With respect to attitude, it is considered important to take the perspective of 'the other,' to pay attention to the welfare of others and to recognize ethical dilemmas, which are all elements of *ethical sensitivity*. Aside from this care-oriented attitude towards interpersonal relationships, justice-orientation is also considered important. Justice-oriented moral reasoning relates to applying general principles to individual cases, for instance gender justice. *Contact and engagement* with people from other cultural or socio-economic backgrounds can yield new insight into oneself and one's biases (Garland Reed, 2011). For students from middle- and upper-class families, such encounters allow them to look beyond their 'privileged lives' (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker & Donahue, 2003). When such encounters take place, students need *intercultural*



*sensitivity*, the ability to notice and experience cultural difference (Hammer, Bennet & Wiseman, 2003; Holm, 2012).

Learning about values through reflection and discussion can contribute to attitude development, which is especially important in the Dutch context, where values do not get much attention in the regular curriculum of higher education (Veugelers, 2010). We distinguish two skills: The first is *recognizing values* behind statements, ideas and perspectives and evaluating how they relate to students' own values. Such skills can be taught by exposing students to different perspectives. They can be asked to think and write about the possibilities and limitations of statements on a certain issue and then discuss these points (Andreotti, Barker & Newell-Jones, 2006). The second skill is *to critically reflect on values*, especially on 'mainstream' thinking related to the dominant neoliberal ideology. Students should be given the opportunity to look into alternative (emergent) ideas and practices and discuss their underlying values.

### *Pedagogical approach*

In the pedagogical approach, the focus is on experiential learning. This kind of learning takes place when students learn from concrete experience by critically looking back at the activity, giving meaning to it and actively testing the resultant insights in another situation or context (Kolb, 1984). Colby et al. (2003) emphasize the importance of a pedagogy that requires students to be active and emotionally engaged in their work. On this approach, students also reflect, interpret and connect their experiences, whereby experiential learning can have a positive influence on students' moral and civic development. When the context is civic, it can offer "social and conceptual complexity and ambiguity and often elicit emotional responses as well as unexamined stereotypes and other assumptions" (Colby et al., 2003, p. 139).

### ***The course Searchers in Society (SIS)***

The curriculum guidelines GJCE were used to examine the SIS program, explained in this section. During the 17 week course (112 hours), students from a US and a Dutch university participated and collaborated in a mutual online class. Searchers in Society is an instance of globally networked learning (GNL), where students from different continents meet up without traveling abroad. The first session took place in 2012 and yielded the data presented here.

SIS focused on the complexity and layers of the globalization process and inquired, “What does it mean to be a member of the global community?” (DeWitt & Damhof, 2012). To delve into this question, the course offered three modules. The first was ‘Making connections, from local to global,’ in which students looked within their community for all kinds of signs of globalization. The second module, ‘The complexity of globalization,’ examined what it means to be a member of the global community, depending on the group to which one belongs and where one lives in the world. During this module, students interviewed migrants or people who work with migrants in their community. During the third module, intercultural teams (from the USA and the Netherlands) worked on a final product to answer the central question of the course.

The economic, political and cultural dimensions of globalization were addressed (DeWitt & Damhof, 2012). Attention was drawn to one (broad) globalization issue, in that students studied the effects of globalization on the movement of people across borders and the resultant impacts on their citizenship rights. They interviewed either migrants or people working with them. This experience was linked to theories of culture, intercultural communication and cultural practices.

The course activities were student-centered, designed to help students learn how to uncover assumptions, analyze situations by considering

multiple perspectives and building a case, and support their claims with valid evidence. The role of teachers in the course was that of facilitator and role model. Their focus was on modelling students' inquiry process.

Three synchronous online class meetings were held, and the degree of intercultural collaboration kept increasing (DeWitt & Damhof, 2012). Outside class, students and teachers communicated both synchronously and asynchronously via social media. Course materials were accessible online. Moreover, students were asked to share their knowledge and experiences by writing eight individual blogs during the course. The other students and the teachers could react by providing feedback and asking questions.

To analyze the characteristics of SIS, we raised two questions. The first concerned the program: How did the course reflect the curriculum guidelines GJCE? The second concerned its effects: What and how did students learn with regard to the intended outcomes of global justice learning as expressed in the curriculum guidelines?

### **Design**

This paper details a case study conducted with a mixed-method approach (Yin, 2009). Table 3.2 provides an overview of the two main research questions and the sub-questions, as well as the instruments used to answer these.

Table 3.2. Research questions and methods and instruments case study

Questions	Methods and instruments
(1) Presence of the guidelines in the course. What are the characteristics of the program? To what extent were the curriculum guidelines global justice citizenship education (GJCE) present?	Analysis from course website; two teacher interviews; teachers' questionnaire on the curriculum guidelines
(2) Learning outcomes <i>Knowledge</i> Do students show an increase in social awareness and knowledge and insights regarding a global issue after participating in the course?	Pre- and posttest with control group: Social Awareness Scale from the Shared Futures Survey (SFS); open-ended evaluation questions (OEQ)
<i>Attitude &amp; Values</i> Do students show an increase in moral development, intercultural sensitivity and other aspects of intercultural learning?  Do students show a possible change in values or opinions after participating in the course?	Pre- and posttest with control group: Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ); Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ)  OEQ
Are students motivated to make a contribution to a more just world after taking this course?	Pre- and posttest with control group: 'Valuing social action,' 'Civic engagement' and 'Speaking up, acting out' from the Shared Futures Survey; OEQ
<i>Pedagogical approach</i> What are students' perspectives on how they learned?	OEQ

### ***Course characteristics and curriculum guidelines***

To investigate the extent to which the curriculum guidelines GJCE were present in SIS, the course program was compared with the guidelines. We

used the course description on the website and conducted *teacher interviews* halfway through and towards the end of the semester (October and December 2012) to collect information on aims, content, learning activities, learning environment and ways of grouping (based on Thijs & van den Akker, 2009). The individually interviewed teachers were asked whether the course was implemented as envisioned, what adjustments were eventually made and why. The transcripts were returned to them for additions and improvements. Furthermore, the teachers provided written information before and after the course took place (June 2012 and May 2013) on where and how they considered the curriculum guidelines to be present in the course program. They each wrote down their thoughts on each guideline, with regard to both the program and its implementation. Also, to get a better sense of how things went, two of the authors attended two course meetings.

Both quantitative measures (pre- and posttest) as well as qualitative measures (open-ended evaluation questions) were used to collect data about the effects of the course on student learning in terms of global justice citizenship (See Table 3.3).

### ***Pre- and posttests***

We used a pre- and posttest design with control groups to measure the effect of the course on students' ethical sensitivity, intercultural sensitivity and motivation to contribute to a more just world. Students filled out the forms at the first (pretest) and last session (posttest). Honors students from both universities who did not participate in the course served as the control group and filled out the forms around the same time.

### ***Ethical sensitivity***

The Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ) consists of seven dimensions (see Table 3.3) and 28 items, measured on a 5-point Likert scale

(Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007; 2011). These dimensions are hierarchical, going from basic to more complicated (Narvaez, 2001). The operationalization of the ethical sensitivity model is satisfactory in that the psychometric properties of the ESSQ are scientifically valid (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007; Gholami & Tirri, 2012).

Table 3.3. The seven dimensions of the Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ) with statement examples

Dimension	Example statement
(1) Reading and expressing emotions	I notice if someone working with me is offended by me.
(2) Taking the perspectives of others	I tolerate different ethical views in my surroundings.
(3) Caring by connecting to others	I am concerned about the wellbeing of my partners.
(4) Working with interpersonal and group differences	I try to consider another person's position when I face a conflict situation.
(5) Preventing social bias	I recognize my own bias when I take a stand on ethical issues.
(6) Generating interpretations and options	I believe there are several right solutions to ethical problems.
(7) Identifying the consequences of actions and options	I see a lot of ethical problems around me.

*Intercultural sensitivity*

The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ) developed by Holm, Nokelainen and Tirri (2009) consists of 23 items on a 5-point Likert scale. This tool is based upon Bennett's (1993) development model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS), which focuses on people's cognitive and behavioral reactions to cultural difference. It concerns the ability to construe and thus experience cultural difference, which can become an active part of one's

worldview (Hammer et al., 2003). The instrument measures five positions of intercultural sensitivity: The first three represent a more ethnocentric orientation, and the last two a more ethno-relativist orientation (see Table 3.4). Its validity was tested by Holm (2012), who considers ICSSQ to be a promising and useful and compact instrument.

Table 3.4. The five Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ) positions with statement examples

Position	Example statement
(1) Denial	I do not need to care about what happens in other parts of the world.
(2) Defense	I divide the students at my school into 'our people' and 'other people.'
(3) Minimization	People around the world need and want approximately the same things.
(4) Acceptance	Different behaviors make me see things in a new way.
(5) Adaptation	I am able to put myself in the position of a person from another culture.

*Motivation to contribute to a more just world*

The Shared Futures Survey (SFS) of the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) is widely used in the USA to ascertain students' thoughts and experiences on various civic, social, cultural and global issues. This instrument is based on measures tested in other surveys; factor and reliability analyses were used to create and verify the scales (Wathington, 2008; Hovland & Wathington, 2009). Four of the SFS scales were used in the current study (see Table 3.5). *Social awareness* refers to the extent to which one believes it is important to be socially and culturally aware (in terms of both knowledge and attitudes or values). The second scale, *valuing social action*, measures the extent to which individuals appreciate the need to take public action. The third, *civic engagement*, measures a student's self-

reported civic behavior in the past year. The fourth, *speaking up and acting out*, measures a student’s political actions in the same period. The latter two are action-oriented scales, in keeping with the curriculum guidelines of GJCE for developing motivation and discovering possibilities to take social action for a more just world.

Table 3.5. Shared Futures Survey, scales and statement examples

Scale	Example statements
Social awareness	Working to end poverty; Promoting racial tolerance and respect
Valuing social action	Creating awareness of environmental issues
Civic engagement	Participated in volunteer work; Acted with others to educate people about a global issue I care about
Speaking up, acting out	Signed a petition; Joined a boycott

***Significance for the participating students***

The third strategy was to ask about the significance of the course. Students filled out an open-ended evaluation sheet (pencil and paper) at the end of the last session (see Table 3.6). Ultimately, the answers were categorized according to the curriculum guidelines by two independently working coders; differences were resolved through discussion.



Table 3.6. Open-ended evaluation questions and related aspects of the global justice citizenship education (GJCE) guidelines

Questions	Model
What was the most important thing that you have learned from this course?	All aspects
How have you been challenged in this course?	All aspects
What have you learned about yourself?	Attitude and values
Which of your values, opinions or beliefs have possibly changed?	Attitude and values
What was the most powerful learning moment that you experienced during the course? Please describe what happened.	Pedagogical approach
What do you value most about how you learned in this course?	Pedagogical approach
What possibilities do you see for yourself to contribute to a more just society in the future?	Overall aim

***Participants***

Twenty-two university students—13 living in the Netherlands and nine in the USA—participated in the course. The control group consisted of 18 non-participating students, of whom 12 were living in the Netherlands and six in the USA. To check for comparability between participants and the control group, data were collected on age; gender; highest educational level of parents or guardians, as an indicator of socio-economic status; and self-reported cultural-ethnic background. We anticipated that age could affect the data, as older persons have more life experience. Furthermore, gender could affect the data, as women tend to score higher than men on ethical sensitivity (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2011) and intercultural sensitivity (Holm, 2012). Both socio-economic status and cultural backgrounds can influence value orientations, the way people look at and interpret the world, and their moral considerations (Graham, Nosek, Haidt, Iyer, Koleva & Ditto, 2011).

The data indicate that the participant group ( $M = 21.3, SD = 2.1$ ) and control group ( $M = 21.3, SD = 2.1$ ) are comparable regarding age and socio-economic status (74% and 78% bachelor degree or higher for participants and control group, respectively). Regarding gender, though, women were over-represented among the participants (79% vs. 50%). Finally, the self-reported cultural-ethnic background was diverse in both groups: In the participant group, 54% mentioned having a background in another country or culture than (the main culture of) the country where they lived, whereas in the control group this portion was 44%. Such cultural-ethnic diversity offers opportunities for participants to learn from each other. However, both groups were far above average regarding socio-economic status: In comparison, about 34% of people in the Netherlands (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek [CBS], Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs [DUO] & het Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap [OCW], 2013) and 42% in the USA (United States Census Bureau, 2014) have completed higher education. The relatively high socio-economic position of the study population suggests a homogeneous setting that is not conducive to learning about diversity.

## Results

### ***Comparison: Curriculum guidelines of global justice citizenship education (GJCE) and the Searchers in Society (SIS) course***

The curriculum guidelines GJCE contain the following domains: knowledge, attitude and values and pedagogical approach. Table 3.7 provides a summary of the comparison between the guidelines and the course, which will be further explained in the text.

Table 3.7. Implementation guidelines global justice citizenship education (GJCE) in course Searchers in Society (SIS): an overview

	GJCE Guidelines	Course SIS	S
K	One global issue	Complexity of globalization	-/+
	Local–global influences	Local–global relations	-/+
	Historical insights root causes injustice	Some attention for historical elements	-/+
A V	Contact groups with other cultural or socio-economic backgrounds	Contact groups with other cultural or socio–economic backgrounds	+/-
	Intercultural sensitivity and awareness	Intercultural cooperation in international groups	+
	Recognizing values and critical reflection on mainstream thinking	Mainly connected with cultural identity and (critical incidents in) intercultural exchange	-/+
PA	Experiential learning. Spend at least 15 hours in civic contexts	Experiential learning by intercultural cooperation; 25% in the community and interview migrants (or people who work with migrants)	+ -/+

*Note.* S = Similarities. – = not present; -/+ = a little present; +/- = clearly present; + = strongly present; ++ completely incorporated

### *Knowledge*

We first explored how the knowledge component of GJCE played out during the course. Three elements are important here: the focus on one global issue, the historical dimension and local–global relationships. The purpose of the course was related to the increasing global interdependence and the impact of globalization on daily life, a broad theme. The teachers stressed that, above all, globalization is complex; the students acknowledged this complexity by the end of the course. Within this theme, the broad *global issue* of migration and related citizenship rights was present in the second module. Complexity in this theme relates to citizenship being determined by national boundaries,

in contrast to the idea of ‘universal’ human rights— that human rights should be granted to all human beings, by virtue of being human. The main question of this module was, How does migration affect people’s lives? The second module examined what it means to be a member of the global community, depending on the group to which one belongs and one’s place of residence. Teachers allowed students to choose who they wished to interview in the community and to define their research questions. They later reported thinking that doing so came at the expense of attention paid to specific issues in depth.

Regarding the historical dimension, students were urged to take *historical events* into account when developing a working definition of globalization. Then, for the final project, when students presented a digital showcase on what it means to be a member of the global community, they were also required to take the historical context into account.

The third element, *linking the local or regional and global*, manifested in the aims, modules and assignments. For instance, in the first assignment, students were invited to make connections between the local and the global by looking for signs of globalization in their community (using photography) and sharing their findings. In the second module, students were immersed in their local communities and then shared what they learned with the other students (in the USA or in the Netherlands) to gain a cross-cultural perspective on the issue of migration.

#### *Attitude and values*

We subsequently explored how the course related to the curriculum guidelines regarding attitudes and values. This domain includes moral and intercultural learning, which can occur through contact and interaction with people from other socio-economic positions or cultural backgrounds. It also includes expanding horizons: gaining another perspective on one’s own

values and habits; accessing other perspectives and a broader perspective on the world; and considering one's own behavior with regard to people from other cultures.

The course was designed to stimulate increasing cooperation in intercultural teams consisting of students from both universities. Furthermore, students interviewed migrants or people who work with migrants. Teachers' implementation information revealed that contact and interaction occurred both within the classroom and in the local community. Teachers wrote, that students attending each university brought along different life experiences and that the communities in which the students live are different. Moreover, groups of students had the opportunity to meet members of their local communities who had different life experiences. It was not clear to the teachers to what extent students reflected on those differences. Furthermore, the teachers added a session on intercultural collaboration "to help students understand the perspective of the 'other' group members."

The second element, recognition of values behind statements, policies or activities, was expected to advance reflection on values, including how they relate to students' own values. Furthermore, critical reflection on the values, especially on mainstream thinking, might induce students to try to understand the origins of various perspectives and their implications and to gain new or alternative perspectives.

Recognition and critical reflection on values and opinions was occasionally present in the course. For example, students were asked to reflect on the culture of their country with the help of Geert Hofstede's theory on cultures which considers values. Furthermore, it was present when students indulged in a debate between 'globalists' and 'skeptics' and on one occasion when the students were asked, "When is globalization bad and for whom?" and "When is globalization good and for whom?" Finally, students reflected on speeches

by Kofi Annan (in 2002, before the Iraq war started) and Barack Obama (in 2012), guided by the questions “what assumptions do they make?” and “how do they address ‘us’ and ‘them’?” They were not specifically asked to discuss ‘mainstream’ perspectives.

### *Pedagogical approach*

The pedagogical approach of experiential learning could, when combined with the other curriculum guidelines, enhance of social responsibility, tolerance and moral learning in general. In the course SIS, the activities were inquiry-based, including experiential learning online and in both communities. Teachers’ implementation information revealed that “students went into their communities to find evidence of globalization through photography and interviews with immigrants or people working with immigrants. The time spent in the community remained as planned (25% of class time).” Reflection occurred in class discussions as well as on the student blogs. For instance, students reflected on the interview by discussing: How did the interview(s) meet your expectations? In your community, has migration made people’s lives harder or easier? On a more personal note, What did you learn? What impressed you, or disappointed you? What do you think is your place in this context? Do you see yourself as a part of this, and if so, where would that be?

### *Pre- and posttests*

#### *Analytical strategy*

We tested whether the course had an impact on students’ *ethical sensitivity*, *intercultural sensitivity* and *motivation to contribute to a more just world* by using a factorial repeated measure analysis, with group as an independent measure (course participant group vs. control group). Specifically, we tested

whether these three outcomes increased in the participant group but not in the control group. As such, statistically we were looking for interaction effects between group and pre-post measures.

We will further report the results in the sequence of the curriculum guidelines GJCE (see Table 3.1).

### *Knowledge*

We used the subscale 'social awareness' from the SFS to check for a possible gain in knowledge about and insight into global justice issues among the participants. For results of reliability measures (Cronbach's alpha values), see Appendix A. Means are reported in Table 3.8. The analysis did not show the anticipated interaction  $F < 1$ . However, the simple effect showed a trend of increase among participants  $F(1,35) = 2.77, p = .10, \eta^2_p = .08$ , while no such increase occurred within the control group,  $F < 1$ . Further, although participants did not differ from the control group at the beginning of the course,  $F(1,33) = 1.90, p = .18, \eta^2_p = .06$ , they scored higher on social awareness at the end of the course,  $F(1,33) = 5.46, p = .026, \eta^2_p = .14$ .

### *Attitude and values*

As we expected moral and intercultural learning to take place, we measured students' ethical and intercultural sensitivity to test the effect of participation in the course.

*Ethical sensitivity.* For results of reliability measures (Cronbach's alpha values) on the seven subscales of the ESSQ, see Appendix A. In the current study, the alpha values were satisfactory except for Subscale 5. According to Tuckman (1972), a lower boundary of 0.5 is acceptable when measuring attitudes. It was decided to include all seven subscales in the analysis, as their reliability

had been proven in former studies (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011; Gholami & Tirri, 2012).

Table 3.8. Means and standard deviations subscales of the Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ), two combined subscales of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ) and the four subscales of Shared Futures Society (SFS).

(Sub) scale	Participants		Control group	
	pre <i>M(SD)</i>	post <i>M(SD)</i>	pre <i>M(SD)</i>	post <i>M(SD)</i>
ESS1	3.62 (.54)	3.63 (.44)	3.66 (.58)	3.62 (.67)
ESS2	4.16 (.38)	4.16 (.44)	3.99 (.53)	3.84 (.61)
ESS3	4.12 (.48)	4.29 (.35)	4.01 (.66)	4.10 (.79)
ESS4	4.01 (.49)	3.97 (.49)	3.68 (.64)	3.74 (.55)
ESS5	3.76 (.58)	3.75 (.54)	3.78 (.40)	3.74 (.57)
ESS6	3.65 (.56)	4.0 (.48)	3.77 (.64)	3.74 (.55)
ESS7	3.67 (.57)	3.83 (.54)	3.65 (.79)	3.68 (.74)
DD	1.78 (.36)	1.83 (.40)	2.08 (.44)	2.05 (.62)
AA	3.98 (.34)	3.98 (.36)	3.78 (.56)	3.74 (.50)
SA	3.15 (.56)	3.33 (.46)	2.89 (.54)	2.95 (.48)
CE	2.38 (.99)	2.50 (.87)	2.18 (1.00)	2.29 (.95)
SuA	1.57 (.43)	1.56 (.45)	1.46 (.41)	1.48 (.57)

*Note.* Subs = Subscales; CE = civic engagement; DD = denial and defense; AA = acceptance and adaptation; SA = social awareness; SuA = speaking up and acting out.

ESS1 *N* participants = 19, *N* control = 17; ESS2 *N* participants = 19, *N* control = 17; ESS3 *N* participants = 19, *N* control = 17; ESS4 *N* participants = 18, *N* control = 18; ESS5 *N* participants = 19, *N* control = 17; ESS6 *N* participants = 18, *N* control = 18; ESS7 *N* participants = 18, *N* control = 18. DD *N* participants = 19, *N* control = 18; AA *N* participants = 19, *N* control = 18. SA *N* participants = 19, *N* control = 16; CE *N* participants = 18, *N* control = 16; SuA *N* participants = 18, *N* control = 16.

We ran the analysis for the seven subscales of the ESSQ separately. Results revealed a significant interaction with respect to the subscale generating



interpretations and options (ESS6)  $F(1,34) = 5.91, p = .02, \eta^2_p = .15$ . To interpret this interaction, we conducted simple effect analysis (means are reported in Table 3.8). This analysis showed that there was indeed a significant increase of generating interpretations and options within the participant group  $F(1,34) = 5.95, p = .02, \eta^2_p = .15$ , while this was not the case within the control condition  $F < 1$ . With respect to the other subscales, no significant interaction effects were found  $F_s < 1$ .

*Intercultural sensitivity.* The reliability of the subscales of the ICSSQ in this research was also tested with the parametric Cronbach's alpha. The results showed a low reliability on all of the six subscales  $\alpha < .50$ . Combining the lower stages of intercultural sensitivity, denial and defense (which represent a more ethnocentric orientation) and the higher two stages of acceptance and adaptation (which represent a more ethno-relativist orientation), however, resulted in more reliable scales (see Appendix A).<sup>2</sup>

The results of the analysis showed no significant interactions for both denial and defense,  $F < 1$ , and acceptance and adaptation,  $F < 1$ . In line with this result, simple effect analysis showed no changes in denial and defense or acceptance and adaptation due to participation in the course,  $F_s < 1$ . Simple effect analysis did, however, show a difference between the control group and the participant group at the end of the course with respect to acceptance and adaptation,  $F(1,35) = 2.95, p = .092, \eta^2_p = .08$ , such that the participant group scored slightly higher. Next to this, there was already a difference between the participant and control group at the start of the course with respect to denial and defense,  $F(1,35) = 5.35, p = .027, \eta^2_p = .13$ . Specifically, the control group scored higher on this scale than the participant group. Means are reported in Table 3.8.

---

2 Also, Holm found a positive correlation between denial and defense in her research,  $r = .69$ , as well as between acceptance and adaptation,  $r = .31$  (Holm, 2012).

*Social-justice-related action.* Social-justice-related action deals with seeing possibilities and developing motivation for taking action. We used the part of the SFS on citizenship and democracy to measure whether the course affected the extent to which students value social action and whether it affected their activities to contribute to making the world better (See Appendix A for internal consistency values). Due to a low internal reliability value at the posttest, it was decided to exclude the 'valuing social action' subscale from the analysis.

With respect to *civic engagement* and *speaking up and acting out* the analyses did not show that the course had an impact on these forms of motivation to contribute to a more just world. There were no interaction effects  $F_s < 1$ , nor did simple effect analysis indicate something along these lines, all  $F_s < 1$ . Moreover, the scores on *civic engagement* and *speaking up and acting out* seem to be rather low. Means are reported in Table 3.8.

### ***Significance of course for participating students***

*Knowledge.* In the open-ended evaluation ( $N = 18$ ) students were asked what the *most important [thing] that they learned was*. Of the 18 answers to this question, three were associated with knowledge and insight: two students mentioned the complexity of globalization, and one noted the threats and opportunities related to the global economy and to wealth distribution and population growth.

Students were also asked how they were *challenged* in this course, and of the 18 answers three can be related to knowledge of globalization: "to think about broader, more abstract global issues"; "really trying to understand how we are influenced by globalization"; and "different views on globalization."

*Attitude and values.* In response to the question of what the *most important thing they learned was*, four of the 18 answers were related to being open

towards others and valuing other cultures. For instance, one said “tolerance is not enough; be aware of differences and accept them.” Another three students mentioned that they communicate or collaborate better with people interculturally or internationally. When asked how students were *challenged* in this course, 12 of the 18 answers were related to international and intercultural cooperation. The following aspects were mentioned: the different time zones and the virtual communication (each three times); different working methods; looking at things from other perspectives and actually challenging one’s own long-held beliefs.

When asked what students *learned about themselves*, half of the responses were about what students are able to do or like to do. Six of the 18 answers concerned being open to and valuing other cultures: for instance, one student stated, “I like to work with different kinds of people from different cultures.” Five referred specifically to globalization or a global issue; for instance, “I have never given the concept of immigration serious thought before” and “the way we see and treat refugees in the Netherlands.” Another seven answers were related to critical self-reflection, mostly on attitude; for instance, “the more I find out, the less I know” and “I am not as flexible as I thought.”

When asked which of their *values, beliefs or opinions had possibly changed*, six of the 18 students reported a positive change in the way they look at or value other cultures or other people’s cultural backgrounds. Two of them mentioned the difference between tolerance and acceptance, for instance noticing “total acceptance of others rather than just tolerance.” Another student said, “I am more open to interacting positively with those from other cultures”; and yet another stated that “My idea of what it means to be born in a country has changed...” Also, one answer was related to sustainable consumption: “Once I have graduated I will buy more organic food and be more aware of the choices I make. What will it mean for somebody else?” Four students mentioned gaining new insights explicitly related to immigration.

For instance, “I used to believe that my nation and county were more accepting than they seemed based on one of my interviews”; “I always was of the opinion that integration was possible if one only puts enough effort in integration, but now I also consider the fact that the culture or society that one wants to integrate in needs to be open to strangers”; “I always believed globalization is merely a good thing for everybody, but maybe that is not always the case.”

*Social justice action.* When asked what possibilities students see for themselves *to contribute to a more just society* in the future, none said they did not see such possibilities. Of the 18 answers, 11 concerned attitude and behavior towards other people, such as “I don’t want to have any assumptions about people anymore. Next to that, I want to influence other people in a positive way about globalization.” Four students referred to their future profession: for instance, “Because I want to go into humanitarian work, I think I can incorporate this aspect into anything I do” and “learn more about cultures and what binds us. Put those learnings into practice in international business communications.” Three answers were activity- or volunteering-related, for instance “Getting more involved in my neighborhood.” Finally, two answers dealt with sustainable consumption, one regarding clothes and the other food.

*Pedagogical approach.* In the open-ended evaluation ( $N = 18$ ), students were asked what they *valued most in how they learned* in the course; seven mentioned learning by experience, citing the practical work, the field research or the interview. For example, they recalled, “...when we had to interview someone from the community and listen to their stories” and “going out in the community.” Another six mentioned cooperation with students overseas: for example, “The fact that we formed friendship with

the X students” and “Skype sessions with our American counterparts.” Four students gave answers related to the teacher or class, such as “the teacher’s critical feedback during the class discussions” and “the class discussion— hearing different smart points of view.” Finally, when asked to name the *most powerful learning moment*, six mentioned the community interview; another six answers were related to the intercultural aspect of the teamwork.

## **Conclusions**

### ***Presence of the curriculum guidelines global justice citizenship education (GJCE) in the course***

In this study, we inquired how the course SIS could enhance social commitment and moral development. The curriculum guidelines GJCE were used to analyze the course and focus our study. Comparison of the course with our guidelines revealed some divergence in aims and focus. The course has a broad theme, globalization, with a focus on learning about complexity and what it means to be a member of the global community. Curriculum guidelines, in contrast, target in-depth knowledge of one specific global issue. Insight into the root causes of injustice, inequality or environmental issues, which is one of the curriculum guidelines, was not a goal for in this course and is thus not visible in its program. Finally, there was attention to the local–global connection, but not specifically aimed at gaining deeper insights into the nature of those connections. And indeed, we did find that students hardly mentioned knowledge as an important outcome of SIS.

We also found several similarities between the curriculum guidelines and the course program. Three guidelines are clearly or strongly visible in the course: contact with people from different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, attention to intercultural sensitivity and attention to experiential learning, partly in civic contexts. Other curriculum guidelines

were covered in the course, but not extensively: attention to one global justice issue, historical insights, insight into local global connections, recognition of and critical reflection on values, and community research.

Consequently, in this study we could not fully assess the possible value that the curriculum guidelines might have in preparing students for global justice citizenship. Specifically, deep knowledge of one global issue, historical insights into root causes of injustice and critical reflection on mainstream values were not represented. For this reason, research is needed on courses that do incorporate these aspects. Furthermore, the evaluation of the course SIS in terms of its own goals could lead to valuable insights other than those generated in this study.

### ***Effects on the students in terms of GJCE***

Our second question was about what and how students learned from the course. This query covered both the intended learning outcomes as specified in the curriculum guidelines—regarding knowledge, attitude and values, and insights and motivation to contribute to a more just world—and the pedagogical approach of experiential learning.

#### *Knowledge*

As the social awareness scale from the Shared Future Survey indicated, the course did produce more awareness of social justice, at least among some of the participants. As the open-ended evaluation questions revealed, moreover, the participants did not see knowledge as an important learning outcome. A few mentioned globalization, citing its complexity, the broad abstract global issues and the challenge of trying to understand how we are influenced by globalization.

### *Attitude and values*

*Ethical sensitivity.* The students who participated in the course showed an increase in ethical sensitivity on one of the seven subscales, namely 'generating interpretations and options,' while the control group did not. This dimension requires the use of creative skills in both interpreting a situation and in dealing with it. Indeed, people often repeat the same mistakes because they react automatically without considering another way to behave (Narvaez, 2001). The ability to respond creatively also implies that the students are more aware of ethical aspects.

Only one subscale improved as a result of the course, but the ability to properly *generate interpretations and options* is conditional on two other dimensions: *how to connect to others* and *how to take others' perspectives* (Narvaez, 2001). Accordingly, some importance may be imputed to the improvement on that one subscale. Growth in ethical sensitivity is also indicated by the positive change reported by six students (30%) in the way they look at and value other cultures.

*Intercultural sensitivity.* The results of the survey on intercultural sensitivity, the ICSSQ, indicate a slight increase in intercultural sensitivity among participants. Furthermore, they had already scored lower on the ethnocentric-oriented stages of denial and defense compared to the control group at the start of the course. Apparently, students who decided to take SIS were already more interculturally sensitive. In the open-ended evaluation, they did offer several responses that signal an increase in intercultural sensitivity. For instance, some noted having learned that there is an important difference between mere tolerance and acceptance. Furthermore, insights in the complexity of intercultural cooperation were also reported.

*Insight and motivation to contribute to a more just world*

The results of the Shared Futures Survey, for the part on civic engagement and speaking up and acting out, do not show an increase in civic or political actions among the participants. Also, the score in the pre- and posttest on both subscales seems rather low, meaning that the students do not often take part in civic or political action.

However, all participants were firm about the contributions they want to make to create a more just world. Participants' answers were related to various roles: their future profession; activity or volunteer work, like becoming more active in one's neighborhood; or being a sustainable consumer. Most answers concerned attitude and being more open towards others. This trend may explain why no effect was found with the SFS, as mentioned above; the reason is that the subscales used, do not contain attitude-related items. Further, the SFS asks about activities in the past year, whereas the open-ended question on students' contributions to a more just society concerns the future.

Finally, some gained insight into global justice. Three participants reported the insight that the difficult position of migrants is related to the culture or attitude of their society. Another student mentioned that globalization might not be a good thing for everybody.

*Pedagogical approach of experiential learning*

In the open-ended evaluation, students said they value learning-by-experience most with regard to how they learned, both in the community and by means of the intercultural teamwork. When asked to identify the most powerful learning moment, students again mentioned experiential learning. This finding aligns with the theory of Colby et al. (2003): Experiential learning, especially in civic contexts, is highly valuable for civic and moral learning in higher education.



## **Discussion**

This research investigated how a course related to global justice citizenship can enhance social commitment and moral development. We used the curriculum guidelines GJCE to analyze the characteristics of the course SIS, as well as its students' experiences and learning outcomes. Quantitative measures indicated the effects of the course on only a minority of the scales used, namely on one aspect of ethical sensitivity and on social awareness. This result could be related to the small group size and the short duration of the course. When a study uses quantitative measures in small groups, significant differences are less easily found. It is even more difficult when measuring the effects of a course lasting just one semester (112 hours). Wathington (2008) drew similar conclusions about administering the SFS in American colleges. To better appreciate what a course like this evokes in the participants, the use of qualitative methods could be expanded to include, for instance, systematic content analyses of student work. Class observations could also provide useful information on how students' experiences in civic contexts are being discussed and reflected upon in class. Such information would enhance the understanding of what students learn from those experiences.

It is also possible that the instrument we used is inappropriate for a specific group of undergraduate students or for the context. There might be such a mismatch with the instrument used to measure intercultural sensitivity, the ICSSQ; the test showed only marginal change. Yet, students did give special emphasis to upbringing, which would suggest the acquisition of intercultural insight and awareness. For instance, when asked about a changed attitude towards people who differ from them in cultural background, some answered that "tolerance is not enough; make active contact." In the Dutch context, 'tolerance is not enough' does not relate to 'everything should be tolerated,' but to one's attitude towards unknown others, which could include people with different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. We consider this

important, as contact with other groups decreases prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

The limited effects measured may also be related to the limits of the course itself, especially regarding the gaining of knowledge and insights. In-depth knowledge on one specific global issue and insight into the root causes of injustice, inequality or environmental issues were not aimed for in this course and were thus not visible in its program. Nor did students discuss mainstream perspectives. However, to be able to understand global issues, a complex web of cultural and material local and global processes and contexts needs to be investigated and unraveled (Andreotti, 2006).

As Colby et al. (2003) explain, the results of civic and moral learning can fade away when students leave college and enter new contexts. Also, the effects may be invisible just after a course, but surface later in life. Further research is needed on the longer-term effects of short undergraduate courses: Does the process continue and under which conditions?

The curriculum guidelines GJCE offer principles for education aimed at developing motivation and identifying possibilities to take action for social justice. Based on this case study, what can be said about these guidelines? It should be noted that an important element, namely looking for root causes of global justice issues, was hardly present in the course. Nonetheless, other guidelines were covered, and their effects could be appraised.

For the most part, students in the global North are relatively well off. Given the above-average educational level of their parents and guardians, this is presumably true of the participating students too. Basically, they can broaden their world through new encounters and knowledge on one specific issue of global justice. In relation to the curriculum guidelines, the course SIS broadened students' world views. Not only did it offer encounters with people varying in cultural background, but it also entailed experiencing international collaboration and interviewing migrants or people who work

with migrants in their community. The added value of increasing intercultural collaboration in this course has been treated in a chapter of a book (DeWitt, Damhof, Oxenford, Schutte & Wolfensberger, 2015).

Students' perspectives on what and how they learned clearly indicate not only the value of these elements but also the power of experiential learning. As this study demonstrates, these experiences brought about new insights, changes in opinions and especially intercultural awareness. This result is important in the light of the public discussions on integration in the Netherlands, where interest in 'the other' is often superficial, couched in generalizations and moral convictions (Nijhuis, 2015). In other words, the guidelines GJCE that are present in the course SIS do seem to be important.

A more open and active attitude towards others is valuable in itself, but could also begin a process of growing global justice awareness. If this effect can be achieved through the SIS course, the initiative could represent a bright spot in the discussion within the critical global citizenship approach: how to enhance a critical attitudes in a situation where the dominant neoliberal ideology permeates all aspects of education (e.g., Kliewer, 2013). Maintaining direct contacts outside of one's own social network while keeping an open mind and sustaining an active attitude could lead to new insights into how people are affected by society and politics, because it is in such contacts that the primacy of the economy is not likely to play a major role.

## Appendix A

Internal consistency values Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ); Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ), combined subscales 'denial and defense' and 'acceptance and adaptation'; and Shared Futures Survey (SFS) subscales: social awareness, valuing social action, civic engagement, and speaking up and acting out.

ESSQ Dimension ( <i>N</i> = 35)	$\alpha$ pretest	$\alpha$ posttest
(1) Reading and expressing emotions	.57	.69
(2) Taking the perspectives of others	.50	.61
(3) Caring by connecting to others	.68	.78
(4) Working with interpersonal and group differences	.69	.67
(5) Preventing social bias	.61	.47
(6) Generating interpretations and options	.69	.69
(7) Identifying the consequences of actions and options	.72	.65
ICSSQ combined subscales ( <i>N</i> = 37)		
(1) Denial & (2) defense	.52	.70
(4) Acceptance & (5) adaptation	.68	.63
SFS subscale ( <i>N</i> = 35)		
(1) Social awareness	.65	.62
(2) Valuing social action	.56	.14
(3) Civic engagement	.89	.79
(4) Speaking up and acting out	.52	.66



# Chapter 4

## Building and implementing a global citizenship course for undergraduate honors students

This chapter has been accepted for publication as: Schutte, I. W., Kamans, E., Wolfensberger, M. V. C., & Veugelers, W. (in press). Building and implementing a global citizenship course for undergraduate honors students. *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity*.

## **Abstract**

This pilot study investigates the development and delivery of a 112-hour undergraduate honors course for global citizenship education, called Society 2.0, in the Netherlands. The theory-based curriculum guidelines Global Justice Citizenship Education (GJCE) were used to build the course by a development team consisting of two teachers, two honors students and one researcher. The course was delivered twice. Content analysis of development documents and teacher interviews were conducted to answer three questions: What was the added value of course development with a team including teachers, students and researcher? How did the curriculum guidelines shape a. the formal and b. the operationalized curriculum? and In what way are the honors pedagogies 'freedom', 'challenge' and 'community' shaped in the course? Results indicate that the open atmosphere and equality in the development team positively influenced the atmosphere in class. The curriculum guidelines in the moral and social domains as well as experiential learning and honors pedagogies were applied in the course. Guidelines in the knowledge domain seemed the most difficult to realize, especially gaining insights in root causes of injustice. Results are discussed in light of their potential benefits to curriculum design and teaching for critical global citizenship in undergraduate honors programs.

## Introduction

Undergraduate high-ability students in the Netherlands and other countries in Europe have increasing possibilities to develop their talents through participation in honors talent programs (Wolfensberger, 2015). These programs target students who are willing and able to go beyond the regular program in terms of academic challenge and personal development (Wolfensberger, 2012; Clark & Zubizaretta 2008, Hébert & McBee, 2007). Policies emphasize the contribution these students could make to the business and knowledge sectors (e.g., Persson, 2011). Learning that addresses global challenges has been marginalized (especially in gifted education) under the influence of industrialism and militarism (Gibson, Rimmington & Landwehr-Brown, 2008).

High-ability students show an above-average interest in moral issues and the wider world (e.g., Roeper & Silverman, 2009; Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue & Weimholt, 2008; Schutte, Wolfensberger & Tirri, 2014). Honors programs can align with their propensity by offering moral and civic learning. Several authors recognize the importance of wisdom in achieving a common good (Sternberg, Jarvin & Grigorenko, 2011), of giving something back to society (Flikkema, 2016) and of leadership and global awareness (Passow & Schiff, 1989; Lee et al., 2008) when educating high-ability students.

The curriculum guidelines Global Justice Citizenship Education (GJCE) integrate those issues and relate to three domains: cognitive, social and moral (see Table 4.1). Global citizenship education has been defined from different viewpoints. The curriculum guidelines GJCE connect to what Westheimer & Kahne (2004) call a justice-oriented citizen: one who is not only engaged in civic society but also looks for structural causes of injustice.



Table 4.1. Global Justice Citizenship Education<sup>1</sup>

Domains	Curriculum guidelines
Knowledge domain	-Gain historical (root causes of injustice) insights and see local-global connections -Focus on one global-justice issue
Moral domain	-Develop ethical and intercultural sensitivity -Recognize own values and critically reflect on mainstream thinking
Social domain	-Contact people with different socioeconomic positions, cultural backgrounds and life chances -Get to know positive role models: active and socially engaged people
Experiential learning	- Spend at least 15 hours in civic contexts

Based on Schutte (2011)

The curriculum guidelines were used to develop ‘Society 2.0’, a global citizenship course for undergraduate honors students at a university of applied sciences in the Netherlands. The aim of this study is to evaluate the formal and operational curriculum for critical global citizenship by posing three research questions: 1. What was the added value of course development with a team including teachers, students and researcher? 2. How did the curriculum guidelines shape a. the formal curriculum and b. the operationalized curriculum? 3. In what way are honors pedagogies implemented in the course?

### ***‘Society 2.0’***

We investigated the development and delivery of a 112-hour undergraduate honors course called ‘Society 2.0, alternative movements and their

---

1 Compared to the second study (chapter 3), the curriculum guidelines GJCE now are classified in three domains. Furthermore, “Get to know positive role models” was added to the social domain.

contribution for a better world'. Alternative movements pursue alternatives to the established order, values and structures, such as a barter economy, green energy and new approaches to housing. The purpose of 'Society 2.0' is to stimulate critical awareness of one's role as a citizen of the world. The course was offered as eight two-hour evening sessions once every two weeks. It was delivered in the autumn of 2014 (ten students) and again in the autumn of 2015 (15 students) as part of an extracurricular honors program (not mandatory).

The structure of the course starts from the student's values and opinions and expands towards the wider world. The learning objectives (and corresponding GJCE- domains) were formulated as follows. Students:

- become aware of how they are influenced by their own socioeconomic background and that of others (social domain);
- gain insight into the historical roots of a social issue and develop a global perspective on it by using different sources and media (knowledge domain);
- formulate criteria for a just and sustainable society (moral domain);
- can make a prediction about the future of the alternative movement where they do their internship, and about its influence, for instance on poverty reduction, climate change or global power differences (knowledge domain);
- learn different perspectives on alternative/social movements (knowledge and moral domains);
- can identify ethical dilemmas regarding the theme/issue (moral domain).

While largely coaching the students in their learning process, the teachers also deliver content, for instance about ethical theory. Besides treating alternative/social movements -- discussing what they are and what they wish

to achieve -- and related global/social issues, there is attention for ethics, socialization, conformism and (sub)cultures. One of the course meetings is dedicated to a current global issue using the 'open space' method, described by Andreotti, Barker & Newell-Jones (2006): students start with a mutual knowledge base, then consider the perspectives of different statements about issues - who could have said this and why - and subsequently consider different - new -- insights.

Students do a 15-hour internship with an alternative/social movement of their choice and interview participants about the ideals of the group and their views on a better world. Students also make a small contribution to that group. They share their knowledge and reflect on their experiences by writing five blogs: 1, How did your background form your opinion about alternative/social movements?; 2, Deepening: explore a theme that appeals to you; 3, Place your theme in historic/future and local-global perspective; 4, Describe and analyze your experiences with your internship; 5, Reflection and evaluation. Additionally, students comment on blogs of at least two fellow students. Further, they discuss their experiences and insights in the class and in small groups.

The final assessment has an individual and a group part. In a one-minute video message, each student tells how he or she could contribute to a better and more sustainable world. Also, small groups of about four make 'a product for global citizens' (in a form of their choice) to help others gain insights. For the lessons table, see Appendix 1.

### ***Curriculum levels***

Our research design was based on Goodlad's model comprising six interrelated levels (Goodlad, 1979) but highlighted three: the ideal, formal and operationalized curriculum, as explained below. Although Goodlad's interpreted curriculum was not addressed directly, we did investigate

teachers' views on pedagogical goals. Goodlad's experienced and effected levels lie beyond the scope of this study.

#### *Ideal curriculum*

The curriculum guidelines GJCE are profiled here as the ideal curriculum. The guidelines were used previously to evaluate an international hybrid honors course (Schutte, Kamans, Wolfensberger & Veugelers, 2017a). They entail a holistic approach, treating values, ethics and social awareness alongside cognitive development. The importance of such an approach in honors education is underscored by Tirri (2011a; 2012) and Tolppanen & Tirri (2014). The curriculum guidelines GJCE are open, giving no guidelines for content, assessment or grouping. It does advocate experiential learning in civic contexts.

#### *Formal curriculum*

The product of the development team is the formal curriculum. We investigated how GJCE shaped the formal curriculum and what the added value was of development by a team consisting of teachers, students and researcher. Honors students were included because of their documented interest in developing their own education (Schutte, Weistra & Wolfensberger, 2010; Wolfensberger, 2012). The teachers met beforehand to see if they could work together; they also taught the course. All team members could draw upon their experiences, convictions and expertise. The development team had nine meetings over a period of three months.

#### *Operationalized curriculum*

The course as it was delivered is the operationalized curriculum. We investigated how GJCE shaped the operationalized curriculum.

### ***Honors pedagogies***

The course targets honors students, for whom three pedagogies are of particular significance (Wolfensberger, 2012): ‘community’, which relates to the importance of a safe learning community for these students; ‘academic competence’, which entails the importance of academic and deeper learning; and ‘bounded freedom’, which relates to the need for autonomy and self-regulation in learning. We were interested in how these pedagogies came forward in the formal and operationalized curriculum.

## **Methodology**

### ***The aim of the study***

This study investigates the creation of a formal and operationalized curriculum for critical global citizenship by asking three questions: 1. What was the added value of course development with a team including teachers and students? 2. How did the curriculum guidelines shape a. the formal curriculum and b the operationalized curriculum? 3. In what way are honors pedagogies implemented in the course?

### ***Data collection***

#### ***Formal curriculum***

Various forms of data on the development of the formal curriculum were collected: notes of all nine team meetings (made by members of the team); documents/products (17) such as elaborations of the theme and the course outline; and email exchanges (89) between the team members. The information was used to answer research questions RQ1, RQ2a and RQ3.

As teachers views play a central role in curriculum development (Van den Akker, 2003), they were asked to answer a questionnaire (during interview

1) on pedagogical goals in citizenship education (Leenders, Veugelers & De Kat, 2008). This questionnaire consists of 18 Likert-scale items across four domains: discipline, autonomy, social involvement and social justice. The overriding question is: How important is it for you to develop these values and behaviors in your students? Items include topics such as honesty, reliability, consideration for others, and solidarity with others. Each item can be rated on a scale of 1 (not important) to 5 (very important).

#### *Operationalized curriculum*

Data on the operationalized curriculum were collected to answer research question RQ2b and RQ3. The data on the two courses comprised 60 email exchanges between teachers and the researcher discussing content, ideas for student activities, comments and experiences regarding class meetings and practical issues. Next to that, three teacher interviews were conducted. Finally, observations by the principal researcher, who attended the course meetings, put the operationalized curriculum into perspective.

Two of the three teacher interviews were held during the first course (after the third and after the seventh lesson), while one was held at the end of the second course (after the last lesson). The interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim. The first interview took approximately forty-five minutes, the second and third about one hour each. The main topics in these semi-structured interviews differed according to the phase of the course (see Table 4.2). The principal researcher conducted all interviews.

Table 4.2. Topics of the interviews

Interview 1	How is the implementation of the guidelines GJCE going so far?	All three interviews:
Interview 2	All the curriculum guidelines GJCE were raised; possible differences between formal and operationalized; teachers' views on these differences	What are you most enthusiastic about? What do you have doubts about?
Interview 3	What was different / changed in the second course and why?	

The first interview was conducted with the two teachers individually, the second jointly and the last with just one, due to the busy schedule of the other teacher. The transcript of this third interview was sent to the absentee, who provided additions and comments.

For an overview of the data collection, see Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. Phases data collection

Phase	Course	Data collection
April- August 2014	Development 'Society 2.0'	Team notes Team products Email exchanges
September –December 2014	First course (10 participants)	Teacher interview 1 Questionnaire Teacher interview 2 Email exchanges
September – December 2015	Second course (15 participants)	Teacher interview 3 Email exchanges

### ***Data analysis***

The data (team notes, team products, emails, interviews) on the course development and delivery phases were subjected to qualitative content

analysis using pre-determined categories that seemed relevant after a first inspection of the data (RQ1) or based on theory (RQ2a, 2b and 3). However, in line with the iterative character of qualitative data analysis, extra categories were added when important themes emerged during the actual coding. Rating was done by two independent coders and the assigned codes were discussed until consensus was reached.

*Added value of development by team (RQ1)*

The data regarding the development process (RQ1) were analyzed using three categories: approach (method of working); roles of participants; atmosphere/spirit. This analysis yielded a supplementary code: 'dealing with time'.

*Relation curriculum to GCJE (RQ2)*

The data regarding how GJCE took shape in the formal and operationalized curriculum (RQ2) were analyzed deductively by using the curriculum guidelines as categories and scrutinizing content dialogues and decisions.

*Honors teaching (RQ3)*

The honors pedagogies 'freedom', 'challenge' and 'community' implemented in the course were analyzed by encoding these three characteristics in the data for both development and delivery. The analysis yielded a supplementary code: 'differences between students'.

## **Results**

*Added value of development by team*

Four themes emerged from the data on the added value of development by a team of teachers and students (RQ1): approach; roles of participants;



atmosphere; and dealing with limited time. In the second interview, the teachers reflected on its value.

### *Approach*

The development team met nine times and used GJCE as its guideline. The members jointly determined the theme (alternative practices) of the course and then individually elaborated what it might entail. Their feedback on each other's documents brought the aims, content and didactics of the final formal curriculum into view. Ideas, proposals and drafts were discussed during team meetings or in written communication, and all team members participated. Together, they gathered course materials and identified internships.

### *Roles of participants*

The researcher elaborated the guidelines in relation to the course theme and commented on proposals for operationalizing the curriculum guidelines GJCE. The two teachers took the lead in formulating course aims, elaborating the course outline and the lessons. When recruiting participants, the two honors students took the lead by making a recruitment plan, designing a flyer and starting a Facebook group. They emphasized the student perspective: whether the course would be interesting and appropriate for potential participants. They helped out with practical tasks like creating a structure for the Dropbox folder. Finally, they were given an opportunity to attend institutional meetings on honors education and a meeting with the researcher's PhD supervisors.

### *Limited time*

Regular work and peak load made it difficult for the team to find points of time to meet up. Also, the one-hour meetings were too short to combine content discussions with arranging to start the course. The solution was

communication in writing, exchanging ideas and giving feedback using email and Dropbox.

### *Atmosphere*

Both teachers mentioned in the second interview that the atmosphere and equality in the team helped establish openness and team spirit in the classroom. The teachers were enthusiastic about the course development, saying they liked the theme, could get along well and were glad to do something they were good at.

### ***Pedagogical goals***

The data from the questionnaire on pedagogical goals in citizenship education showed that the teachers held different views, specifically on the importance of discipline and social justice. One teacher considered social justice less important than its role in our GJCE-guidelines.

### ***Relation curriculum to the guidelines GCJE***

This section turns to question RQ2: How did the curriculum guidelines shape a. the formal curriculum and b. the operationalized curriculum? For each domain, the guidelines pertaining to it are described. These guidelines are then evaluated with regard to how they correspond to the formal and operationalized curriculum. Subsequently, the teachers' experiences during course delivery are presented.

### *Knowledge domain*

There are three curriculum guidelines in the knowledge domain: Focus on acquiring deep knowledge regarding one global issue instead of more superficial knowledge on several subjects (Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005); Look for possible root causes before thinking about solutions or acting

(Westheimer & Kahne, 2004); Make local-global connections between the village, town or region and other parts of the world concerning this issue (Oxfam, 2006). This connectivity extends to the possible impact of one's own behavior or action on other parts of the world.

The *formal curriculum* requires students to delve into a theme of their choice and write a blog about it; in their next blog they give some historical/future and local-global perspective on that theme. They also comment on the blogs of at least two fellow students. Experiences and insights in societal issues are discussed during class meetings and in small groups of three or four. The development team deliberated whether each student should choose a single issue for both the internship and the historical and local-global insights (more in-depth approach) or different issues for these elements (broader approach). The course allowed both approaches. Further, one of the course meetings explores a current global issue using the open space method described by Andreotti, Barker & Newell-Jones (2006).

For the *delivery of the course* the open space method was used to address specific issues: income inequality and poverty in the first course; and the proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) in the second course. Short films were shown on alternative movements and practices. Students had to underpin their opinions and provide references in their blogs, in keeping with the in-depth approach. The teachers confronted the students with their judgments and asked follow-up questions. Students were expected to present arguments when making statements or giving their opinion. Root causes of global justice issues did not get much attention. Regarding the time (historical-present-future) dimension, the teachers mentioned they gave examples of alternative/social movements that became mainstream. The principal researcher observed all of the above-mentioned teaching behaviors. In the second course, the students were given more space at the beginning of each lesson to share experiences and insights. This part

was expanded in the second course because, compared to the first course, the students already knew about alternative movements and could give more input. Dialogue among teachers and the principal researcher yielded ideas on how to achieve more in-depth knowledge.

In the *teachers' experience*, allowing more time for students to tell about their experiences and insights led to interesting conversations and a further elaboration of the topics. Teachers mentioned the difficulty of combining the broad scope of the course, which included two themes and several curriculum guidelines, with in-depth knowledge. One teacher noted that students find it difficult to form an opinion: "Most students talk more easily about themselves, their lives, what had happened in their lives, rather than about a global issue or global perspective". To facilitate the latter, this teacher had to be more directive.

#### *Moral domain*

The guidelines in the moral domain involve both ethics and values. One guideline relates to ethical sensitivity, the awareness of the ethical aspects of a situation, which includes the ability to see something from the perspective of someone else. This is an aspect of intercultural sensitivity (Holm, Nokelainen & Tirri, 2009), another guideline in the moral domain. Intercultural sensitivity is the competence to act in different cultural situations and contexts. With regard to values, the curriculum guidelines are a consciousness about one's own values as well as the different values that underlie approaches to current societal and global issues. Attention should be drawn to values concerning the dominant ideology of neo-liberalism and mainstream thinking (Andreotti, 2006).

The *formal curriculum* included a lecture on the history of ethics (the great thinkers of antiquity) in the fourth course meeting, accompanied by a homework assignment on ethical experiences. The team discussed whether

to focus on ethical choices at the level of the individual or in the aggregate: ethical behavior of persons or groups in society, like the media, politicians or action groups. Both levels featured in the formal curriculum.

Regarding values in the *formal curriculum*, the theme ‘alternative movements’ entails contact with non-mainstream values; the formal curriculum included contact with students from a non-western country to discuss the value and significance of ideas and findings in another context. The development team discussed the concept of justice and agreed that the course was meant to help students discover the meaning of a more just society. The team gathered materials on ‘alternative, non-mainstream’ approaches and opinions such as articles, documentaries, magazines, and web links.

Regarding ethics in the *delivery of the course*, ethical sensitivity was a recurrent topic. One teacher started a conversation in which students shared examples of what they perceived as their own unethical behavior, and students were given an article about ethics in research in another cultural context (on children in South Africa).

Regarding values in the *delivery of the course*, contact with students from another (non-western) country could not be arranged in time. However, the teachers regularly shifted the perspective in class, asking for instance how something would be perceived by a girl in India. Different layers of culture were discussed; for instance, several maps of the world were shown, each with a different projection depending on what was considered the ‘center’. Teachers raised the question “how do you view the world?” at the beginning and during the course. In each instance, they said there is no right or wrong answer; all insights are okay, just keep an open mind. Students could formulate their own definition of alternative movements, for example. Attention was devoted to critical reflection on values and opinions in specific lessons, for instance on where values and norms originate, on awareness

of judgments and prejudices and on conformism. In the second course, lesson 7 was dedicated to helping students connect more strongly with the course content by exploring what it meant to them. Students answered straightforward questions: what are your values and norms?; what is your ambition?; what would you like to change and how can you do that?

The main thrust of the course, in the *teachers' experience*, is showing different perspectives, their possibilities and restrictions. Teachers indicate that several students discovered that there are many sides to alternative/ social movements and that these are much more complex than expected. At least some students were willing to look critically at themselves and sometimes talked to a teacher about this. Facilitating a stronger connection between students and course content in lesson 7 of the second course turned out to fit in well at that stage. By then, the students knew each other and there was trust and openness in the group. The students were attentive to each other, asking questions and discussing the answers, which helped them make choices and be honest and open.

### *Social domain*

A curriculum guideline regarding the social domain is contact with people outside the students' own social/cultural group. Such contacts can broaden the students' world by raising awareness of their relatively privileged position (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker & Donahue, 2003). In the Dutch context this is especially important because of early tracking in the educational system and socioeconomic segregation in the school system (Schmidt, Burroughs, Zoido & Houang, 2015). Another guideline in the social domain is meeting positive role models. These are active and socially engaged people who possess the courage, persistence and confidence that they can make a change for the better. By setting an example, such people can strengthen the students' belief that change towards more justice is not only

possible but worth aiming for and committing to (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont & Stephens, 2003).

Regarding the *formal curriculum*, the theme of the course combines elements of the social and moral domains of GJCE. Alternative movements can provide positive role models, and their ideals are not mainstream. Examples of alternative movements students learned about are: Mieslab, a social laboratory experimenting with concepts for the economy and society, for instance ‘unconditional basic income’; and ‘Grunneger Power’, a cooperative providing green energy by and for people from the province of Groningen. This encounter with alternative values can help students clarify and develop their own beliefs. Some other guidelines in the social domain are pursued by doing an internship at such an alternative movement, where students are likely to meet up with people outside their own social/cultural group. Learning from community leaders (positive role models) underpins the assignment to conduct an interview during the internship. The team reconsidered *the name of the theme*: ‘alternative/social movements’ or ‘alternative practices’, noting that the former embraces collectivity and justice (Collom, 2007).

When *delivering the course*, the teachers used the wording ‘alternative practices’ and showed short films of such practices and movements. Further, contact with people from different social or cultural backgrounds did occur during the internship. Teachers emphasized the importance of the interview about the ideals of the group where the students did their internship.

In the *teachers’ experience*, the students’ interest and empathy was triggered by contacts during their internship. Several students said it affected them; one, for instance, said she did not simply walk past a homeless person anymore.

### *Experiential learning*

The curriculum guidelines GJCE emphasizes the value of experiential learning in civic contexts, as students should be active and emotionally engaged in their work to enhance civic and moral learning (Colby et al., 2003). Moreover, the social and conceptual ambiguity and complexity of civic contexts challenge students to think deeper and refrain from drawing superficial and obvious conclusions (Colby et al., 2003).

The *formal curriculum* calls for a 15-hour internship at an alternative/ social movement. Students conduct an interview about its ideals and views on a better world. They also make a small contribution to that group. The internship can be done alone or with a fellow student. Students reflect on their experiences in Blog 4: Describe and analyze your experiences with your internship.

*Teachers consider* the internship as a key element of the course. They heard enthusiastic reactions to the internship and think it might have influenced the students' image of the world.

### ***Honors teaching***

Three conditions of the learning environment are considered especially important for high-ability students (Wolfensberger, 2012): freedom, academic challenge and community. All three were met in the formal and in the operationalized curriculum, as follows.

*Freedom* was offered by giving students the opportunity to choose both a global issue and the subject of and place for their internship. They could choose from the prearranged internships or find one themselves. Several students took the opportunity to organize their own internship. Furthermore, for the final assessment, students were free to choose the form in which to present their insights (a 'handbook' for global citizens). This freedom was



appreciated by several students, one of whom did not have possibilities for this kind of creativity in his own program.

*Academic challenge* was incorporated in several ways. First, the group had an heterogeneous background regarding the content and subcultures of their education. Furthermore, delving into a global justice issue and alternative/ social movements is both novel and challenging. The teachers noted that students were not used to talking about such issues. Besides, students had to characterize an alternative movement themselves without being provided with a definition. In the same vein, they had to find their own criteria to answer “what is a more just society?”. They were not accustomed to this, so the challenge was difficult for some students, as the teachers perceived. Finally, the teachers often made a change of perspective.

*Community* was addressed in the following ways. The course was scheduled to meet one evening every two weeks in keeping with the regular planning of these programs at the institution, not by choice of the development team. Also, students follow their regular program at their own department, so they normally do not meet in the interim. These circumstances require extra attention for community-building. The first assignment is to write a blog called “where do you come from?” and to make a mood board and elucidate it in small groups. Also, reacting to each other’s blogs can stimulate the exchange of knowledge, discussion, interest in one other and curiosity about each other’s viewpoints and perspectives. The Facebook group set up by the student members of the development team was used to communicate news, interesting readings, lectures and meetings or TV programs. Finally, students were encouraged to meet up in between course meetings.

*Differences between students.* The teachers noted that the participating honors students differed in their knowledge, awareness and ambition regarding social (justice) issues. Reflecting on how they handled this divergence, the teachers concluded that it might be alright that not everybody

could immediately process questions or information. Giving students the freedom to do things their own way, for instance find their own internship, probably helped serve different levels of knowledge, awareness and ambition. Facebook was used to provide input (information, articles, events) for the eager students. Sometimes students formed pairs and could support each other's decisions, for instance about the approach. Also, when students were especially interested in a topic, the teachers could lend them a book. One teacher was struck by the differences between honors students in their proactive stance.

### **Conclusions, discussion and limitations**

In this pilot study we investigated the development and delivery of a 112-hour undergraduate honors course for critical global citizenship entitled Society 2.0. It was built on theory-based holistic curriculum guidelines Global Justice Citizenship Education (GJCE) involving the knowledge, moral and social domains and advocating experiential learning. The study was conducted at a university of applied sciences in the Netherlands. This pilot study can inform similar programs all over the world and help them to develop contents and methods for the holistic citizenship development of honors students.

Regarding our first research question -- What was the added value of a development team including teachers and students? -- the results indicate the importance of equality and team spirit. The two teachers experienced that these conditions positive influenced the atmosphere in class. The team's composition and way of doing things further enabled each member to contribute and take the lead in aspects of their competence. The teachers mentioned that they liked the theme, could get along well and were happy to do something they were good at. It seems that autonomy, relatedness and competence were addressed, all of which are important for self-motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Regarding the question (RQ2a), How did the curriculum guidelines GJCE shape the formal curriculum?, it can be concluded that most of the guidelines in the moral and social domains as well as experiential learning in civic contexts are manifest in the formal curriculum. However, attention for root causes of injustice, a key guideline in the knowledge domain, was not manifest in the formal curriculum of 'Society 2.0'. In part, this may be due to the theme of the course. Indeed, alternative movements do not necessarily seek to change the existing social structure, since they might rather create an alternative to it (Collom, 2007). The teachers also felt that the short duration and wide scope of this course made it difficult to go into more depth. When developing a similar program, it could be of importance to consider both the length and theme of the course in relation to possibilities for students to gain insights in root causes of injustice. Another explanation for the lacking attention to root causes of injustice might be that for one of the teachers social justice is not a main pedagogical goal in (honors) teaching. Therefore, taking time to discuss the importance of the political dimension in global citizenship education (Veugeliers, 2011c) between course developers is recommended.

Regarding the question (RQ2b), How did the curriculum guidelines GJCE shape the operationalized curriculum?, the results indicate that the teachers elaborated on the curriculum guidelines in each domain. Teachers confronted students for making ungrounded judgments (knowledge and moral domain); kept asking for arguments (knowledge domain); gave examples of alternative movements accompanied by questions (social domain); posed reflective questions (all domains); and devoted much attention to perspective (moral domain). Further, teachers emphasized open-mindedness. These teaching behaviors correspond to features of justice-oriented education (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Although the findings reported here are based on teachers' self-report, which may be considered a limitation of this study, the

researcher's informal observation while attending the lessons are consistent with the teachers' self-reported behaviors.

The data also provided suggestion for adjustment of our GJCE-guidelines. Attention to collectivity is an aspect of justice-oriented civic education (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), as social change is often the result of a collective effort (see also Friedman, 2000, on identity groups). The dialogue between teachers and the principal researcher indicates that attention to collectivity could not be taken for granted. It seems that explicitly including the role of collectivity in social change in our guidelines GJCE, might improve its possible value as a basis for courses aimed at critical global citizenship.

Regarding our third research question, about honors pedagogies (Wolfensberger, 2012), bounded freedom and academic challenge seem to be a good fit with justice-oriented citizenship education, which does not aim to impart a fixed set of truths or critiques about society and its structure (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Indeed, freedom for students in choosing content and form is manifest in the formal and operationalized curriculum. Challenge was embedded in the multiple disciplines represented in the group, the interdisciplinary themes 'global justice issue' and 'alternative movements' as well as the multiple perspectives teachers incorporated. The third aspect of honors pedagogies, community, was implemented as teamwork, both in class and for homework, and in the assignment to react to each other's blogs. Since students asked for more contact, a Facebook group was started. Community-building warrants extra attention when students don't meet up on a daily basis and course meetings are held just once every two weeks.

Other lessons from our pilot study that can be used when designing a similar course are the following. First, although the formal curriculum was structured in a way that it started with the students (relating their background to their values and opinions) and expanded to embrace global society, teachers observed that students sometimes kept distance in

discussions in that they did not make the connection with themselves, their lives and attitudes. The teachers therefore introduced a method to support students in helping each other to strengthen this connection. Second, honors students differ considerably in pro-activity, and knowledge and awareness of (global) societal issues (See also Achterberg, 2005; Rinn & Plucker, 2004; Schutte et al., 2014) and teachers have to find ways to deal with these differences between students.

Equality and openness in the development team and the use of theoretical based curriculum guidelines, resulted in a course teachers have faith in and are enthusiastic about. We wish our work helps others to build courses preparing students for their future role in society as critical, well-informed and committed global citizens. Especially as their commitment is imperative, given the severity of global issues our world is facing.

Appendix 1. Lessons table 'Society 2.0'

---

- 1 Making acquaintance, identifying reasons for participating, expectations.  
First exploration theme; introduction final questions and assessment.  
Introduction assignment: *present yourself in a mood board: which messages did you get? Write about assignment 1 in Blog 1.*
  - 2 Sharing experience: mood board  
Theory, definitions: Socialization and conformism.  
Assignment: *Alternative practices: map what you think is included in this. Which sources did you use? Why those? Ask at least three other persons.*
  - 3 Sharing experience: alternative practices.  
Theory (sub)culture and examples current themes (basic income; refugees).  
Define and refine: definitions needed to be able to gather in-depth knowledge. Introduction assignment: *Choose an internship, why this one? Define a learning goal and make an action plan. Determine theme, why this one? Write Blog 2.*
  - 4 Sharing experience: choice internship, plan and purpose and theme.  
Introduction ethics: origin, definition, ethical behavior, ethical sensitivity.  
Assignments: *Be alert to and write down: ethical behavior of yourself and others; statements in the media regarding ethical aspects. Choose a dimension and further explore your theme. Write Blog 3.*
  - 5 Sharing experience: inspiration, internship, ethical dilemma....  
Discussion/debate: Open space methodology.  
Assignment: *Look for information about interviewing, write abstract to use as guideline. Bring it to course meeting six.*
  - 6 Sharing experiences: ethical experiences.  
Introduction views, convictions, paradigm shifts: How do you go about it; theory ethical sensitivity: how can you deal with...;  
Assignment: *interview(s) at your internship. Write Blog 4.*
  - 7 Sharing experiences on interviews/ internship  
Introduction final assignment.  
Assignment: *Preparation of final presentations; Write Blog 5.*
  - 8 Final presentations and evaluation.
-



# Chapter 5

## Preparing students for global citizenship: the effects of a Dutch undergraduate honors course

This chapter has been published as: Schutte, I. W., Kamans, E., Wolfensberger, M. V. C., & Veugelers, W. (2017). Preparing students for global citizenship: the effects of a Dutch undergraduate honors course. *Education Research International, special issue 'Education for Creativity and Talent Development in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century'*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/3459631>



### **Abstract**

Using a mixed method approach, this case study investigates effects on the participating students ( $N = 25$ ) of an undergraduate honors course in the Netherlands, aimed at global justice citizenship. Knowledge about effects of global citizenship courses is still limited. The Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire and the Global Citizenship Scale were used in a pre- and posttest design to measure possible development in the moral and civic domain among the participants of the course. In the qualitative part, deductive content analyses of students' work and students' written reflection on the course, utilizing the theory-based curriculum guidelines Global Justice Citizenship Education, was performed. In addition, a follow-up blog and interview were analyzed to learn students' perception on the effects of the course after half a year. Quantitative results show increased ethical sensitivity as well as global civic engagement and global competence among the participants. Qualitative results point in the same direction and provide deeper insights in the content of students' learning and the perceived impact of the course on their attitudes and behavior. Results are discussed in relation to theory on justice-oriented global citizenship and honors pedagogies.

## Introduction

Preparing undergraduate honors students for their role as citizens of the world is an important task in higher education, given the challenges global society faces (Gibson, Rimmington & Landwehr-Brown, 2008). Furthermore, research indicates an above-average interest among honors students in moral issues and the wider world (see Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue & Weimholt, 2008; Lovecky, 2009, for a review). Nevertheless, global citizenship receives little attention in higher education and few studies consider the effects of global citizenship education on undergraduates (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003). It has been argued that such programs enable them to lead a responsible and moral life (Gibson & Landwehr-Brown, 2009). As discussed by Colby et al. (2003), this effect has been demonstrated for service learning, which combines community service with academic learning and personal development. For example Lee et al. (2008) found that gifted high-school students had an enhanced awareness of civic issues, increased motivation to engage in social issues in their communities and new understanding and respect for diversity after a three-week service learning program.

In this study, we connect to the justice-oriented approach of global citizenship that includes a desire to improve society (Johnson & Morris, 2010).

We conceptualize global citizenship similarly to the justice approach of global citizenship as described by Westheimer and Kahne (2004), which implies that ‘global citizens’ take informed action based upon insights in structural causes of global injustice or sustainability issues. Next to this, our conceptualization of global citizenship includes a global approach to citizenship, as in this globalized world, justice- and sustainable issues unmistakably contain a global dimension. This global dimension is connected to Nussbaum’s (1997, 2002) moral cosmopolitanism Nussbaum’s moral cosmopolitanism, especially regarding the abilities to think as citizen of the

world and to imagine what it would be like to be in the position of someone quite different from yourself.

In the light of this conceptualization of global citizenship and based on literature about (global) justice oriented citizenship education, curriculum guidelines were developed for the knowledge-, moral- and social domain. A learning environment that combines elements from these three domains acknowledges the needs of gifted students (Tirri, 2011a; Tirri & Kuusisto, 2013; Tolppanen & Tirri, 2014). We call these curriculum guidelines Global Justice Citizenship Education (GJCE). For an overview, see Table 5.1. In short, these curriculum guidelines concern the following:

Knowledge domain. In the knowledge domain, the guidelines are: (1) Gaining historical (root causes of injustice) insights. The historic dimension offers insight in the societal context in which the issue developed (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004; Andreotti, 2006; Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005). (2) Seeing local-global connections, as students should understand the global dimension of their own actions and the interdependence between places in the world (Oxfam, 2006). (3) Focus on one global-justice issue instead of gaining more superficial broader knowledge (see Davies et al., 2005, on exploring issues), as narrowing the focus allows one to grasp the social, political and economic structures that underlie injustice and power differences.

Moral domain. In the moral domain, two curriculum guidelines were formulated. (1) Develop ethical and intercultural sensitivity (Holm, Nokelainen & Tirri, 2009; Hammer, Bennet & Wiseman, 2003; Holm, 2012). Ethical sensitivity relates to the ability to take the perspective of 'the other', to pay attention to the welfare of others and to recognize ethical dilemmas (Bebeau, Rest, & Narvaez, 1999). When encountering people with other cultural backgrounds, students need intercultural sensitivity, the ability to notice and experience cultural difference (Hammer, Bennet & Wiseman, 2003; Holm, 2012). Ethical and intercultural sensitivity relate to one of

the guiding aims in Nussbaums' view on world citizenship: being able to understand the world "from the point of view of the other" (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 11; Friedman, 2000). (2) Recognize (own) values and critically reflect on mainstream thinking (Andreotti, 2006). The first is about recognizing values behind statements, ideas and perspectives and evaluating how they relate to students' own values (Andreotti, 2006). The second skill is critically reflecting on values, especially on 'mainstream' thinking related to the dominant neoliberal ideology. This is important because neoliberal ideology highly impacts all aspects of education (Kliwer, 2013) and historically grown power differences lead to problematic assumptions in the western world about for instance 'progress'.

Social domain. Regarding the social domain, the two guidelines are: (1) Contact people with different socioeconomic positions, cultural backgrounds and life chances. Such contacts can yield new insight in oneself and one's biases (Garland Reed, 2011); and (2) Get to know positive role models: active and socially engaged people with both courage and persistence to contribute to a better world based upon other than mainstream values (Colby et al., 2003).

Experiential learning in civic contexts. Finally, experiential learning in civic contexts was added to the guidelines. Colby et al. (2003) emphasize the value of student centered learning and of pedagogies that actively and emotionally involve students in the learning process. In addition, students' practicing what is hoped for they will learn, in this case global / societal commitment, will lead to intrinsically interesting tasks for students. Experiential learning in civic contexts can provide these possibilities.

Table 5.1. Curriculum guidelines Global Justice Citizenship Education

Domains	Curriculum guidelines
Knowledge domain	- Gain historical (root causes of injustice) insights and see local-global connections - Focus on one global-justice issue
Moral domain	- Develop ethical and intercultural sensitivity - Recognize own values and critically reflect on mainstream thinking
Social domain	- Contact people with different socioeconomic positions, cultural backgrounds and life chances - Get to know positive role models: active and socially engaged people
Experiential learning	- Spend at least 15 hours in civic contexts (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003; Mabry, 1998)

Based on: Schutte (2011)

The current case study investigated the effects of an undergraduate honors course called ‘Society 2.0’ in the Netherlands, which is aimed at global citizenship. The Dutch educational context characterizes by socially segregated schools (Schmidt, Burroughs, Zoido & Houang, 2015) and low scores on civic skills and attitudes towards foreigners (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2009; Veugelers, 2011a). Aims of citizenship education, such as active participation and social integration, relate to traditional national citizenship (Veugelers, 2011b). Furthermore, ethics is not explicitly treated. Under these circumstances, the youngsters’ world could be broadened by contact with people from different socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds as well as by attention to their moral development.

Currently, honors programs are under development in Dutch higher education (Wolfensberger, 2015), which offers opportunities to develop new content and teaching methods, also on global citizenship. In 2014, such an opportunity arose at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences,

where two teachers, two students and one researcher developed an undergraduate honors course 'Society 2.0'. The study load of the course is 112 hours, including eight class meetings of all together 16 hours (eight times two hours). The curriculum development team used the theory-based curriculum guidelines Global Justice Citizenship Education (see Table 5.1). The development and delivery of Society 2.0 has previously been investigated and described (Schutte, Kamans, Wolfensberger & Veugelers, in press). The current study investigates the effects of the course as delivered in 2014 and 2015 on the participants of the two groups from both years.

Society 2.0 meets eight times for two hours (contact time), one evening every fortnight, and lasts four months. It focuses on alternative/social movements and their ideals (moral domain). The course starts with the values and norms of students' upbringing (moral domain) and then broadens out. Students delve into a societal theme (knowledge domain) and do a 15-hour internship at an alternative/social movement (experiential learning). While there, they interview people in that movement about their ideals (social domain, positive role models). In their lessons, the teachers cover different perspectives and the importance of being non-judgmental (moral domain). They mostly function as coaches but also teach some theory about ethics, conformism and cultures (moral domain). Students acquire knowledge on societal (global) issues by writing two blogs on a self-chosen theme, exploring its historical-future and local-global dimensions (knowledge domain). Furthermore, one meeting is dedicated to a global issue: 'poverty' in the first course and the 'free-trade treaty TTIP' in the second (knowledge domain). Students back up their opinions and provide references in their blogs. In the final meeting, students present a 'one-minute paper' on how they will contribute to a better world. They also make a product in small groups demonstrating how others could learn from their exposure to global citizenship.

'Society 2.0' is geared to honors students, i.e. students who are both willing and able to go beyond the regular program in terms of academic challenge and personal development (Wolfensberger, 2012, Clark & Zubizaretta, 2008; Hébert & McBee, 2007). They do not comprise a homogeneous group (Achterberg, 2005; Rinn & Plucker, 2004). Teaching honors students presumes that three conditions are met (Wolfensberger, 2012): a safe learning community, academic challenge and bounded freedom (facilitating autonomy and self-regulation). This pedagogical approach was applied to Society 2.0.

The researcher attended the course meetings in 2014 and 2015 and made the following observations. A 'typical lesson' would start with an inventory of students' experiences during the past two weeks -- for instance their (search for) internship or homework on ethics. Teachers ask who wants to share his/her experience, and individual students respond, after which other students and teachers ask questions and/or add their own experiences. Some lessons begin with a short film on an alternative movement, followed by questions: what did you see, what do you think, why did they start this, which values are involved? The teachers provide an overview of each lesson and its aims and ask how students are getting on with their assignments. Sometimes students spontaneously tell about an experience connected to the course. Each lesson has a general part for the whole class and a breakout part in which students work in small groups of three or four. In lesson three, which focuses on ethics, the teachers first present theory and then the students share their own experiences of unethical behavior within the group. This is followed by a homework assignment in which students had to be alert to ethical conduct of themselves and others over the coming week and condense these observations into keywords. Several students present their experiences with that assignment at the beginning of lesson four. Teachers

include multiple perspectives in every lesson. Each meeting ends by looking ahead to upcoming lessons and discussing the homework assignments.

Two cohorts of students (2014-2015; 2015-2106), altogether 25 students, participated in the study. The main question asked in the present study is: What do students learn from the undergraduate honors course aimed at global citizenship? That question has been broken down into three sub-questions: (SQ1) Do students show an increase in ethical sensitivity and global citizenship (social responsibility, global competence and global civic engagement) after taking the course?; (SQ2) How do students express themselves regarding knowledge and ethics when writing about a societal issue?; and (SQ3) Which insights do participants of the course report regarding knowledge, ethics and their role as global citizens when reflecting on the course?

## Methods

### *Participants*

The 25 students in this case study all participate in an honors talent program at their own institute/school, meaning that they follow a 30-ECTS two-year extra-curricular program. ECTS refers to European Credit Transfer System. One point corresponds to 24 to 30 working hours for the average student. For an overview of the participants' characteristics, see Table 5.2. Regarding parental educational background, the percentage of having completed higher education is comparable with the overall student population of the Hanze University of Applied Sciences. It is above the average educational level in the Netherlands, as about 34% of the Dutch population completed higher education (CBS, DUO & OCW, 2013).



Table 5.2. Characteristics of participants

Participants ( <i>N</i> = 25)	Descriptives
Age (mean)	19-25 years (21.24)
Female / Male	Female 72% / Male 28%
Educational background students (number)	Economy (10) Law (5) Sports (4) Education & Technical /computing (2) Nursing & Communication (1)
Year of study (number)	Second year (4); Third year (16); Fourth year (5)
Educational background parents/ caregivers	56% completed higher education
Perceived cultural-ethnic background (number)	Dutch (24); Dutch-Moroccan (1)

During the course, participants had to choose a societal topic. Twelve students (46%) chose to write about a sustainability-related issue. Nine (35%) chose an issue related to equality: either social/cultural, such as discrimination and social acceptance, or financial, such as equity-based crowd funding and unconditional basic income.

Participants further had to choose an organization to do a short internship. Fourteen students (54%) chose an internship related to the issue they had written about. For instance S3, a business student, wrote blogs about self-sufficient living and did her internship at 'Place the World'- a place to work and share ideas on living with nature in a multicultural world. S14, studying human resource management, wrote blogs about discrimination and did her internship at the discrimination contact point. In other instances, the issue covered in the blog was not related to the internship: for example S4, doing sports studies, wrote blogs about green playgrounds but did her internship at

the discrimination contact point. S10, studying life science, wrote blogs about 'art from waste' but did her internship at Young Gold, a project to promote volunteer work among youngsters. For three students the internship is unknown.

### ***Data Collection***

#### *Instruments*

For the quantitative measure to answer the first question, two instruments were used. The Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ) consists of seven dimensions and 28 items, which are measured on a 5-point Likert scale (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011). There is some hierarchy in the dimensions, from basic to more complicated (Narvaez, 2001). The operationalization of the Ethical Sensitivity model is satisfactory in that the psychometric properties of ESSQ are scientifically valid (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011; Gholami & Tirri, 2012). Reliability analysis of the subscales (Cronbach, 1984) yielded scores between  $\alpha = .78$  and  $\alpha = .50$ . Reliabilities tend to be low due to the multi-dimensional construct as well as the high abstraction level of the concepts (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007). Two examples of the dimensions are 'caring by connecting to others' (with the item "I tolerate different ethical views in my surroundings") and 'working with interpersonal and group differences' (with the item "I try to consider another person's position when I face a conflict situation").

The Global Citizenship Scale (GCS, Morais & Ogden, 2010; Lang, 2013) aims to measure global citizenship as an outcome of global education. GCS was used in this study because its three dimensions relate to the intended learning goals set forth in our curriculum guidelines GJCE. These dimensions are 'social responsibility' (including social justice), 'global competence' (including global knowledge and intercultural communication), and 'global civic

engagement' (including involvement in civic organizations and global civic activism). GCS was validated by means of two confirmatory factor analyses with multiple datasets (Morais & Ogden, 2010), resulting in a measurement model of six first-order factors (self-awareness, intercultural communication, global knowledge, involvement in civic organizations, political voice, global civic activism), three second-order factors (social responsibility, global competence, global civic engagement), and one higher-order factor (global citizenship). These results support its underlying theoretical model. Reliability analysis of the subscales (Cronbach, 1984) yielded scores from  $\alpha = .69$  to  $\alpha = .92$ . The items of the GCS are measured on a 5-point Likert scale. For example, one item in the dimension 'social responsibility' is "The world is generally a fair place". In the dimension 'global competence', one item is "I am confident that I can thrive in any culture or country". Finally, in the dimension 'global civic engagement', an item is "Over the next 6 months, I plan to get involved in a program that addresses the global environmental crisis".

### *Data*

To answer SQ1, a pre- and posttest design was used to measure the effect of the course on students' ethical sensitivity and global civic competence, engagement and responsibility. Students filled out the questionnaires ESSQ (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011) and GCS (Morais & Ogden, 2010; Lang, 2013) in class at the beginning of the first course meeting (pretest) and at the end of the last course meeting (posttest). After being provided with an explanation about the research and the anonymously processing of the data, all the students agreed to participate.

To answer SQ2 - How do students express themselves regarding knowledge and ethics when writing about a societal issue? - data were collected from two blogs that students had to write as part of their course

assignments. For blog 2, they were asked to “explore a theme / issue that appeals to you and discuss a book, article or presentation of your choice”. For blog 3, they were asked to “locate your theme in a historic-future and local-global perspective”. The collected data comprise 32,081 words ( $N = 24$ ).

To answer SQ3 - Which insights do participants of the course report regarding knowledge, ethics and their role as global citizens when reflecting on the course? - data were collected from their final blog on ‘reflection and evaluation’ and from their answers to evaluation questions. These two questions are open-ended: (1) What is the most important thing that you learned about society? Please explain why this is important to you; and (2) What possibilities do you see for yourself to contribute to a more just society in the future? The collected data comprise 12,595 words ( $N = 25$ ). Again, the focus was on ethics and knowledge and on global citizenship: what do students write about their role as global citizens?

Finally, we investigated the students’ perception on possible effects of the course half a year after they finished it. That time frame was selected because effects - especially in moral development - might fade away or appear after a course has ended (Colby et al., 2003). Therefore, all participants of the two courses were approached three times by email. In addition, participants of the second course were approached once through the Facebook group. In the end, data were collected from nine students. These nine were then invited for an interview, which started with the request to write (again) a blog giving their ‘reflection on the course’ in about 15 minutes. After that, they were asked two questions: (1) What is the most important knowledge (emphasis) you gained from the course? and (2) What is the added value of the course in your daily life, how do you notice this and how do other people notice this? Two of the interviews were conducted using Skype. The categories for each sub-question are shown in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3. Data collection and qualitative data analysis sub-questions 2 and 3

Sub-question	Data	Categories
2	Blogs 2 and 3 ( $N = 24$ )	knowledge and ethics
3	Final blog + two open-ended evaluation questions ( $N = 25$ )	insights (knowledge, ethics, global citizenship) and intentions (role global citizen)
	Follow-up blog + interview ( $n = 9$ )	insights (knowledge, ethics) and behavior (global citizen)

### ***Data analysis***

Quantitative analyses. The impact of the course on students' *ethical sensitivity* and *global citizenship competence, social responsibility and global civic engagement* was tested by using the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed rank test for repeated measures. A non-parametric test was chosen because of the small dataset in this study ( $N = 25$ ).

Qualitative analyses. First, two coders read and summarized all five blogs as to gain a good understanding of the data. This wider frame helped to put outcomes of the actual analysis into perspective. After this, the blogs of interest for the current study (blogs 2, 3 and 5) were coded deductively using the following codebook. Regarding the category ethics, the code 'ethical sensitivity', i.e. writing about ethical aspects of a situation, was used. The dimensions from Narvaez's theory (Narvaez, 2001) on ethical sensitivity, which correspond with the ESSQ (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011) were all categorized as 'ethics'. Additional to elements of caring ethics from this theory, also more 'justice-oriented' fragments were coded 'ethics'. Further, fragments were categorized under 'ethics' not only when students wrote about their own attitude and behavior but also when they wrote about behavior and attitudes of others / groups in society. Regarding the category knowledge, the codes 'historical dimension' and 'local-global connections'

were deduced from the curriculum guidelines GJCE. Further, the code ‘global justice citizenship (other)’ was used, which relates to the curriculum guideline ‘critically reflecting on (mainstream) values’. Finally, regarding the impact of the course, the code “students’ intentions regarding their role as global citizens” was added. Table 5.4 shows the categories and codes for SQ2 and Table 5.5 presents the categories and codes for SQ3.

Two coders independently coded all materials used in this qualitative part of our study. Coding was done by selecting the relevant parts of the Blog-texts and by adding the code in the text margins. After the two different documents were combined into one and codes were compared as to establish inter rater reliability; the coders discussed differences until agreement was reached. Then, in the next step, fragments falling within one category were put together. Finally representative examples were selected by the first and second author.

Table 5.4. Overview of codes for each category SQ2

Category	Code
Knowledge	- historical (-future) dimension
	- local-global connection
Ethics	- ethical sensitivity (both own behavior and that of others / groups)

Table 5.5. Overview of codes for each category SQ3

Category	Code
Intentions (future) role as global citizen	- sustainability-related
	- social area
Insights	- knowledge-related
	- ethics-related
	- global justice citizenship (other)

## Results

### *Quantitative results*

A Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test revealed a statistically significant increase in ethical sensitivity after participating in Society 2.0 on three of the seven subscales. Regarding ESSQ 2: Taking the perspectives of others,  $z = -2.131$ ,  $p < .033$  with a medium effect size ( $r = .30$ ) using Cohen's (1998) criteria of .1 = small effect, .3 = medium effect and .5 = large effect. The median score on 'taking perspectives of others' increased from ( $Md = 3.88$ ) before the course to ( $Md = 4.25$ ) after the course. Regarding ESSQ 3: Caring by connecting to others,  $z = -2.179$ ,  $p < .029$  with a medium effect size ( $r = .31$ ). The median scores on 'caring by connecting to others' were the same on both occasions ( $Md = 4.00$ ). And regarding ESSQ 5: Preventing social bias,  $z = -2.695$ ,  $p < .007$  with a medium effect size ( $r = .38$ ). The median score on 'preventing social bias' increased from ( $Md = 3.50$ ) to ( $Md = 3.75$ ) after taking the course. See Table 5.6 for details on these results.

Table 5.6. Pre- and posttest differences on ethical sensitivity (ESSQ),  $N = 25$

ESSQ	<i>Md</i> (pre)	<i>Md</i> (post)	<i>Z</i> ( <i>p</i> )	<i>r</i>
1 Reading and expressing emotions	4.00	4.00	-.84 (.400)	.12
2 Taking the perspectives of others	3.88	4.25	-2.13 (.033)	.30
3 Caring by connecting to others	4.00	4.00	-2.18 (.029)	.31
4 Working with interpersonal and group differences	3.75	3.75	-1.77 (.077)	.25
5 Preventing social bias	3.50	3.75	-2.695 (.007)	.38
6 Generating interpretations and options	3.67	4.00	-1.61 (.107)	.23
7 Identifying the consequences of actions and options	3.50	3.75	-1.88 (.060)	.27

Regarding global citizenship as measured by the GCS, a Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test revealed a significant increase across all three sub-dimensions of global civic engagement and in two of the three sub-dimensions of global competence, namely self-awareness and global knowledge. The results are as follows. Self-awareness,  $z = -4.00$ ,  $p < .0005$  with a large effect size ( $r = .57$ ). The median score on ‘self-awareness’ increased from ( $Md = 2.67$ ) at the outset to ( $Md = 3.67$ ) after taking the course. Global knowledge,  $z = -3.02$ ,  $p < .003$  with a medium to large effect size ( $r = .43$ ). The median score on ‘global knowledge’ increased from ( $Md = 3.33$ ) to ( $Md = 3.67$ ). Involvement in civic organizations,  $z = -2.79$ ,  $p < .005$  with a medium to large effect size ( $r = .40$ ). The median score on ‘involvement in civic organizations’ increased from ( $Md = 2.75$ ) to ( $Md = 3.25$ ). Political voice,  $z = -2.53$ ,  $p < .011$  with a medium size ( $r = .36$ ). The median score on ‘political voice’ increased from ( $Md = 2.25$ ) to ( $Md = 2.75$ ). And Global civic activism,  $z = -2.93$ ,  $p < .003$  with a medium to large effect size ( $r = .40$ ). The median score on ‘global civic activism’ increased from ( $Md = 3.00$ ) to ( $Md = 3.33$ ) after taking the course. See Table 5.7 for further details.

Table 5.7. Pre- and posttest differences on the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS),  $N = 25$

Dimension	Sub-dimension	(Md) pre	(Md) post	Z (p)	r
Social Responsibility		4.00	4.00	-2.23 (.818)	.03
Global Competence	Self-awareness	2.67	3.67	-4.00 (.000)	.57
	Intercultural communication	4.00	3.67	-3.36 (.720)	.05
	Global knowledge	3.33	3.67	-3.02 (.003)	.43
Global Civic Engagement	Involvement in civic organizations	2.75	3.25	-2.79 (.005)	.40
	Political voice	2.25	2.75	-2.53 (.011)	.36
	Global civic activism	3.00	3.33	-2.93 (.003)	.40



To summarize the results from the quantitative part of our research on the effect of participation in Society 2.0, it was found that students showed an increased score on three of the seven dimensions of ethical sensitivity (with medium effect sizes). Further, students' scores had also increased on two of the three dimensions - and within those on five of the six sub-dimensions of global citizenship (with medium to high effect sizes).

### ***Qualitative results***

**SQ2** How do students express themselves regarding knowledge and ethics when writing about a societal issue? Content analyses of the blogs students wrote about a self-chosen societal issue revealed the following points. Sixteen students (67%) wrote about **knowledge** in the way we defined it (historical-future and local-global connection). Fourteen out of 24 (58%) treated the **historical dimension** in one way or another, mostly in a few (four to nine) sentences. Five students described the historical dimension from the angle of an alternative movement rather than of a societal/global issue. For instance: (S15) *The strange thing about self-sufficient living is that it is not a new lifestyle at all, because in earlier days we all had to organize and arrange our own food and ways to keep warm. [...] nowadays we forget how it will be to take care of your own food and heating.* A second example is the following: (S8) *Permaculture was invented in 1970 by two Australians, Bill Mollison and David Holmgren from the University of Tasmania. Together they did research on the functioning of the ecosystem in the Tasmanian forests. The research was motivated by agricultural issues that were going on. The aim was to formulate principles to enable man to build and maintain an ecosystem with optimal attention for nature.*

An example touching upon the historical dimension of discrimination is the following blog. (S14) drew connections with what she learned at her previous school about not being allowed to discriminate. The examples she

used were World War II, racial segregation in the USA and 'apartheid' in South Africa. She tried to find out if it is possible to see a turning point in the way people (in a certain country) think about discrimination. She wrote that she came to realize the answer to this question can be different depending on the country and the ethnic group involved.

Regarding the **local-global** perspective, it was found that 11 students (46%) dealt with that topic in one way or another. Two of them wrote about an issue that is often not perceived to play a role in the Netherlands, just in other parts of the world. (S25) wrote about poaching: *I always thought that animals living in the nature in the Netherlands had a rather good life here, but that is not true at all: 3663 poaching alerts within one year.* The other student (S20) argued that *the impact of internet censorship is not as dependent on location as people seem to think and not limited to countries like China and North Korea. In the Netherlands, there is trust in the government and the legislation. However, from the examples [this student gave] it is clear that in democratic politics also a lot of 'people-unfriendly' decisions are being made.*

Other students also wrote on this aspect. For instance, one (S7) described the international framework of human rights, such as the universal declaration of human rights and the EU legislation. Another (S18) mentioned the global scope of the effects of the use and depletion of fossil fuels. Yet another (S2) compared the attitude of Dutch people on homosexuality with that of people in several other countries.

When coding the blogs, we noticed that students had learned both from reading each other's blogs and in interaction with each other. Students responded to each other's blogs, writing that an issue was new for them and that they were interested in it. Further, they asked follow-up questions. For instance (S13): *Nice blog! I also think it is a very interesting issue (barter economy). Are you familiar with the trend that people even exchange food*

*that they have left over*; such follow-up was often about the other student's experiences and opinions. Several also delivered new input on the issue. For instance, *Your blog reminded me of my own 'doubts' about what to do in life to and how to become more happy. [...] I also immediately thought of a book I am reading [...]*. For an overview of the assigned codes for knowledge and ethics, see Table 5.8.

Table 5.8. Overview of codes assigned for each category SQ2,  $N = 24$

Category	Code	Number of students	Number of fragments
Knowledge/ insights	- historical (-future) dimension	14	22
	- local-global connection	11	11
Ethics	- ethical sensitivity (both own behavior and that of others / groups)	14	30

Fourteen students (58%) described **ethical** aspects and/or ethical considerations, either in their own blogs or in response to those of others. In total 30 separate fragments were coded 'ethical sensitivity'. Most writings concern ethical aspects of the theme / social issue students had written about. Four students wrote about unethical behavior in society in the form of discrimination. One (S14) provided a detailed analysis of the process of discrimination. After that she showed sensitivity to social bias, writing *When being white in the Netherlands wanting to avoid racism, one easily makes the mistake to become defensive and forget that you were influenced by the system you grew up in*. The writers go on to relate this knowledge to his/her own thoughts and behaviors. Another student (S26) also noticed the prevalence of discrimination and subsequently wrote, *Fighting discrimination starts with yourself*.

Four more students focused on social inequality and ways to overcome it. For instance, regarding unconditional basic income (S5), *A man had to apply for jobs because he was obliged to find a job as soon as possible, whilst being out of work meant he could take care of his ill mother, who otherwise would have to go to a nursing home.* Another student (S13) showed involvement with the welfare of others by writing, *I believe this initiative [store for homeless people] is great. Homeless people getting the opportunity to pick out free clothing.*

Two other students wrote about the unethical behavior of states and banks. One (S20) described how unlawful behavior of intelligence agencies has consequences for people's privacy. In a similar vein, (S19) detected a risk for low-educated people to become victims of nearly bankrupt enterprises. In response to that blog, another student (S12) proposed possible solutions to this problem, namely establishing a 'watchdog' and providing information. Finally, four students wrote about ethical aspects of sustainable food issues. As one wrote, *With the same reasons (money, lust) people kill animals. Why they do it, I can't understand.*

Although the fragments on ethics were not coded separately on the different dimensions of ethical sensitivity, we noticed that the fragments mainly reflect the following dimensions: involvement with welfare of others (ES3); seeing own prejudices, social bias regarding ethical issues (ES5); looking for alternative solutions for ethical problems (ES6); and seeing consequences of actions and options (ES7).

**SQ3** Which learning outcomes do participants of the course report regarding global citizenship, ethics and knowledge when reflecting on the course? When writing about *intentions* regarding **their role as global citizen, sustainability** came up 12 times (48%). Seven students did formulate intentions regarding their own sustainable behavior: eat no meat or less meat; use less packaging; reuse things; buy second-hand clothes; exchange

and share; make use of local gardens; eat vegetables in season and biological food and do not unnecessarily turn on the lights. Three students formulated other intentions regarding sustainability. For instance, (S4) wrote, *Now that the course has ended I want to further delve into this subject (green playgrounds) and hope to start this project in several towns.* (S3) wrote, *I intend to help spread the message about sustainable living for man, plants and animals.* And (S15) wrote, *Finally I found something concrete in my own discipline (civil engineering): building with nature.* One student (S15) wrote, *The most valuable [lesson] I learned from my internship (and the course) is the knowing that you are not alone. You never are the only one who worries (in my case about the climate) about the world. Speak out your 'worries' and especially what you are interested in. When people hear that you are interested in something, they might (unconsciously) look for information and soon something might come up for you.*

Twelve students (48%) formulated intentions **in the social area**. Four of them intend to do or continue volunteer work (S6, S10, S15, S20). For instance (S15) wrote, *One year ago I stopped with volunteer work, which I did since I was 16 years old. During the course I noticed how much I miss that, so I will immediately look for that again.* Another student was looking specifically into how he can contribute to the town he is living in (S8). Two more students had already started with volunteer work (S26, S18). The intentions of the last four were related to equality, justice and ethics. (S16) wrote, *Bring several cultures together by means of organizing a festival on short notice focusing on the multicultural society. The idea is that bands from [town] and from the asylum seekers center perform together, and the aim to connect people [this has been accomplished during the course].* (S9): *I study law and that is where I see myself contribute to a more just society in the future.* (S22): *Inform and activate other people and make them aware of ethical issues.* Finally, two

students emphasized the importance of taking small steps at a time. For instance (S14) wrote, *I came to realize that I have to focus on specific issues and take one step at a time.*

Regarding **insights** gained from the course, 19 students (76%) mentioned **ethical aspects** in altogether 38 fragments. Fourteen students mentioned that they are more aware of or have more respect for people who are different from themselves. Their comments reflect two dimensions of ethical sensitivity: exploring multiple perspectives (ES2) and understanding that differences could lead to misunderstandings (ES4). For instance (S22) wrote, *Respect each other's identity, try not to judge and pay respect.* And (S25) wrote, *last year was a period in which my world became much broader and I developed more respect for 'things' which are different.* (S4) wrote, *After my internship I came to realize that I also have prejudices about other people and other cultures.* (S5) wrote, [...] *We talked a lot about homeless people and also about people who live in poverty, and who, according to us, sometimes make stupid choices (you don't smoke if you do not have money, do you). We can in no way judge about this, without knowing more about people, situations and surroundings. So sometimes it is good to not take your own view and prejudices too seriously and important to be a little more forward looking.* And (S16): [...] *I was opposed to refugees, but thanks to the course and especially insights from others, my thoughts about this have been changed.*

Two students wrote that all alternative movements deserve respect. Also, two students mentioned that they have become more aware of ethics, norms and values. For instance (S23): *I more often remark on ethical aspects and talk with others about that. I also notice that I more often watch interesting documentaries about this subject.* One student (S25) wrote that the most important lesson she learned about society concerned *The helping of each*

other. People are there for you and that is a reassuring feeling. Also, one student wrote that he is more aware of other people (S8): *I cycle through the city more happily and notice more the people around me. I more often talk with them and in that way come to know things. This interest for people from Groningen has been aroused by the course 'Society 2.0'.* Finally, one student (S9) wrote, *Society only functions if we keep talking to each other. Ignorance creates a distinction between groups within society.*

Eighteen students (72%) reported **knowledge-related insights** in altogether 27 text fragments. Almost all of these refer to gaining broader knowledge and a broader view. For instance (S13) wrote, *I became fascinated by the barter economy.* (S17): *An inspiring group of motivated students have also pointed out all kinds of movements to make this world an even better place.* (S23): *I learned a lot about society, about different cultures, alternative movements and ethical aspects. Very important aspects, which are not always being discussed in daily life.* And (S24): *I am much more aware of what is going on in the world and I notice more articles about a societal theme like TTIP, which I then read with pleasure.*

Other insights, specifically regarding **global justice citizenship**, were reported by five students (20%). Two students wrote about equality. For instance (S10) wrote, *I learned it is good to help a little in society, but that help is not always necessary whilst 'we people from western countries' feel the urge to help people living in a less prosperous countries then we do 'the white savior syndrome'.* Two students wrote about the importance of collective action / cooperation for a better world. For instance (S6) wrote, *When I look at the Netherlands I can see that we have become more individualistic. We have to collaborate to make the world a better place. We expect too soon that other people will change and that it is no use to do something on your own. Although you will have to collaborate, you can also contribute on your own.* As one student (S19) remarked when asked to describe the most important lesson (s)he had

learned from Society 2.0, it was *that most people think too mainstream*. For an overview of assigned codes regarding students' intentions as global citizen and gained insights, see Table 5.9.

Table 5.9. Overview of codes assigned for each category SQ3,  $N = 25$

Category	Code	Number of students	Number of fragments
Intentions (future) role as global citizen	- sustainability-related	12	16
	- social area	12	13
	- other	4	4
Insights	- knowledge-related	18	27
	- ethics-related	19	38
	- global justice	5	5
	citizenship (other)		

When coding the students' final blogs, we also noticed that students often said they learned from their internship. Seventeen of the 25 students mentioned the internship in altogether 45 fragments.

With regard to the students' perception on effects on them ( $n = 9$ ) **half a year after the course was finished**, the following points were found. Students wrote in their follow-up blogs about how the course still influenced them. Three of them mentioned paying more attention to their surroundings. For instance (S1) mentioned, *seeing more what happens around me*; and (S3) recalled *noticing more small initiatives when walking in the street*. Others reported that they developed a different view or perspective. (S17): *developed critical look regarding certain issues, for instance TTIP*. (S19) reported: *notice that I look from a different perspective, which sometimes leads to nice insights in the tough financial world*. And related to ethics, (S1) wrote: *looking for alternative solutions for problems, also involving fairness*.



When asked about specific **knowledge** gained from the course, all but one student said things like “not particularly knowledge”. But (S8): *thoughts and ideas that you share with others and that help broaden your horizon.* (S3): *that you have to start with yourself, but after that it is also important to share your ideas or initiatives.* (S1): *alternative movements, what you can reach with those, however small they may be.* And (S14): *I better think about my own opinion, have become more critical.* One student did mention gaining specific knowledge, but not on a global issue. (S7): *what I really remember is conformism; I knew the concept but never gave it much thought. How she [the teacher] told about it, I thought yes, everybody does it, it just happens.*

When asked for the **added value in their daily lives**, three students mentioned the dialogue with others. For instance (S8): *I share more thoughts and ideas with people and take initiatives to do things together (with colleagues).* (S14): *[...] more open to opinions of others and take things not personally anymore.* Another student brought up the attitude towards others (S7): *Try to be positive and gay every day and give compliments and also become happy from the reactions I get.*

Two more students mentioned ethics-related aspects. (S1): *pay more attention to someone else's norms and values.* And (S5): *my acting has changed a lot, for instance regarding homeless people, “you have a lot less than I have while I can easily do with a little less money”.*

Four students mentioned sustainable behavior: (S5): *change of lifestyle, more fresh and biological food;* (S1): *more thrifty with waste;* (S17): *eat less meat and more aware of power consumption;* and (S7): *don't let the water run, removing the electric plug, don't leave the lights on and so on.* One student mentioned now being able to acquire deeper knowledge (S5): *more deepening when reading a magazine on global justice issues.*

## Discussion and limitations

In our research on the effects of a global citizenship course on the participants, quantitative results showed a positive impact on students' ethical sensitivity as well as on their attitude and behavior as global citizen. The analyses of students' work and of their perception of what they had learned point in the same direction. The course offered them new insights and broader knowledge, made them think about ethical issues and their values and stimulated them to deal with their role as global citizen.

To answer the first sub-question SQ1: Do students show an increase in ethical sensitivity and global citizenship (social responsibility, global competence and global civic engagement) after taking the course? a quantitative measure of ethical sensitivity ESSQ and the global citizenship GCS in a pre- and posttest design were used. Results revealed increased ethical sensitivity on three of the seven dimensions of the ESSQ: 'taking the perspective of others' (which relates to exploring multiple perspectives on situations and events); 'caring by connecting to others' (which relates to the process of expanding one's sense of self to include others and involves developing a sense of connectedness to other people, both globally and locally) and 'preventing social bias' (which involves understanding, identifying and actively countering bias). Effect sizes were medium. No significant increase in scores was found on four dimensions: 'reading and expressing emotions', 'working with interpersonal and group differences', 'generating interpretations and options' and 'identifying the consequences of options and actions'.

Results regarding global citizenship revealed an increased score on the dimensions 'global civic engagement' and 'global competence'. Effect sizes were medium to high. Global civic engagement relates to involvement in civic organizations, political voice and global civic activism. Regarding global competence, an increased score was found on 'self-awareness' (recognizing

own limitations and ability to engage successfully in an intercultural encounter) and 'global knowledge' (displaying interest and knowledge about world issues and events) but not on intercultural communication. Students' scores did not significantly increase on the third dimension, namely 'social responsibility' (awareness of interdependence and social concern for the environment, other people and society in general). This result might be related to the rather high score on both intercultural communication and social responsibility that the students already had recorded at the start of the course (Md = 4 on a 5-point Likert scale).

Based on these results it can be concluded that students increased their ethical sensitivity as well as their global competence and global civic engagement by taking the course. However, the absence of a control group means that the results should be interpreted with some caution, as it cannot be proven that it was solely the course that caused this increase. Further, the sample size of 25 students is rather small and should be considered a major limitation with regard to the quantitative analyses with the instruments ESSQ and GCS.

Regarding our second sub-question (SQ2), How do students express themselves in the knowledge and ethics when writing about a societal issue?, content analyses of two blogs revealed that students dealt in some way with *ethical aspects* and *knowledge* when writing about a self-chosen societal issue. For instance, they wrote about the ethical aspects of discrimination, unconditional basic income, behavior of states and banks and sustainability. With regard to *knowledge*, most of the writings about historical aspects were found to be short. Notably, the students had learned about each other's issue and in that way broadened their knowledge about societal/global issues. Students regularly expressed enthusiasm about new insights, although it

cannot be proven that what they wrote in their blogs is a reflection of new knowledge acquired in the course.

Regarding our third sub-question (SQ3), Which insights do participants of the course report regarding *ethics, knowledge and their (future) role as global citizen* when reflecting on the course?, students reported *knowledge*-related insights, mostly referring to broader knowledge and a broader view. Likewise, students reported *ethics*-related insights, especially having more respect for people different from themselves. Signs of insight into other aspects of justice-oriented *global citizenship* were also visible, namely regarding equality, individualism and mainstream thinking. It was further noted that students wrote about the importance of their internship. Students' *intentions about their (future) role as global citizen* were equally related to sustainability and to the social arena, such as volunteering, bringing cultures together or striving for more justice within their profession.

Although the giving of politically correct answers cannot entirely be excluded, we think that there are several circumstances in this course that might make the probability of this kind of answering smaller. First: In this course, there is not something like right or wrong according students' intentions for the future. Instead, students reflected on their intentions and plans during the course and had to give arguments for choices. Second: in that same vein, there were students who did not have concrete plans yet, but nevertheless passed the course. Third: several of the intentions of students were already put to practice and students wrote and told about what they learned from it, hence this did reflect their behavior and not a tendency to come across as for example ethical. Fourth: in their Blogs and during classes (observed by the first author), students showed severe enthusiasm about new insights and new experiences they got and intentions were linked to these insights and experiences, for instance becoming vegetarian, organizing a

cultural festival with refugees and inhabitants of a village, and making more active contact with unknown others.

Finally, from the follow-up blog and interview among nine students half a year after participating in the course, it can be concluded that students experienced that Society 2.0 still had an influence on them. This was especially apparent in their writing and talking about taking a different perspective and paying more attention to (people in) their surroundings. Students mentioned that they gained more insights than specific knowledge, giving the importance of sharing ideas as an example. Regarding behavior, five students mentioned that their attitude towards others had changed (towards sharing ideas, paying more attention) and four students remarked that they were behaving more sustainably.

It should be noted that not all students were interviewed; only nine participated in the follow-up blog and interview. It might be that the students who agreed to participate in an evaluation six months after taking the course are not representative for the whole group. However, the fact that no more students signed up for the follow-up study, even though their involvement with the course seemed to be deep, could be related to the extra workload of 15 ECTS each year in an honors program and to the half-year internship in the third year of study, conditions that applied to 64% of the students in this course.

The reason why this course had a positive impact on the participating students could be related to the use of the theory-based insights underlying the development of the course as well as to the teaching behavior. Regarding the theory, the curriculum guidelines GJCE in the knowledge, moral and social domains combined with experiential learning, were largely implemented in the course. Several ways of gaining more knowledge on societal/global issues were combined with explicit attention for ethics and an internship at

an alternative social movement. The latter activity offered new perspectives on mainstream values and positive role models for the students.

Theoretical insights regarding honors pedagogies were also implemented and might have contributed to the results of the course as well. These were: offering a safe learning community, academic challenge and bounded freedom (Wolfensberger, 2012). Of special note is that a great deal of freedom was offered. Students could choose an issue to write about, an internship, and the form and content of their final assignment. Community-building was accomplished in two ways: the course was started with attention for the values and norms the students were brought up with; and the teachers offered space for the students to exchange experiences related to the course. Students wrote they had learned from each other. Teachers also paid attention to different perspectives and emphasized being nonjudgmental (Schutte et al., in press), which is reflected in the students' writing and perceptions of what they learned.

Despite the positive outcomes of the course, students seem to have merely broadened their knowledge and hardly gained insight into the root causes of injustice, which is one of the curriculum guidelines GJCE. To achieve the latter aim, a more extended course will probably be necessary. Moreover, specific attention would have to be given to the structures that maintain injustice for the students to develop such insights (Schutte et al., in press).

Also, it should be kept in mind that the participants in this case study were honors students. The results might be different for regular (i.e. non-honors) students. One reason for this is that high ability students on average reveal more interest in ethical issues (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007; Schutte, Wolfensberger & Tirri, 2014). Finally, students deliberately chose to participate in this course aimed at global citizenship. Making that choice implies that they were already motivated to find answers about their role as

citizen or were at least curious about the subject of global citizenship. The results might be different when such a course is mandatory. However, three principles that teachers applied in the course 'Society 2.0' (Schutte et al., in press) could also contribute to positive results in other contexts: starting with the student (in this case relating their background to their values and opinions); responding to differences between students and making of adaptations in the course program when it seems necessary for the students' learning.

### **Conclusions**

Under current conditions of emerging populism and severe ecological problems worldwide, undergraduate students should be able to count on our help and support in their efforts to gain deeper insights in the global society and to find their own way to act as an engaged global citizen. Especially honors students, with their above-average motivation, abilities and interest in moral issues, could also contribute to solutions of global justice and sustainability issues. The results of our case study show that a 112-hour theory-based global citizenship course can have a positive impact on undergraduate honors students' insights, ethical sensitivity and the development of attitudes and behaviors as engaged citizens.







# Chapter 6

Conclusions and discussion

The general aim of this thesis is to contribute to empirical knowledge about honors education with regard to moral and civic domains by examining the ethical sensitivity (an aspect of moral development) of undergraduate honors students and investigating how education can help prepare these students to be engaged global citizens. The main questions investigated are as follows. The first empirical chapter—focusing on ethical sensitivity—asked: “Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between academically average and high-ability students?” While the following three empirical chapters—examining justice-oriented global citizenship education—asked: “How can educational programs further enhance the moral and civic development of undergraduate honors students?”

We used the Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ), based on the theory of Narvaez (2001) on ethical sensitivity, to compare the ethical sensitivity of undergraduate, high-ability students with that of their average-ability peers.

The studies on global justice citizenship education, connect to a justice-oriented (Johnson & Morris, 2010) and globally oriented citizenship. Curriculum guidelines for Global Justice Citizenship Education (GJCE) were used to examine the global justice orientation of an existing undergraduate honors course, SIS, and to build a new course for undergraduate honors students, Society 2.0. The effects of both courses on the participating students were investigated.

In the remainder of this chapter, first the summaries of the four empirical chapters are presented. Then the discussion section is provided, which consists of limitations and practical implications and further research, followed by the general conclusions in relation to the main questions presented above. This chapter ends with final remarks.

## Summary of the empirical chapters

**Chapter 2** examines the possible advantaged position of undergraduate, high-ability students regarding ethical sensitivity (Narvaez, 2001), an aspect of moral development (Rest, 1999; Bebeau, Rest & Narvaez, 1999). Although many studies suggest that gifted persons are on average ahead of their peers in moral reasoning skills, little data exists for those 18 years and older. This study presents empirical data on ethical sensitivity for 731 students in Dutch higher education (median age, 20 years). Data was collected by administering the ESSQ (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011), based on the theory of ethical sensitivity formulated by Narvaez (2001). High ability in this study was categorized into three groups, namely undergraduate students who (1) participate in honors programs; (2) participate in other special talent programs such as a University College; (3) students with a grade point average (GPA)  $\geq 8$  who do not choose to participate in an honors program. Significantly higher scores were found for high-ability, compared to average-ability, students on all five subscales of the ESSQ included in the study, clearly indicating an ability-related difference. That finding corresponds with the results of prior research among the age group of 14-17 years, in that high-ability students show advanced moral reasoning (Howard-Hamilton, 1994), moral judgment (Lee, et al., 2006) and a higher estimation of their ethical sensitivity compared to their average-achieving peers (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007). Results from Chapter 2 indicate that an advantaged position in the moral maturation of high-ability students remains when they are around 20 years.

The study included data from research universities and universities of applied sciences and different types of talent programs. Analysis showed that ethical sensitivity did not differ across these programs, nor across type of universities. However, there were some differences with regard to gender in so far as female students showed a higher self-assessed ethical sensitivity

than male students on the dimension 'caring by connecting to others.' This finding is partly consistent with the literature, which suggests that girls are more care-oriented in their moral orientation, while boys are more justice-oriented (Gilligan, 1982; Björklund, 2003; Tirri, 2003; Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007).

**Chapter 3** analyzes what and how students learn from an undergraduate, international, blended honors course, namely SIS, oriented towards the inquiry of students into what it means to be a member of a global community. First, the course was analyzed by means of the curriculum guidelines GJCE, with the aim of determining the extent to which this course relates to justice-oriented, global citizenship education. Analysis of the program showed that the course partially reflects the curriculum guidelines for GJCE's critical perspective on global citizenship education, namely in addressing attitude (contact with people from different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds; attention to intercultural sensitivity) and experiential learning, partly in civic contexts. Second, the effects of the course on the participating students were analyzed using a mixed methods approach. The study measured whether the course enhanced ethical sensitivity (using the ESSQ; Tirri & Nokelainen 2007, 2011), social awareness, civic engagement, and social and political activities (using the SFS of the AAC&U; Wathington, 2008), and intercultural sensitivity (using the ICSSQ; Holm, 2012; Holm, Nokelainen & Tirri, 2009) of the 22 participating students.

The quantitative analysis showed that students' score increased on one of the seven dimensions of ethical sensitivity, namely the ability to generate interpretations and options. This ability relates to the use of creative skills in both interpreting a situation and dealing with it. Moreover, participants scored higher on social awareness, defined as the extent to which one believes it is important to be socially and culturally aware, at the end of the

course. The participants did not show a significant increase in intercultural sensitivity after taking the course. It was found that compared to the control group, these participants already scored higher on intercultural sensitivity at the start of the course. Further, participants scored slightly higher on the ethno-relative orientation at the end of the course. This means that, in contrast to the ethnocentric orientation, one's culture is experienced in the context of other cultures. Regarding student's self-reported civic behavior and political actions in the past year, results did not show an impact of the course on these forms of motivation to contribute to a more just world.

Qualitative measures regarding the significance of the course for the students, gave some indication that participants positively changed the way they look at and value other cultures and developed a more open and active attitude towards unknown others after the course. When asked what possibilities students see to contribute to a more just society in the future, all participants of the course were firm about making such a contribution, although not all the answers were justice-related. Participants' answers were related to various roles: their future profession; activity or volunteer work, like becoming more active in one's neighborhood; or being a sustainable consumer. Regarding how they learned in the course, students considered experiential learning to be a powerful aspect of the pedagogical approach.

**Chapter 4** investigates the development of the formal curriculum and delivery of the operationalized curriculum of the undergraduate honors course Society 2.0. In this program, we intended to incorporate the curriculum guidelines GJCE to a greater extent. Society 2.0 aimed at global justice-oriented citizenship and the curriculum guidelines for GJCE were used to build the course. It further investigated how pedagogies important for honors students, namely 'community', 'academic competence', and 'bounded freedom' (Wolfensberger, 2012) were integrated in this course. Finally, the

added value of working with a curriculum development team consisting of teachers, students, and a researcher was investigated.

It was found that the curriculum guidelines in the moral and social domains, as well as experiential learning and honors pedagogies, were applied in the course. Teachers implemented curriculum guidelines in their teaching behavior, for instance, by confronting students when making ungrounded judgments (knowledge and moral domain), and requesting arguments (knowledge domain), and posing reflective questions (all domains). Guidelines in the knowledge domain seemed most difficult to realize. This was particularly apparent with regard to gaining insight into the root causes of injustice.

Results regarding honors pedagogies showed that all three elements were embedded in the course. Bounded freedom and academic challenge also appear to be a good fit with justice-oriented citizenship education, which does not aim to impart a fixed set of truths or critiques about society and its structure (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Regarding educational practice, it was found that community building appears to warrant extra attention when students do not meet on a daily basis and course meetings are held just once every two weeks. In general, it was possible to include the curriculum guidelines. However, the research also showed that it is not easy to include the guidelines in 112-hours program without substantial training of the teachers involved. Regarding the added value of a development team including teachers and students, results indicate the importance of equality and team spirit, as teachers experienced that these conditions positively influenced the atmosphere in class.

**Chapter 5** investigates the effects of the course Society 2.0 on the 25 participating students using a mixed methods approach. The curriculum guidelines GJCE were largely applied in this course, for example in the

following ways. Society 2.0 focused on alternative/social movements and their ideals. This primary theme of the course directly reflected the moral domain. The course further began with the values and norms of students' upbringing (moral domain) and then broadened. Students delved into a societal theme (knowledge domain) and completed a 15-hour internship with an alternative/social movement (experiential learning and social domain).

Quantitative results using the ESSQ showed that students self-assessed their ethical sensitivity higher on three of the seven dimensions, namely TPO (exploring multiple perspectives), CCO (expanding self-concern to include others, connectedness to others), and 'preventing social bias' (understanding, identifying, and actively countering bias) after taking the course. Regarding global citizenship-related attitudes and skills, as measured by the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS; Lang, 2013; Morais & Ogden, 2010), participants enhanced global competence (global knowledge and intercultural communication) and global civic engagement (involvement in civic organizations and global civic activism) after taking the course.

Qualitative results provided deeper insight into the content of students' learning regarding ethics, social and sustainability issues, and the impact of the course on students' attitudes and behavior. They point in the same direction as the quantitative results as they showed that students dealt in some way or another with ethical aspects when writing about a self-chosen societal issue. For instance, they wrote about the ethical aspects of discrimination, unconditional basic income, the way governments and banks operate, and sustainability. With regard to knowledge, most writings about historical aspects were found to be short. Notably, students learned about each other's issue and as such broadened their knowledge about societal global issues. Students' intentions regarding their (future) roles as global citizens were equally related to sustainability and the social arena, such as volunteering, bringing cultures together, or striving for more justice within



their professions. The results of a follow-up blog and interviews ( $N = 9$ ) half a year after the course concluded, provided some indication of a lasting impact of course participation on students' attitude and behavior towards others, as well as in generating sustainable behaviors.

## **Discussion**

### ***Limitations***

#### *Definition of high-ability students*

The concepts of high ability and talent are under development and different views, as well as different practices in research about giftedness, exist. Sternberg et al. (2011) emphasize that giftedness is a social construction and thus what it means can vary from one time and place to another. This also applies to the concept of 'high ability'. In educational practices, this situation is reflected, for instance, by the existence of different admission requirements for honors programs. Therefore, honors students in higher education do not comprise a homogeneous group (Achterberg, 2005; Rinn & Plucker, 2004). In the first study (Chapter 2), a broader operationalization is chosen by defining high ability to include all students in special talent programs (honors, as well as university college students) and students with a GPA  $\geq 8$ . This should be kept in mind when comparing this study with other research. High ability was defined in this way because some students with above average motivation and abilities may choose other paths than an honors program. With this definition, the study aimed to construct a group that distinguishes itself by showing higher abilities, as well as—in most cases—higher motivation compared to its peers. One could, however, argue that honors students are not necessarily high-ability students. And indeed,

different admission procedures, as well as differences in educational entry levels, may trouble the equation of honors and high ability.

In the Netherlands about one third of the population in the age bracket 15–75-years-old, completed higher education. Hence, higher education students can be argued to belong to roughly the top third of the country regarding – mainly - cognitive abilities. Further, honors students distinguish themselves from other students by being able and motivated to do more than the regular curriculum offers. Finally, honors programs have clear admission criteria (Wolfensberger, 2015). As such, it can be assumed that honors students are more likely to be on the high end of a normal distribution regarding abilities relevant to higher education. Nevertheless, one should keep this potential uncertainty in mind when comparing the results of this study to other work on high-ability students, because ‘high ability’ is not clearly defined.

#### *Measuring of ethical sensitivity*

The ESSQ (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007; 2011), designed to self-assess one’s ethical sensitivity, was used in three of the four chapters. The 28 items are not content-specific, which is an important advantage because, as a result, the ESSQ can be used in different contexts and multidisciplinary contexts. Consequently, the items are rather abstract. In the test phase of the first study, several students made remarks about the abstractedness of some items. They noticed that as a result of the abstract quality of some of the items, their answers greatly depended on their interpretation. Tirri and Nokelainen (2011) argue that this abstract quality, combined with the limited number of four items for each subscale, could lead to lower reliability scores. In addition, because the instrument is multidimensional it yields lower alpha reliability coefficients (Helms, Henze, Sass & Mifsud, 2006). Indeed, in the first study (Chapter 2), it was found that for the subscales (1) reading and expressing

emotions, and (5) preventing social bias, the reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) were too low to make meaningful analysis possible. In chapters 3 and 5, when the ESSQ was used in a pre-and posttest design, reliabilities showed a few values that were rather low (.50). However, these low reliability values may have been due to the small sample size.

Regarding the use of the ESSQ in pre- and posttest designs, it is relevant to discuss whether the initial measurement could have an effect on the follow-up. This question is especially pertinent, as the intuitive character of moral reasoning has been emphasized by research on morality (Haidt, 2001; Narvaez, 2013). Arguably, specifically in an educational context with hardly any explicit attention to morality and ethics—as is the case in the Netherlands—completing a questionnaire in which students are prompted to think about their behavior and decisions regarding ethical issues could lead to more awareness and hence influence the answers that students provide when given the test a second time. This would mean that students' awareness of ethical aspects of a situation would increase by completing the questionnaire. However, as a control group is used in Chapter 3, it is not likely that this explains the findings.

### *General formulated curriculum guidelines*

The curriculum guidelines GJCE are generally formulated and not elaborated upon in much detail. The choice for a more general formulation was made because it was considered important to offer possibilities to developers and teachers to determine content and to use their own expertise and experience as a teacher in developing a course. Regarding the course Society 2.0 (Chapters 4 and 5), it was found that the teachers who were also member of the curriculum development team delivered valuable input concerning the structure of the course.

A possible disadvantage of general formulated curriculum guidelines might be that they can be multi interpretable. It seems that especially the curriculum guideline 'Gain historical (root causes of injustice)' offered too little support to give substance to the justice orientation. Furthermore, it was found that although social change is often the result of a collective effort, there was little attention for collectivity in the course Society 2.0 (see Chapter 4). In addition, the global dimension of citizenship education could have been further elaborated in the curriculum guidelines, specifically regarding international exchange. In the course SIS this exchange was already incorporated. In the course Society 2.0, it was attempted to establish online exchange with students from other parts of the world but this exchange could not be realized. By such international exchange, the participants could have put their experiences and insights from the course into perspective.

*Small number of participants in the second case study*

The number of participants in Society 2.0 (Chapter 5,  $N = 25$ ) is rather small to apply quantitative analysis. Given such a small group, the decision was made to use a non-parametric test. Still, the small sample size should be considered a major limitation with regard to the quantitative analyses with the ESSQ and GCS.

Furthermore, it could be considered a limitation that no control group was used in the quantitative measurements of ethical sensitivity and global citizenship competence with a pre- and posttest design in the second case study. The results of Chapter 5 should therefore be interpreted with some caution, as it cannot be proven that the course solely caused increased scores on ethical sensitivity, global competence, and global civic engagement. However, qualitative measurements support the findings of our quantitative research, such as greater awareness of ethical issues and enhanced insights into sustainability and justice-related issues.

***Practical implications and further research***

The findings from these studies have theoretical and practical implications while generating further research questions.

*Ethical sensitivity of undergraduate honors students*

There seems to be consensus that honors is not simply about a high Grade Point Average (GPA) (Wolfensberger, 2012, p. 77; Kool, 2016). In educational practice, this opinion is reflected as honors students are not solely selected based on former achievements. Additionally, individuals involved in honors education believe that honors education is broader than simply IQ or related to achievement. Our study indicates that this broadness also includes ethical sensitivity, i.e. the above average interest of undergraduate honors students in ethical issues.

For the educational practice, the findings in this thesis suggest that including ethical issues and being attentive to moral development in programs for honors students might also meet their interest. Furthermore, paying attention to ethical issues can also serve the wider society in its struggle with global justice issues, as honors students in higher education could, given their above average motivation and abilities, contribute to solutions to global issues.

Wolfensberger and Pilot (2014) consider societal engagement to be an important aspect of honors education in the Netherlands. It is however not clear to which extent there is explicit attention to moral and civic development in Dutch honors programs and what the aims and results of such programs would be. These are questions for further research.

*Effects of the two different courses*

It was found that the course from the second case study, Society 2.0, appeared to have more impact on participating students compared to the

course SIS from the first case study. In terms of quantitative results of the ESSQ, measuring ethical sensitivity before and after taking the course, as well as qualitative measurements of what students learned, the course Society 2.0 yielded more effects. This finding could be related to the theory-based curriculum guidelines GJCE, which were largely implemented in the course Society 2.0. In Society 2.0, the theme alternative/social movements combined elements of the social and moral domains of GJCE. In addition, an internship in a civic context, wherein students contributed and interviewed individuals involved in a movement about their ideals was incorporated in Society 2.0 and not in the course SIS. Finally, students' learning about social and sustainable global issues took place in Society 2.0 by means of discussions in class and reacting to each other's blogs. Hence, it seems that the curriculum guidelines GJCE can provide some direction for creating education which enhances honors students' ethical sensitivity and global civic engagement. The curriculum guidelines GJCE can be used and further improved in educational practice.

*Justice approach to global citizenship education*

The curriculum guidelines for GJCE build on a justice approach to global citizenship education, including the desire to improve society and construct a better world (Johnson & Morris, 2010). In the current societal context, such an approach can be difficult to realize as neoliberal ideology highly affects all aspects of education (Kliewer, 2013). Bourke (2013) describes the tension between two tasks that universities around the world have to perform: translate knowledge in products and services for the market (related to economic development) and simultaneously work with communities to alleviate economic excesses in the market. This tension also becomes visible in global citizenship education (DiCicco Cozzolino, 2016): the technical-economic agenda of GCE focusses on 21<sup>st</sup> century skills, such as problem

solving, critical thinking, and effective communication, which help students to compete in the global labor market. However, GCE for social justice has another orientation and aims for engaged and responsible citizenship, dealing with issues that affect the well-being of all. Several analyses of educational practices show the prevalence of a technical economic approach (DiCicco Cozzolino, 2016; Kliewer, 2013; Veugelers, 2011c) while neglecting historically rooted inequalities in global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2015).

In line with these empirical findings, the case study regarding Society 2.0 revealed that the curriculum guideline 'gaining historical insights in root causes of injustice' was most difficult to realize (chapters 4 and 5). There appear to be several reasons why such insights could not be realized in the course Society 2.0. First, although the theme of alternative social movements offers non-mainstream values, alternative movements do not necessarily seek to change existing social structures, as they may rather aim to create an alternative to it (Collom, 2007). Second, the duration of the course (112 hours), in combination with the broad scope, made it difficult to find sufficient time for historical investigations. Third, for one of the teachers social justice was not an important goal. Consequently, the focus of the course was on seeing different perspectives rather than knowledge and insights in root causes of injustice.

In aiming to strengthen the justice approach by paying more attention to historical knowledge and insights the following points of attention can be helpful.

- At Dutch universities, it may take time to find teachers who endorse a global justice approach, as politics in education seems to be a rather sensitive issue among teachers (Veugelers, 2011c).
- Discuss the political dimension of global citizenship with the developers and teachers of a course and allow them to become acquainted with methods and materials that can offer direction for gaining such deeper

insights. For instance methods and materials that pay attention to the change of existing social structures and the role of collective effort in establishing social change (see Chapter 4).

- A smaller content scope within a course may be more beneficial for generating depth.

Instead of evidence suggesting students gained deeper knowledge and insight into the root causes of injustice, it was found that participants of Society 2.0 broadened their knowledge about several societal issues related to justice and sustainability (see Chapter 5). Students could learn about these issues by reading other students' blogs, asking follow-up questions, and exchanging knowledge, ideas, and experiences in class. This finding is in line with critical pedagogy of Paulo Freire (1972), which emphasizes the importance of dialogue. A community of learners, in which social issues including moral aspects and values are discussed, may help students build their capacity to become active and effective citizens (Fisher, 2008). A stronger incorporation of the social approach to learning into the curriculum guidelines for GJCE could enhance its value as a methodological base to develop global justice-oriented citizenship education.

## **Final conclusions**

### ***Do undergraduate honors students show higher ethical sensitivity compared to their peers?***

The first study, in which the self-assessed ethical sensitivity of undergraduate high ability students was compared with the scores of their average ability university peers, found that high ability 18+-year-old students show a higher self-assessed ethical sensitivity. High ability students in this study include students in special talent programs, both honors programs and university



colleges, as well as students with a GPA  $\geq 8$  who were not participating in such a program. The results indicate that the privileged position in the maturation of moral thinking that was found among gifted children and adolescents (e.g. Lovecky, 2009) still seems to exist at the age of around 20 years.

The results contribute to existing literature concerning high ability and ethical sensitivity. As remarked in the introduction, high ability does not always lead to strength in moral judgement (e.g. Ruf & Radosevich, 2009). Gifted children being *at promise* for high moral development (Roeper & Silverman, 2009, p.251) implies that this development cannot automatically be taken for granted. Undergraduate honors education can contribute to the further enhancement of students' moral development.

The results of Chapter 2 suggest an advanced ethical sensitivity of undergraduate honors students. This finding adds a new perspective to the body of literature investigating possible characteristics of honors students (Scager et al., 2012; Kool, 2016).

### ***How can educational programs further enhance the moral and civic development of undergraduate honors students?***

Based on a literature search of theoretical and empirical studies on global citizenship education, curriculum guidelines for developing social- and moral-related programs for undergraduate honors students were designed, aimed at promoting their role as committed citizens of the world. The design was created in relation to a justice-oriented and globally-oriented citizenship and built on several authors (Andreotti, 2006; Colby et al., 2003; Davies et al., 2005; Strain, 2005; Strand et al., 2003; Oxfam, 2006; Veugelers, 2007; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) in composing the curriculum guidelines for GJCE. Moreover, a holistic educational approach was used treating values, ethics and social awareness alongside cognitive development (Tirri, 2011a; 2012; Tolppanen & Tirri; 2014).

The study investigated the effects of two different undergraduate honors courses related to global citizenship, SIS and Society 2.0, on the participating students. The results indicate that such programs help students develop attitudes and insights to further fulfill their roles as engaged global citizens. As a result, the study may contribute to the generation of greater balance in higher education between a focus on professional excellence, on the one hand, and societal engagement and moral development, on the other.

It was found that both programs broadened participants' views on society in the sense that they reported to see more perspectives and complexity. Also in both courses, participants reported that they gained a more open and active attitude towards (unknown) others. Furthermore, it was found that the course Society 2.0 which largely incorporated the curriculum guidelines GJCE, yielded more effects than the course SIS. For instance positive effects on students' ethical sensitivity and their knowledge about different societal and sustainability issues.

Regarding the curriculum guidelines for GJCE, it was found that these theory-based guidelines from the justice approach of global citizenship, combining knowledge, moral, and social domains with experiential learning in civic contexts, can provide some direction for creating education which enhances honors students' ethical sensitivity and global civic engagement. However, gaining deeper insight into root causes of injustice and sustainability issues appears the most difficult to realize. In addition, learning from each other seems to be of special importance for students in broadening their knowledge about injustice and sustainability issues.

### **Final remarks**

All students could benefit from incorporating ethics and reflection on values in higher education. The current attention for high-ability students and the consequent development of special programs for this group in Dutch

higher education, offer a chance to include ethical issues from the start. Furthermore, honors students in higher education could, given their above-average motivation and abilities, contribute to the solution of global issues. The results of this research suggest an advanced ethical sensitivity of this group, which might be an additional reason to devote attention to ethical and social issues in programs for high-ability students. The presented case studies show that global citizenship courses can support students in their moral development and can enhance behavior, insights, and ideas in becoming engaged global citizen. Given current, global ecological and humanitarian problems and challenges, these courses can be of special importance for all students.





# References

## References

---

- Aben, E., & Rutgers, V. (2009). Social responsibility in university education. *AEF Yearbook 2009* (pp. 59-63). Retrieved from [http://www.aef-international.com/media/dossier/pdf/6\\_universitair\\_ond.pdf](http://www.aef-international.com/media/dossier/pdf/6_universitair_ond.pdf)
- Achterberg, C. (2005). What is an honors student? *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, 6(1), 75-81.
- Alnabhan, M. (2011). How does moral judgment change with age and giftedness? *Gifted and Talented International*, 26(1-2), 25-30.
- Ameen, E. C., Guffey, D. M., & McMillan, J. J. (1996). Gender differences in determining the ethical sensitivity of future accounting professionals. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15, 591-597.
- Andreotti, V., Barker L., & Newell-Jones, K. (2006). *Critical Literacy in Global Citizenship Education. Professional Development Resource Pack*. Derby: Global Education Derby.
- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Development Education, Policy and Practice* 3(1). Retrieved from <http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue3-focus4?page=show>
- Bartelds, V., Drayer, A. L. & Wolfensberger, M. V. C. (2012). Mission, Performance Indicators and Assessment in US-honors: a view from The Netherlands. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, 13(2), 129-145.
- Bebeau, M. J., Rest, J. R., & Narvaez, D. (1999). Beyond the promise: A perspective on research in moral education. *Educational Researcher*, 28(4), 18-26.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M.R. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Björklund, F. (2003). Differences in the justification of choices in moral dilemmas: Effects of gender, time pressure and dilemma seriousness. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 44(5), 459-466.

- Bourke, A. (2013). Universities, civil society and the global agenda of community-engaged research. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, (11)4, 498-519. doi: 10.1080/14767724.2013.834182
- Cambia, J. M. & Engel, R. S. (2004). *Innovations in Undergraduate Research and Honors Education Proceedings of Second Schreyer National Conference* (NCHC Monographs Series). Retrieved from University of Nebraska website: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nchcmono/12>
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS), Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs (DUO) en het Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (OCW) (2013). *Kengetallen [Key figures]*. Retrieved from <http://www.onderwijsincijfers.nl/>
- Clark, B. (2008). *Growing up gifted: Developing the potential of children at home and at school* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Clark, L., & Zubizaretta, J. (2008). *Inspiring exemplary teaching and learning: perspectives on teaching academically talented college students*. Lincoln, NE: NCHC.
- Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens. Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Collom, E. (2007). Alternative Movements. In G. L. Anderson and K. G. Herr (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Activism and Social Justice* (pp. 76-78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1984). *Essentials of psychological testing* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(1), 66-89.



## References

---

- De Wit, K., & Verhoeven, J. C. (2001). The Higher Education Policy of the European Union. With or against the Member States? In J. Huisman, P. Maassen, & G. Neave (Eds.), *Higher education and the nation state* (pp. 194-250). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- DeWitt, J., & Damhof, L. (2012, October). *Beyond the Intercultural Paradox: Transformation by Design*. Paper presented at the Conference Evoking Excellence in Higher Education and Beyond. Groningen, The Netherlands. Retrieved from <http://www.academia.edu/2929093>
- DeWitt, J., Damhof, L., Oxenford, C., Schutte, I., & Wolfensberger, M. (2015). Global Partnerships for Intercultural Learning. In A. Schultheis Moore, & S. Simon (Eds.), *Globally Networked Teaching in the Humanities. Theories and Practices* (pp. 79-93). New York, NY: Routledge.
- DiCicco Cozzolino, M. (2016). Global citizenship education within a context of accountability and 21st century skills: The case of Olympus High School. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(57). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2364>
- Dohmen, J. (2015). Over de toekomst van ons onderwijs. Pleidooi voor een moreel Bildungsprogramma. [About the future of our education. Plea for a moral 'Bildungs' program]. In A. Klarus, & F. de Beer (Eds.), *Goed en schoon onderwijs* (pp. 224-244). Leusden, The Netherlands: ISVW uitgevers.
- Dronkers, J. (2007). *Backbone of inequality. Constraints and possibilities of education policy in Europe*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Mets & Schilt / Wiardi Beckman Stichting.
- Faber, T., & Tiesinga, L. (2010). *Honors bij de Hanzehogeschool Groningen*. [Honors at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences.]. Retrieved from <https://www.yumpu.com/nl/document/view/19972195/lammert-tiesinga-en-trijnie-faber-conferentie-studiesucces/7>
- Fisher, R. (2008). *Teaching thinking: Philosophical enquiry in the classroom* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Continuum.

- Flikkema, M. (2016). *Sense of serving*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: VU University Press.
- Ford, D.Y., & Whiting, G.W. (2008). Cultural competence: Preparing gifted students for a diverse society. *Roeper Review*, 30(2), 104–110.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M.B. Ramos, trans.). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Friedman, M. (2000). Educating for world citizenship. *Ethics*, 110, 586-601.
- Garland Reed, G. (2011). The complexity of moral learning: diversity, deprovincialisation and privilege. *Journal of Moral Education*, 40(3), 359-367.
- Gholami, K., & Tirri, K. (2012). The Cultural Dependence of the Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire: The Case of Iranian Kurdish Teachers. *Education Research International*. doi:10.1155/2012/387027
- Gibson, C. M. (2012). New times demand new scholarship 1: research universities and civic engagement: a leadership agenda. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(4), 235-269.
- Gibson, K.L., & Landwehr-Brown, M. (2009). Moral Development in Preparing Gifted Students for Global Citizenship. In D. Ambrose & T. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, Ethics, and Gifted Minds*, (pp. 301-313). New York, NY: Springer.
- Gibson, K.L., Rimmington, G.M., & Landwehr-Brown, M. (2008). Developing global awareness and responsible world citizenship with global learning. *Roeper Review*, 30(1), 11-23.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1979). *Curriculum Inquiry: The Study of Curriculum Practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366-385.
- Haidt, J. (2001). The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(4), 814-834.

## References

---

- Hammer, M. R., Bennet, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 421-443.
- Heater, D. B. (1980). *World Studies: Education for International Understanding in Britain*. London, UK: Harrap.
- Hébert, T. P., & McBee, M. T. (2007). The impact of an undergraduate honors program on gifted university students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 51(2), 136-151.
- Helms, J. E., Henze, K. T., Sass, T. L. & Mifsud, V. A. (2006). Treating Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients as data in counseling research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(5), 630-660.
- Holm, K. (2012). *Ethical, Intercultural and Interreligious Sensitivities. A case study of Finnish urban secondary school students*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Holm, K., Nokelainen, P., & Tirri, K. (2009). Relationship of gender and academic achievement to Finnish students' intercultural sensitivity. *High Ability Studies*, 20(2), 187-200.
- Hovland, K., & Wathington, H. D. (2009). Building Knowledge, Growing Capacity: Global Learning Courses Show Promise. *Diversity and Democracy*, AAC&U. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2009/winter>
- Howard-Hamilton, M. (1994). An assessment of moral development in gifted adolescents. *Roeper Review*, 17(1), 57.
- Jacobsen, J.E. (2009). Moral leadership, effective leadership, and intellectual giftedness: problems, parallels, and possibilities. In D. Ambrose & T. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, Ethics, and Gifted Minds* (pp. 29-46). doi:10.1007/978-0-387-89368-6
- Johnson, L., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal*, 21(1), 77-96.
- Keestra, M. (2007). Vliegles voor de uil van Minerva?: hoger onderwijs als voorbereiding op arbeidsmarkt en burgerschap. [Flying lesson for the owl of Minerva?: higher education preparing for the job market and citizenship.]. *Tijdschrift voor Hoger Onderwijs*, 25(2), 69-83.

- Killick, D. (2007). Internationalisation and engagement with the wider community. In Jones, E. and Brown, S. (Eds.), *Internationalising Higher Education*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Kliwer, B.W. (2013). Why the Civic Engagement Movement Cannot Achieve Democratic and Justice Aims. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19(2), 72-79.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347-480). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kool, A. (2016). *Excellence in higher education: Students' personal qualities and the effects of undergraduate honours programmes* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from: <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/342101>
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). Zin en onzin van competentiegericht opleiden. [Sense and nonsense of competence-based education.]. *VELON-Tijdschrift* 25(1), 13-23.
- Lang, J. S. (2013). *Assessing the Impact of Various Experiences on Students' Levels of Global Citizenship*, Master's thesis Oregon State University.
- Lee, S., & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2006). The emotional intelligence, moral judgment, and leadership of academically gifted adolescents. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30(1), 29-67.
- Lee, S., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., Donahue, R., & Weimholt, K. (2008). The Civic Leadership Institute: A service-learning program for academically gifted youth. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 19(2), 272-308.
- Leenders, H. & Veugelers, W. (2004). Waardevormend onderwijs en burgerschap. Een pleidooi voor een kritisch-democratisch burgerschap. [Value education and citizenship. A plea for a critical democratic citizenship.]. *Pedagogiek*, 24(4), 361-375.

## References

---

- Leenders, H., Veugelers, W., & De Kat, E. (2008). Teachers' views on citizenship education in secondary education in The Netherlands. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 38*(2), 155-170. doi: 10.1080/03057640802063106
- Lovecky, D. (2009). Moral sensitivity in young gifted children. In D. Ambrose & T. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, Ethics, and Gifted Minds* (pp. 161-176). doi:10.1007/978-0-387-89368-6
- Mabry, J. B. (1998). Pedagogical Variations in Service-Learning and Student Outcomes: How Time, Contact, and Reflection Matter. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 5*(5), 32-47.
- Matthews, M. S. (2004). Leadership education for gifted and talented youth: a review of the literature. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 28*(1), 77-113.
- McCadden, B. (1998). *It's Hard to Be Good*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Morais, D. B., & Ogden, A. C. (2010). Initial Development and validation of the Global Citizenship Scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 1*(22). doi: 10.1177/1028315310375308
- Narvaez, D. (1993). High achieving students and moral judgment. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 16*(3), 268-279.
- Narvaez, D. (2001). *Ethical Sensitivity. Activity Booklet 1*. Retrieved March 2, 2007 from <http://www.nd.edu/~dnarvaez/>
- Narvaez, D. (2013): The future of research in moral development and education, *Journal of Moral Education, 42*(1), 1-11.
- Narvaez, D., & Endicott, L. (2009). *Nurturing Character in the Classroom, EthEx Series, Book 1: Ethical Sensitivity*. Notre Dame, IN: ACE Press.
- Nokelainen, P., & Tirri, K. (2010). Role of motivation in the moral and religious judgment of mathematically gifted adolescents. *High Ability Studies, 21*(2), 101-116.
- Nijhuis, T. (2015, May 5). Het vijanddenken woekert voort. [The hostility endures.]. *De Volkskrant*. Retrieved from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/opinie/het-vijanddenken-woekert-voort~a3999761/>

- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*, 289–303.
- Oxfam GB (2006). *Education for Global Citizenship: A guide for schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides>
- Passow, A. H. & Schiff, J. H. (1989). Educating gifted persons who are caring and concerned. *Gifted Education International, 6*(1), 5-7.
- Persson, R. S. (2011). Ability climates in Europe as socially represented notability. *High Ability Studies, 22*(1), 79-101. doi: 0.1080/13598139.2011.576086
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751-783. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751
- Plater, W. M. (2011). The context for international service learning: An invisible revolution is underway. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (Eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (pp. 29-56). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Renzulli, J. S. (2005). The three-ring conception of giftedness: A developmental model for creative productivity. In R. J. Sternberg & J. E. Davidson (Eds.), *Conceptions of giftedness* (2nd ed., pp. 246-279). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (1986). The enrichment triad/revolving door model: A schoolwide plan for the development of creative productivity. *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented, 216-266*.
- Rest, J.R. (1983). Morality. In P. H. Mussen (series Ed.), J. Flavell & E. Markman (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Cognitive development: Vol. 3*. (pp. 556-629). New York, NY: Wiley.

## References

---

- Rinn, A.N., & Plucker, J.A. (2004). We recruit them, but then what? The educational and psychological experiences of academically talented undergraduates. *Gifted child quarterly*, 48(1), 54-67.
- Robertson, S.L. (2008, October). *The Bologna Process Goes Global: A Model, Market, Mobility, Brain Power or State Building Strategy?* Invitational paper presented at the ANPED's Annual Conference, Brazil. Retrieved from: [www.bris.ac.uk/education/people/academicStaff/edslr/publications/31slr](http://www.bris.ac.uk/education/people/academicStaff/edslr/publications/31slr)
- Roeper, A., & Silverman, L. (2009). Giftedness and Moral Promise. In D. Ambrose & T. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, Ethics, and Gifted Minds* (pp. 161-176). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-89368-6
- Roxas, M. L., & Stoneback, J. Y. (2004). The importance of gender across cultures in ethical decision-making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50, 149-165.
- Rudolph, F. (1977). *Curriculum. A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ruf, D. L., & Radosevich, D. M. (2009). How personality and gender may relate to individual attitudes toward caring for and about others. *Roeper Review*, 31(4), 207-216.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *The American psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. doi:10.1037/110003-066X.55.1.68
- Scager, K., Akkerman, S., Keesen, F., Mainhard, M. T., Pilot, A. & Wubbels, T. (2012). Do honors students have more potential for excellence in their professional lives? *Higher Education*, 64(1), 19-39.
- Schmidt, W. H., Burroughs, N. A., Zoido, P., & Houang, R. T. (2015). The Role of Schooling in Perpetuating Educational Inequality: An International Perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 44(7), 371-386.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38 countries*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: IAE.

- Schutte, I.W. (2011, June). Honours en wereldburgerschapseducatie. [Honours and global citizenship education.]. In A. Timmermans (Chair), *Excellence in Higher Education and Society*. Symposium conducted at the annual Educational Research Days, Maastricht, the Netherlands. Retrieved from <https://hbo-kennisbank.nl/record/oai:repository.samenmaken.nl:smpid:46112>
- Schutte, I., Kamans, E., Wolfensberger, M. V. C., & Veugelers, W. (2017a). Effects of an international undergraduate honors course on global justice awareness. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Schutte, I. W., Kamans, E., Wolfensberger, M. V. C., & Veugelers, W. (in press). Building and implementing a global citizenship course for undergraduate honors students. *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity* 5(1), -
- Schutte, I. W., Weistra J. S. R., & Wolfensberger M. V. C. (2010). Ontwikkeling honours ondersteund door onderzoek. [Development of research supported honors education.]. *Onderzoek van Onderwijs*, 39, 55-61.
- Schutte, I. W., Wolfensberger, M. V. C., & Tirri, K. (2014). The Relationship between ethical sensitivity, high ability and gender in higher education students. *Gifted and Talented International*, 29 (1/2), 39-48. doi: 10.1080/15332276.2014.11678428
- Silverman, L. K. (1994). The moral sensitivity of gifted children and the evolution of society. *Roeper Review*, 17, 110–116.
- Spivak, G (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak?, in C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271-313). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2003). WICS: A Model of Leadership in Organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2(4), 386-401. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2003.11902088
- Sternberg, R. J., Jarvin, L., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2011). *Explorations in giftedness*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Strain, C.R. (2005). Pedagogy and practice: Service-Learning and students' moral development. *New directions for teaching and learning*, 103, 61-72.



## References

---

- Strand K. J., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-Based Research in Higher Education: Principles and Practices*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Teodoro, A., & Guilherme, M. (Eds.). (2014). *European and Latin American Higher Education Between Mirrors*. Taipei, Taiwan: Sense Publishers.
- Terry, A. W., & Bohnenberger, J. E. (2003). Service learning: Fostering a cycle of caring in our gifted youth. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 15(1), 23-32.
- Thijs, A. & Van den Akker, J. (2009). *Leerplan in ontwikkeling*. [Curriculum under development.]. Enschede, The Netherlands: Stichting Leerplanontwikkeling.
- Tirri, K. (2003). The moral concerns and orientations of sixth-and ninth-grade students. *Educational Research & Evaluation*, 9(1), 93-108.
- Tirri, K. (2011a). Holistic school pedagogy and values: Finnish teachers' and students' perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 50(2), 159-165.
- Tirri, K. (2011b). Combining excellence and ethics: Implications for moral education for the gifted. *Roeper Review*, 33(1), 59-64.
- Tirri, K. (2012). What kind of learning environment supports learning of gifted students in science? In A. Ziegler, C. Fischer, H. Stoeger & M. Reutlinger (Eds.), *Gifted education as a life-long challenge: Essays in honour of Franz J. Mönks* (pp. 13-24). Münster, Germany: LIT Verlag.
- Tirri, K., & Kuusisto, E. (2013). How Finland serves gifted and talented pupils. *Journal for the Education of Gifted*, 36 (1), 84-96.
- Tirri, K., & Nokelainen, P. (2007). Comparison of academically average and gifted students' self-rated ethical sensitivity. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 13(6), 587-601. doi:10.1080/13803610701786053
- Tirri, K., & Nokelainen, P. (2011). *Measuring multiple intelligences and moral sensitivities in education*. Taipei, Taiwan: Sense Publishers.
- Tolppanen, S., & Tirri, K. (2014). How an Enrichment Summer Program is Meeting the Expectations of Gifted Science Students: A Case Study from Finland. *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity*, 2(1), 103-117.

- Tuckman, B.W. (1972). *Conducting educational research*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- United States Census Bureau (2014). Educational attainment in the United States: 2014. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2014/tables.html>
- Van den Akker, J. J. H. (2003). Curriculum perspectives: an introduction. In J. J. H. Van den Akker, W. Kuiper, & U. Hameyer (Eds.), *Curriculum landscapes and trends* (pp. 1-10). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Veugelers, W. (2007). Creating critical-democratic citizenship education: Empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch education. *Compare: Journal of Comparative Education* 37(1), 105-119.
- Veugelers, W. (2010). Teaching religions and world views in a plural society: teachers in-between society and students. In C. Klaassen & N. Maslovaty (Eds.), *Moral courage and the normative professionalism of teachers* (pp. 103-116). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Veugelers, W. (2011a). Theory and Practice of Citizenship Education. The Case of Policy, Science and Education in the Netherlands. *Revista de Educación [Journal of Education]*, 209-224.
- Veugelers, W. (2011b). A humanist perspective on moral development and citizenship education. In W. Veugelers (Ed), *Education and Humanism* (pp. 9-35). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Veugelers, W. (2011c). The Moral and the Political in Global Citizenship: Appreciating Differences in Education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 473-485.
- Veugelers, W., de Groot, I., & Nollet, F. (2014). Higher education and citizenship development. In A. Teodoro & M. Guilherme (Eds.), *European and Latin American Higher Education Between Mirrors* (pp. 179-196). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

## References

---

- Wathington, H. (2008). *Shared Futures: General Education for Global Learning. Evaluation Report on Common Global Survey*. Unpublished manuscript. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.
- Wolfensberger, M. V. C. (2012). *Teaching for Excellence. Honors Pedagogies revealed*. Münster, Germany: Waxmann.
- Wolfensberger, M. V. C. (2015). *Talent development in European higher education: Honors programs in the Benelux, Nordic and German-speaking countries*. Springer Open. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-12919-8
- Wolfensberger, M. V. C., van Eijl, J. P., & Pilot, A. (2004). Honors Programmes as Laboratories of Innovation: A Perspective from the Netherlands. *Journal of the NCHC*, 5(1), 115-142.
- Wolfensberger, M.V.C., van Eijl, J.P. & Pilot, A. (2012). Laboratories for Educational Innovation: Honors Programs in the Netherlands. *Journal of the NCHC*, 13(2), 149-170.
- Wolfensberger, W., & Pilot, A. (2014). Uitdagingen voor onderzoek naar honorsonderwijs. [Challenges for research on honors education.]. *Tijdschrift voor Hoger Onderwijs*, 31/32(4/1), 124-136.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.





# Summary

Attention to moral development and educating students for citizenship is not widespread in Dutch higher education. This lack of attention also applies to programs for high-ability or gifted students. Influenced by the perspectives of politicians and the business community, excellence in higher education is often steered by the requirements of the market and knowledge economy. However, students with above average abilities and motivation could also contribute to the solution of global challenges like climate change and poverty. Dutch higher education offers undergraduate honors programs, designed for students who are able and motivated to do more than the regular curriculum offers. The development of new honors education in addition to regular curricula, offers opportunities to include morality and citizenship-related aims.

This thesis aims to contribute empirical knowledge concerning honors education in the moral and civic area. Two approaches were chosen. This thesis examines the ethical sensitivity (an aspect of moral development) of undergraduate honors students and investigates how education can foster their moral and civic development and thus help prepare these students for a role as engaged global citizens.

## **Problem description and context**

### **Chapter 1**

Attention to moral and civic development seems to be of specific importance in Dutch education. In comparison to adolescents in other countries of the global North, Dutch youth score low on civic skills and on positive attitudes towards foreigners. There is little explicit attention for ethics and values in Dutch education. Moreover, as a result of early tracking and the substantial social segregation between schools, Dutch youth mainly comes across peers

with similar social and cultural backgrounds (Schmidt, Burroughs, Zoido & Houang, 2015).

### *Ethical sensitivity*

Ethical sensitivity is a main theme of this thesis. Ethical sensitivity entails the recognition of moral aspects of a situation and being able to identify with the role of another person. Ethical sensitivity is one of the four aspects of moral development in the often-used theory of Rest (1983). It is conditional for the other three aspects of moral development: moral motivation, moral decision-making and moral character.

Three of the four studies in this thesis used the instrument Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ, Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011). ESSQ is an instrument for self-assessment of ethical sensitivity, based on the theory of Narvaez (2001). This theory distinguishes seven dimensions of ethical sensitivity: reading and expressing emotions; taking the perspectives of others; caring by connecting to others; working with interpersonal and group differences; preventing social bias; generating interpretations and options; and identifying the consequences of actions and options.

Researchers found a positive relationship between intellectual capacity (giftedness, related to a high IQ) and aspects of moral development. The advanced position of gifted children and adolescents in moral reasoning is associated with their rapid cognitive growth. High academic ability does however not always lead to strength in moral judgment. In addition, research was mainly performed amongst children and adolescents. So far, little research has been done in the 18+-age bracket. Chapter 2 details a comparative study about the ethical sensitivity of high-ability students (including honors students) and average-ability students.



### *Global citizenship education*

The three studies of Chapters 3, 4 and 5 focus on educating undergraduate honors students for global citizenship. The concepts of moral and civic development are intertwined in that citizenship often involves moral values. In addition, morality involves one's behavior towards others.

Global citizenship and global citizenship education are broad concepts that have been defined in different ways and from different viewpoints. The definition of global citizenship education in this thesis considers a global citizen as someone with insight in structural causes of global injustice and sustainability challenges who contributes to a better world. The global orientation is included because in a globalized world justice and sustainability issues unmistakably contain a global dimension. For the purposes of this thesis, global citizenship education is defined as: Social justice oriented education, aimed at preparing students for their role as engaged citizens of the global world.

Based on a literature search regarding theory and empirical studies in global citizenship education we developed curriculum guidelines for global citizenship education. They are called *curriculum guidelines Global Justice Citizenship Education (GJCE)*. The guidelines cover three domains, namely the knowledge domain, the moral domain and the social domain, as well as experiential learning. In the knowledge domain, the guidelines concern insight in root causes of injustice, focus on one global issue, and insight in the connection between local and global. In the moral domain, the guidelines are about development of ethical and intercultural sensitivity, recognition and evaluation of own values and critical reflection on mainstream thinking. The social domain entails contact with people who differ from the students regarding their backgrounds, and getting to know positive role models who are socially active and engaged. Experiential learning in civic contexts (at

least 15 hours) was added to the guidelines. The curriculum guidelines GJCE were used in three case studies, described in Chapters 3, 4 and 5.

## **Results from the studies**

### **Chapter 2**

The first study (Chapter 2) investigates the question: Are there any differences in ethical sensitivity between academically average and high-ability students? To answer this question, a comparison was made between participants of a special talent program (honors program or university college) supplemented with students with a GPA (Grade Point Average) of  $\geq 8$  who did not participate in such a program, and their peers. The total number of participants was 731, consisting of students from Utrecht University and Hanze University of Applied Sciences Groningen. The participants filled out the self-rating instrument ESSQ and the data were analyzed making use of the non-parametric Mann-Whitney *U* Test. Results showed that high-ability students rated themselves higher on all five dimensions of ethical sensitivity that could be analyzed. It concerns the following dimensions: taking the perspectives of others; caring by connecting to others; working with interpersonal and group differences; generating interpretations and options; and identifying the consequences of actions and options.

### **Chapter 3**

The second study (Chapter 3) investigates the online bachelor honors course 'Searchers in Society' (SIS), in which Dutch students and students from the USA explore together what it means to be a member of the global society. The first question "How did the course relate to the curriculum guidelines?" was investigated by means of a content analyses of the course description, interviews with the teachers and their written information about

the curriculum guidelines in the course. It was found that the course SIS partly reflects the social justice approach in global citizenship education, in particular by addressing contact with people with backgrounds different from the students, intercultural sensitivity and experiential learning. The second question “What and how did students learn from the course?” was investigated using the quantitative measures ESSQ and the Shared Futures Survey (SFS, American Association of Colleges & Universities) in a pre- and posttest design with control groups. The SFS measures aspects of global citizenship. Results showed growth in just one aspect of ethical sensitivity among the 22 participants, namely generating interpretations and options. Participants also scored higher on social awareness, the extent to which they believe it is important to be socially and culturally aware. Qualitative measures gave some indication that participants positively changed the way they look at and value other cultures, and that participants developed a more open and active attitude towards unknown others. Regarding how students learned in the course, it was found that participants appreciated experiential learning most. According to them, experiential learning also led to the most powerful learning moments.

### **Chapter 4**

The third study (chapter 4) investigates the development of the formal curriculum and the delivery of the operationalized curriculum of the undergraduate honors course Society 2.0. This interdisciplinary course focused on alternative/social movements and their ideals. The curriculum guidelines GJCE were used to build this course. Results from the content analyses of teacher interviews and of documents made during the development, indicated that the curriculum guidelines in the moral and social domains and experiential learning were applied in the course. Further, all three elements of honors pedagogies (Wolfensberger, 2012), namely a

safe learning community, academic challenge, and bounded freedom were embedded in the course Society 2.0. In the delivery of the course, teachers implemented the curriculum guidelines in their teaching behavior, for instance by confronting students when making ungrounded judgments (knowledge and moral domain) and by paying much attention to perspective change (moral domain). Curriculum guidelines in the knowledge domain seemed most difficult to realize. This was particularly apparent with regard to gaining insight into the root causes of injustice.

## **Chapter 5**

The fourth study (Chapter 5) investigates the effects of the course Society 2.0 on the 25 participating students from two course groups, from 2014 and 2015. In this study a mixed methods approach was used. Quantitative measures in a pre- and posttest design of both ethical sensitivity, and attitudes and skills related to global citizenship education have been performed. Results showed that participants self-assessed their ethical sensitivity higher on three of the seven subscales after taking the course. Regarding global citizenship as measured by the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS, Morais & Ogden, 2010), participants self-assessed their global competence (global competence and intercultural communication) and global civic engagement (including involvement in civic organizations and global civic activism) higher after taking the course. Qualitative analysis of 25 students' work (two blogs that they wrote about one self-chosen societal issue) and their reflection on the course (one blog that students wrote about how they look back on the course) point in the same direction. Participants for instance wrote about ethical aspects of discrimination, unconditional basic income, the way in which banks and governments operate, and sustainability issues. Participants merely broadened their knowledge about several issues. Deepening of historic insights was less clearly visible. Results of follow-up research six

months after the course finished involving nine participants indicate a possible lasting impact of the course regarding attitude and behavior towards others and sustainable behavior.

## Conclusions

### Chapter 6

#### *Ethical sensitivity*

From the study that compared the ethical sensitivity from high-ability students in higher education with that of their average ability peers, using the instrument Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire, it was found that high ability students showed a higher score on five dimensions of ethical sensitivity that could be included. The results indicate that the privileged position in the maturation of moral thinking that was found among gifted children and adolescents (Lovecky, 2009) still seems to exist at the age of around 20 years.

#### *Global citizenship*

The studies investigating the effects of two bachelor honors courses show, that such courses can help students to develop attitudes and insights that support their role as engaged global citizens. Participants of both programs reported that they developed a broader view on society, seeing several perspectives and achieving a more profound realization of the complexity of globalization and global issues. Furthermore they reported to have gained a more open and active attitude towards (unknown) others. The course 'Society 2.0', which largely incorporated the curriculum guidelines GJCE, yielded more effects than the course SIS. For instance positive effects on

students' ethical sensitivity and their knowledge about different societal and sustainability issues.

In conclusion the curriculum guidelines GJCE building on social justice oriented global citizenship can provide some direction for creating education which enhances honors students' ethical sensitivity and global civic engagement. However, gaining deeper insight into root causes of injustice and sustainability issues appears the most difficult aspect to realize. In addition, learning from each other seems to be of special importance to students when broadening their knowledge about injustice and sustainability issues.

### **Practical implications from the research**

The results from the first study in this thesis suggest that paying attention to ethical issues and being attentive to moral development in programs for honors students might also meet their interest. The attention for ethical issues in honors programs can also serve the society at large, as honors students in higher education could - given their above average motivation and abilities - contribute to solutions for global justice and sustainability issues.

Points of attention to strengthen the justice approach in global citizenship education in higher education are the following. 1. At Dutch universities, it may take time to find teachers who endorse a global justice approach, as politics in education seems to be a rather sensitive issue among teachers (Veugelers, 2011c). 2. Discuss the justice approach in global citizenship with the developers and teachers of a course and allow them to become acquainted with methods and materials that can offer direction for gaining historical insights in root causes of injustice. For instance, methods and materials that pay attention to the change of existing social structures and the role of collective effort in establishing social change. 3. Finally, avoid a broad theme

because a more narrow content scope within a course may be more beneficial for generating in depth knowledge.

### **Final remark**

All students could benefit from incorporating ethics and reflection on values in higher education. The case studies in this thesis show that courses of global citizenship education can support students in their moral development and these courses can improve attitudes, behavior and insights in becoming engaged global citizens. The current, global ecological and humanitarian problems and challenges such as climate change and poverty, emphasize the importance of these courses.







# Nederlandse samenvatting

Summary in Dutch

Er is weinig aandacht voor morele en burgerschapsontwikkeling in het hoger onderwijs in Nederland. Ook niet in speciale programma's die zijn bedoeld voor extra gemotiveerde studenten met bovengemiddelde capaciteiten. De politiek en het bedrijfsleven benadrukken de bijdrage die deze studenten kunnen leveren aan de markt en kenniseconomie. Echter, studenten met bovengemiddelde capaciteiten en motivatie kunnen ook bijdragen aan de oplossing van maatschappelijke problemen die op mondiaal niveau spelen, zoals armoede en klimaatsverandering. Voor studenten die meer willen en kunnen dan het reguliere curriculum biedt, worden in het hoger onderwijs in Nederland honors programma's aangeboden. De ontwikkeling van nieuw honors onderwijs naast de reguliere curricula, biedt mogelijkheden om er morele en burgerschapsontwikkeling in op te nemen.

Het doel van dit proefschrift is om bij te dragen aan empirische kennis over honors onderwijs op het gebied van morele en burgerschapsontwikkeling. Daarbij is gekozen voor twee invalshoeken. Dit proefschrift rapporteert over empirisch onderzoek naar ethische sensitiviteit (een aspect van morele ontwikkeling) van honors studenten in het Nederlandse hoger onderwijs en over empirisch onderzoek naar hoe honors programma's de morele en burgerschapsontwikkeling van deze studenten kunnen bevorderen en zo studenten kunnen voorbereiden op een rol als betrokken burger van de wereld.

## **Probleembeschrijving en context**

### **Hoofdstuk 1**

Aandacht voor ethiek en wereldburgerschap lijkt in het Nederlandse onderwijs om drie redenen extra van belang te zijn. Ten eerste scoren Nederlandse jongeren lager dan jongeren in vergelijkbare landen op burgerschapsvaardigheden en op positieve houding ten opzichte van

buitenlanders. Ten tweede is er weinig expliciete aandacht voor ethiek en waarden in het onderwijs. Ten slotte is er in Nederland sprake van vroege selectie en van relatief (ten opzichte van vergelijkbare landen) grote sociale segregatie tussen scholen, waardoor jongeren met verschillende achtergronden elkaar op school niet snel tegenkomen.

### *Ethische sensitiviteit*

Ethische sensitiviteit vormt een rode draad in dit proefschrift. Ethische sensitiviteit gaat over het herkennen van ethische aspecten van een situatie en het vermogen tot identificatie met de rol van iemand anders. Ethische sensitiviteit is voorwaardelijk voor de andere drie aspecten van morele ontwikkeling in de veelgebruikte indeling van Rest (1983). Naast ethische sensitiviteit zijn dat morele motivatie, morele besluitvorming en morele karaktervorming.

In drie van de vier studies in dit proefschrift is het instrument Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ, Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007, 2011) gebruikt. Dit is een instrument voor zelfbeoordeling van ethische sensitiviteit, gebaseerd op de theorie van Narvaez (2001). Zij onderscheidt zeven dimensies van ethische sensitiviteit, zoals kijken vanuit het perspectief van anderen en het voorkomen van sociale vooroordelen.

In eerder onderzoek onder kinderen en adolescenten is er een positieve relatie gevonden tussen intellectuele capaciteiten (gerelateerd aan IQ) en aspecten van morele ontwikkeling. Het gevorderde niveau van moreel argumenteren bij hoog intelligente kinderen en adolescenten wordt in verband gebracht met hun snelle cognitieve ontwikkeling. Het betekent echter niet dat hoge intelligentie altijd leidt tot een sterke morele oordeelsvorming. Daarnaast is er nog weinig onderzoek naar de relatie tussen intellectuele capaciteiten en aspecten van morele ontwikkeling in de leeftijdsgroep 18+. In Hoofdstuk 2 onderzoeken we of zeer capabele studenten – een groep waar

honors studenten ook toe gerekend kunnen worden - in het hoger onderwijs zich onderscheiden wat betreft ethische sensitiviteit van studiegenoten die niet deelnemen aan een talentprogramma.

### *Wereldburgerschapeducatie*

Het thema wereldburgerschapeducatie staat centraal in de hoofdstukken 3, 4 en 5 van dit proefschrift. Burgerschapsontwikkeling en morele ontwikkeling zijn aan elkaar verwant. Burgerschap gaat vaak over morele waarden. Andersom gaat moraliteit ook over hoe iemand zich wil gedragen ten opzichte van anderen.

Wereldburgerschap en wereldburgerschapeducatie kennen vele definities en benaderingen. De definitie van wereldburgerschapeducatie in dit proefschrift sluit aan bij de visie dat een wereldburger iemand is die met kennis en inzicht in structurele oorzaken van onrechtvaardigheid en duurzaamheidsproblemen op mondiaal niveau, een bijdrage levert aan een betere wereld. Het perspectief is dat van wereldburgerschap en niet van burgerschap, omdat aan sociale rechtvaardigheid en duurzaamheid gerelateerde uitdagingen zich ook op mondiaal niveau afspeelen. In dit proefschrift wordt wereldburgerschapeducatie als volgt gedefinieerd: educatie gericht op sociale rechtvaardigheid, met als doel om studenten voor te bereiden op een rol als betrokken burger van de wereld.

Op basis van literatuuronderzoek naar zowel theorie als empirische studies over wereldburgerschapeducatie, ontwikkelden we curriculumrichtlijnen voor wereldburgerschapeducatie. We noemen deze *Global Justice Citizenship Education (GJCE) curriculumrichtlijnen*. De richtlijnen beslaan drie domeinen, namelijk het kennisdomein, het morele domein en het sociale domein, en ervaringsleren. In het kennisdomein gaat het over inzicht in historische wortels van sociale onrechtvaardigheid, focus op één mondiaal issue en inzicht in de relatie tussen lokaal en mondiaal. In het morele domein gaat

het over het ontwikkelen van ethische en interculturele sensitiviteit, het herkennen van eigen waarden en het kritisch reflecteren op 'mainstream' (dominante, toonaangevende) opvattingen. In het sociale domein gaat het over contact met mensen met andere culturele of sociaaleconomische achtergronden en het leren kennen van positieve rolmodellen. Ervaringsleren in de (burger)maatschappij (minimaal 15 uur) is toegevoegd aan de curriculumrichtlijnen. Deze GJCE-curriculumrichtlijnen zijn gebruikt in drie casestudies, beschreven in de hoofdstukken 3, 4 en 5.

## **Resultaten van de studies**

### **Hoofdstuk 2**

De eerste studie (Hoofdstuk 2) onderzoekt de vraag: Zijn er verschillen in ethische sensitiviteit tussen zeer capabele studenten en gemiddelde studenten? Daartoe zijn studenten die deelnemen aan een speciaal talent programma (honors programma of university college) en studenten die een gemiddeld cijfer van 8 of hoger haalden in dat jaar, vergeleken met hun studiegenoten. De in totaal 731 deelnemers in dit onderzoek, waren afkomstig van de Universiteit Utrecht en de Hanzehogeschool Groningen. We gebruikten het instrument ESSQ en analyseerden de data met de non-parametrische Mann-Whitney *U* Test. De resultaten lieten zien dat de zeer capabele studenten zichzelf hoger beoordeelden op alle vijf dimensies van ethische sensitiviteit die konden worden geanalyseerd. Het zijn de volgende dimensies: kijken vanuit het perspectief van de ander; zorg voor anderen door het maken van contact; kunnen omgaan met verschillen tussen mensen en tussen groepen (bijvoorbeeld interculturele verschillen); mogelijkheden zien om een situatie te interpreteren en ermee om te gaan; verschillende handelwijzen afwegen op basis van inzicht in consequenties.

### **Hoofdstuk 3**

De tweede studie (Hoofdstuk 3) onderzoekt de bachelor honors cursus 'Searchers in Society' (SIS), waarin een cursusgroep uit de VS en een cursusgroep uit Nederland samen online exploreren wat het betekent om deel uit te maken van de wereldgemeenschap. De eerste onderzoeksvraag luidt: Hoe verhoudt de cursus zich tot de GJCE-curriculumrichtlijnen. Deze vraag is onderzocht door analyse van de cursusbeschrijving, van interviews met docenten en van schriftelijke informatie van docenten, over hoe ze de curriculumrichtlijnen terugzien in de cursus. De uitkomst was, dat de cursus SIS deels de op sociale rechtvaardigheid gerichte benadering van wereldburgerschapeducatie hanteert. Er is namelijk aandacht voor houding (contact met mensen met andere achtergronden en aandacht voor interculturele sensitiviteit) en er vindt ervaringsleren plaats. De tweede onderzoeksvraag 'Wat en hoe leerden studenten van deze cursus' werd beantwoord met behulp van een kwantitatieve meting en een kwalitatieve meting. Voor de kwantitatieve meting gebruikten we naast de vragenlijst ESSQ ook de vragenlijst Shared Futures Survey (SFS, van de American Association of Colleges & Universities) over maatschappelijke, sociale, culturele en mondiale aspecten van wereldburgerschap. De meting van effecten op de 22 deelnemers in een pre- en posttest design met controlegroepen wees uit dat ze significant hoger scoorden op één aspect van ethische sensitiviteit, namelijk de ontwikkeling van creatieve vaardigheden om meer kanten te zien van een situatie en meer alternatieven te bedenken om ermee om te gaan. Ook scoorden de deelnemers hoger op één aspect van wereldburgerschap, namelijk de mate waarin ze sociaal bewustzijn van belang achten. Kwalitatieve metingen gaven enige indicatie voor een positieve verandering in de wijze waarop deelnemers naar andere culturen kijken en deze waarderen, en voor een meer open en actieve houding naar onbekende anderen. Ervaringsleren werd door deelnemers het meest gewaardeerd in

hoe ze leerden en leverde volgens hen ook de krachtigste leermomenten op.

#### **Hoofdstuk 4**

De derde studie (hoofdstuk 4) onderzoekt de ontwikkeling van het formele curriculum en de uitvoering van het geoperationaliseerde curriculum van de cursus Samenleving 2.0. Deze interdisciplinaire bachelor honors cursus gaat over alternatieve bewegingen en hun bijdrage aan een betere wereld. De GJCE-curriculumrichtlijnen zijn gebruikt bij de ontwikkeling van Samenleving 2.0. De inhoudsanalyse van documenten uit de ontwikkel- en uitvoeringfase van de cursus en van interviews met docenten liet zien, dat de curriculumrichtlijnen in het morele en sociale domein, en ervaringsleren zijn toegepast in het curriculum van Samenleving 2.0. De drie kernelementen van honors pedagogiek zijn eveneens toegepast. Dit zijn: een veilige leergemeenschap, academische uitdaging en autonomie/zelfregulering (Wolfensberger, 2012). Ook bij de uitvoering van de cursus hebben de docenten de curriculumrichtlijnen in praktijk gebracht. Bijvoorbeeld door studenten te confronteren met ongefundeerde oordelen (kennis- en morele domein) en veel aandacht te besteden aan verschillende perspectieven (morele domein). Richtlijnen in het kennisdomein bleken het moeilijkst toe te passen, vooral het verkrijgen van inzicht in de historische wortels van maatschappelijke onrechtvaardigheid.

#### **Hoofdstuk 5**

De vierde studie (Hoofdstuk 5) onderzoekt de effecten van de cursus Samenleving 2.0 op de 25 deelnemers die afkomstig waren uit twee cursusgroepen, van 2014 en 2015. Kwantitatieve metingen van ethische sensitiviteit en van houding en vaardigheden gerelateerd aan wereldburgerschap met een pre- en posttest zijn uitgevoerd. Hieruit



bleek dat deelnemers hun ethische sensitiviteit na afloop van de cursus hoger beoordeelden op drie van de zeven dimensies. Zelfbeoordeling van wereldburgerschap met de Global Citizenship Scale (GCS, Morais & Ogden, 2010) liet een hogere score zien van 'global competence' (kennis en interculturele communicatie) en van betrokkenheid bij maatschappelijke organisaties en mondiaal activisme. Kwalitatieve analyses van het werk van de 25 deelnemers (twee blogs die zij schreven over één mondiaal issue) en van hun reflectie op de cursus (één blog die zij schreven over hoe zij terugkijken op de cursus) wezen in dezelfde richting. Deelnemers schreven over ethische aspecten van bijvoorbeeld discriminatie, onvoorwaardelijk basisinkomen, de wijze waarop banken en overheden functioneren en duurzaamheid. Vermeerdering van kennis vond voornamelijk in de breedte plaats, doordat studenten vooral over verschillende onderwerpen kennis verwierven. Verdieping van historisch inzicht was minder zichtbaar. Resultaten van de inhoudsanalyse van een follow-up interview met negen deelnemers en de blog die zij schreven een half jaar na afloop van de cursus, wezen op een mogelijk blijvende impact van de cursus wat betreft houding en gedrag ten opzichte van anderen en duurzaam gedrag.

## **Conclusies en discussie**

### **Hoofdstuk 6**

#### *Ethische sensitiviteit*

Uit het vergelijkende onderzoek naar ethische sensitiviteit van zeer capabele studenten en gemiddelde studenten met het zelf-beoordelingsinstrument Ethical Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ESSQ, Tirri & Nokelainen, 2007; 2011) blijkt dat de zeer capabele studenten hoger scoren op de vijf dimensies van ethische sensitiviteit die konden worden onderzocht. Deze resultaten

indiceren dat de morele ontwikkeling van zeer capabele studenten (waar honors studenten toe gerekend kunnen worden) van ongeveer 20 jaar oud in het hoger onderwijs, verder gevorderd is dan die van hun studiegenoten. De resultaten komen overeen met de uitkomsten van eerder onderzoek onder kinderen en adolescenten (Lovecky, 2009).

### *Wereldburgerschap*

De studies naar de effecten van twee verschillende bachelor honors cursussen op het gebied van wereldburgerschap laten zien, dat dergelijke programma's studenten kunnen helpen in de ontwikkeling van houdingen en inzichten om een rol te vervullen als betrokken wereldburgers. Deelnemers van beide programma's rapporteerden dat ze een bredere visie op de maatschappij ontwikkeld hebben, dat wil zeggen dat ze meerdere perspectieven en meer complexiteit zagen. Ze schreven eveneens dat ze een meer open en actieve houding hadden naar (onbekende) anderen. De cursus 'Samenleving 2.0', die de curriculum richtlijnen GJCE grotendeels heeft geïncorporeerd, laat meer effecten zien dan de cursus SIS. Bijvoorbeeld positieve effecten op ethische sensitiviteit en op verbreding van kennis over verschillende sociale en duurzaamheidsthema's.

De GJCE-curriculumrichtlijnen, met een accent op sociale rechtvaardigheid, blijken enige richting te kunnen geven aan onderwijs dat de ontwikkeling van ethische sensitiviteit en betrokken mondiaal burgerschap van honors studenten bevordert. Van deze curriculumrichtlijnen bleek inzicht in de historische wortels van maatschappelijke onrechtvaardigheid en duurzaamheidsproblemen het moeilijkst te realiseren. Verder bleek het leren van elkaar belangrijk te zijn geweest voor studenten om inzichten te verwerven en hun kennis te verbreden.

### *Praktische implicaties*

De resultaten van de eerste studie naar ethische sensitiviteit in dit proefschrift suggereren dat aandacht voor ethische vraagstukken en morele ontwikkeling in programma's voor honors studenten aansluit bij hun belangstelling. Aandacht voor ethische vraagstukken en morele ontwikkeling in deze programma's kan ook een breder maatschappelijk doel dienen, omdat honors studenten met hun bovengemiddelde motivatie en capaciteiten zouden kunnen bijdragen aan oplossingen voor mondiale kwesties en uitdagingen.

Aandachtspunten voor versterking van de op sociale rechtvaardigheid gerichte benadering van wereldburgerschapeducatie in het hoger onderwijs zijn de volgende. 1. Het kan in het Nederlandse hoger onderwijs tijd kosten om docenten te vinden die deze benadering onderschrijven, omdat politiek in onderwijs een gevoelig onderwerp lijkt te zijn (Veugelers, 2011c). 2. Bespreek de op rechtvaardigheid gerichte benadering met ontwikkelaars en docenten en laat hen kennismaken met methoden en materialen die historische kennis en inzichten kunnen versterken. Bijvoorbeeld door aandacht te besteden aan verandering van maatschappelijke structuren en de rol van collectieve inspanning bij het bereiken van sociale verandering. 3. En tot slot maak de thematiek van een cursus niet te breed, waardoor verdieping van kennis beter mogelijk is.

De waarde van de GJCE-curriculumrichtlijnen voor cursusontwikkeling wereldburgerschapeducatie kan wellicht worden vergroot door de volgende uitbreiding: het leren van elkaar (studenten onderling), inzicht in de rol van collectieve inspanning bij sociale verandering en internationale (online) uitwisseling van ervaringen en inzichten die zijn opgedaan in de cursus.

### **Slotopmerking**

Alle studenten in het hoger onderwijs kunnen baat hebben bij het opnemen van ethiek en reflectie op waarden in hun programma's. De casestudies in

dit proefschrift laten zien dat cursussen wereldburgerschapeducatie in het hoger onderwijs honors studenten kunnen ondersteunen in hun morele ontwikkeling en dat dergelijke cursussen houding, gedrag en inzichten kunnen bevorderen om betrokken wereldburgers te worden. De huidige ecologische en humanitaire mondiale uitdagingen, zoals op het gebied van armoede en klimaatsverandering onderstrepen het belang van dergelijk onderwijs.



# Dankwoord

Aan het einde van het promotietraject is het nu tijd voor een dankwoord. De eerste persoon die ik wil bedanken is Marca Wolfensberger, de lector van de onderzoeksgroep 'Excellentie in Hoger Onderwijs en Samenleving' (EHOS) bij de Hanzehogeschool Groningen en copromotor. Marca heeft dit onderzoek mogelijk gemaakt en gefaciliteerd, en ze heeft ruimte geboden om een onderwerp te kiezen dat mij na aan het hart ligt. Ik weet nog hoe geweldig ik het vond om te ontdekken hoeveel wetenschappers al onderzoek hebben gedaan naar wereldburgerschap en wat zij allemaal hebben gevonden. En hoe mooi is het dat je tijd krijgt om dat te lezen, tot je te nemen en je er toe te verhouden. Deelname aan de kenniskring EHOS van Marca en alle activiteiten die van daaruit worden ondernomen was en is zeer leerzaam.

Zonder mijn promotor Wiel Veugelers had ik deze thesis niet kunnen volbrengen. Zijn kritisch-democratische burger is sociaal betrokken en stelt bestaande machtsstructuren ter discussie. Voor mij was het waardevol om een promotor te hebben met deze visie en voor mij herkenbare keuzes in zijn onderzoek. Bovendien heb ik genoten van het plezier waarmee Wiel zijn werk als hoogleraar doet. De Graduate School van de Universiteit voor Humanistiek en de groep educatie van Wiel hebben mij veel kennis en inzichten gebracht.

Kirsi Tirri uit Finland was ondanks de afstand betrokken en altijd op een positieve manier. Als ik Kirsi had gesproken dan voelde ik dat het goed kwam. Wanneer Kirsi zei 'I shall be honest with you', dan wist ik ook dat er nog iets verbeterd of aangepast moest worden. Via Kirsi kwam ik in contact met haar collega Elina Kuusisto, met wie ik heel plezierig heb samengewerkt. Soms op rare tijden en plaatsen, zoals tijdens een kerstvakantie in Zwitserland, achter de computer van de hoteleigenaar.

Ongeveer halverwege het promotietraject werd Elanor Kamans mijn dagelijks begeleider. Elanor heeft me veel geleerd over kwantitatieve onderzoeksmethoden en hoe je de dingen opschrijft 'zoals het hoort'. Haar feedback op concept teksten was zeer waardevol en ik kijk terug op een leerzame en plezierige samenwerking.

De collega's van de kenniskring EHOS en vooral de 'kleine kring' op de vrijdagochtend van 9 tot 10 uur, hebben mij enorm geholpen met tips en feedback op presentaties en teksten. Nelleke de Jong, Arie Kool en Elanor Kamans hebben daarnaast ook bijgedragen aan analyses van data.

De Hanzehogeschool Groningen heeft middels haar promotieregeling dit onderzoek mede mogelijk gemaakt. Het Stafbureau Onderwijs en Onderzoek van de Hanzehogeschool heeft mij de benodigde steun en facilitering geboden om dit promotieonderzoek te kunnen doen en te kunnen volbrengen. Mijn twee teamleiders gedurende deze periode, Marianne Eggermont en Abelius Reitsma wil ik daarvoor speciaal dank zeggen.

Met mijn collega en 'roommate' bij het Stafbureau Onderwijs en Onderzoek, Chaja van Albada, heb ik fijne gesprekken gevoerd. Vooral in de afrondende fase heeft mij dat geholpen om vol te kunnen houden.

Tijdens het hele promotietraject kreeg ik veel inspiratie door de samenwerking met studenten. Marte Wachter heeft geholpen bij mijn eerste stappen (terug) in SPSS. Richard Wiltjer en Patrick Roossien waren betrokken bij de ontwikkeling van de cursus 'Samenleving 2.0'. Verschillende studenten hebben een bijdrage geleverd aan het onderzoek, naast Marte en Richard waren dat Shahin Nazar en Anique Elling.



Twee geweldige docenten hebben de cursus Samenleving 2.0 tot een succes gemaakt: Jacqueline Selker en Loes Damhof. Ook van hen en van de deelnemers aan die cursus heb ik veel geleerd. Ook Pieter Veenstra van het Hanze Honours College bij de Hanzehogeschool ben ik veel dank verschuldigd, hij heeft het mede mogelijk gemaakt dat deze cursus ontwikkeld en uitgevoerd kon worden en nog steeds wordt.

Bij het onderzoek naar de cursus Searchers in Society (SIS) heb ik samengewerkt met collega's in de VS, Janine DeWitt en Carolyn Oxenford. We hebben gezamenlijk gepresenteerd bij een conferentie in Washington en ik ben gastvrij ontvangen bij Janine thuis. Dank daarvoor!

Last but not least wil ik mijn vrienden en familie dank zeggen voor hun ondersteuning, warmte en gezelligheid. Jullie zijn voor mij ook een voorbeeld en inspiratiebron als het gaat om maatschappelijke betrokkenheid en strijd voor een betere wereld.

Lieve Mannes, dank voor je geduld en nuchterheid en voor het overnemen van kookbeurten. Lieve Boris en Jarmo, wat mooi om te zien hoe jullie leren en studeren. En wat ontzettend leuk dat jullie mijn paranimfen willen zijn.

Tot slot een woord van dank voor allen die op welke manier dan ook hebben bijgedragen aan de totstandkoming van dit boekje en die ik hier niet met name heb genoemd.





# Curriculum vitae

Ingrid Schutte was born on September 30, 1957, in Enschede, the Netherlands. She studied Educational Sciences at the University of Groningen and graduated in 1982. Her graduation research was about possibilities to use Paolo Freire's methods in adult literacy work in the Netherlands. During her study she volunteered as a teacher in literacy work for Dutch (semi-) illiterate adults.



The main theme in her career is diversity; how to connect education to the features and backgrounds of different students and student-groups. Ingrid was a teacher and projectleader at the Centre for Vocational Training for adults (Centrum voor Technische Vakopleiding voor Volwassenen, CVV) in Amsterdam which aimed at facilitating women to choose for a technical training/education. In Flevoland, she initiated a project to implement the succesful methods of the FNV women's vocational schools (Vrouwenvakscholen FNV) at institutions for secondary vocational education.

In 2003 Ingrid started working as an educational advisor at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences. From 2006-2009 she participated in the project 'Care for diversity'. In this project, she initiated studentmentoring and she also co-authored a brochure regarding diversity policies at Hanze University of Applied Sciences. This brochure focused on informing students and professionals in dealing with cultural differences.

Since 2009 Ingrid is member of the research group 'Excellence in Higher Education and Society' at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences, where she started her PhD-research in 2012. During her PhD, she presented her work at several national and international conferences. Presently, as educational advisor, she supports Hanze schools, degree programs and lecturers in teaching personal and social development.

