

Building and Implementing a Global Citizenship Course for Undergraduate Honors Students

Ingrid W. Schutte; Elanor Kamans;
Marca V.C. Wolfensberger; Wiel Veugelers
Hanze University of Applied Sciences, Groningen;
University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, the Netherlands

Abstract

This pilot study investigates the development and delivery of a 112-hour Dutch undergraduate honors course for global citizenship education, called Society 2.0. 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 model 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.

Keywords: Curriculum development; global citizenship education; honors education; social justice.

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 (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 (Roepers & 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; Schutte, Kamans, Wolfensberger & Veugelers, 2015) integrate those issues and relate to three domains: the cognitive, social and moral domain (see Table 1). 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 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. Accordingly, we define global citizenship education as social justice oriented education, aimed at preparing students for their role as engaged citizens of the global world. Justice orientation is an orientation that includes a desire to improve society (Johnson & Morris, 2010).

Table 1: Global Justice Citizenship Education.

Domains	Curriculum guidelines
Knowledge domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gain historical (root causes of injustice) insights and see local-global connections. ▪ Focus on one global-justice issue.
Moral domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop ethical and intercultural sensitivity. ▪ Recognize own values and reflect on mainstream thinking
Social domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contact people with different socioeconomic positions, cultural backgrounds and life chances. ▪ Get to know positive role models: active and socially engaged people.
Experiential learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spend at least 15 hours in civic contexts.

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 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); and,
- 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, they discuss what they are and what they wish to achieve related to global/social issues. Attention is also directed toward 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 component. 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 (Schutte et al., 2015) are profiled here as the ideal curriculum. The guidelines were used previously to evaluate an international hybrid

honors course (Schutte et al., 2015). 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 (2011; 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, 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 individual held interview took approximately forty-five minutes, the interviews with both teachers together took about one hour each. The main topics in these semi-structured interviews differed according to the phase of the course (see Table 2). The principal researcher conducted all interviews.

Table 2: Topics of the interviews.

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

For an overview of the data collection, see Table 3.

Table 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, namely 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 on 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. Finally, 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 allows both approaches. Further, one of the course meetings explores a current global issue using the open space method described by Andreotti et al. (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 time 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* includes 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 were featured in the formal curriculum.

Regarding values in the *formal curriculum*, the theme 'alternative movements' entails contact with non-mainstream values; the formal curriculum includes 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.

Ethical sensitivity was a recurrent topic in the *delivery of the course*. 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?; and 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 indicated 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 *GJCE-guidelines* include 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 a heterogeneous background regarding the content and subcultures of their education. Furthermore, delving into a global justice issue and alternative/social movements was 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. For instance the change from the students’ perspective to that of someone else, when asking ‘How would this be for a girl in India?’

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 followed their regular program at their own department, so they normally did not meet in the interim. These circumstances required extra attention for community-building. The first assignment was 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 another 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 pro-active 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 around 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 positively 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 was not a main pedagogical goal in (honors) teaching. Therefore, taking time to discuss the importance of the political dimension in global citizenship education (Veugelers, 2011) 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, the 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 adding the role of the collective with respect to social change to 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 a distance in discussions where 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, knowledge, and awareness of (global) societal issues (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 hope our work helps others build courses preparing students for their future role in society as critical, well-informed, and committed global citizens. Especially their commitment is imperative, given the severity of global issues our world is facing.

References

- Achterberg, C. (2005). What is an honors student? *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, 6(1), 75-81.
- 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>
- Andreotti, V., Barker L., & Newell-Jones, K. (2006). *Critical Literacy in Global Citizenship Education. Professional Development Resource Pack*. Derby: Global Education Derby.
- Clark, L., & Zubizarreta, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Inspiring exemplary teaching and learning perspectives on teaching academically talented college students*. Lincoln, NE: NCHC.
- 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.
- 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.
- Flikkema, M. (2016). *Sense of serving*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
- Friedman, M. (2000). Educating for world citizenship. *Ethics*, 110, 586-601.
- 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.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1979). *Curriculum Inquiry: The Study of Curriculum Practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- 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.
- 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.
- Johnson, L., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal*, 21(1), 77-96.
- 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., & 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
- Oxfam GB (2006). Education for Global Citizenship: A guide for schools. Retrieved from:
<http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides>
- 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.
- 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
- 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
- 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
- Schutte, I., Kamans, E., Wolfensberger, M. V. C., & Veugelers, W. (2017). Effects of an undergraduate honors course on global justice awareness. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Schutte, I. W., Weistra J. S. R., & Wolfensberger M. V. C. (2010). Ontwikkeling honors 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
- 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.
- Sternberg, R. J., Jarvin, L., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2011). *Explorations in giftedness*. Cambridge: University Press.
- 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.

-
- Tirri, K. (2011). Holistic school pedagogy and values: Finnish teachers' and students' perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 159-165.
- 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). Lit Verlag: Münster.
- 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.
- 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: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Veugelers, W. (2011). The Moral and the Political in Global Citizenship: Appreciating Differences in Education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9 (3-4), 473-485.
- 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. (2015). *Talent Development in European Higher Education. Honors programs in the Benelux, Nordic and German-speaking countries*. Cham: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-12919-8
- Wolfensberger, M. V. C. (2012). *Teaching for Excellence. Honors Pedagogies revealed*. Münster: Waxmann.
-

About the Authors

Ingrid W. Schutte is a Ph.D. student, educational advisor, and researcher at the Talent Development in Higher Education and Society Professorship, Hanze University of Applied Sciences. Her research interests focus on moral development, global citizenship education, and education for diversity.

Elanor Kamans works as a senior researcher at the Talent Development in Higher Education and Society Professorship, Hanze University of Applied Sciences. Her research interests focus on the culture of excellence and cultural change through honors education as well as empathy and global citizenship education.

Marca V.C. Wolfensberger, Ph.D., heads the professorship Talent Development in Higher Education and Society at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences in Groningen and is Honors Director of the Department of Geography and Planning of Utrecht University. Her research interests include honors education and honors pedagogies, honors communities, and global citizenship. She is both an appointed fellow and co-chair of the research committee in the National Collegiate Honors Council.

Wiel Veugelers is Professor of Education at the University of Humanistic Studies in Utrecht. Previously he was an associate professor in curriculum studies at the University of Amsterdam. He has published many books and articles in the areas of moral development, citizenship education, and educational change. In 2015 he received the Kuhmerker Career Award of the Association on Moral Education.

Address

Ingrid W. Schutte;
Hanze University of Applied Sciences;
Staff Office of Education & Applied Sciences;
Zernikepark 4, 9747 AN Groningen, the Netherlands.

e-Mail: i.w.schutte@pl.hanze.nl

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: <i>present yourself in a mood board: which messages did you get? Write about assignment 1 in Blog 1.</i>
2	Sharing experience: mood board Theory, definitions: Socialization and conformism. Assignment: <i>Alternative practices: map what you think is included in this. Which sources did you use? Why those? Ask at least three other persons.</i>
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: <i>Choose an internship. Why this one? Define a learning goal and make an action plan. Determine theme. Why this one? Write Blog 2.</i>
4	Sharing experience: choice internship, plan and purpose and theme. Introduction ethics: origin, definition, ethical behavior, ethical sensitivity. Assignments: <i>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.</i>
5	Sharing experience: inspiration, internship, ethical dilemma.... Discussion/debate: Open space methodology. Assignment: <i>Look for information about interviewing, write abstract to use as guideline. Bring it to course meeting six.</i>
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: <i>interview(s) at your internship. Write Blog 4.</i>
7	Sharing experiences on interviews/ internship Introduction final assignment. Assignment: <i>Preparation of final presentations; Write Blog 5.</i>
8	Final presentations and evaluation.