



Global Citizenship Education in Action: Students' Reflections and Their Impact on a Local College's Core Values

Ronald A. Gonzales^{ORCID}, Roseller H. Rizal^{ORCID}, Gerby R. Muya^{ORCID}, Simplicio P. Alba^{ORCID},
Mary Rose F. Montano*^{ORCID}, Renante A. Artificio^{ORCID}
City College of Calamba, Philippines

Received: January 28, 2026

Revised: March 18, 2026

Accepted: March 27, 2026

Online: April 20, 2026

Abstract

Despite the growing integration of global citizenship education (GCED) in higher education institutions globally and locally, limited empirical evidence exists on how such programs tangibly influence students' values and perspectives—particularly from the students' standpoint. Thus, this study examines how the reflections of the City College of Calamba's students who have completed the GCED course align with the core values of social responsibility, national service, moral uprightness, and commitment to lifelong learning. Specifically, it aims to examine how student reflections vary across demographic groups, investigate the correlation between students' reflections on the GCED course and their perceptions of the course content and delivery, and identify which aspects of the GCED course students find most influential in shaping their values and outlook as future global professionals. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the researchers purposively selected 308 City College of Calamba (CCC) students who had completed the Global Citizenship Education (GCED) course during the first semester of AY 2024-2025. Data drawn were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, the Kruskal-Wallis test, and Spearman's rho. Results revealed that students have generally developed strong reflections on Global Citizenship Education (GCED), particularly in social responsibility ($r = .770$), national service ($r = .754$), moral uprightness ($r = .776$), and commitment to lifelong learning ($r = .741$). However, significant differences in reflections emerged by academic program and by the semester or year in which the course was taken, suggesting that pedagogical strategies, course delivery formats, and contextual influences affect how students internalize GCED values. The study proposed an action plan that includes capacity building for faculty in reflective and contextualized pedagogies and embedding GCED themes.

Keywords: *Global Citizenship Education (GCED), Reflections, Core Values, Higher Education, Local College*

INTRODUCTION

Education must evolve in an increasingly interconnected world to prepare students not only for local and national responsibilities but also for participation in a complex global society. In higher education, this shift is closely linked to Outcomes-Based Education (OBE), institutional accountability, and the demand for graduates who demonstrate global competence, ethical responsibility, and civic engagement (UNESCO, 2022; Tarozzi, 2023). Within this context, Global Citizenship Education (GCED) has emerged as an important framework that integrates knowledge, skills, and values needed to address global challenges while remaining grounded in local realities (Akkari & Maleq, 2020; Milana & Tarozzi, 2021).

Despite the growing adoption of GCED in higher education curricula, a critical issue remains: many institutions integrate GCED rhetorically but provide limited empirical evidence demonstrating whether such courses effectively influence students' value formation and reflective learning. This gap raises concerns about curricular effectiveness, institutional accountability, and universities' ability to demonstrate outcomes aligned with global competence and values-based education. In response, this study examines how students at the City College of Calamba (CCC) reflect on their experiences with Global Citizenship Education (GCED)—an institutional course designed to promote values such as social responsibility, national service, moral uprightness, and

Copyright Holder:

© Ronald, Roseller, Gerby, Simplicio, Mary & Renante. (2026)
Corresponding author's email: mfmontano@ccc.edu.ph

This Article is Licensed Under:



lifelong learning.

Glocal Citizenship Education, which integrates global awareness with local engagement, has been widely promoted as a means of preparing learners to address complex global and societal issues (Tarozzi, 2023). Beyond its alignment with global development agendas, GCED is grounded in scholarly literature emphasizing reflective learning, ethical reasoning, and intercultural understanding as essential competencies for responsible citizenship (Milana & Tarozzi, 2021). As an institutional course across all academic programs at CCC, GCED aims to cultivate globally competent yet locally responsive graduates, reflecting broader efforts in higher education to integrate global perspectives into institutional curricula.

Although previous studies show that GCED can foster empathy, civic engagement, and social responsibility among students (Andres, 2024; Tuazon & Claveria, 2022), empirical research examining how students internalize GCED values—particularly within local colleges—remains limited. Much of the existing literature is theoretical or qualitative, underscoring the need for quantitative evidence measuring how GCED influences students' reflective learning and value formation (González-Valencia et al., 2022; Biay & Tenorio, 2024).

In the Philippines, local colleges and universities (LCUs) play a pivotal role in localizing Global Citizenship Education (GCED). While GCED is promoted globally through UNESCO's Education 2030 Agenda and SDG 4.7 (UNESCO, 2025) and implemented nationally through policies like CHED Memorandum Order No. 1, s. 2015 (Commission on Higher Education, 2015), LCUs translate these broad frameworks into concrete local practices. Thus, as a local college, the City College of Calamba must examine how GCED is integrated into its curricula, community engagement, and extension programs, ensuring that students—especially those from underserved communities—develop critical thinking, ethical awareness, global competencies, and a sense of “glocal” responsibility that links local development needs with global citizenship ideals.

This study, therefore, investigates students' reflections on the GCED course and examines their relationship with the institution's core values—social responsibility, national service, moral uprightness, and commitment to lifelong learning. By providing empirical evidence on how GCED contributes to student value formation, the study contributes to ongoing scholarly discussions on global citizenship education, reflective learning, and values-based higher education.

Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to address the following main problem: “To what extent do the reflections of CCC students who have completed the GCED course demonstrate alignment with the core values of social responsibility, national service, moral uprightness, and commitment to lifelong learning?”

To address this overarching question, the following subproblems are posed:

1. What are the students' levels of reflection on the GCED course in terms of:
 - Social responsibility?
 - national service?
 - Moral uprightness?
 - Commitment to lifelong learning?
 - Course content and delivery?
2. How do these reflections vary across student demographics (e.g., program, year level, and sex)?
3. Is there a significant correlation between the level of students' reflection on the GCED course content and delivery and their perceived internalization of CCC's core values?
4. What aspects of the GCED course do students perceive as most influential in shaping their values and outlook as future global professionals?

LITERATURE REVIEW

GCED as an Academic Course: Structure and Implementation

In today's interconnected world, Global Citizenship Education (GCED) provides a dynamic and interdisciplinary framework that empowers learners to engage meaningfully with both global and local issues. Rather than functioning solely as a stand-alone subject, GCED is increasingly integrated across higher education curricula or delivered as institutional courses that address themes such as human rights, sustainability, intercultural dialogue, and social justice. These approaches aim to develop cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral competencies—including empathy, ethical reasoning, and intercultural understanding—through reflective and participatory learning experiences (UNESCO, 2025; Akkari & Maleq, 2020). GCED is frequently associated with global education agendas such as Sustainable Development Goal 4.7, which emphasizes education for sustainable development, global citizenship, and lifelong learning.

Despite its growing adoption in policy and institutional frameworks, scholars note that the implementation of GCED remains uneven across educational contexts. Research suggests that while universities often articulate GCED principles in institutional missions or policy documents, translating these ideals into structured classroom practices can be challenging (Edwards, 2024; Al'Abri et al., 2022). Common barriers include conceptual ambiguity, limited pedagogical guidance, insufficient teacher training, and weak monitoring mechanisms for evaluating GCED outcomes. As a result, GCED initiatives may exist symbolically within curricula but lack systematic instructional strategies that meaningfully influence student learning.

Evidence from different regions highlights similar implementation challenges. In Southeast Asia and other developing contexts, institutions often integrate GCED informally through curricular themes, co-curricular programs, or community engagement initiatives rather than through comprehensive institutional policies (Bercasio & Perez, 2020). Policy analyses in Oman likewise demonstrate that although GCED principles are embedded within national education visions, implementation gaps persist due to unclear pedagogical frameworks and limited faculty capacity (Al'Abri et al., 2022). Taken together, these findings suggest that the effectiveness of GCED depends not only on policy endorsement but also on the quality of learning experiences and institutional support structures that translate global citizenship principles into meaningful educational practice.

GCED, Values Formation, and Higher Education

Higher education institutions play a central role in cultivating values that shape students' civic engagement and ethical responsibility. Global Citizenship Education is widely regarded as a pedagogical approach that fosters values such as social responsibility, intercultural understanding, civic participation, and a commitment to sustainable development (Van, 2024; Akçay et al., 2024). These competencies align with the broader mission of universities to produce graduates capable of addressing societal challenges within both local and global contexts.

Research increasingly emphasizes that values development within GCED is most effective when learning experiences incorporate reflective, dialogic, and experiential pedagogies. Through activities such as community-based projects, classroom discussions, and reflective learning exercises, students are encouraged to examine their identities, question social inequalities, and explore their responsibilities as members of both national and global communities. Such approaches help learners connect abstract global issues with their personal experiences and social environments, strengthening ethical awareness and civic engagement (Tarozzi, 2023).

Nevertheless, scholars caution that values-oriented curricula may remain largely conceptual if instructional strategies fail to support meaningful engagement. Studies of civic and citizenship education have shown that students may recognize global issues yet struggle to demonstrate deeper critical analysis or sustained civic participation when learning experiences are primarily

theoretical (González-Valencia et al., 2022). This suggests that effective GCED requires carefully designed pedagogical practices that integrate reflection, dialogue, and real-world engagement.

GCED Outcomes: Global and Regional Perspectives

Empirical research indicates that exposure to GCED can influence students' attitudes, values, and civic participation. International studies on civic education reveal that schools worldwide are increasingly integrating GCED and Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) programs, with a focus on skills such as global awareness, cultural understanding, and ethical responsibility (Damiani & Fraillon, 2025). These competencies are widely regarded as vital when dealing with the complexities of globalization.

In Southeast Asia and the Philippines, emerging scholarship provides growing evidence of GCED's role in shaping students' civic and global competencies. Studies in the Philippine context report that GCED initiatives contribute to improved intercultural awareness, civic engagement, and ethical consciousness among learners (Andres, 2024; Tuazon & Claveria, 2022).

Research involving Filipino preservice teachers further indicates that global citizenship competencies are positively associated with cultural intelligence, adaptability, and lifelong learning orientations (Biay & Tenorio, 2024). Similarly, Salvador-Desnacido and Pecson (2025) found that exposure to global citizenship education in higher education strengthened competencies related to critical thinking, leadership, and social participation.

Despite these encouraging findings, several scholars highlight a persistent knowledge-action gap, in which students understand global citizenship concepts but face institutional or structural barriers that limit sustained civic engagement (Andres, 2024; Victa et al., 2024). This gap underscores the importance of examining how GCED learning experiences influence students' reflective processes and the internalization of values within specific institutional contexts.

Measurement of GCED Learning and Student Reflection

Evaluating the impact of GCED requires systematic approaches to measuring learning experiences and the development of values. Previous studies have used various assessment tools to examine global citizenship competencies, including scales measuring global awareness, civic responsibility, intercultural sensitivity, and ethical engagement (Kim et al., 2020; Damiani & Fraillon, 2025). These measures often capture both cognitive and socio-emotional dimensions of global citizenship learning.

Reflection has also been recognized as a key indicator of learning in values-based education. Reflective learning enables students to interpret experiences, evaluate ethical dilemmas, and integrate new perspectives into their value systems (Dewitte & Dezutter, 2021). In educational research, reflection is often evaluated using self-reported instruments that gauge students' perceived learning, value alignment, and engagement with course experiences.

However, few studies connect students' perceptions of their GCED learning experiences to clear evidence of their institutions' values, especially in local colleges. This highlights the importance of empirical models that examine how perceptions of course content and instructional delivery relate to students' internalization of institutional core values.

In line with these perspectives, the present study examines how GCED is contextualized at the City College of Calamba, where structured reflection activities have been shown to foster civic engagement, moral awareness, and social responsibility. The findings affirm that when GCED is implemented through a localized, hope-centered approach, it strengthens institutional values and equips students to become critically aware, compassionate, and globally competent citizens.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in reflective and experiential learning theories, which propose that meaningful learning occurs when individuals interpret experiences and connect them with personal beliefs and social contexts. Reflective learning enables students to critically examine experiences and transform attitudes and values (Dewitte & Dezutter, 2021). In the context of Global Citizenship Education (GCED), reflection encourages learners to evaluate global issues, consider ethical responsibilities, and relate these insights to their roles in society.

Experiential learning complements this process by emphasizing authentic learning activities—such as discussions, collaborative work, and community engagement—that facilitate the internalization of value. In this context, GCED learning experiences (such as course materials, teaching methods, and hands-on activities) encourage students to think deeply, helping them adopt important values such as social responsibility, national service, moral integrity, and a dedication to lifelong learning.

Hypotheses

Based on the literature and theoretical framework, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- H1: There are significant differences in students' reflections on the GCED course when grouped according to demographic variables such as academic program, sex, and year level.
- H2: Students' reflections on GCED learning experiences are significantly correlated with their perceived internalization of institutional core values.
- H3: Students' perceptions of GCED course content and delivery are positively associated with their alignment with the institution's core values of social responsibility, national service, moral uprightness, and commitment to lifelong learning.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study used a descriptive and correlational (non-causal) research design, employing a one-time survey to examine students' perceptions of the Global Citizenship Education (GCED) course and their understanding of the City College of Calamba (CCC)'s core values. The cross-sectional design involved one-time data collection from students who had completed the GCED course in the first semester of the 2024-2025 academic year.

The descriptive component determined students' levels of reflection across four dimensions: social responsibility, national service, moral uprightness, and commitment to lifelong learning. It also examined demographic variations and identified aspects of the GCED course perceived as most influential in shaping students' perspectives. The correlational component examined the relationship between students' GCED reflections on course content and delivery and their perceived internalization of CCC's core values. This design is appropriate for describing patterns and examining relationships among variables without manipulating them or inferring causal effects.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a self-developed questionnaire consisting of four parts. Part I gathered respondents' demographic information, including academic program, year level, age, and sex. Part II contained the GCED Reflection Scale, composed of 16 items measuring four dimensions—social responsibility, national service, moral uprightness, and commitment to lifelong learning—with four items per dimension, rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Part III assessed students' perceptions of how GCED course content, learning activities, teaching strategies, and community engagement contributed to their internalization of

the institution’s core values and the effectiveness of instructional approaches.

Part IV consisted of a checklist identifying the course components perceived as most influential in shaping students’ values and perspectives, including classroom discussions, reflection papers, group or community projects, case studies on local and global issues, multimedia resources, and guest speakers or webinars; respondents could select all applicable options, and results were analyzed using frequency counts and percentages. Mean scores for Likert-scale items were interpreted using the following thresholds (Likert, 1932; Sullivan & Artino, 2013): 4.50–5.00 = Strongly Agree, 3.50–4.49 = Agree, 2.50–3.49 = Neutral, 1.50–2.49 = Disagree, and 1.00–1.49 = Strongly Disagree.

The instrument underwent content validation by three experts, and items with insufficient item-level content validity index (I-CVI) were revised or removed, resulting in a scale-level content validity index (S-CVI) of 1.0. A pilot test with 30 GCED students assessed reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha, which yielded the following coefficients indicating high internal consistency across all components of the questionnaire (Cronbach, 1951; Taber, 2018).

Table 1. Content Validation Results

Scale	Cronbach Alpha	Items	Reliability
Social Responsibility	0.908	4	High
National Servitude	0.916	4	High
Moral Uprightness	0.921	4	High
Commitment to lifelong learning	0.925	4	High
Course Content and Delivery	0.899	4	High

An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using principal component analysis was conducted to investigate the underlying structure of each of the 4-item surveys. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy for each component was all more than 0.8 (0.837, 0.834, 0.854, 0.838, 0.847, respectively, for the social responsibility, national servitude, moral uprightness, commitment to lifelong learning, and course content and delivery survey components), and with Bartlett’s test of sphericity all being significant. Based on the Kaiser criterion with eigenvalues > 1, a one-factor solution for each component was retained, accounting for at least 75% of the total variance in the component surveys. The survey method was used because reflection and value internalization are subjective constructs best captured through self-reported perceptions, although such measures may be subject to social desirability bias.

Data Collection and Analysis

Prior to data collection, ethical clearance and institutional permission were obtained from the Office of the College President through the recommendation of the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation.

The study population consisted of 993 students who had completed the GCED course during the academic year in which data were collected. All eligible students were invited to participate through official GCED group chats. A total of 308 students submitted complete responses, which constituted the final dataset for analysis. Responses with missing or incomplete data were excluded from the final analysis to ensure accuracy and consistency in statistical computations.

Participation was voluntary. Students were informed about the purpose of the study, the confidentiality of responses, the voluntary nature of participation, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were used to determine students’ levels of reflection across the four GCED dimensions. To examine how reflection levels

differ across groups of students (such as program, sex, and year level), the researchers used the Kruskal–Wallis H test, a method for comparing groups when the data are ranked or not normally distributed (Kruskal & Wallis, 1952). When significant differences were detected, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences.

The study employed Spearman's rho correlation coefficient to examine the relationship between students' perceptions of the GCED course and their comprehension of CCC's core values, indicating the strength and nature (positive or negative) of the correlation between the two ranked datasets (Spearman, 1904). All statistical analyses were conducted using a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

Respondents' Description

The study included 308 student respondents drawn from a population of 993 students who had completed the GCED course at the City College of Calamba. Participants represented multiple academic programs and year levels, providing diverse perspectives on GCED learning experiences.

Purposive sampling was used to select students who had completed the GCED course. Participation was voluntary, and the survey was distributed through official group chats. This procedure constitutes a non-probability sampling method and may introduce self-selection bias, as participation depended on students' willingness to respond.

To determine the minimum sample size for adequate statistical precision, Cochran's formula for large populations (Cochran, 1977) was applied, yielding a recommended minimum sample size of 278 respondents at a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. Although the study employed non-probability sampling, the obtained sample size of 308 exceeded this minimum threshold, providing sufficient observations for the planned statistical analyses. However, the results should be interpreted as reflecting the views of participating respondents rather than representing the entire student population.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Age Distribution

Table 2 presents the demographic profile of the 308 respondents by age. The data indicate that most student participants fall within the typical college-age range of 18 to 22 years old. Specifically, 36.7% of respondents were 20 years old, 29.2% were 19 years old, and 15.3% were 21 years old. These three categories together account for more than 81% of all responders. Results in Table 2 indicate that the GCED course is being implemented primarily among students at the expected stage of undergraduate education, making the course's content and structure appropriate for their developmental level.

Table 2. Age Distribution

Age	Frequency	Percent
18	20	6.5
19	90	29.2
20	113	36.7
21	47	15.3
22	21	6.8
23 - 46	17	5.5
Total	308	100.0

Sex Distribution

The sex distribution in Table 3 shows that the majority were female, accounting for 66.9% of the total sample. Male respondents accounted for 29.9%, while 3.2% of participants chose not to disclose their sex. The data shows a notable sex imbalance, with female students making up over two-thirds of the participants. Similarly, [Alshawi \(2023\)](#) reported a similar trend in enrollment in global citizenship classes in Qatar, with females comprising the majority of students. Likewise, [Ancheta-Arrabal and Galguera \(2025\)](#) also found the same sex distribution pattern across multiple European countries. The authors found that females generally supported global citizenship education more than males.

Table 3. Sex Distribution

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Female	206	66.9
Male	92	29.9
Prefer not to say	10	3.2
Total	308	100.0

Program Distribution

Table 4 shows that the Bachelor of Science in Psychology program had the most significant number of respondents, accounting for 63.6% of the total sample. This was followed by students from the Bachelor of Science in Accountancy program at 20.5% and the Bachelor of Science in Accounting Information System at 8.8%. Other programs were represented in much smaller proportions.

This uneven distribution suggests that some programs, particularly Psychology and Accountancy, had higher participation or larger enrollment in the GCED course during the study period. As a result, findings may reflect more on students from these disciplines. The dominance of Psychology students may influence aggregate reflections, especially given the program’s emphasis on values, self-awareness, and human behavior, which could make students more attuned to reflective tasks.

Table 4. Program Distribution

Program	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor of Elementary Education	7	2.3
Bachelor of Science in Accountancy	63	20.5
Bachelor of Science in Accounting Information Systems	27	8.8
Bachelor of Science in Computer Science	1	.3
Bachelor of Science in Psychology	196	63.6
Bachelor of Secondary Education Major in English	1	.3
Bachelor of Secondary Education Major in Mathematics	11	3.6
Bachelor of Secondary Education Major in Science	2	.6
Total	308	100.0

Semester and Year Level Distribution

The data in Table 5 reveal that most respondents were enrolled in the second year, second semester, comprising 63.3% of the total sample. This was followed by those in the first year and second semester, at 29.5%. Collectively, these two groups account for over 92% of all respondents, indicating that the GCED course is primarily taken in the early years of the academic program. Very

few respondents came from other year levels.

Table 5. Semester and Year Level Distribution

Year	Semester	Frequency	Percent
1st Year	1st Semester	10	3.2
	2nd Semester	91	29.5
2nd Year	1st Semester	4	1.3
	2nd Semester	195	63.3
3rd Year	2nd Semester	2	.6
4th Year	1st Semester	2	.6
	2nd Semester	4	1.3
Total		308	100.0

Level of Reflections on the GCED Course

Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics for students’ reflections on the GCED course across four dimensions: social responsibility, national service, moral uprightness, and commitment to lifelong learning. In addition to the means reported, the median score for all variables was 5.00, indicating that the central tendency of responses falls within the “strongly agree” category. This suggests that students generally perceive the GCED course as influential in shaping their understanding of the institution’s core values.

Among the dimensions, moral uprightness obtained the highest mean, followed by national service, commitment to lifelong learning, and social responsibility. These results suggest that GCED learning experiences are strongly associated with ethical awareness, civic engagement, and personal development. This finding supports previous studies highlighting the role of GCED in strengthening ethical sensitivity and global competence among university students (Stankovska et al., 2019) and promoting social justice awareness through moral pedagogy (Auh & Kim, 2024).

Strong reflections on national service also indicate that the course fosters civic responsibility and awareness of national development goals. Likewise, the high ratings for lifelong learning and social responsibility suggest that students recognize the importance of continuous learning and social engagement in addressing societal issues, consistent with research emphasizing lifelong learning as a core element of GCED (Milana & Tarozzi, 2021).

However, the consistently high average scores (above 4.50) and little variation in responses might also indicate that people wanted to give positive answers or felt loyal to the institution, since the survey asked about values that closely matched the institution's. The limited variation in responses may further indicate restricted scale discrimination, suggesting that the instrument captured strong agreement but may be less sensitive to subtle differences in perception.

Despite these considerations, the results indicate that GCED is perceived as a meaningful component of the curriculum that reinforces institutional values such as social responsibility, moral integrity, and civic engagement. In light of global challenges to globalization, the experience at the City College of Calamba shows that a strong institutional commitment and teaching methods that respond to the local context can support effective global citizenship education, even with limited resources (Agoi, 2025).

Table 6. Level of Reflections on the GCED Course

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Verbal Interpretation
Social Responsibility	308	4.5260	.55823	5.0	Strongly Agree
National Service	308	4.5584	.54578	5.0	Strongly Agree
Moral Uprightness	308	4.5731	.53114	5.0	Strongly Agree
Commitment to Lifelong Learning	308	4.5317	.55114	5.0	Strongly Agree
Course Content and Delivery	308	4.4651	.57375	4.5	Agree to Agree Strongly
Valid N (listwise)	308				

Differences in Reflections Across Student Demographics

Reflections Across Age Groups

Results revealed no statistically significant differences in reflections across age groups for social responsibility, national service, moral uprightnes, or commitment to lifelong learning ($H(5) = 8.820, p=0.116, H(5) = 7.730, p=0.172, H(5) = 8.964, p=0.111, H(5) = 8.397, p=0.136$, respectively). The minimal effect sizes indicate that age did not significantly affect students' reflections on the GCED course. These findings indicate that students across age categories showed similar levels of engagement with GCED themes, possibly due to the narrow age range typical of undergraduate populations.

Reflections Across Sex Categories

Similarly, no significant differences were observed across sex groups for any of the four reflection dimensions learning ($H(2) = 0.149, p=0.928, H(2) = 0.231, p=0.891, H(2) = 1.05, p = .587, H(2) = 1.185, p=0.553$, respectively). Effect size estimates indicated negligible group differences.

These results suggest that students' reflections on the GCED course were consistent across sex identities, indicating that the curriculum and pedagogical approaches were perceived similarly by male and female students. This finding aligns with [UNESCO's \(2022\)](#) emphasis on inclusive education, which promotes equitable learning outcomes for all learners regardless of sex.

Global examples further illustrate this principle: inclusive education initiatives in Lao PDR and Bangladesh emphasize community engagement and targeted support for marginalized groups, while the Netherlands promotes flexible, student-centered curricula to address diverse learning needs ([UNESCO, 2025b](#)). Together, these practices highlight the importance of designing educational programs that provide equitable learning experiences for diverse student populations.

Reflections Across Academic Programs

Conversely, notable disparities in reflection levels were detected among academic programs. The Kruskal–Wallis test indicated statistically significant differences in social responsibility, national service, moral uprightnes, and commitment to lifelong learning ($H(7) = 26.986, p < .001, H(7) = 18.871, p=0.009, H(7) = 29.284, p < .001, H(7) = 27.412, p < .001$, respectively). Post hoc comparisons suggested that students from programs emphasizing human behavior and social interaction, such as Psychology, reported higher levels of reflection than those from more technically oriented programs. This pattern may reflect disciplinary orientations, as fields focused on human behavior and social issues often incorporate reflective, discussion-based pedagogies that encourage ethical reasoning and civic engagement.

However, the observed effect sizes were small to moderate, indicating that the academic program explains only part of the variation in reflection levels. Prior studies indicate that disciplinary context can affect students' engagement with global citizenship themes, especially

when programs vary in their focus on social responsibility and community involvement (Van, 2024; Akçay et al., 2024).

These findings highlight the importance of context-sensitive GCED implementation across academic disciplines. Programs such as education and psychology naturally provide more opportunities for reflective learning and values-oriented discussions, which may deepen students' engagement with GCED themes like moral uprightness and social responsibility. This variation suggests the need for differentiated instructional strategies that align GCED content and learning activities with disciplinary contexts. As noted by Goyibova et al. (2025), effective differentiation requires institutional support, ongoing research, and faculty development to ensure that global citizenship competencies are meaningfully integrated across diverse academic programs.

Social Responsibility Across Programs

The study reveals a statistically significant difference in social responsibility between students in the Bachelor of Science in Psychology and Bachelor of Science in Accountancy programs. The pairwise comparison yielded a test statistic of 55.224 (SE = 12.215; Z = 4.521) with an adjusted p-value of .000, confirming a highly significant difference and suggesting that the academic program influences students' perceived level of social responsibility.

Previous studies support the role of education in shaping social responsibility. Karatana (2025) found that Global Citizenship Education (GCED) enhances students' capacity to contribute to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and fosters positive attitudes toward environmental, economic, and social issues. Similarly, Kolomiets et al. (2021) emphasized that social responsibility develops more effectively when students engage in socially responsible activities, collaborative projects, and meaningful community experiences.

National Service Across Programs

Results for national service between students enrolled in the Bachelor of Science in Psychology and the Bachelor of Science in Accountancy programs reveal a statistically significant difference. The test yielded a test statistic of 43.414, a standard error of 12.046, and a standardized test statistic (Z) of 3.604. The p-value is .000, and the adjusted significance stays at .009 after taking into account multiple comparisons. Since the adjusted p-value is less than the conventional alpha level of 0.05, the result indicates a significant difference in national service levels between the two groups.

This suggests that students in the psychology program demonstrate a significantly higher sense of national service than those in the accounting program. The difference may be explained by Psychology's human-centered and service-oriented nature, which often involves activities and discussions focused on civic duty, empathy, and social contribution. In contrast, the Accountancy curriculum may prioritize technical and analytical skills with fewer direct opportunities to engage in socially driven or nationalistic endeavors.

Moral Uprightness Across Programs

Results for moral uprightness show a significant difference between students in the Bachelor of Science in Psychology and Bachelor of Science in Accountancy programs. The test produced a statistic of 55.844 (SE = 12.092; Z = 4.618) with an adjusted p-value of .000, indicating that Psychology students demonstrate significantly higher moral uprightness than Accountancy students.

In contrast, the comparison between Psychology and the Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Mathematics yielded a test statistic of -73.289 (SE = 25.871; Z = -2.833). Although the unadjusted p-value is .005, the adjusted significance value is .129, indicating no significant

difference after adjustment.

These findings suggest that moral uprightness may vary across academic programs, with Psychology students scoring higher, possibly due to the ethical and interpersonal focus of their training. The absence of a significant difference between Psychology and Mathematics Education students indicates comparable moral orientation between these programs. The results highlight the need to strengthen values-based education, particularly in technical and business-related programs such as Accountancy.

Commitment to Lifelong Learning Across Programs

A comparison of commitment scores between students enrolled in the Bachelor of Science in Psychology and those in the Bachelor of Secondary Education, major in Mathematics, revealed no statistically significant difference after adjustment. The test statistic is -59.993 with a standard error of 26.039, resulting in a standardized test statistic (Z) of -2.304. Although the unadjusted p-value is .021, indicating a potential difference at face value, the adjusted significance value is .594, well above the standard threshold of 0.05. This suggests that, after accounting for multiple comparisons, the difference in commitment levels between the two groups is not statistically significant.

This result implies that students in both Psychology and Mathematics Education programs exhibit similar levels of commitment, particularly after applying statistical adjustments for multiple comparisons. This finding may indicate that commitment, as a core value, is nurtured equally across academic disciplines, or that the factors influencing commitment are more individual or institution-wide than program-specific.

Reflections Across Semester and Year Taken

The study found statistically significant differences in GCED reflections across semester and academic year for social responsibility ($p < .001$), national service ($p = .003$), moral uprightness ($p < .001$), and lifelong learning ($p = .001$). These results indicate that students' levels of reflection varied across cohorts. These findings suggest that changes in teaching methods, teachers' approaches to the material, the type of classes (in-person or online), and events such as the pandemic or national issues may have greatly affected how deeply students reflected on the material. Later cohorts may have had better teaching methods, while earlier ones may have used simplified or experimental methods.

These variations show that curriculum review and instructional enhancement are essential for consistent and meaningful learning. Effective strategies must be identified and scaled using data-driven decision-making, feedback loops, and stakeholder engagement (Dumbuya, 2024). Cohort-based differences at City College of Calamba suggest the need for a systematic curriculum evaluation to standardize high-impact practices. Use post hoc pairwise comparisons to identify trends and guide targeted improvements. By using real-world data and global standards to teach, institutions can make GCED more flexible, fair, and effective for all students.

Correlations between GCED reflections and their perceived internalization of CCC's core values

Spearman's rho analysis showed strong, meaningful positive associations between students' perceptions of GCED course content and delivery and their perceived internalization of CCC's core values. Correlation coefficients ranged from $r = .741$ to $r = .776$ ($p < .01$), indicating strong monotonic associations. Moral uprightness showed the strongest relationship with GCED reflections, followed by social responsibility, national service, and commitment to lifelong learning. These results suggest that students who report stronger engagement with GCED learning

experiences also perceive greater alignment with the institution’s core values.

The findings support the view that GCED contributes to the formation of holistic values, reinforcing ethical awareness, civic responsibility, and lifelong learning—key outcomes aligned with CCC’s mission to develop globally competent and socially responsible graduates. Similar findings were observed in [Dorji's \(2024\)](#) study on GCED in Bhutan, where the curriculum was connected to the concept of Gross National Happiness (GNH), demonstrating how GCED can help develop important social and emotional values such as compassion, respect, and responsibility.

However, the very high correlations observed ($r = .741-.776$) warrant cautious interpretation. Such magnitudes may partly reflect common method bias, as both constructs were measured using the same self-report instrument at a single point. Additionally, the items measuring GCED reflections and institutional value internalization may capture closely related or overlapping constructs, inflating correlation coefficients.

Despite these limitations, the results point out the power of GCED to strengthen institutional values through reflective and experiential learning. Strengthening participatory pedagogies—such as collaborative reflection, service-learning, and community engagement—may further enhance the course’s role in fostering globally aware and socially responsible graduates.

Table 7. Spearman’s Rho Correlations Between CCC’s Core Values and Students’ Reflections on GCED Course Content and Delivery

			Social Responsibility	National service	Moral Uprightness	Commitment to lifelong learning
Spearman's rho	Course Content and Delivery	Correlation Coefficient	.770**	.754**	.776**	.741**
		Sig. (2- tailed)	< .001	< .001	< .001	< .001
		N	308	308	308	308

Aspects of the GCED Course Students Perceive as Most Influential

Based on responses from 308 students, the most influential aspect of the GCED course was classroom discussions, cited by 100% of respondents, highlighting the importance of dialogue and guided interaction in understanding global citizenship concepts. Group or community projects ranked second (90.9%), emphasizing the value of collaborative and real-world learning experiences. Case studies (33.4%) and multimedia resources (26.9%) were moderately influential. In contrast, guest speakers/webinars (25.6%) and reflection papers (20.5%) were considered the least impactful, suggesting that students prefer interactive and experiential learning over passive or individual tasks (see Table 8).

These findings indicate that the GCED course is most effective when it adopts participatory, discussion-based, and community-integrated approaches. Less engaging methods, such as reflection papers and occasional use of multimedia, may need to be redesigned to incorporate more collaborative or experiential activities. This aligns with [Alvero \(2025\)](#), who found a gap between instructors’ reported integration of Global Citizenship Competencies (GCCs) and students’ actual awareness, highlighting the need to strengthen GCED pedagogy and delivery.

Table 8. Most Influential Aspects of the GCED Course

	Frequency	Percent	Rank
Classroom Discussions	308	100.0	1
Reflection Papers	66	20.5	6
Group/Community Projects	280	90.9	2
Case Studies on Local/Global Issues	103	33.4	3
Multimedia Resources (e.g., videos, articles)	83	26.9	4
Guest Speakers or Webinars	79	25.6	5
Total	n=308	100.0	

Action Plan to Strengthen GCED Course Implementation

GCED supports a lifelong and flexible learning framework that includes both formal and informal, curricular and extracurricular settings. This is in line with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) set out in Agenda 2030. However, a study by [Bercasio and Perez \(2020\)](#) found that the institutional implementation of GCED often remains implicit and informal, with no formal policies guiding its integration into curricula and teaching practices. To fill this gap, an action plan for the institution was developed based on global GCED standards and the institution's goals, and it received a very positive evaluation, emphasizing the need to include GCED in the system officially.

Enhancing Interactive Learning Experiences

To address findings that traditional methods are less effective at helping students internalize GCED, structured classroom discussions will be prioritized, focusing on real-world issues and global challenges. Instructors will be encouraged to facilitate debates, group activities, and peer-led dialogues that promote critical thinking and the formation of values. This initiative aims to make classroom sessions more dynamic and participatory.

Expanding Community-Based Projects

Recognizing the substantial impact of hands-on experiences as shown in the study, the course will integrate service-learning projects that directly engage students with their local communities. Partnerships with local government units (LGUs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and civic groups will be established to provide students with meaningful opportunities for action and reflection.

Redesigning Reflection Activities

To increase student engagement in reflective practice, traditional written essays will be complemented—or in some cases replaced—by alternative formats such as group reflective journals, vlog reflections, or digital storytelling. Rubrics will be refined to ensure that these outputs effectively demonstrate students' internalization of values and understanding.

Enhancing Multimedia Integration

Multimedia content such as documentaries, podcasts, and infographics will be used more strategically as part of active learning. Instead of assigning webinars as passive-viewing tasks, these resources will serve as starting points for discussion, analysis, and collaborative projects, thereby reinforcing course themes.

Strengthening Guest Speaker Engagement

Guest speakers will continue to be part of the GCED course, but with improved vetting and alignment to course objectives. Pre- and post-session assessments will be administered to measure

the effectiveness of these sessions in enhancing students' awareness and advocacy regarding global citizenship issues.

Instituting Continuous Monitoring and Feedback Mechanisms

To ensure the ongoing relevance and effectiveness of the course, student feedback will be systematically collected mid-semester and at the end of each term. This data will inform iterative improvements to teaching strategies, learning activities, and assessment methods.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings show that students demonstrated strong reflections on Global Citizenship Education (GCED) regarding social responsibility, moral uprightness, national service, and commitment to lifelong learning. The strong link between students' thinking about the GCED course material and their sense of having adopted the school's core values suggests that aligning reflection with course content can be a useful way to measure how values are formed in higher education. The result provides quantitative support for the role of reflective learning in developing students' civic and ethical competencies (Dewitte & Dezutter, 2021; Milana & Tarozzi, 2021).

Significant differences between academic programs and semester groups indicate that students' internalization of GCED values is influenced by their program and teaching methods, highlighting the need for tailored approaches across different fields of study (Goyibova et al., 2025; Ludvik et al., 2023). In contrast, the absence of differences across sex and age groups suggests that the GCED course is inclusive and developmentally appropriate for diverse learners (UNESCO, 2025b).

Based on these findings, GCED should focus on teaching methods that align with the specific program, encourage thoughtful, hands-on learning, and incorporate real-world social issues to enhance students' understanding of civic responsibilities and ethical engagement. These strategies can further support CCC's mission of developing globally competent and socially responsible graduates (Bercasio & Perez, 2020; UNESCO, 2025b).

LIMITATION & FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, collecting data from a single institution may limit the generalizability of the results to other higher-education contexts. The implementation and experience of Global Citizenship Education (GCED) may vary depending on institutional culture, curriculum design, and student demographics.

Second, the study relied on self-reported survey data, which may be subject to social desirability bias and institutional loyalty bias, particularly because the measured constructs align closely with the institution's core values. Third, the strong links between GCED reflections and value internalization may be due to the data collection method or to both being measured simultaneously with the same instrument.

Future research may address these limitations by conducting multi-institutional comparative studies to examine how GCED outcomes vary across academic programs and institutional contexts. Given the observed differences across programs in this study, further research may also explore discipline-specific pedagogical approaches to GCED implementation. In addition, mixed-method approaches, such as focus group discussions or in-depth interviews, may offer more information about students' reflective processes and value formation. Finally, longitudinal studies may help determine whether GCED reflections translate into sustained civic engagement, ethical behavior, and global awareness beyond students' academic experience.

REFERENCES

- Agoi, R. (2025). The continued relevance of global citizenship education: Addressing global challenges through learning. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 12(3), 200–219.
- Akçay, K., Altınay, F., Altınay, Z., Dağlı, G., Shadiev, R., Altınay, M., & Okur, Z. G. (2024). Global citizenship for students of higher education in the realization of sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, 16(4), 1604. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16041604>
- Akkari, A., & Maleq, K. (2020). Rethinking global citizenship education: A critical perspective. In A. Akkari & K. Maleq (Eds.), *Global citizenship education* (pp. 279–294). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44617-8_15
- Al'Abri, K. M., Ambusaidi, A. K., & Alhadi, B. R. (2022). Promoting global citizenship education (GCED) in the Sultanate of Oman: An analysis of national policies. *Sustainability*, 14(12), 7140. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14127140>
- Alvero, J. C. (2025). Integrating global citizenship competencies into general education: A basis for an enhanced curriculum guide in Philippine higher education. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(5), 613–620. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.677>
- Alshawi, A. A. H. (2023). Global citizenship skills among Qatar University students. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 698. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02216-6>
- Ancheta-Arrabal, A., & Galguera, M. P. (2025). Education for global citizenship towards the new European Education Area. *Social Sciences*, 14(2), 73. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14020073>
- Andres, B. Y. (2024). Taking global citizenship education beyond the classroom: Analyzing the advocacy projects of GCED-trained educators in the Philippines. *Alipato: A Journal of Basic Education*, 15, 42–59. <https://www.journals.upd.edu.ph/index.php/ali/article/view/10697>
- Auh, Y., & Kim, C. (2024). Global citizenship education: Towards a critical moral pedagogy. *Social Education Research*, 5(2), 450–471. <https://doi.org/10.37256/ser.5220244897>
- Bercasio, R. R. O., & Perez, A. S. (2020). Global citizenship education in Bicol University: Proposed framework and action plan. *BU R&D Journal*, 23(2), 10–22. https://journal.bicol-u.edu.ph/assets/journal_pdf/Bercasio%20Perez_10-22.pdf
- Biay, K. K., & Tenorio, A. (2024). The relationship of cultural intelligence and global citizenship levels of preservice teachers in the Philippines. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 11(3), 387–406. <https://doi.org/10.52380/ijcer.2024.11.3.685>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2015). *CHED memorandum order (CMO) No. 1, series of 2015: Revised general education curriculum*. CHED.
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
- Damiani, V., & Fraillon, J. (2025). Civic and citizenship education, global citizenship education, and education for sustainable development: An analysis of their integrated conceptualization and measurement in ICCS 2016 and 2022. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, 13(1), Article 37. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-025-00237-y>
- Dewitte, L., & Dezutter, J. (2021). Meaning reflectivity in later life: Relationships between meaning in life and depressive symptoms in adults over 75. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 726150. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.726150>
- Dorji, Y. (2024). Integration of global citizenship education (GCED) into Bhutan's curriculum: Alignment and enrichment of GNH as a framework. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(9), 1142–1157. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.809097>
- Dumbuya, E. (2024). Personalized learning through artificial intelligence: Revolutionizing education. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 13(2), 2818–2820.

- <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijjsra.2024.13.2.2487>
- Edwards, D. B. (2024). Hidden in plain sight: The foundations and limitations of global governance and global goals. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 106, 103013. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2024.103013>
- González-Valencia, G., Sabater, M. M., & Fernández, A. S. (2022). Critical global citizenship education: A study on secondary school students. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, Article 867113. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.867113>
- Goyibova, N., Muslimov, N., Sabirova, G., Kadirova, N., & Samatova, B. (2025). Differentiation approach in education: Tailoring instruction for diverse learner needs. *MethodsX*, 14, 103163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2025.103163>
- Karatana, Ö. (2025). The effect of global citizenship education on nursing students' meeting sustainable development goals: A pre- and poststudy. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 64, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20250609-01>
- Kim, E., Min, S., Lee, S., & Kim, H. (2020). The achievements and tasks of the global citizenship education university course development project. *Journal of Education for International Understanding*, 15(1), 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.35179/jeiu.2020.15.1.33>
- Kolomiets, L. I., Shulga, G. B., & Lebed, I. (2021). Formation of social responsibility of young people in the process of obtaining higher education. *Society, Integration, Education*, 1, 292–305. <https://doi.org/10.17770/SIE2021VOL1.6417>
- Kruskal, W. H., & Wallis, W. A. (1952). Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 47(260), 583–621. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1952.10483441>
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1–55.
- Ludvik, M. B., Wills-Jackson, C., Eberhart, T. L., Mulholland, S., Bhansali, S., Nolan-Arañez, S., & Henline, J. (2023). Exploring the potential of mindful compassion pedagogies for global citizenship education and education for sustainable development. *International Review of Education*, 69(3), 275–297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-023-10009-x>
- Milana, M., & Tarozzi, M. (2021). Rethinking adult learning and education as global citizenship education: A conceptual model. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 13(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.14324/IJDEGL.13.1.04>
- Salvador-Desnacido, G. A., & Pecson, R. R. (2025). Juxtaposing the global citizenship competencies of senior high school and college students: Input for a contextualized learning plan. *Indonesian Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 2(2), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.61251/ijoe.v2i2.170>
- Spearman, C. (1904). The proof and measurement of association between two things. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 15(1), 72–101. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1412159>
- Stankovska, G., Dimitrovski, D., Memedi, I., & Ibraimi, Z. (2019). Ethical sensitivity and global competence among university students. *Bulgarian Comparative Education Society*, 17, 132–138. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED596917.pdf>
- Sullivan, G. M., & Artino, A. R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 5(4), 541–542. <https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-5-4-18>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48, 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tarozzi, M. (2023). Futures and hope of global citizenship education. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 15(1), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.14324/ijdegl.15.1.05>

- Tuazon, A. P., & Claveria, J. G. (2022). Global education and students' acquisition of global perspectives in social studies. *Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal*.
- UNESCO. (2022). *Beyond limits: New ways to reinvent higher education: Working document for the World Higher Education Conference*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2022). *Global education monitoring report 2022: Gender report—Deepening the debate on those still left behind*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381329>
- UNESCO. (2025, March 4). What you need to know about global citizenship education. Retrieved June 17, 2025, from <https://www.unesco.org/en/global-citizenship-peace-education/need-know>
- UNESCO. (2025b, July 22). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education*. GCED Clearinghouse. <https://www.gcedclearinghouse.org/resources/guide-ensuring-inclusion-and-equity-education>
- Van, P. T. T. (2024). Global citizenship education. *Conhecimento & Diversidade*, 16(43), 581–602. <https://doi.org/10.18316/rcd.v16i43.11984>
- Victa, L. G. B., Asuncion, J. A., Del Rosario, L. Z., De Castro, L. B., Buhain, V. I., & Henson, L. D. (2024). Lived experiences of social studies teachers in teaching global citizenship education in junior high school: A phenomenological approach. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 22(7), 772–785.