

# Integrating Global Citizenship Competencies into General Education: A Basis for an Enhanced Curriculum Guide in Philippine Higher Education

John Clifford M. Alvero

San Pablo Colleges, San Pablo City, Philippines

Author Email: [jc.alvero@sanpablocolleges.edu.ph](mailto:jc.alvero@sanpablocolleges.edu.ph)

**Date received:** December 14, 2024

**Date revised:** April 11, 2025

**Date accepted:** May 3, 2025

**Originality:** 99%

**Grammarly Score:** 99%

**Similarity:** 1%

## Recommended citation:

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>

**Abstract.** Preparing students to become responsible global citizens is essential in today's interconnected world. This study explored how well Global Citizenship Competencies (GCCs) are integrated into General Education Courses (GECs) in higher education. Specifically, it assessed students' achievement of GEC learning outcomes, their awareness of Global Citizenship Education (GCED) concepts, the extent of GCC integration, and the acceptability of a proposed curriculum guide. Using a descriptive-developmental design, data were gathered from 310 students and 27 GEC teachers through surveys and interviews. Results showed that students had only a low level of achievement in GEC learning outcomes and limited awareness of GCED concepts. Teachers rated GCC integration as moderate, while students rated it as low, showing a clear gap in instruction and understanding. However, deans, curriculum experts, and faculty members rated the enhanced curriculum guide highly acceptable. These findings highlight the need to improve curriculum content and teaching strategies to integrate global citizenship education better. The study recommends adopting the enhanced curriculum guide to help higher education institutions prepare students with the values, skills, and understanding needed to face global challenges.

**Keywords:** Global citizenship competencies; General education; Higher education; Curriculum development; Student awareness.

## 1.0 Introduction

As globalization continues to reshape modern society, higher education institutions (HEIs) around the world, including in the Philippines, are prioritizing the development of global citizenship competencies (GCC) among learners (Nguyen, 2021; Massaro, 2022). These competencies aim to prepare students for academic success and active participation in global issues. They include critical thinking, intercultural understanding, empathy, collaboration, and respect for diversity – traits that help students become informed and responsible global citizens. In response to this need, the Philippine education system has begun integrating Global Citizenship Education (GCED) into the curriculum to promote these values (Hibanada, Dellomos, & Romero, 2020). However, the challenge lies in how to integrate GCED into lessons in a consistent and meaningful way. According to the Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding and the Philippine Normal University (2021c), practical teaching strategies are necessary for embedding GCED into classroom instruction.

The push to cultivate global citizens stems from the growing cultural diversity of local communities and the increasing interconnectedness of global challenges. Empathy, acceptance, and self-confidence must be developed

alongside skills like multilingual communication, strategic innovation, intercultural marketing, and diplomacy. These interconnected abilities prepare students for leadership and impact in fields such as commerce, governance, education, and social entrepreneurship. Developing these skills is essential for tackling economic inequality, discrimination, and global crises.

Despite growing awareness of GCED's importance, several barriers prevent its full integration into Philippine higher education. One key issue is the lack of a clear curricular framework. Bernardo et al. (2022) pointed out that no unified guide for embedding global citizenship themes across disciplines results in fragmented and inconsistent GCED delivery. Likewise, Maribojoc (2018) emphasized that the country lacks a national curriculum that defines specific learning outcomes for global citizenship, which makes it difficult for institutions to plan, implement, and assess related educational practices effectively.

This study addresses these challenges by enhancing the curriculum guide for General Education (GE) courses in higher education. It proposes a more systematic and cohesive approach to GCED, bridging gaps between subjects and aligning instructional strategies with desired global citizenship outcomes. By emphasizing integrating cognitive skills like critical thinking with socio-emotional traits such as empathy and cultural sensitivity, the enhanced curriculum guide seeks to develop learners' abilities to understand and respond to global challenges. The study also aims to support educators, administrators, and policymakers by providing clear, actionable guidelines. Ultimately, the goal is to equip students with the knowledge, values, and skills needed to become engaged global citizens capable of leading positive change in an interconnected world.

## **2.0 Methodology**

### **2.1 Research Design**

This research employs a quantitative, descriptive-developmental approach to assess GEC learning outcomes, awareness of GCED core conceptual domains, integration of GCCs, and acceptability of the enhanced curriculum guide. The descriptive design provides insights into targeted areas, supporting informed decision-making. These findings are crucial for crafting an enhanced curriculum guide that effectively integrates GCCs, enhances GCED, and fosters essential competencies among learners. Developmental research, focused on designing, developing, and evaluating instructional programs, is essential for creating effective instructional materials (Ibrahim, 2016).

### **2.2 Research Locale**

This research study is situated within an HEI in CALABARZON. It is a prominent educational institution offering diverse programs. The institution's commitment to academic excellence and holistic student development aligns well with the objectives of this research, which aims to propose an enhanced framework for the GE curriculum by integrating global citizenship competencies. Also, the institution fosters a culture of collaboration and engagement, allowing for meaningful interactions between learners, faculty members, academic heads, and curriculum experts. This collaborative ethos is crucial for successfully integrating global citizenship competencies into the General Education curriculum.

### **2.3 Research Participants**

A complete enumeration approach was employed for 27 teacher-respondents. Simultaneously, 310 college learners were chosen using purposive sampling from a pool of 1248 second to fourth-year students. Specific criteria were established for respondent selection: (1) learners who had completed GEC 1 to 8 without any incomplete remark, and (2) learners who were currently enrolled in the institution during the academic year 2022 - 2023. The dissertation evaluators from the different regions of the country were chosen through quota sampling. They comprised 10 academic deans, all of whom possess doctoral degrees, 5 curriculum experts who graduated with their doctorate degrees in Curriculum and Instruction, and 40 GEC teachers, all of whom hold master's degrees, some of whom have completed doctoral units, and a few of whom already hold doctorate degrees. Dissertation output evaluators came from different regions in the Philippines. Regions III and IV-A have the highest representation of Academic Deans. Region IV-A has the highest representation of Curriculum Experts. Moreover, Region IV-A, NCR, and Region XI represent GEC Teachers most. Jakob Nielsen recommends that a range of three to five evaluators is adequate (Wong, 2022).

## 2.4 Research Instrument

The first draft of the learners' questionnaire had four parts: Part I covered data privacy; Part II evaluated the attainment of GEC learning outcomes with 23 indicators; Part III assessed GCED core conceptual domains awareness with 47 indicators; and Part IV appraised GCC integration with 80 indicators. Likewise, teachers' questionnaires were composed of two parts, covered data privacy, and evaluated global citizenship competencies integration with 80 indicators.

Validity and reliability are crucial in research. A survey questionnaire was developed and validated by a panel of five experts, chosen based on their expertise. The questionnaire underwent face and content validity assessments and a reliability test. Feedback from experts confirmed positive face validity. Content validity was assessed using the Content Validity Ratio, and items with low ratings were removed. The V Index categorized the validity of items, and revisions were made to achieve a perfect Content Validity Index (CVI) of 1.00. The final draft of the questionnaires showed a high level of content validity.

The results of the V Index categorize the validity of an item or device. An index value  $\leq 0.4$  indicates low validity, while  $0.4 < V \leq 0.8$  signifies medium validity. An index value greater than 0.8 is classified as high or very valid (Retnawati, 2016, as cited in Prasetya & Hortono, 2020). Following expert validation, the questionnaires underwent pilot testing, during which they were distributed to a group comprising 30 learners and 5 teachers. The results of Cronbach's alpha for learners' questionnaire demonstrated a remarkably high level of statistical acceptability ( $\alpha = 0.984$ ), Excellent as depicted in Table G. Similarly, for teachers' questionnaire illustrates that the results for Cronbach's alpha were statistically satisfactory ( $\alpha = 0.908$ ), Excellent (StatisticsHowTo.com., 2021).

The final questionnaires, comprising 85 items for learners and 49 for teachers, were suitable for distribution and administered using Google Forms. The learner questionnaire had four sections, covering data privacy, GEC learning outcomes, familiarity with GCED Core Conceptual Domains, and integration of GCCs into the curriculum. The teacher questionnaire had two sections addressing data privacy and integrating global citizenship competencies.

## 2.5 Data Gathering Procedure

A formal communication requesting the names of learners who completed all eight GEC subjects was directed to the School's Registrar. The seven Academic Heads obtained the necessary permissions to initiate the study. Upon receiving approval, the distribution and administration of questionnaires were facilitated through using Google Forms. Follow-up communications were initiated through social media platforms to encourage a higher rate of feedback compliance and increase the return rate of completed questionnaires. Subsequently, the amassed data underwent a thorough collation, organization, tabulation, and review in preparation for subsequent stages involving statistical treatment, analysis, and interpretation.

## 2.6 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used; mean and standard deviation were utilized in determining the extent of attainment to each statement of GEC learning outcomes, the level of awareness on GCED core conceptual domains, the extent of integration of GCCs by the GEC teachers as self-assessed by teachers and learners, and the level of acceptability of the enhanced curriculum guide. The enhanced curriculum guide's acceptability level was evaluated using a thorough rubric. This rubric offers a systematic and comprehensive method to assess the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed framework and curriculum guide. It aids in informed decision-making and ensures seamless integration into the educational context. A heightened numerical value conveyed by the dissertation's output assessors, encompassing academic deans, curriculum experts, and GEC teachers, correlates with an augmented degree of acceptability of the dissertation's output. The indicators mentioned, including Integration of Global Citizenship Competencies, Coherence and Alignment, Pedagogical Strategies, Assessment and Evaluation, Resources, Alignment to Research Data, Completeness of Curriculum Guide elements, Impact and Outcomes, and Overall Evaluation, provide a comprehensive agenda for assessing the quality of the enhanced curriculum guide.

## 2.7 Ethical Considerations

This study is conducted strictly to ethical principles to protect the rights and well-being of all respondents involved in the study. The dissertation adviser has reviewed and approved the research design and data collection procedures to ensure compliance with ethical guidelines. Due to the sensitivity of the nature of the study, the identities and responses of the respondents were kept confidential. The study's respondents were assured that their participation would be voluntary and that they could withdraw at any point if they wished to. Survey questionnaire results were encoded without the names of the respondents.

## 3.0 Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Level of Attainment of GEC Learning Outcomes as Evaluated by the Learners

Attainment of learning outcomes in general education courses can vary depending on the specific course and institution. However, general education courses typically aim to provide students with a broad foundation of knowledge and skills across various disciplines. Table 1 details the extent of attainment of GEC learning outcomes. The overall assessment revealed that GEC learning outcomes were attained to a low extent ( $M = 2.37$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ).

**Table 1.** Summary of the level of attainment of GEC learning outcomes as evaluated by the learners

Variables	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Intellectual competencies	2.41	0.49	Attained to a Low Extent
2. Personal and Civic Responsibilities	2.32	0.48	Attained to a Low Extent
3. Practical Skills	2.39	0.50	Attained to a Low Extent
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>Attained to a Low Extent</b>

**Note:** 4.00 – 3.26 – Attained to a Great Extent (GE); 3.25 – 2.51 – Attained to a Moderate Extent (ME);  
2.50 – 1.76 – Attained to a Low Extent (LE); 1.75 – 1.00 – Not attained (NA)

Intellectual competencies received the highest mean score but still fell under the category of “Low Extent,” implying that learners, on average, feel they have not achieved these competencies to a significant extent. Personal and Civic Responsibilities followed, also categorized as “Low Extent,” suggesting learners believe there is room for improvement in these areas. Practical Skills received a slightly higher mean score but remained in the “Low Extent” category, indicating some perceived achievement, but not to a great extent. The overall mean score, representing the collective perception of all aspects, was categorized as “Low Extent.” This overarching assessment suggests that, when considering all learning outcomes together, learners generally feel they have not reached their desired levels of attainment.

These findings have important implications; this suggests that there is a need for a critical review of the curriculum and teaching methods to better align with the intended learning outcomes. It may also indicate a requirement for additional support mechanisms or resources to help learners bridge the gap between their current levels of attainment and the desired outcomes. Additionally, educators and institutions must engage with learners to better understand their specific concerns and identify areas that require improvement. This data should be a valuable tool for informed decision-making and guiding educational reforms that aim to enhance the overall learning experience and outcomes for students in the GEC program. The study's results are in accordance with the study of Peñalba (2020), which found that GEC exposes students to learning opportunities that harness their intellectual competencies, personal and civic responsibilities, and practical skills. Tadese et al. (2022) highlighted that gaining knowledge, attitudes, values, and skills through education is not a simple task but a long and challenging trip in life.

### 3.2 Level of Awareness of GCED Core Conceptual Domains as Evaluated by the Learners

Global Citizenship Education (GCED) aims to develop learners' understanding of global issues, intercultural competence, and their sense of responsibility as global citizens. Learners' awareness level regarding GCED core conceptual domains can vary based on various factors, including their educational experiences, exposure to global issues, and the pedagogical approaches employed. Table 2 particularizes learners' awareness level of GCED core conceptual domains. The overall assessment was ( $M = 2.33$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ), verbally interpreted as Partially Aware.

The Socio-Emotional Domain ranks first, indicating that learners perceive a relatively higher level of awareness in this aspect compared to the other two domains. This could be attributed to the emphasis on social and emotional learning within educational programs, which fosters an understanding of interpersonal relationships and

emotional intelligence. The assumption here is that learners may be more familiar with concepts related to their own emotions and social interactions.

**Table 2.** Summary table of the level of awareness of GCED core conceptual domains as evaluated by the learners

Variables	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Cognitive Domain	2.33	0.49	Partially Aware
2. Socio-Emotional Domain	2.37	0.50	Partially Aware
3. Behavioral Domain	2.29	0.47	Partially Aware
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>Partially Aware</b>

Note: 4.00 – 3.26 – Fully Aware (FA); 3.25 – 2.51 – Moderately Aware (MA); 2.50 – 1.76 – Partially Aware (PA); 1.75 – 1.00 – Not Aware (NA)

On the other hand, the Cognitive Domain ranks 2nd, suggesting a somewhat lower but still partial awareness among learners. This ranking implies that while students may have some understanding of cognitive aspects such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and knowledge acquisition, there is room for improvement in enhancing their awareness in this domain. The Behavioral Domain ranks 3rd, indicating the lowest level of awareness among the three domains. The assumption is that learners may have a limited understanding of how their behaviors contribute to global citizenship and ethical decision-making.

This assessment for all domains further supports the conclusion that, on average, learners are partially aware of the GCED core conceptual domains. This suggests the need for educational interventions and strategies to enhance awareness and understanding in all three domains. There may be a need to emphasize critical thinking skills and global issues to improve awareness in the Cognitive Domain. Addressing the Behavioral Domain might involve incorporating ethical decision-making and responsible behavior in the curriculum. Overall, the findings underscore the importance of comprehensive GCED initiatives to equip learners with a well-rounded understanding of global citizenship concepts across cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral dimensions. This assessment holds significant value as it signifies an initial step toward successfully integrating GCED into the educational framework. The uniformity in awareness suggests that educational initiatives promoting global citizenship have consistently reached learners across these diverse conceptual domains. This consistency is essential for learners' holistic and well-rounded development as global citizens. The observed uniformity also indicates that efforts to incorporate GCED principles and concepts are not disproportionately focused on one area at the expense of others. Instead, it suggests a comprehensive approach to education that addresses cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral dimensions. This bodes well for the overarching goal of fostering global citizenship, as it implies that learners are exposed to diverse skills and values essential for understanding and engaging with the complex challenges of a globalized world.

In conclusion, the consistent level of awareness across the conceptual areas underscores the potential success of integrating GCED into the educational curriculum. This foundation provides a solid platform for educators to refine further and expand GCED initiatives, ensuring a more nuanced and profound understanding of global citizenship concepts among learners. It also emphasizes the importance of maintaining a balanced focus on cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains to cultivate well-informed and socially responsible global citizens. Education has expanded to include non-cognitive learning involving values, attitudes, social and emotional competencies, and actions for positive change (APCEIU, 2018). Al-Ani's study (2022) found that the socio-emotional domain has the highest mean, with students embracing global citizenship and rejecting extremism, fostering sympathy for refugees, and becoming more independent in judgment. This progress towards global citizenship is vital (Al-Ani, 2022). Soriano, Ferrer, and Ferrer (2022) emphasize the importance of incorporating Global Citizenship Education (GCED) into higher education curricula, requiring knowledgeable and values-driven academic leaders. Conversely, Xiaoyong's study (2021) highlights that in China, GCED focuses more on cognitive than behavioral aspects, primarily educating about citizenship rather than through or for it. Global citizenship competencies encompass a range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable individuals to understand and engage with global issues, promote social justice, and contribute to a sustainable and interconnected world. By evaluating the current state of integration, this study aims to provide insights into the level of emphasis placed on GCED within general education programs.

### 3.3 Level of Curriculum Integration of GCED as Evaluated by Teachers and Learners

Table 3 summarizes the extent to which general education curriculum (GEC) teachers integrate global citizenship competencies in the curriculum, as assessed by both teachers and students. The teachers' assessments across

various competencies show mean scores ranging from 3.11 to 3.21, with the overall composite mean being 3.15, indicating a moderate extent (ME) of integration. The highest mean score was observed in "Respect for diversity/intercultural understanding" (M=3.21), suggesting that teachers feel confident integrating this competency into the curriculum. Conversely, "Critical thinking/problem solving" and "Conflict resolution" received the lowest mean score of 3.11, indicating a relatively lower integration of these competencies from the teachers' perspective.

**Table 3.** Summary table of the level of curriculum integration of GCED as evaluated by teachers and learners

Variables	Teachers' assessment				Students' assessment			
	M	SD	VI	Rank	M	SD	VI	Rank
1. Empathy	3.13	0.50	ME	4 <sup>th</sup>	2.40	0.49	LE	1 <sup>st</sup>
2. Critical thinking/ problem solving	3.11	0.50	ME	8 <sup>th</sup>	2.32	0.48	LE	6 <sup>th</sup>
3. Communicating and collaborating with others	3.17	0.52	ME	3 <sup>rd</sup>	2.37	0.49	LE	3 <sup>rd</sup>
4. Conflict resolution	3.11	0.50	ME	8 <sup>th</sup>	2.34	0.49	LE	4 <sup>th</sup>
5. Sense of security of identity	3.20	0.57	ME	2 <sup>nd</sup>	2.37	0.50	LE	3 <sup>rd</sup>
6. Shared universal values	3.13	0.42	ME	5 <sup>th</sup>	2.28	0.47	LE	7 <sup>th</sup>
7. Respect for diversity/ intercultural understanding	3.21	0.48	ME	1 <sup>st</sup>	2.33	0.48	LE	5 <sup>th</sup>
8. Recognizing global issues - interconnectedness	3.12	0.47	ME	6 <sup>th</sup>	2.27	0.46	LE	8 <sup>th</sup>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>ME</b>		<b>2.33</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>LE</b>	

**Note:** 4.00 – 3.26 – Integrated to a Great Extent (GE); 3.25 – 2.51 – Integrated to a Moderate Extent (ME); 2.50 – 1.76 – Integrated to a Low Extent (LE); 1.75 – 1.00 – Not integrated (NA)

In contrast, students' assessments reflect lower mean scores across all competencies, ranging from 2.27 to 2.40, with an overall composite mean of 2.33, denoting a low extent (LE) of integration. The highest mean score in the students' assessment was for "Empathy" (M=2.40), which was rated highest despite still being low. The lowest mean score was "Recognizing global issues - interconnectedness" (M=2.27), indicating that students perceive this competency as the least integrated into the curriculum. These discrepancies between teachers' and students' assessments highlight potential gaps in the effectiveness of teaching methods or the perceived relevance of these competencies in real-world applications. Addressing these areas may involve professional development opportunities for teachers and a continuous review and adjustment of the curriculum to meet the evolving needs of global citizenship education.

Global citizenship competencies are vital for nurturing engaged global citizens in our interconnected world. To enhance their integration, updating the curriculum guide to include them as essential learning outcomes and providing teachers with ongoing professional development and support is crucial. Partnering with local communities, organizations, and experts can offer valuable resources and authentic learning experiences. By actively addressing these challenges and implementing effective strategies, educational systems can better prepare students to be responsible global citizens who positively contribute to our interconnected world.

Teachers play the role of uniting the community and preparing young minds for future challenges. They are the transformation agents. Any modification in the societal needs comes with the adaptation in the teacher education content and their training. When teachers are imparted education of inclusive and emerging trends, they get equipped for the forthcoming trials and prepare their learners for the education related to living in peace with others, building tolerance, and appreciating the culture and their heritage (Durrani, Malik, & Jumani, 2019). As critical agents of Global Citizenship Education (GCE), teachers, as highlighted by Goren and Yemini (2016), determine how GCE is integrated into the curriculum and conveyed in classrooms. Furthermore, their perceptions of GCE influence the extent to which they consider this form of citizenship relevant to their students and schools, as Hou (2021) noted. Teachers play a pivotal role in guaranteeing the delivery of quality education. As UNESCO emphasizes, "the quality of an education system cannot surpass the quality of its teachers and the quality of teaching." UNESCO (2018) underscores the importance of teachers evolving into global citizens.

### 3.4 Level of Acceptability of the Enhanced Curriculum Guide

Table 4 summarizes the evaluation of the enhanced curriculum guide for GEC with the integration of Global Citizenship Competencies as rated by Deans, Curriculum Experts, and GEC Teachers. The overall mean scores reflect a "Highly Acceptable" (HA) rating across all groups: Academic Deans/Program Chairs (M=3.74), Curriculum Experts (M=3.82), and GEC Teachers (M=3.71). Among the aspects evaluated, "Integration of Global Citizenship Competencies" was rated the highest by GEC Teachers (M=3.85), signifying its alignment with



classroom needs. At the same time, Curriculum Experts gave equal importance to multiple aspects, including "Coherence and Alignment," "Completeness of Curriculum Guide Elements," and "Overall Evaluation" (M=4.00). Academic Deans/Program Chairs placed "Coherence and Alignment," "Completeness of Curriculum Guide Elements," and "Overall Evaluation" (M=3.90) at the top, emphasizing structural soundness.

**Table 4.** Summary table of the level of acceptability of the enhanced curriculum guide

Variables	Academic Deans/ Program Chairs			Curriculum Experts			GEC Teachers		
	M	VI	Rank	M	VI	Rank	M	VI	Rank
1. Integration of Global Citizenship Competencies	3.80	HA	5 <sup>th</sup>	4.00	HA	4 <sup>th</sup>	3.85	HA	1 <sup>st</sup>
2. Coherence and Alignment	3.90	HA	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4.00	HA	4 <sup>th</sup>	3.75	HA	3 <sup>rd</sup>
3. Pedagogical Strategies	3.80	HA	5 <sup>th</sup>	3.60	HA	9 <sup>th</sup>	3.70	HA	6 <sup>th</sup>
4. Assessment and Evaluation	3.50	HA	9 <sup>th</sup>	3.60	HA	9 <sup>th</sup>	3.55	HA	9 <sup>th</sup>
5. Resources	3.60	HA	8 <sup>th</sup>	3.60	HA	9 <sup>th</sup>	3.65	HA	7 <sup>th</sup>
6. Alignment to Research Data	3.60	HA	8 <sup>th</sup>	3.80	HA	6 <sup>th</sup>	3.73	HA	5 <sup>th</sup>
7. Completeness of Curriculum Guide elements	3.90	HA	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4.00	HA	4 <sup>th</sup>	3.73	HA	5 <sup>th</sup>
8. Impact and Outcomes	3.70	HA	6 <sup>th</sup>	3.80	HA	6 <sup>th</sup>	3.63	HA	8 <sup>th</sup>
9. Overall Evaluation	3.90	HA	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4.00	HA	4 <sup>th</sup>	3.83	HA	2 <sup>nd</sup>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>HA</b>		<b>3.82</b>	<b>HA</b>		<b>3.71</b>	<b>HA</b>	

Note: 4.00 – 3.26 – Highly Acceptable (HA); 3.25 – 2.51 – Acceptable (A); 2.50 – 1.76 – Not Acceptable (NA); 1.75 – 1.00 – Highly Not Acceptable (HNA)

The findings highlight several implications for curriculum development. High scores in "Integration of Global Citizenship Competencies" and "Overall Evaluation" underscore the relevance of incorporating global perspectives in academic programs. However, aspects like "Assessment and Evaluation" and "Resources," which received lower ratings (M=3.50 to 3.60 across groups), suggest areas requiring improvement, such as developing better assessment tools and resource support to enhance implementation fidelity. Addressing these gaps can fortify the curriculum's impact and efficacy. These insights advocate for continuous refinement and stakeholder collaboration to maintain the curriculum's alignment with institutional goals and global educational standards.

## 4.0 Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the integration of Global Citizenship Competencies (GCCs) in General Education Courses (GEC) in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) remains limited. Although instructors reported moderate integration, students reflected only partial awareness and understanding of the core concepts of Global Citizenship Education (GCED), revealing a disconnect between teaching efforts and learner experiences. This gap hinders the development of students' knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for active and informed global engagement. A key contribution of this study is the development and validation of an enhanced GEC curriculum guide, which was found to be highly acceptable among stakeholders. The guide aligns with the principles of GCED and provides a practical framework for embedding global citizenship content into general education subjects through relevant teaching methods and assessment tools. Adoption of this guide can support HEIs in preparing students to understand global issues, respect cultural diversity, and contribute to inclusive, sustainable communities. The study also highlights the need for real-world, experiential learning approaches, continuous faculty development, and institutional support to implement GCED in higher education effectively. Furthermore, establishing a clear and consistent assessment system will help institutions track progress and ensure ongoing improvement.

## 5.0 Contributions of Authors

John Clifford M. Alvero and Dr. Noriel Navita co-authored this manuscript. John Clifford M. Alvero conceived the research, conducted the literature review, designed the methodology, collected and analyzed the data, interpreted the results, and drafted the manuscript. Dr. Noriel Navita provided valuable suggestions and comments that enhanced the academic quality of this paper.

## 6.0 Funding

This research received no external funding from any agency.

## 7.0 Conflict of Interests

I declare that there are no conflicts of interest associated with this research.

## 8.0 Acknowledgment

Research endeavors are rarely solitary pursuits; the successful completion of this project owes much to the collaboration, assistance, and encouragement of many individuals. The researcher extends profound gratitude to God the Father Almighty for the gifts of life, knowledge, and wisdom that guided this scholarly undertaking. Sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. Bernardo C. Lunar, Dean of the Graduate School, for his unwavering commitment to excellence and visionary leadership, which have significantly elevated the quality of graduate programs. The researcher is deeply indebted to Dr. Noriel C. Navita, Dissertation Adviser, whose extensive knowledge, scholarly insights, and steadfast support have profoundly shaped the research. Gratitude is also extended to the Deans, Program Chairs, GEC teachers, and college learners who contributed to this study through their invaluable support and participation. The expert validators and dissertation output evaluators deserve special recognition for their meticulous review and constructive feedback, which significantly enriched the quality and reliability of the research. Finally, heartfelt thanks are due to the researcher's parents, family, loved ones, friends, and colleagues for their unwavering support, understanding, and belief. Their contributions, encouragement, and sacrifices were instrumental in achieving this scholarly accomplishment.

## 9.0 References

- Al-Ani, W. T. (2022). University students' perception toward global citizenship's knowledge, skills, and values in the Sultanate of Oman. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 11(3), 40. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v11n3p40>
- Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding & Philippine Normal University. (2021c). Technical report: GCED curriculum development and integration project in the Philippines (Year 3). Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/yv9nsaj7>
- Bernardo, A. B. I., Cordel, M. O., Il, Ricardo, J. G. E., Galanza, M. A. M. C., & Almonte-Acosta, S. (2022). Global citizenship competencies of Filipino students: Using machine learning to explore the structure of cognitive, affective, and behavioral competencies in the 2019 Southeast Asia primary learning metrics. *Education Sciences*, 12(8), 547. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12080547>
- Durrani, R., Malik, S., & Jumani, N. B. (2019). Education for sustainable development (Esd) in pre-service teachers education curriculum at pakistan: Current status and future directions. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, 5(2), 67–84. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1266665>
- Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2016). Global citizenship education in context: Teacher perceptions at an international school and a local israeli school. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 46(5), 832–853. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2015.1111752>
- Hibanada, R. R., Dellomos, C. O., & Romero, R. C. (2016). PISA global competence framework vis-a-vis Philippine 2016 K to 12 curricula in social studies and values education. In M. U. Balagtas & M. C. Montealegre (Eds.), *Challenges of PISA: The PNU report* (pp. 142–193). Philippine Normal University & Rex Institute for Student Excellence, Inc.
- Hou, Y. (2021). Enhancing teachers' role in global citizenship education (GCE): Compare the approaches of UNESCO and Oxfam in preparing GCE teachers. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/yc7kmyyz>
- Ibrahim, A. A. (2016). Definition purpose and procedure of developmental research: An analytical review. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ARIASS/2016/30478>
- Maribojoc, J. G. (2018). The Philippines: Global citizenship education (GCED) and education for sustainable development (ESD) in basic education. In 2018 Asia Pacific Regional Global Citizenship Education Network Meeting. UNESCO.
- Massaro, V. R. (2022). Global citizenship development in higher education institutions: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 6(1), 98–114. <https://doi.org/10.5038/2577-509X.6.1.1124>
- Nguyen, M. T. (2021). Validating a scale for measuring students' perspectives towards global citizenship: A case at a private university in Vietnam. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 4(3). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1318825.pdf>
- Nunez, I. (2019). *Aprendizaje-servicio y rendimiento académico del alumnado universitario: La evaluación de un programa* (Doctoral dissertation). Universidade Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
- Peñalba, E. H., Samaniego, C. R. C., & Romero, S. M. A. (2020). Digital storytelling: A tool for promoting historical understanding among college students. *Research in Learning Technology*, 28. <https://doi.org/10.25304/rlt.v28.2348>
- Prasetya, Y., & Hartono. (2020). The characteristics of mathematical material deepening test for the national examination of junior high school. *Journal of Physics Conference Series*, 1581(1), 012022. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1581/1/012022>
- Retnawati, H. (2016). Proving content validity of self-regulated learning scale (The comparison of Aiken index and expanded Gregory index). *Research and Evaluation in Education*, 2(2), 155–164. <https://doi.org/10.21831/reid.v2i2.11029>
- Soriano, D. Jr., Ferrer, C., & Ferrer, J. (2022). International academic leaders' cognitive representations of global citizenship education in the higher education curriculum. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4242679>
- Tadese, M., Yeshaneh, A., & Mulu, G. B. (2022). Determinants of good academic performance among university students in Ethiopia: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Medical Education*, 22, 395. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03461-0>
- Wong, E. (2022). Heuristic evaluation: How to conduct a heuristic evaluation. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/h9xj7h5x>
- Xiaoyong, Z. (2021). Global citizenship education in school curricula: A Chinese perspective. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science*, 9(4), 40–60. <https://ijlass.org/articles/9.4.6.40-60.pdf>