

Empowering Future Global Citizens: An Integrated GCED Framework for Enhancing Cognitive, Socio-Emotional, and Behavioral Domains in Philippine Higher Education

John Clifford M. Alvero

San Pablo Colleges, San Pablo City, Philippines

Author Email: jc.alvero@sanpablocolleges.edu.ph

Date received: July 9, 2025

Date revised: July 29, 2025

Date accepted: August 19, 2025

Originality: 92%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 8%

Recommended citation:

Alvero, J. C. (2025). Empowering future global citizens: An integrated GCED framework for enhancing cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains in Philippine higher education. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(9), 383-390. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.564>

Abstract. This study examines the extent to which Filipino higher education students demonstrate Global Citizenship Education (GCED) competencies across the cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains. It proposes an Integrated GCED Development Framework to address identified gaps. Grounded in the Philippine GCED framework and aligned with international benchmarks, the research utilized a descriptive quantitative design involving 234 undergraduate students from diverse academic programs—a validated 280-item instrument measured self-reported GCED competencies. Descriptive statistical analysis revealed that cognitive competencies were demonstrated to a moderate extent ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.56$), with strengths in evaluating credible information but limited proficiency in synthesizing multiple perspectives and recognizing complex global interdependencies. Socio-emotional competencies were exhibited to a great extent ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.55$), particularly in respect for cultural and spiritual diversity, although global self-efficacy and sustained dialogic engagement remained underdeveloped. Behavioral competencies were displayed to a moderate extent ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.60$), indicating strong ethical awareness but limited civic initiative and advocacy involvement. These findings underscore a persistent knowledge-to-action gap in GCED implementation. In response, the study introduces a context-responsive, three-pillar Integrated GCED Development Framework—Cognitive Empowerment, Socio-Emotional Cultivation, and Behavioral Engagement—designed to strengthen global citizenship competencies among Filipino learners holistically. The framework emphasizes interdisciplinary curriculum integration, dialogic and participatory pedagogies, and experiential learning initiatives. By providing empirical insights and actionable strategies, this research contributes to the enhancement of transformative GCED in Philippine higher education. It supports broader goals of education for sustainable development, peacebuilding, and global solidarity.

Keywords: Cognitive, socio-emotional, behavioral competencies; Global citizenship education (GCED); Higher education; Integrated development framework; Philippines.

1.0 Introduction

Global Citizenship Education (GCED) has emerged as a key pedagogical framework for equipping learners with the competencies necessary to thrive in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world (UNESCO, 2021). As global challenges such as climate change, inequality, and sociopolitical conflict transcend national boundaries, higher education institutions have a critical role in cultivating students' cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral competencies to foster critical thinking, intercultural understanding, and civic responsibility (Massaro, 2022; Roussel et al., 2024; Lumb et al., 2019; Hackett et al., 2023). Across diverse national contexts, GCED has been integrated into university curricula to prepare students as informed, empathetic, and active global

citizens.

In the Philippines, the integration of GCED has gained momentum in the last decade, supported by curriculum reforms and capacity-building initiatives aimed at aligning national education policies with global sustainability and equity goals. Despite these developments, the empirical examination of GCED implementation at the tertiary level remains limited. Existing studies have primarily focused on frameworks and policy alignment, offering insufficient insight into the measurable outcomes of GCED integration across cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains.

Recent local research underscores this gap. Hunahunan (2022) observed that many higher education faculty engage in GCED-aligned teaching practices without explicitly identifying them as such, while Alvero (2023) found only moderate levels of student achievement in GCED competencies within general education programs. Magnaye (2020) highlighted deficiencies in students' critical thinking and self-confidence—core dimensions of GCED—while Andres (2025) documented the efforts of GCED-trained educators to lead advocacy initiatives, noting, however, the structural limitations imposed by policy and funding constraints. Collectively, these studies provide valuable but fragmented insights into GCED in the Philippine context, particularly at the higher education level.

On a broader scale, regional and international studies advocate for culturally contextualized GCED assessment tools. For instance, the Southeast Asia Primary Learning Metrics (SEA-PLM) emphasized the multifaceted nature of global competencies among Filipino students, while also revealing inconsistent inclusion of topics such as environmental sustainability (Bernardo et al., 2022). Without localized approaches to GCED implementation and assessment, initiatives risk remaining performative rather than transformative (Goren & Yemini, 2024; Massaro, 2022). Philippine pilot projects led by APCEIU and the Department of Education (2022) have developed instructional materials and strategies, yet systematic evaluations of their impact on student learning outcomes are still lacking.

This study seeks to address these critical gaps by empirically assessing the extent to which Filipino higher education students demonstrate key GCED competencies. Specifically, it evaluates students' ability to understand complex global issues, engage in respectful intercultural dialogue, and participate in civic actions. Anchored in both national curriculum standards and global benchmarks, the research offers a baseline analysis of GCED indicators across the cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains. The findings aim to inform the development of a context-specific GCED framework for Philippine higher education and to provide actionable recommendations for educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers. In doing so, this study contributes to the global discourse on GCED by advancing evidence-based strategies for meaningful and measurable implementation in tertiary education.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design, appropriate for systematically measuring and analyzing college students' global citizenship competencies across cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains. This design enables the quantification of self-reported data to identify prevailing patterns, competency levels, and potential areas for pedagogical enhancement. It aligns with methodological approaches previously adopted in global citizenship and civic education research (Yemini & Beach, 2021; UNESCO, 2022), where descriptive designs have proven effective for profiling competencies and informing curricular reforms.

2.2 Research Participants

The target population comprised undergraduate students enrolled in various academic programs within higher education institutions in the Philippines. A total of 234 students participated in the study. Stratified random sampling was employed to ensure proportional representation across year levels, academic disciplines, and institutional affiliations, thereby enhancing the generalizability of findings. Inclusion criteria required participants to be (1) currently enrolled in an undergraduate program, (2) at least 18 years of age, and (3) willing to participate voluntarily. Students on academic leave or with prior exposure to the study instrument were excluded to minimize bias.

2.3 Research Instrument

Data were collected using a researcher-developed structured questionnaire, containing 280 items designed to assess Global Citizenship Education (GCED) competencies across the cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains. The instrument's content drew from internationally recognized frameworks—including UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives (2022), the Philippine Department of Education's GCED Manual (2020), and validated scholarly instruments—and was culturally contextualized for Philippine higher education while maintaining alignment with global GCED standards.

Responses were recorded on a four-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 4 = Strongly Agree), with no neutral point to encourage decisive feedback. To establish content and face validity, five subject matter experts in education, curriculum studies, and global citizenship conducted independent reviews. Employing Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR) method, each expert rated items as "essential," "useful but not essential," or "not necessary". CVR was calculated to determine item retention, with items meeting or exceeding Lawshe's critical threshold (for five experts, a minimum CVR $\approx$ of 0.99) retained. The overall instrument-level Content Validity Index (CVI)—computed as the average of CVR scores from retained items—was 0.94, with an average item-level CVR (item-CVI) of 0.92, both surpassing the recommended benchmark of 0.80, indicating excellent content validity. Following expert validation, the instrument underwent pilot testing with 30 undergraduate students from a comparable institution not included in the main sample. The pilot phase assessed item clarity, comprehension, and overall usability. Participant feedback was incorporated to refine wording and format. Reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha produced coefficients of 0.84 (cognitive), 0.88 (socio-emotional), and 0.91 (behavioral), with an overall reliability of 0.89—indicating high internal consistency and supporting the instrument's use for large-scale administration.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, formal approval was secured from the relevant institutional authorities, including the deans of participating colleges. Data collection was conducted over four weeks using an online platform (Google Forms), selected for its accessibility, scalability, and compliance with ongoing public health protocols. Survey invitations, including informed consent forms, were disseminated via official institutional email lists and student organization networks. Participation was voluntary, and access to the questionnaire was granted only after electronic consent was obtained.

2.5 Data Analysis Procedure

Collected data were meticulously coded, cleaned, and organized to ensure accuracy and completeness. Descriptive statistical techniques were employed to analyze students' responses, with both the mean and standard deviation (SD) serving as primary indicators. The mean was used to determine the central tendency of GCED competency levels across the cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains, while the standard deviation provided insights into the variability or consistency of responses within each domain. This analytical approach enabled the development of a comprehensive descriptive profile of students' competencies, in alignment with the study's objectives. All interpretations were based on the pre-established four-point Likert scale, ensuring clarity and uniformity in evaluating the results. As the study was exploratory and descriptive, no inferential or comparative statistical analyses were performed.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

This study strictly adhered to international ethical standards for research involving human participants. Prior to participation, all respondents received an informed consent form detailing the study's purpose, voluntary nature, and guarantees of confidentiality. No personally identifiable information (such as names, student ID numbers, or contact details) was collected at any point during the data gathering process. Responses were anonymized and analyzed in aggregate form to ensure privacy and reduce the risk of individual identification. All data were stored in a secure, password-protected digital repository accessible only to the researcher. Throughout the study, ethical principles such as respect for autonomy, non-maleficence, and data confidentiality were upheld by the standards of the Declaration of Helsinki and applicable local research ethics guidelines.

3.0 Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics on students' self-reported demonstration of cognitive domain indicators aligned with Global Citizenship Education (GCED) in the Philippine context. The overall mean score across all six indicators was $M = 3.24$ ($SD = 0.56$), placing student performance within the category of Demonstrated to a

Moderate Extent (DME). This suggests that while students are engaging with cognitive aspects of GCED, there remains room for deeper integration of higher-order thinking skills.

Table 1. Summary of the Extent to Which Students Demonstrate Cognitive Domain Indicators of Philippine Global Citizenship Education (GCED)

Indicators	M	SD	VI	Rank
1. Recognize complex situations or problems	3.21	0.54	DME	5 th
2. Explain communicative contexts and respectful dialogue	3.28	0.55	DGE	2 nd
3. Illustrate connections from multiple perspectives and world views	3.20	0.57	DME	6 th
4. Analyze information from reliable and relevant sources	3.31	0.58	DGE	1 st
5. Evaluate appropriate actions, consequences, and implications	3.23	0.57	DME	3 rd
6. Formulate arguments through reasoning with evidence	3.21	0.57	DME	5 th
Overall	3.24	0.56	DME	

Note: 4.00 – 3.26 – Demonstrated to a Great Extent (DGE); 3.25 – 2.51 – Demonstrated to a Moderate Extent (DME); 2.50 – 1.76 – Demonstrated to a Low Extent (DLE); 1.75 – 1.00 – Not at all Demonstrated (NAD)

The highest-rated indicator was “Analyze information from reliable and relevant sources” ($M = 3.31$), which falls within the Demonstrated to a Great Extent (DGE) range. This finding indicates that Filipino students exhibit relatively strong abilities in evaluating the credibility and relevance of information—an essential competency in an era of digital misinformation and global interconnectivity. The next highest was “Explain communicative contexts and respectful dialogue” ($M = 3.28$), also within the DGE range, suggesting that students are moderately skilled at recognizing the role of communication in global and intercultural contexts. Conversely, the lowest-rated indicators were “Illustrate connections from multiple perspectives and world views” ($M = 3.20$) and “Recognize complex situations or problems” ($M = 3.21$), both falling within the DME range. These results point to relatively weaker performance in areas requiring integrative thinking and perspective-taking—core competencies emphasized in global citizenship education.

These results are consistent with prior findings in both local and regional studies. Bernardo et al. (2022) reported that while Filipino primary-level students were beginning to develop global awareness, they struggled to interpret multifaceted global issues and understand diverse viewpoints. Similarly, Alvero (2025) found that higher education students exhibited moderate proficiency in critical thinking and argument construction—patterns that mirror the current study’s moderate-to-strong performance in analytical skills but relatively lower scores in broader, integrative cognitive competencies. These findings underscore a critical implication for higher education pedagogy: while Filipino students are capable of engaging in evidence-based reasoning and information literacy—cornerstones of GCED—they require more structured opportunities to practice complex problem analysis, multiple-perspective thinking, and ethical decision-making. Enhancing these competencies will require curriculum designs that go beyond content delivery, incorporating experiential learning, dialogic pedagogy, and cross-cultural inquiry.

Table 2 displays descriptive results regarding students’ demonstration of socio-emotional domain indicators as aligned with the Philippine Global Citizenship Education (GCED). The overall mean score was $M = 3.30$ ($SD = 0.55$), which falls within the category of Exhibited to a Great Extent (EGE). This suggests that Filipino higher education students possess strong socio-emotional competencies that reflect empathy, respect for diversity, and a deep sense of humanistic values—key elements in UNESCO’s socio-emotional GCED framework (UNESCO, 2022).

Table 2. Summary of the Extent to Which Students Exhibit Socio-Emotional Domain Indicators of Philippine Global Citizenship Education (GCED)

Indicators	M	SD	VI	Rank
1. Acknowledge levels of shared identity and diversity: local, national, regional, and global	3.30	0.54	EGE	4 th
2. Communicate various perspectives through discourses and dialogues	3.23	0.58	EME	7 th
3. Show concern and respect for humanity based on human rights	3.30	0.57	EGE	4 th
4. Value humanity and the nation as the basis for identity and citizenship	3.34	0.54	EGE	2 nd
5. Commit to assume responsibility, mutual assistance, cooperation, and collaboration in various contexts in the world	3.25	0.54	EME	6 th
6. Characterize global mindedness and global self-efficacy	3.25	0.54	EME	6 th
7. Demonstrate respect for different beliefs and expressions of spirituality	3.40	0.52	EGE	1 st
Overall	3.30	0.55	EGE	

Note: 4.00 – 3.26 – Exhibited to a Great Extent (EGE); 3.25 – 2.51 – Exhibited to a Moderate Extent (EME); 2.50 – 1.76 – Exhibited to a Low Extent (ELE); 1.75 – 1.00 – Not at all Exhibited (NAE)

The highest-rated indicator was “Demonstrate respect for different beliefs and expressions of spirituality” ($M = 3.40$), highlighting students’ strong cultural sensitivity and spiritual tolerance. This result is consistent with

the Philippines' multicultural and religiously diverse environment, where spiritual expression is often integrated into personal and communal identity. Closely following was "Value humanity and nation as the basis for identity and citizenship" (M = 3.34), reflecting learners' dual orientation toward national pride and global solidarity—an essential balance in fostering a globally competent yet locally rooted citizenry. Despite the generally strong socio-emotional profile, the lowest-rated indicators—"Communicate various perspectives through discourses and dialogues" (M = 3.23), "Commit to assume responsibility, mutual assistance, cooperation" (M = 3.25), and "Characterize global mindedness and global self-efficacy" (M = 3.25)—fell within the Exhibited to a Moderate Extent (EME) range. These findings point to challenges in cultivating dialogic engagement, collective action, and students' confidence in their global roles and capacities.

Such limitations echo the findings of Quintana and Taac-Taac (2025), who observed that while Filipino learners exhibited strong values-oriented dispositions, they struggled to meaningfully connect with peers beyond local or national boundaries, particularly in articulating diverse global perspectives and engaging in cooperative problem-solving. The moderate scores on dialogue and global self-efficacy suggest that although Filipino students display empathy and intercultural respect, they may benefit from more structured opportunities to engage in reflective dialogue, collaborative learning, and experiential encounters with global issues. Taken together, these results highlight the nuanced socio-emotional profile of Filipino college students: grounded in human rights, spirituality, and solidarity, yet requiring pedagogical scaffolding to develop stronger dialogic, collaborative, and globally confident orientations. Addressing this will require reimagining instructional strategies—particularly those that foster intercultural exchanges, role-playing, and participatory community-based learning—to deepen socio-emotional engagement beyond values affirmation.

Table 3 presents findings on students' demonstration of behavioral domain indicators within the Philippine Global Citizenship Education (GCED) framework. The overall mean score was M = 3.23 (SD = 0.60), categorized as Displayed to a Moderate Extent (DME). This suggests that while Filipino college students exhibit foundational behavioral competencies aligned with GCED, these behaviors are not yet fully embedded or consistently translated into active civic engagement.

Table 3. Summary of the Extent to Which Students Demonstrate Behavioral Domain Indicators of Philippine Global Citizenship Education (GCED)

Indicators		M	SD	VI	Rank
1.	Demonstrate ethical and responsible behavior for a just and sustainable society	3.33	0.56	DGE	2 nd
2.	Conduct civic actions on global issues	3.20	0.59	DME	3 rd
3.	Act habitually based on respect and empathy	3.43	0.55	DGE	1 st
4.	Initiate actions about local, national, and global issues (e.g., advocacies for peace-oriented values, security, and stability) that can be taken individually and collectively	3.12	0.64	DME	4 th
5.	Design initiatives to advance the common good	3.06	0.65	DME	5 th
Overall		3.23	0.60	DME	

Note: 4.00 – 3.26 – Displayed to a Great Extent (DGE); 3.25 – 2.51 – Displayed to a Moderate Extent (DME); 2.50 – 1.76 – Displayed to a Low Extent (DLE); 1.75 – 1.00 – Not at all Displayed (NAD)

The highest-rated indicator was "Act habitually based on respect and empathy" (M = 3.43, SD = 0.55), which falls within the Displayed to a Great Extent (DGE) range. This reflects the strong internalization of pro-social values and relational ethics among Filipino learners, consistent with the high cultural emphasis on pakikipagkapwa (shared humanity) and communal harmony. Closely following was "Demonstrate ethical and responsible behavior for a just and sustainable society" (M = 3.33, SD = 0.56), further indicating a strong alignment with GCED's ethical dimensions as defined by UNESCO—particularly regarding fairness, sustainability, and accountability. In contrast, the lower-rated indicators—"Design initiatives to advance the common good" (M = 3.06), "Initiate actions about local, national, and global issues" (M = 3.12), and "Conduct civic actions on global issues" (M = 3.20)—fell within the DME range. These results highlight a recurring trend in global citizenship research: the discrepancy between ethical dispositions and active civic participation.

This behavioral gap aligns with regional findings. Bernardo et al. (2022), analyzing data from the SEA-PLM assessment, reported that while Filipino primary learners often express strong ethical awareness and global concern, their actual engagement in civic initiatives remains limited. Similarly, Nayle et al. (2024) observed that although student leaders in Philippine universities exhibit heightened environmental consciousness, their involvement in sustainability-related actions and advocacy remains sporadic and low in intensity. Such findings indicate a systemic challenge in bridging the affective-behavioral divide—where students internalize values like justice, sustainability, and empathy, but encounter structural, motivational, or contextual barriers in translating

these into concrete action. Addressing this requires institutional investment in pedagogical interventions such as service-learning, experiential education, community-based projects, and structured opportunities for civic engagement that move beyond classroom discussion to authentic, student-led social action. Ultimately, these results underscore the importance of embedding action-oriented GCED approaches within the curriculum, ensuring that behavioral competencies are not only taught but practiced, assessed, and reinforced through real-world application.

Integrated GCED Development Framework for Philippine Higher Education

This study addresses a critical gap in the implementation of Global Citizenship Education (GCED) in the Philippines by systematically assessing the extent to which higher education students demonstrate core GCED competencies—particularly in recognizing complex global issues, engaging in respectful intercultural dialogue, and participating in civic action. While the global GCED discourse consistently emphasizes the transformative role of education in cultivating informed, empathetic, and engaged global citizens, empirical data from the Philippine higher education context remains scarce, fragmented, and insufficiently systematized.

Drawing from national policy instruments—such as the Philippine Development Plan and the Commission on Higher Education’s GCED framework—as well as international guidelines developed by UNESCO (2021), OECD (2022), and the Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU), this study provides a baseline assessment of students’ cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral competencies. The results serve not only to identify existing strengths and gaps but also to guide the design of a developmentally appropriate and context-sensitive framework for advancing GCED in higher education institutions (HEIs) across the country.

Findings revealed that Filipino students moderately demonstrate cognitive competencies, particularly in analyzing reliable information. However, they struggle to synthesize diverse perspectives and recognize interdependent global complexities. Socio-emotional indicators reflected stronger performance, especially in areas related to empathy, cultural and spiritual respect, and a sense of belonging. However, efficacy in global dialogue and intercultural collaboration remained limited. Notably, behavioral competencies emerged as the weakest dimension. While students showed awareness of ethical responsibilities, they displayed relatively low levels of civic participation and initiative in global or local advocacy work. These patterns highlight a persistent “knowledge-to-action” gap that limits the transformative potential of GCED in the Philippine higher education sector.

Proposed Framework: A Holistic and Contextual Approach

In response, this study proposes an Integrated GCED Development Framework tailored explicitly to the Philippine higher education context. The framework is structured around three interdependent pillars—Cognitive Empowerment, Socio-Emotional Cultivation, and Behavioral Engagement—each addressing a specific domain of student development while responding to the cultural and institutional realities of the Philippine setting.

1. Cognitive Empowerment

This pillar focuses on developing students’ analytical, critical, and systems-thinking skills necessary for understanding complex global phenomena. Recommended strategies include:

- Curriculum integration of global issues through interdisciplinary, case-based learning.
- Digital information literacy programs that promote source verification and critical evaluation.
- Dialectical learning activities such as academic debates, policy simulations, and scenario analysis to build structured reasoning and global issue mapping.

2. Socio-Emotional Cultivation

This dimension targets the nurturing of empathy, intercultural competence, and global self-efficacy. Key initiatives may include:

- Interfaith and intercultural dialogues to foster mutual understanding.
- Virtual exchange programs with international partner institutions to support cross-border perspective-taking.
- Reflective practices such as empathy mapping and digital storytelling, which allow students to internalize global experiences and humanize abstract issues.

3. Behavioral Engagement

This pillar bridges the gap between ethical awareness and civic participation. It emphasizes:

- Service-learning courses anchored in community-based issues aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- Student-led advocacy campaigns promoting peace, human rights, and sustainability.
- Capstone projects focusing on local-global action in areas such as environmental justice, social equity, and conflict transformation.

Guiding Principles

The framework is guided by four foundational principles that ensure its relevance and applicability:

- **Contextualization:** GCED must be culturally grounded, integrating Filipino values such as *bayanihan* (communal unity) and *pakikipagkapwa* (shared identity).
- **Inclusivity:** GCED strategies must be equitable and accessible, particularly for students from marginalized or underserved backgrounds.
- **Transformative Learning:** Pedagogical approaches should prioritize student-centered, dialogic, and participatory methods to foster active engagement.
- **Institutional Integration:** GCED should be embedded not only in curricular structures but also in co-curricular activities, faculty development, and institutional policies.

Phased Implementation Strategy

To operationalize the framework effectively, a four-phase strategy is proposed:

1. **Phase 1 – Capacity Building:** Conduct training programs for faculty, administrators, and support staff to build foundational GCED knowledge and pedagogy.
2. **Phase 2 – Curriculum Integration:** Infuse GCED concepts across general education and discipline-specific courses, ensuring alignment with CHED's quality assurance indicators.
3. **Phase 3 – Experiential Application:** Institutionalize experiential learning through partnerships, service-learning modules, and internationalization efforts.
4. **Phase 4 – Monitoring and Evaluation:** Develop and adopt assessment tools based on UNESCO GCED learning outcomes and CHED evaluation metrics to track student competency growth and program effectiveness.

Toward Measurable and Transformative Outcomes

By generating empirical evidence and offering a localized yet globally aligned framework, this study contributes a significant foundation for transforming Philippine higher education into a strategic platform for global citizenship. It advances the field by moving GCED implementation beyond aspirational rhetoric and toward measurable, contextualized, and actionable outcomes. Ultimately, this framework aspires to cultivate a generation of Filipino learners equipped not only with global awareness but also with the agency and commitment to contribute to a more just, peaceful, and sustainable world.

4.0 Conclusion

The findings reveal that while students demonstrate moderate to high engagement across these three domains, critical developmental gaps remain. Cognitively, students show a strong capacity in analyzing credible information, indicating sound analytical foundations. However, limitations in synthesizing diverse perspectives and recognizing complex, interconnected global challenges suggest the need for enhanced critical and systemic thinking skills. In the socio-emotional domain, students exhibit a pronounced respect for human dignity, cultural diversity, and spiritual pluralism—affirming the relational and values-based foundations of GCED. However, their global self-efficacy and capacity for sustained intercultural dialogue appear insufficiently developed, indicating a need for deeper affective engagement. Behaviorally, while ethical awareness and empathic dispositions are evident, students show limited initiative in civic actions and advocacy efforts, pointing to a persistent gap between internalized values and externalized, action-oriented participation.

In response, this study advances an Integrated GCED Development Framework specifically contextualized for Philippine higher education. Grounded in critical pedagogy, transformative learning, and experiential engagement, the framework seeks to strengthen students' global competencies holistically. It underscores the importance of embedding GCED principles across both general education and disciplinary curricula through

interdisciplinary approaches that cultivate systems thinking, critical global literacy, and collaborative inquiry. To realize this vision, higher education institutions are urged to conduct systemic curriculum reviews and implement learning innovations that promote dialogic classrooms, ethical reasoning, and intercultural exchange. Experiential learning mechanisms – such as service-learning, virtual global classrooms, and student-led civic initiatives – must be institutionalized to bridge the divide between theory and practice. Equally essential is the continuous professional development of faculty to ensure the delivery of context-responsive, equity-driven, and pedagogically sound GCED instruction.

Moreover, a robust monitoring and evaluation system, aligned with both national indicators and international benchmarks (e.g., UNESCO GCED learning outcomes), should be adopted to measure student growth longitudinally across cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral dimensions. By establishing a baseline profile of GCED competencies among Filipino university students and offering a scalable, context-sensitive development framework, this study contributes meaningfully to the global discourse on education for sustainable development, peacebuilding, and global solidarity. Its insights are intended to inform institutional policies, instructional practices, and educational reforms aimed at cultivating a new generation of globally competent, socially responsible, and ethically grounded learners. In an era of intensifying global interdependence, such efforts are not only timely but essential for building inclusive, peaceful, and sustainable futures – locally and globally.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

This manuscript is solely authored by John Clifford M. Alvero. He independently conceptualized the study, conducted the literature review, designed the research methodology, developed the research instrument, collected and analyzed the data, interpreted the findings, and wrote the entire manuscript.

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

The author wishes to express heartfelt gratitude to all those who contributed to the completion of this study. Sincere thanks are extended to the participants who generously shared their time and insights. Appreciation is also given to colleagues and peers for their encouragement and informal feedback during various stages of the research. Special acknowledgment is due to the academic mentors and institutional support that provided the environment and resources necessary for the completion of this work. Lastly, the author is grateful to family and friends for their unwavering support and understanding throughout the research journey.

9.0 References

- Akçay, K., Altınay, F., Altınay, Z., Dağlı, G., Shadiev, R., Altınay, M., Adedoyin, O. B., & Okur, Z. G. (2024). Global citizenship for the students of higher education in the realization of sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, 16(4), 1604. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16041604>
- Alvero, J. C. M. (2023). Integration of global citizenship competencies in general education courses in a higher education institution in Laguna, Philippines: Basis for curriculum innovation. *Education & Learning in Developing Nations*, 1(2), 86–93. <https://doi.org/10.26480/eldn.02.2023.86.93>
- Alvero, J. C. M. (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>
- Andrés, B. Y. (2025). 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(1).
- Arviola, S. A., & Dellomos, C. O. (2023). Global citizenship education in the Philippines: Adaptations and innovations. *Human Rights Education in Asia-Pacific*, 13, 267–280. <https://tinyurl.com/mrx4znmw>
- Bernardo, A. B. I., Cordel, M. O., 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>
- Falame, M. R. F., Oliva, W. M., Perdiguerra, A. K. B., & Ada, J. C. S. (2021). Integration of global citizenship education competencies (GCED) in the teaching of intermediate English [conference paper]. IOER–IMRJ World Research Conference Across Disciplines, Batangas State University. <https://tinyurl.com/2hbn69tn>
- Hackett, S., Janssen, J., Beach, P., Perreault, M., Beelen, J., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2023). The effectiveness of collaborative online international learning (COIL) on intercultural competence development in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00373-3>
- Hunahunan, L. C. (2022). Curriculum integration of global citizenship education: A phenomenological inquiry. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 6(4), 2255–2261. www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd49826.pdf
- Lumb, P., Razack, Y., Arman, S., & Wugalter, T. (2019). "Innovating curriculum: integrating global citizenship and equity education for student success".
- Hoffman, J., Blessinger, P., & Makhanya, M. (Ed.). *Strategies for fostering inclusive classrooms in higher education*. International Perspectives on Equity and Inclusion (Innovations in Higher Education Teaching and Learning, Vol. 16), Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds, pp. 111–127. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-364120190000016011>
- 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>
- Militante, A. J. M., Ferrer, B. A., Anonuevo, B. M., & De Lara, R. B. R. (2024). Learning integration as a pedagogical strategy for enhancing higher education students' global citizenship competencies. *Journal of Social Knowledge & Education*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.37251/jske.v6i1.1222>
- Nayle, A. C., Tarroza, C. C., Lualhati, G. P., & Atienza, J. B. (2024). Level of environmental ethics awareness and environmental citizenship participation among Filipino higher education student leaders. *Community and Social Development Journal*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.57260/rcmrj.2024.267020>
- Quintana, M. L., & Taac-taac, J. L. (2025). Assessment of global citizenship education competencies among grade 5 to grade 12 students of Scuola Dei Bambini. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 31(7), 691–703. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14823284>
- Roussel, P. A. V., Ndongmo, G. K., & Picard, N. (2024). Global citizenship education in curriculum development: Perspectives from Asian universities. *International Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1(1), 20–27. <https://tinyurl.com/n98w99jx>
- UNESCO. (2021). Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives. UNESCO Publishing. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232993>
- Yemini, M., & Beach, P. (2021). *Internationalization and global citizenship: Policy and practice in education* (pp. 7–28). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38939-4>