

# Impact of socio-cultural environment on global citizenship scale: The case of Chinese university students

Meng Sichen

(Received. October 7, 2022)

**Abstract:** The notion of global citizenship (GC) has been increasingly advocated for amidst the globalization process. Concerns have been raised about integrating global citizenship education (GCE) into educational practices; this has been very difficult in a collectivist society that values national identity. From a historical angle, Chinese universities function as potential actors that influence educational policy to develop personalized needs and foster responsible global citizens, while only a few outcomes have been recognized. In this dilemma, the socio-cultural environment (SCE) is addressed as an alternative to enable universities to make a breakthrough to visualize their efforts and adjust interventions for cultivating global citizens. In embracing the possibility of GC development, this study explores the impact of SCE in universities on students' GC development, considering demographic traits. A quantitative approach was used to analyze the relationship between SCE and GC development by measuring three factors (3Cs): the number of students who participate in subjects in the curriculum and co-curriculum, respectively, and their sense of community toward the university in connection with the global citizenship scale. The results indicate that the 3Cs were positively intertwined with students' GCS in general, while different impacts were observed among different dimensions of GC. Potential items—such as students' participation in subjects, including global issues—were not able to exhibit significance as expected, which implies a fairly inactive implementation of GC and the reflection process occurring among teachers and students.

**Key words:** Global Citizenship Scale, socio-cultural environment, Chinese university

## 1. Introduction

In the wake of global trend in developing global citizenship (GC), China was seen fallen behind despite its unique status in the process of global integration. Under the nationalism tradition, elements of GC were lost in curriculum and teaching guideline, making GC a deficient proposal in China (Song, 2016). Serving as one of the prominent “professional interest groups”, universities possess their autonomy to determine the prioritized task in educational network (Han & Ye, 2017). Despite lacking full integration of global citizenship education (GCE), some Chinese traditional values survive and even show a new meaning in response to a 21st century vision. The phenomenon aligns with the evolution of GC concept, that is drawing on the past where sustainable values continue to reverberate today, extending its content from a more contemporarily updated pool. Consequently, concerns on how Chinese universities expose students to the notion of GC naturally arose. Echoing the demand, an

---

This paper has been refereed.

alternative to developing GC in an unclarified GCE setting was addressed as socio-cultural environment (SCE) perceived by students, further conceptualized as their *sense of community*, number of students who participated in *curriculum* and *co-curriculum* activities on campus (Ferguson, 2013). The containing of these alternative factors demonstrated a potential in enhancing global perspectives, whereas its effectiveness on a GC framework remained to be examined. Global citizenship scale (GCS), a widely used measurement so far, may possibly showcase the overview of GC awareness of Chinese university students, the topic which has not been studied previously.

Against this backdrop, this study aims to explore the impact of SCE factors in universities on students' GC development, by asking 1) the state of GCS of Chinese university students, and 2) the impact of SCE perceived by students on their GCS.

## 2. Emerging global dimensions in Chinese Higher Education Institutions

China's educational reform initially embarked as an opening-up policy for economic growth. Over the last two decades, educational initiatives reflected on the international agendas with an effort to adapt to the demand of a globalized world. In 2010, a remarkable guideline, *Outline of China's National Plan for Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development (2010-2020)*, was released to portray future citizens in a Chinese context. It emphasized "persistence on competences" and interaction with the global world (Central Government of the People's Republic of China, 2010, July 30). It was followed by a concept of "core literacy" in 2016 which illustrated the skills and competence required in the 21st century. It explicitly stressed points such as "humanistic connotations, assuming responsibility, practical innovation, international understanding" and so on (Qiu et al., 2019). Education objectives were extended beyond individual and national development to an international society-orientation and were expected to be consistent with the GC qualities. Nevertheless, this attempt was only allowed under the premise that national identity elements are maintained. A tension between nationalism and globalization occurred and was exacerbated in educational practices from then on (Law, 2014).

Challenged by possible extreme nationalism and patriotism tradition, higher education was seen most likely to have room for embracing global elements comparing with other education levels. In the transition of *Education for Modernization*, universities started to serve as one type of "interest group" in policymaking process and more and more able to exert its influence on their professionalism and impendency of connecting with the market (Han & Ye, 2017). Chinese universities have undergone steady internationalization through a set of national projects. The "One Belt One Road" initiative started in 2013 has brought about great chances to introduce Western educational philosophy, curriculum and methodology for teaching and management in the interaction with other culture (Wang, 2017). Further encouraged by globalized higher education market, constructing universities of "Double World-class Project" was launched for quality improvement and ranking up to a world-class university or discipline. In effect, international elements proliferated in multiple ways among elite universities.

## 3. Literature Review

### 3.1 Approaches to GCE and challenges of the localization in China

Despite the increasing prevalence in developing GC, rarely any country has fully integrated it in its own education practice. A possible reason comes from the criticism on the contested concept of GC itself (e.g., Roman, 2003), leaving it up to for education practitioners to conceptualize and operationalize GC. Still, there has been a strong advocate for promoting GC-specified curricula globally. In practice, two approaches were suggested in terms of delivering GC in school curriculum: one is a "stand-alone" subject, or the use of clearly labelled course units within "carrier" subjects such as

history, geography, foreign language or religious studies; another is the reinforcement through other parts of the curriculum and process of schooling (EAA, 2012). A stand-alone subject for GC can be a challenge to some countries. It requires content design and teaching training for a full understanding of GC, whereas 97.4% teachers in Chinese secondary schools failed in teaching GC due to their unpreparedness (Feng, 2014). Implementing GC curriculum is difficult in a context where borderless elements were seen to be conflicting with local national identity. As Zhao (2013) noted, cultivating GC as an emerging theme on citizenship education in China was mainly used to strengthen the leadership of government. It resulted in showing precaution among Chinese authorities when it comes to GCE and stagnation in subject development. Meantime, integrating GCE elements into curricula was proved more applicable in educational frontlines. Nevertheless, the lack of articulation in syllabus, teaching guidelines and specific evaluation criteria allowed free discretion of schools and teachers. As a result, providing a globally expected GCE remained challenging and uncertain.

Lack in specificity of GCE doesn't necessarily imply that there has been no progress at all in China nor an undeveloped situation in terms of GC among Chinese students. Still, students are possibly influenced by traditional Confucian values and moral education to think and behave in a fashion that suits global citizens. In prior studies, this was mostly addressed in a way as "GCE localized in a Chinese context" concentrating on the ideological, political and moral education, and in parallel facilitated by a competency-based education (Hong, 2020). Nonetheless, concerns on "an assertive nationalism" (Song, 2016) and neoliberalism constrains (Pashby et al., 2020) make it hardly able to carry a full meaning of raising global citizens.

### 3.2 Education for GC through socio-cultural environment

Universities can function to "socialize students into the new national ideal of GC" (Zemach-Bersin, 2007), while the socialization of students doesn't merely rely on a sole program but a university as a whole (Whitley & Yoder, 2015). Traditional school education has its limits in developing GC, and consequently, interventions are taken in internationalizing the campus. In "Personal Investment Theory", individuals decide to which degree they will invest resources of time and efforts in a certain activity for a certain purpose while receiving external influences from individual interests and people around them (Kegan, 1994). University potentials in offering a "socio-cultural environment" (SCE) can influence students to invest in themselves, particularly interplaying with students' perceived ideas and pattern of behavior (Braskamp et al., 2006). To advance university education reform, SCE was characterized as one dimension describing campus characteristics, including *sense of community*, *curriculum*, and *co-curriculum* (3Cs) in relation with multitude student development (Braskamp et al., 2011). 3Cs value students' perspectives by investigating how they perceive campus characteristics and how they react. The introduction of 3Cs in China can mirror the impact of the incoherent intervention on promoting GCE.

Grounded on the framework of 3Cs, *curriculum* was explained focusing on promising courses and pedagogy employed by instructors; *co-curriculum* referred to experimental and participatory activities as to foster global citizen qualities, generally taking place outside the classroom. Topics in terms of each type of activity were initially presented in the work of Braskamp et al. (2006), while it has not been examined against a GC development yet. Furthermore, as some prior empirical studies revealed the impact of certain potential course-relative or educational practices on the development of GC (e.g., history and geography subjects, service-learning experience), curriculum and co-curriculum can serve as an appropriate approach to synthesize essential elements. Another key concept of *sense of community* contains a sense of belonging and attachment, besides members identify and share the same values within the group, while they can feel their group attractive and themselves influential to the group simultaneously (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Significant impact of SCE was presented using Global

Perspective Inventory (GPI) (Braskamp et al., 2011), a model widely utilized by leading universities in the US to assess their internationalization efforts. The item cluster in GPI corresponded to the nature of sense of community mentioned above, describing how students understand the university and to what extent students feel being encouraged and supported to develop their strengths and talents. However, GPI intermingled the “sense of self” (“do you consider yourself a global citizen?”) with “sense towards GC” (level of GC awareness) and thus problematizes its consistency. Moreover, GPI was simply created based on a preliminary understanding of GC. It focused on the overlapped domains with other existing areas such as multicultural and cross-cultural competency but did not include extensive original concrete topics. The lack of clarity of GC prevented to vividly portray a real state of GC in Chinese universities.

### 3.3 Global citizenship scale

Regardless of the disputed feature of GC, cultivating global citizens was integrated into many countries' educational policy throughout the world. Resonating with this popularity, efforts have been made over the years for obtaining measurable outcomes regarding GC in the Western culture, mainly led by the US and the UK. Morais and Ogden (2011) developed a framework to interpret GC from multiple dimensions. It comprises three overarching dimensions of *social responsibility*, *global competency*, and *global civic engagement*, including six sub-scales. The construct has been adopted from the prominent theoretical and philosophical literatures, reflecting on undergraduate international education. Named as Global Citizenship Scale (GCS), it has been used to describe students' GC traits, in connection with effects of study abroad or other international programs. Most of the past studies targeted students coming from a Western context, but a few from an Eastern context. Dissimilarities regarding GC studies by region were of high complexity varying from economic size, religion, or having a democratic tradition or not (Cox, 2017). Although there have been data accounting for Asian students, they were cultivated with a mixture of values that hardly can be categorized by initial nationality. Researchers based in Hong Kong tended to make progress on this concern. Lo and colleagues (2014 and 2020) explored the validation of GCS in a Hong Kong setting. Moreover, the work in 2020 targeting on a larger and relative diverse sample showed more validity for application. It also updated Morais and Ogden's work (2011) examining the impact of service-learning activities. Significant efforts were made for cross-cultural application, but Hong Kong is quite different from the mainland China's context as discussed above. Plus, the validation showed divergence in dimension structure of GC between datasets in Lo's study series. On the other hand, it revealed likelihood that GCS measurement can vary in different contexts, which raised the necessity to adjust for portraying expected targets.

## 4. Research Methods

Quantitative method was used in this study to explore the correlations between SCE variables and GCS. Other factors were controlled to identify the sole impact of 3Cs. A questionnaire was designed comprising three sessions: demographic characteristics, SCE factors, and GCS with the following particulars.

Curriculum and co-curriculum: to understand the curriculum situation, GC-relevant questions on curriculum and co-curriculum are included based on prior literature, such as Ferguson (2013) and Braskamp et al. (2006). The questions were posed in such a way as “How many have you participated in terms of this kind of courses or activities?” with options like: (1) I don't think it is provided by my university, (2) Course is provided but I didn't participate in any, (3) about 1~2, (4) about 3~5, (5) about 6~10, and (6) more than 10. In order to better adapt to a Chinese context, modifications were made by deleting items related to religions, considering their weak relevance in Chinese non-religious setting.

Sense of community: campus characteristics perceived were measured by six questions derived from GPI version 5 (Braskamp et al., 2006). The extent of respondents' endorsement to the statement was asked from 5-point Likert scale (1= "strongly disagree", 5= "strongly agree"). Question items were as follows: (1) I have a strong sense of affiliation with my university, (2) I feel that my university community honors diversity and internationalism, (3) I understand the mission of my university, (4) I am both challenged and supported at my university, (5) I have been encouraged to develop my strengths and talents at my university, and (6) I feel I am a part of a close and supportive community of the university and friends.

GCS: this study is grounded on the initial version by Morais and Ogden (2011) to portray the state of GCS for university students in mainland China. It contains three core dimensions including six subscales with a total of 30 items, on students' endorsement to each statement from 5-point Likert scale (1= "strongly disagree", 5= "strongly agree").

Regarding sampling, three anonymous universities (coded as UA, UB, and UC) based in Beijing were selected in terms of their leading status in the "Double World-class Project." Two of them (UB and UC) fall into the world-class institution objective, and another in the world class disciplines list (UA). Target institutions share a similar objective in fostering graduates to improve global competitive capacity. Additionally, the universities were selected from different categories to identify gaps generated by different campus characteristics. UA is a polytechnic university; UB covers comprehensive disciplines; UC specializes in foreign language studies. Questionnaires were randomly distributed to 149 undergraduate students from the three universities (50 from UA; 51 from UB; 48 from UC) in September 2019, with 144 valid responses (50 from UA; 51 from UB; and 43 from UC). Representativeness of the sampling in each university was considered in terms of participants' academic division, as a result, the three cohorts aligned respectively to the population construct of each university's category feature.

## 5. Result

This study involved 144 of student participants generally sharing an average distribution of gender (Female=54.9%; Male=45.1%). Among them, 23 come from rural areas (16%) and 121 from urban areas (84%). Most of them (N=127) are Han ethnicity, the rest (N=17) are from other minority ethnic groups. The sample population ratio of Han ethnic group (88.2%) is close to the national one (91.6%). Age of participants ranges from 18 to 24 and they study at Grade 2 to Grade 4. Due to the limited enrolment duration, Grade 1 students were excluded from the target group. Participants were also required to broadly specify their majors between Science and Humanities (Science, n=23; Humanities, n=121).

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted based on the original version developed by Morais and Ogden (2011) to analyze the validity of the system. Seven items were discarded in total. Items SR 1.2, GC 3.2, GC 3.3, GCE 1.8, and GCE 2.2 were successively discarded due to insignificant cross-loading. Then SR 1.4 and GC 3.1 were deleted for decreasing the validity. As a result, a five-factor model comprising of: *Social responsibility*, *Self-awareness*, *Intercultural communication*, *Involvement in civic organizations & political voice*, and *Global civic activism*, emerged in interpreting the construct of GCS in this study (see Table 1). Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value of overall content and each dimension were of appropriate level. The cumulative variance contribution rate of 64% indicated a good construct validity.

Table 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis Result of Global Citizenship Scale

Subscale item	Factor loading				
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
<b>Social Responsibility (SA) (<math>\alpha = .753</math>)</b>					
SR.1.1 I think that most people around the world get what they are entitled to have.	.727				
SR.1.3 I think that people around the world get the rewards and punishments they deserve.	.790				
SR.1.5 The world is generally a fair place.	.747				
SR.1.6 I think that many people around the world are poor because they do not work hard enough.	.642				
<b>Global Competency (GC)-Self-awareness (SEA) (<math>\alpha = .700</math>)</b>					
GC.1.1 I know how to develop a place to help mitigate a global environmental or social problem.	.841				
GC.1.2 I know several ways in which I can make a difference on some of this world's most worrisome problems.	.752				
GC.1.3 I am able to get other people to care about global problems that concern me.	.603				
<b>Global Competency (GC)-Intercultural communication (IC) (<math>\alpha = .695</math>)</b>					
GC.2.1 I consciously adapt my behaviours and mannerisms when I am interacting with people of other cultures.		.760			
GC.2.2 I often adapt my communication style to other people's cultural background.		.847			
GC.2.3 I am able to communicate in different ways with people from different cultures.		.735			
<b>Global Civic Engagement (GCE)-Involvement in civic organizations &amp; political voice (I&amp;P) (<math>\alpha = .932</math>)</b>					
GCE.1.1 Over the next 6 months, I plan to do volunteer work to help individuals and communities abroad.				.698	
GCE.1.2 Over the next 6 months, I will participate in a walk, dance, run, or bike ride in support of a global cause.				.742	
GCE.1.3 Over the next 6 months, I will volunteer my time working to help individuals or communities abroad.				.749	
GCE.1.4 Over the next 6 months, I plan to get involved with a global humanitarian organization or project.				.868	
GCE.1.5 Over the next 6 months, I plan to help international people who are in difficulty.				.843	
GCE.1.6 Over the next 6 months, I plan to get involved in a program that addresses the global environmental crisis.				.758	
GCE.1.7 Over the next 6 months, I will work informally with a group toward solving a global humanitarian problem.				.808	
GCE.2.1 Over the next 6 months, I will contact a newspaper or radio to express my concerns about global environmental, social, or political problems.				.720	
GCE.2.4 Over the next 6 months, I will contact or visit someone in government to seek public action on global issues and concerns.				.751	
GCE.2.6 Over the next 6 months, I will participate in a campus forum, live music, or theatre performance or other event where young people express their views about global problems.				.589	
<b>Global Civic Engagement (GCE)-Global civic activism (GCA) (<math>\alpha = .622</math>)</b>					
GCE.3.1 If at all possible, I will always buy fair-trade or locally grown products and brands.					.626
GCE.3.2 I will deliberately buy brands and products that are known to be good stewards of marginalized people and places.					.767
GCE.3.3 I will boycott brands or products that are known to harm marginalized global people and places.					.719
<i>Note.</i> $N=144$ . Item codes followed Morais and Ogden (2011). Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.					

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to know the impact of SCE factors on GCS. As shown in Table 2, five dimensions of GCS differed in being influenced by SCE factors. For *social responsibility*, 3Cs can explain 10.4% of the observed variation, while among factors the number of curriculum taken by students took a negative role in the model. *Self-awareness* can be explained by 3Cs for 9.2% and GPA was significant in raising the predictable rate to 11.6%. For *Intercultural communication*, 13.5% can be explained by 3Cs and the explanation rate went up to 25.1% when other correlated factors are included. Among the factors, sense of community, geographic location and being abroad experience showed statistical significance. For *Involvement in civic organizations & political voice*, 3Cs and age were able to explain 17.8% of its variants, while only co-curriculum was insignificant in the model. Lastly for *Global civic activism*, it can merely be positively explained by sense of community factor, while negatively explained by gender difference with the variation of 8.8%.

**Table 2: Result of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Global Citizenship Scale**

Independent variables	Social responsibility	Self-awareness		Intercultural communication			Involvement in civic organizations & political voice			Global civic activism
	Model 1	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1
<b>Socio-cultural environment</b>										
Sense of community	.183*	.077	.051	.268**	.188*	.236**		.137	.124	.265**
Curriculum	-.206*	.211*	.180		.225*	.133			.060	
Co-curriculum	.292*	.083	.098		.044	.052	.361***	.316*	.288*	
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>										
Gender (0-female; 1-male)										-.112
Age							-.176*	-.141	-.142	
Geography (0-rural; 1-urban)				.238**		.217**				
University (0-UA; 1-UB; 3-UC)						-.105				
GPA			.161*							
Income						.045				
Abroad experience				.265***		.244*				
<b>Model coefficients</b>										
F	5.418	4.741	4.581	13.773	7.278	6.505	13.400	9.924	7.515	6.798
Significance	.001	.004	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.002
R square	.104	.092	.116	.228	.135	.251	.160	.175	.178	.088

Note: \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## 6. Discussion and Conclusion

This article examined the relationships of SCE factors in university with students' GCS in a Chinese context by reorganizing it into a new five-dimension construct. Distinctive from the initial construct, *global knowledge* sub-dimension was deleted, and two sub-scales under *global civic engagement* were merged into one dimension. Although the high correlation with initial model supported the possible interpretation of GC in this study, differences from the previous cases reaffirmed the variability of GC in different contexts. The result also showed the complexity of Chinese students' performance in global competency: a higher level of intercultural communication ability does not necessarily mean a corresponding intention in expressing opinions on global issues. Students were more taught to be competitive in language having respect to other cultures but had less interest in the culture and history of other countries. For global civic activities, there was not any significant performance gaps in raising political voices or involving themselves in civic organizations. Regarding relationship of two variables, an overall result indicated that 3Cs had positive impacts on GCS, which was consistent with the Engberg and Davidson's finding (2016). Specific results emerged from three focused factors to identify diverse impacts as below.

Curriculum: Mean number of curricula related to GC topic taken by students positively accounted for the self-awareness and intercultural communication scale, while surprisingly negatively associated with social responsibility dimension. In particular, courses related to multiculturalism, foreign language, or involving students or teachers from different cultures were seen correlated with students' stronger awareness toward a global society, while not significant enough under the control of GPA. It seemed that students with higher GPA tended to have more confidence in knowing about the concerns and solutions to current global issues. Students' intercultural communication scale was found to have a closer relation with curriculum part. Particularly, contents of world history or geography had a stimulating impact, which reaffirmed the value of geography as part of GCE (Gaudelli & Heilman,

2009). On the other hand, contrary to other studies, no significant relations were found with regard to courses including contents of global issues. Participating in courses that highlighted GCE may raise the attention to global society and bring about expected outcomes of communication capacities in multicultural setting, while it was significantly constrained by certain status of students such as their academic score, urban or rural area education background, and an experience of being abroad. These suggested that the provision of course on campus was not intensive or effective enough to all students as to be a global competitive citizen.

Co-curriculum: Distinctive from the impact of related curriculum, a higher mean number of students who participated in co-curriculum had a positive impact on students' level of social responsibility and involvement in civic and political activities. It aligns with the study using GPI performed in the US (Engberg & Davidson, 2016). Among co-curriculum activities, students having participated in service-learning displayed a significantly higher intention to devote themselves in global civic activities, which corresponded to the prior literature (e.g., Larsen, 2014) and justified the value of service-learning in a Chinese higher education setting. Regarding correlational scope, students who attended a service-learning or a diversity-related event tended to have a positive relation with a higher level of social responsibility. However, for both dimensions, the role of each was not as substantial as service-learning despite a low participation rate. The dimension of *Global civic activism* embracing an anticipation for actions taken in local community was not significantly predictable by the number of co-curriculum taken by students as the dimension of *Involvement in civic and political activities* did. This effect gap on two dimensions indicated that co-curricular activities more focused on enlightening behavior intention towards political engagement in Chinese university case. The idea that significant local actions are connected with a global common good was not made engrained enough to most of the course participants.

Sense of community: Among 3Cs, sense of community was proved most active in influencing intercultural communication dimension. It was in accordance with Attfield's viewpoint (2002) on the acknowledgement of relevancy with GC, especially when the community refers to the network of relations of responsible agents. How students feel about their university determines the way in which they learn and interact within it. Statistically, sense of community can also predict a higher level of social responsibility. A strong sense of community embraced the shared objective and identified responsibility with university, so that an internationalization dynamism seen from the community level will probably elicit every active global engagement taken by individuals. The result also examined the likelihood that the existing sensitiveness to local community can expand to a global scope where social responsibility makes sense. While the impact on political engagement was not as strong as co-curriculum experience, global civic activism describing a couple of concrete local action was seen most likely to be explained by stronger sense of community. Besides, what universities can do could be overestimated since good significance found on the students' sense of community may be influenced by personality difference to some extent. This indirectly proved the existence of individual divergence in terms of citizenship performance.

Universities in China have displayed substantial roles in promoting GC identification by strengthening three SCE factors to realize how they anticipate their students to think and behave as a global citizen. Nevertheless, provision of potentially useful curricula or activities does not always ensure an expected learning outcome. Orientation in co-curriculum program impacts students' learning to a varied extent by organizational characteristics (Mayhew, Vanderlinden, & Kim, 2010). Universities are supposed to make qualified efforts to visualize their goal in terms of GCE among students and faculty members and keep integrating essential contents into students' learning experiences such as global issues topics and service-learning. Not only introducing novel diversity and internationalization elements, other existing courses and activities should be re-evaluated on their effectiveness. The



process requires strengthening the pool of capable teachers who are conscious of GCE as well as specific feedback investigation on students.

Although significances were shown on the construct of GCS and its relationship with the 3Cs, the validities did not reach an excellent level in statistic. As mentioned before, the existing studies in an Eastern context did not present a good consistency. This brings us back to the argument on GC which is hard to define and measure. Either attempt possibly makes the interpretation on GC divergent in different contexts, particularly between individualist and collectivist societies. It will then hold that any one-size-fits-all model would be inappropriate to draw a general conclusion, and the differences appear for a reason. In this sense, the construct shows its qualified validity in illustrating a Chinese style GC context. This accounted for why educational practitioners embrace the criticism while they keep upholding GCE.

This study employed the one-time data lacking the baseline information, and accordingly was unable to identify the change in unique university environment which is found to be significantly impacted by initial personality or awareness. Further investigation is expected to be longitudinal and focus on those who have a lower awareness before entering a university.

## References

- Attfield, R. (2002). Global citizenship and the global environment. In Dower, N., Williams, J. (Eds.), *Global citizenship: A critical reader* (pp. 191-200). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., Merrill, K. C., & Engberg, M. (2011). *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its purpose, construction, potential uses, and psychometric characteristics*. Global Perspective Institute, Inc., Chicago, IL.
- Braskamp, L. A., Trautvetter, L. C., & Ward, K. (2006). *Putting students first: How to develop students purposefully*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Central Government of the People's Republic of China. (2010, July 30). *Outline of China's national plan for medium and long-term education reform and development (2010-2020)*.
- Cox, C. (2017). *Global citizenship concepts in curriculum guidelines of ten countries: Comparative analysis*. IBE-UNESCO & APCEIU, Geneva.
- EAA [Education Above All] (2012). *Education for global citizenship*. Doha, Qatar.
- Engberg, M. E. & Davidson, L. M. (2016). Students' precollege engagement and the development of a global perspective. *Journal of The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 28(1), 49-70.
- Feng, J. J. (2014). The global civil society and the global citizenship education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 35(3), 6-14.
- Ferguson, C. W. (2013). *Factors contributing to students' global perspectives: An empirical study of regional campus, business, and study abroad students*. Miami University.
- Gaudelli, W. & Heilman, E. (2009). Reconceptualizing geography as democratic global citizenship education. *Teachers College Record*, 111(11), 2647-2677.
- Han, S. M. & Ye, F. G. (2017). China's education policymaking: a policy network perspective. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(4), 389-413. DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2017.1291998.
- Hong, Y. (2020). Do the conditions in Chinese secondary school education imply a need for global citizenship education? An exploration of six secondary schools in Jiangsu. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21(3), 455-472.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: the mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Larsen, M. A. (2014). Critical global citizenship and international service learning: A case study of the intensification effect. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, 4(1): 1-42.

- Law, W. W. (2014). Understanding China's curriculum reform for the 21st century. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(3), 332-360.
- Lo, K. W. K., Kwan, K. P., Ngai, G., & Chan, S. C. F. (2020). Evaluating global citizenship in international service-learning: development and validation of a short form of the global citizenship scale. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Service-Learning, January 2019, Hong Kong*, 12-17.
- Lo, K. W. K., Kwan, K. P., Ngai, G., & Chan, S. C. F. (2014). An initial exploration of the cross-cultural validity of the Global Citizenship Scale in the Hong Kong setting. In *1st International Conference on Service-Learning, Hong Kong*, 126-131.
- Mayhew, M. J., Vanderlinden, K., & Kim, E. K. (2010). A multi-level assessment of the impact of orientation programs on student learning. *Research in Higher Education*, 51(4), 320-345.
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(1), 6-23.
- Morais, D. B., & Ogden, A. C. (2011). Initial development and validation of the global citizenship scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(5), 445-466.
- Pashby, K., M. da Costa, S. Stein, & V. Andreotti. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, 56(2): 144-164.
- Qiu, Y., Lu, X. T., Fu, T. S., & Du, D. L. (2019). Analysis of China's core literacy research based on keyword clustering. *Creative Education*, 10, 1002-1022.
- Roman, L. G. (2003). Education and the contested meanings of 'global citizenship'. *Journal of educational change*, 4(3), 269-293.
- Song, G. (2016). Shifting global citizenship education: Broadening citizenship education through global events in China. *Asian Journal of Education*, 17, 81-105.
- Wang, J. S. (2017). New prospect of internationalization of China's higher education under the initiative of "One Belt and One Road". *Chinese Adult Education*, 18, 24-31.
- Whitley, C. T. & Yoder, S. D. (2015). Developing social responsibility and political engagement: Assessing the aggregate impacts of university civic engagement on associated attitudes and behaviors. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*, 10(3), 217-233.
- Zemach-Bersin, T. (2007). Global citizenship and study abroad: It's all about US. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 1(2), 16-28.
- Zhao, Z. (2013). The Shaping of citizenship education in a Chinese context. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 8, 105-122.

(主指導教員 吉田和浩)