

The Perceptions of Undergraduate Students in Southern Thailand Regarding Global Citizenship

การรับรู้ของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรีในภาคใต้ของประเทศไทยเกี่ยวกับความเป็นพลเมืองโลก

Huynh Van Hien^{}, Kevin John Laws^{**}, and Noppakao Naphathalung^{***}*

Receiving Date: Jul 5, 2024 Revising Date: Sep 12, 2024 Accepting Date: Sep 17, 2024

Abstract

Global citizenship, a concept that basically reflects the interconnectedness and collective responsibility, has been remarkably attracting the attention of both the public and academic circles (Biccum, 2020). While there have been a number of studies related to global citizenship and global citizenship education (Habibah & Saproyah, 2021), those focusing on the perceptions of certain groups of people in some particular regions are still modest. This study explored the perceptions of final-year undergraduate students in southern Thailand regarding cosmopolitan and advocacy global citizenship, with cosmopolitan-type global citizenship including political, moral, economic and cultural considerations; and advocacy-type global citizenship including social, critical, environmental, and spiritual features (Oxley & Morris, 2013). The research involved 141 students in a university in Songkhla, Thailand. The survey utilized a questionnaire modified from that of the Development Educational Professionals in Southeast Asia (Laws & Thanosawan, 2018), which was built in light of the typology of Oxley and Morris (2013). The questionnaire consisted of 27 items categorized into the two types - cosmopolitan and advocacy - of global citizenship. The results revealed that students in southern Thailand exhibited high perceptions of both types of global citizenship, with a stronger inclination towards the cosmopolitan type. These findings suggest that while students are receptive to cultural exchange and global cooperation, it is recommended that their engagement with the activist

^{*} International College, Thaksin University, 140 Moo 4, Tambon Khoa-Roob-Chang, Muang Songkhla 90000, Thailand; Corresponding author, Email: hvhien@ctu.edu.vn

^{**} Sydney School of Education and Social Work, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

^{***} Faculty of Education, Thaksin University, 140, Moo 4, Tambon Khoa-Roob-Chang, Muang Songkhla 90000, Thailand

dimensions of global citizenship be enhanced. This study contributes to the existing body of research on global citizenship and emphasizes the importance of fostering a balanced approach that integrates both cosmopolitan and advocacy elements.

Keywords: Global citizenship, Cosmopolitan, Advocacy, Undergraduate students, Southern Thailand

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยเรื่องนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาความเห็นหรือมุมมองของนักศึกษาในภาคใต้ของประเทศไทยเกี่ยวกับแนวคิดของการเป็นพลเมืองโลก (Global Citizenship) ซึ่งคำว่า พลเมืองโลก (Global Citizenship) เป็นแนวคิดที่สะท้อนถึงความเชื่อมโยงและความรับผิดชอบร่วมกันของคนทุกคนที่อยู่บนโลก โดยตลอดเวลาที่ผ่านมาแนวคิดนี้ได้รับความสนใจอย่างมากจากสาธารณชนและวงการวิชาการ (Biccum, 2020) แม้ว่าจะมีงานวิจัยที่เกี่ยวข้องกับพลเมืองโลก (Global Citizenship) และการศึกษาเรื่องพลเมืองโลก (global citizenship education) เป็นจำนวนมาก (Habibah & Saproyah, 2021) แต่การศึกษาเกี่ยวกับการมุ่งเน้นการรับรู้ของกลุ่มคนบางกลุ่มในบางภูมิภาคเกี่ยวกับพลเมืองโลกยังมีจำกัด โดยการศึกษาครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสำรวจการรับรู้ของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรีชั้นปีสุดท้ายในภาคใต้ของประเทศไทย เกี่ยวกับพลเมืองโลกแบบ cosmopolitan และพลเมืองโลกแบบ advocacy โดยพลเมืองโลกแบบ cosmopolitan ครอบคลุมการพิจารณาด้านการเมือง ศิลปกรรม เศรษฐกิจ และวัฒนธรรม ส่วนพลเมืองโลกแบบ advocacy ครอบคลุมคุณลักษณะด้านสังคม การวิพากษ์วิจารณ์ สิ่งแวดล้อม และจิตวิญญาณ (Oxley & Morris, 2013) การวิจัยนี้ได้ทำการสำรวจนักศึกษาจำนวน 141 คนจากมหาวิทยาลัยในจังหวัดสงขลา ประเทศไทย โดยใช้แบบสอบถามที่ปรับมาจากของ The Development Educational Professionals in Southeast Asia (Laws & Thanosawan, 2018) ซึ่งถูกพัฒนาขึ้นตามรูปแบบของ Oxley และ Morris (2013) ทั้งนี้แบบสอบถามประกอบด้วยคำถามจำนวน 27 ข้อที่จัดแบ่งออกเป็นสองประเภท ได้แก่ ความเป็นพลเมืองโลกแบบ cosmopolitan และ ความเป็นพลเมืองโลกแบบ advocacy ผลการศึกษาพบว่านักศึกษาในภาคใต้ของประเทศไทยมีความรับรู้สูงเกี่ยวกับพลเมืองโลกทั้งสองประเภท โดยมีแนวโน้มที่สูงกว่าไปทางประเภทพลเมืองโลกแบบ cosmopolitan ผลการศึกษานี้ชี้ให้เห็นว่า แม้นักศึกษาจะมีจิตใจเปิดกว้างต่อการแลกเปลี่ยนทางวัฒนธรรมและความร่วมมือระดับโลก แต่ควรเพิ่มการมีส่วนร่วมของพวกเขาในมิติของนักเรียนในเรื่องความเป็นพลเมืองโลกให้มากขึ้นและประโยชน์ที่สำคัญของงานวิจัยนี้คือการเพิ่มพูนความรู้เกี่ยวกับพลเมืองโลกและเน้นความสำคัญของการส่งเสริมแนวทางที่มีความสมดุลซึ่งรวมทั้งองค์ประกอบของ พลเมืองโลกแบบ cosmopolitan และพลเมืองโลกแบบ advocacy

คำสำคัญ: พลเมืองโลก, พลเมืองโลกแบบ cosmopolitan, พลเมืองโลกแบบ advocacy, นักศึกษาปริญญาตรี, ภาคใต้ของประเทศไทย

1. Introduction

Global citizenship is increasingly gaining recognition in the public as well as in academic circles (Biccum, 2020). The notion, which may trace its roots back to around 450 BC, in Socrates' philosophy (Bowden, 2003), promotes a sense of belonging to a global community and a commitment to collective responsibility, social justice, human rights, and environmental sustainability at local, regional and global levels (Catalano, 2013; Habibah & Sapriyah, 2021). Despite its popularity in the public and in the studies of a wide range of disciplines, the definition and the scope of global citizenship has remained contested, complex and diverse (Catalano, 2013), depending on the perspectives and interpretations of scholars and organizations. Accompanying global citizenship is global citizenship education, which is gaining more and more popularity in the curricular of many countries worldwide as a need to increase students' awareness of the world in which the interconnectedness of people with a diversity of culture is on the increase, contributing to students' identification as global citizens (Osiaacz, 2018; Reysen et al., 2012).

While there have been a number of studies related to global citizenship and global citizenship education (Habibah & Sapriyah, 2021), those focusing on the perceptions of certain groups of people in some particular regions are still modest. This study explored the perceptions of final-year undergraduate students in Southern Thailand regarding cosmopolitan and advocacy global citizenship (Oxley & Morris, 2013). The study was conducted in early 2020 at a university which was referred to as Southern University (fictitious name) in Songkhla, Thailand. The university was selected mainly because it promoted student's competences for social innovations, which is very close to the reason why this study is conducted.

Southern Thailand, where Southern University is located, is geographically the smallest region of Thailand, contributing approximately 14 percent of the nation's land (Ouyyanont, 2017) with 14 provinces (National Statistical Office, 2023). Some account of history shows that this region is about 25,000 years old (Wangkumhang et al., 2013). The current largest city of the region is Hat Yai, an important international trade center, especially with Malaysia (Hafner et al., 2024). This is a multicultural region where different ethnic groups including Thai, Malay and Chinese communities live together, shaping a dynamic society. With approximately 1.8 million Muslims, the region has two-fifths of the total number of this ethnic group of the whole nation (Scupin, 2013). It is also a place influenced by the

philosophy, ideologies and teaching of a variety of religions, especially Buddhism, Islam, and Muslim, which promote loving, harmony, charity and interconnectedness (Ouyyanont, 2017).

2. Objectives

This study aimed to identify undergraduate students' perceptions of global citizenship of two types – cosmopolitan and advocacy; and to learn whether they regard themselves as more cosmopolitan or advocacy global citizens. The findings from the study will contribute to literature about perceptions of students in a particular region with regard to global citizenship. In particular, this study looks for the answers to the following two research questions: (1) What are Southern Thailand undergraduate students' perceptions of global citizenship?, and (2). Do Southern Thailand undergraduate students perceive themselves more strongly as cosmopolitan or as advocacy global citizens?

3. Literature Review

3.1 Definitions of global citizenship

Studying about global citizenship is one of the priorities worldwide because the world is growing more and more interconnected and varied (Torres, 2017). Even though the concept of global citizenship has been used so frequently in many different fields, a mature and clear definition has remained elusive (Morais & Ogden, 2011; Torres, 2017; UNESCO, 2017). The first part of the literature review briefly discusses some of the definitions of the term.

Considering global citizenship a non-legal status and as an ethos or metaphor, UNESCO (2017) stated: “Being a framework for collective action, global citizenship can, and is expected to, generate actions and engagement among, and for, its members through civic actions to promote a better world and future” (para. 4). This emphasizes the role of global citizens. Similarly, Davies (2006), and Stromquist (2009) agreed that global citizenship is a metaphorical notion and it differs from national citizenship as it lacks formal regulation and legal status.

Oxfam (n.d.) suggested that global citizens should have good awareness and understanding of their own community and the world, and be willing to cooperate with people in their own place or in the world to make the earth a place of peace, sustainability and fairness.

Thanosawan and Laws (2013) recommended that each individual should understand both local and global issues, and that individuals can hold multiple levels of citizenships simultaneously.

Schattle (2008), and Bosio and Terres (2019) added that global citizenship also involves understanding interconnectedness and advocating for cultural and immaterial values such as global peace, spirit and solidarity.

Overall, in most of the definitions, even though different organizations and scholars have looked at different roles and responsibilities of citizenship, it is agreed that global citizenship is not a legal status, and each global citizen should have awareness and responsibilities beyond their communities and their nations to the global scale society.

From the above discussion of the definitions of this contested term, we suggest that global citizenship refers to a sense of belonging that goes beyond a local, regional and national boundary into a worldwide community, and a recognition of interdependence among countries, cultures, economies, ecosystems and other aspects of the world. Global citizenship is a metaphor, embracing collective responsibility to positively contribute to the global society. Global citizenship also encompasses a commitment to human rights, cultural sensitivity, and a willingness to take individual or collective action for the common good. A global citizen, then, is someone who understands their place and role in the wider world, actively taking actions in their community and collaborating with others to promote a peaceful, sustainable, and fair world.

3.2 Types of global citizenship

Oxley and Morris (2013) constructed a typology to identify and distinguish the diversity of conceptions of global citizenship. The typology, which is “an integrative and extensive model that reveals overarching themes” (Goren & Yemini, 2017, p. 171), consists of two major categories; namely, cosmopolitan global citizenship, and advocacy global citizenship. “Cosmopolitan” used in this typology is from the term “cosmopolitanism” which had the origin in Ancient Greek with “cosmos” meaning universe or the world, and advocacy global citizenship, according to Goren and Yemini (2017), is “more critical, action-based” (p. 171). Cosmopolitan global citizenship includes four distinct conceptions. (1) Political global citizenship emphasizes the relationships of the individuals and the state and other polities. (2) Moral global citizenship focuses on individuals and groups’ ethical positioning with an emphasis on topics such as human rights. (3) Economic global citizenship concentrates on interactions between power and different forms of capital, labor, resources and human

conditions, frequently featured as international development. (4) Cultural global citizenship highlights the symbols unifying or dividing members of societies, particularly emphasizing the globalization of arts, media, languages, sciences and technologies. Advocacy global citizenship consists of four types. (1) Social global citizenship focusses on the interrelationships between individuals and groups, and their promotion of global civil society. (2) Critical global citizenship emphasizes addressing issues as results of inequalities and oppression, based on critique of social norms, promoting action to improve the lives of marginalized groups, particularly through “post-colonial agenda” (p. 306). (3) Environmental global citizenship promotes changes in humans’ action in relation with the natural environment, usually referred to as sustainable development agenda. (4) Spiritual global citizenship focusses on the intangible and non-scientific aspects of human relationships, encouraging caring, loving, spirituality and emotions.

Pashby et al. (2020) stated that many studies “do not distinguish between global citizenship and global citizenship education” (p. 148), and provided a comparison of nine typologies published from 2006 and 2018, in which these two terms are sometimes not clearly distinguished. The current study utilizes the typology generated by Oxley and Morris (2013). The main reason for choosing this typology is because it proves to be “the most comprehensive taxonomy to date” (Goren & Yemini, 2017, p. 170), covering all major aspects of global citizenship. There have not been sound definitions for the two concepts. However, from the existing literature, it can be inferred that cosmopolitan global citizenship emphasizes human rights, shared global values, focusing on ethical responsibilities and global solidarity; and advocacy global citizenship highlights a more action-oriented dimension, addressing specific issues.

3.3 Studies on global citizenship

Research into globalization and global citizenship has been paying much attention to global citizenship education, which has become a priority in policy making and education worldwide (Torres, 2017). Goren and Yemini (2017) commented that while national citizenship education remains fundamental in formal education, global citizenship education has been integrated in the curricular contents transnationally, emphasizing global competences and global consciousness. The contents of global citizenship education aim to equip and prepare students for global awareness (ethical values) and global skills (economic competences), for global prosperity, goodwill, and human rights, and to encourage students to perceive themselves as members of a global community, acting for the benefits of the

globe (Dill, 2013); to highlight the importance of respecting diverse cultural perspectives in order to develop ethical intercultural communication (Flammia, 2017), and expand students' perspectives and instill prosocial values (Reysen et al., 2012).

In Thailand, the educational system is adapting to and address the shifting dynamics of global changes (EduBright Resources, 2018). The Thailand Ministry of Education established agenda for formatting global citizenship as an objective and mission of Thai schools. Thai higher educational institutions aim for graduates to be aware of global issues and understand their rights and duties in regional and global contexts (Thanosawan & Laws, 2013).

Despite the popularity of global citizenship, research on Thai students' perceptions, especially those in specific regions are still limited. This gap motivated the current study to focus on the perceptions of students in Southern Thailand region.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1 Participants

This study involved 141 final-year undergraduate students. In April and May of 2020, the third author of this article visited classes of Southern University, introduced the project, invited students to participate on a voluntary basis, then provided a Google Forms link for them to respond to the questionnaire in class. These students were chosen because they were over 20 years old and they were going to finish tertiary education; therefore, their maturity was high.

4.2 Research instruments

This study used a survey, utilizing a questionnaire modified from that of The Development Educational Professionals in Southeast Asia (Laws & Thanosawan, 2018), which was developed based on the typology with the features of global citizenship introduced by Oxley and Morris (2013). The questionnaire had three main parts. Part one included introductory comments, an invitation to participate, and a confidentiality statement. Part two collected respondents' personal demographic information. Part three comprised 27 items, divided into two categories (C); namely, C1 - Cosmopolitan global citizenship with 17 items, and C2 - Advocacy global citizenship with 10 items. Part three of the questionnaire used a 5-point Likert scale - a common measurement to obtain opinions and attitude (Cohen et al., 2018), ranked "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Neither Agree or Disagree", "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree". After the original English version of the questionnaire was established and its items were randomized, it was translated into Thai. The respondents provided their

answers via a Google Forms link. The five options of each item of the Likert scale questionnaire were assigned, from 5 to 1, from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”, respectively.

4.3 Data analysis

The weighted mean for each item of the questionnaire was calculated, using the formula, outlined by Allen and Seaman (2007), and Salem and Kattara (2015):

$$\text{Class interval} = (\text{Very high limit} - \text{Very low limit}) / \text{number of intervals} = (5 - 1) / 5 = 0.80.$$

As noted by Salem and Kattara (2015), in this formula, the length of period (...) is calculated in which the five-point Likert scale has four distances between numbers (a distance from 1 to 2, from 2 to 3, from 3 to 4, and from 4 to 5. Thus, four distances divided by five-point, equals 0.80. (p. 7)

The interpretations of the weighted mean, then, was as in Table 1:

Table 1 Weighted mean and interpretation

Weight (Likert scale)	Weighted mean	Interpretation
5	From 4.20 to 5.00	Strongly agree/ Very high
4	From 3.40 to 4.19	Agree/ High
3	From 2.60 to 3.39	Neither agree nor disagree/ Medium
2	From 1.80 to 2.59	Disagree/ Low
1	From 1.00 to 1.79	Strongly disagree/ Very low

The responses to the questionnaire were transformed into SPSS (Statistic Package for the Social Sciences), Version 20. A total number of four tests were run for data analysis: (1) Scale test to check the reliability of the interval consistency of all the items; (2) Descriptive statistics to measure the means and the standard deviations of each of the 17 items of C1, the whole C1 category, 10 items of C2, and the whole C2; (3) One-sample t test to measure the mean and test values of each category; and (4) Paired-sample t test to compare the means of C1 and C2.

5. Results and Discussion

The result of the scale test revealed that the questionnaire was reliable (with Cronbach’s alpha = 0.85), indicating that all the results of the study satisfied reliability (Bartolucci et al., 2016; Cohen et al., 2018; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

5.1. Southern Thailand students as global citizens

Table 2 presents the results of the descriptive analysis of C1 and its items.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of C1 - Cosmopolitan Global Citizenship (N = 141)

Questions/ Items	Min	Max	M	SD
1 I have been fortunate to have had international experiences.	1.0	5.0	2.89	1.04
3 I enjoy working with people who have different cultural values from mine.	2.0	5.0	4.00	.67
4 I stay informed about current international issues.	1.0	5.0	3.57	.93
6 I do not feel responsible for the world's inequities and problems.	1.0	5.0	3.41	1.13
8 I believe that the more I learn about different cultures helps me become a better global citizen.	2.0	5.0	4.45	.66
9 I think that for certain problems, like environmental pollution, international bodies should have the right to enforce solutions.	2.0	5.0	4.45	.64
11 I believe that I must be open to cultural differences if I want to be a global citizen.	1.0	5.0	4.49	.62
12 I think that it is possible to be a good national citizen at the same time as being a good global citizen.	3.0	5.0	4.41	.60
14 I think the moral values I have learned from my family help me act as a good global citizen.	1.0	5.0	4.43	.70
15 I have a good awareness of global issues.	3.0	5.0	4.18	.59
17 I think the moral values I have learned from my education help me act as a good global citizen.	3.0	5.0	4.45	.55
18 I respect the human rights of all people.	3.0	5.0	4.68	.48
21 I can communicate effectively with people from different cultures.	2.0	5.0	3.99	.67
22 I am well informed about current issues that have an impact upon international relationships.	2.0	5.0	3.83	.75
24 I think it is important for me to be a good citizen of my home country before I can become a good global citizen.	2.0	5.0	4.43	.64

25 I am interested in learning about the many cultures that exist in the world.	1.0	5.0	4.24	.72
27 I think I am a global citizen.	2.0	5.0	4.34	.63
C1. Cosmopolitan global citizenship	3.18	5.0	4.13	.34

The mean of C1 was 4.13. To measure the mean (4.13) and test value, a one-sample t test was run for C1 (Table 3).

Table 3 One-Sample t Test of C1

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
C1	-2.42	140	.02	-.07	-.12	-.01

The results showed that the 2-tailed significance value was $p = .02$, indicating the mean and the test value were significantly different. Referring to the interpretation of Likert interval scale in Table 1, in the case of C1, the level of agreement was high (or agree). These results revealed that the final-year undergraduate students in Southern Thailand had a high level of perceptions of cosmopolitan global citizenship, or they highly perceived themselves to be cosmopolitan global citizens.

Table 4 presents the results of the descriptive analysis of C2 and its items.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics of C2 - Advocacy Global Citizenship (N = 141)

Questions/ Items	Mi n	Max	M	SD
2 I deliberately buy brands and products from companies that are known to be good stewards of marginalized people and places.	1.0	5.0	3.45	.80
5 I boycott brands or products that are known to harm marginalized people and places.	1.0	5.0	3.36	.87
7 I have the right to express my views on a variety of issues freely.	1.0	5.0	4.14	.86
10 I use social media such as Facebook, Instagram and LINE, to express my concerns on global issues.	1.0	5.0	4.18	.80
13 I make a special effort to sort glass or tins or plastic or paper for recycling.	1.0	5.0	3.86	.76

16 I empathize with people from other parts of the world.	3.0	5.0	4.29	.58
19 I am an active member of my community.	2.0	5.0	3.85	.76
20 I have changed my behavior as a result of my understanding of global environmental, social and economic challenges.	2.0	5.0	4.03	.68
23 It is my responsibility to be actively involved in global issues.	3.0	5.0	4.23	.62
26 I always buy fair-trade or locally grown products and brands whenever possible.	2.0	5.0	4.17	.69
C2. Advocacy global citizenship	3.0	5.0	3.96	.41

The mean of C2 was 3.96. Then, to measure the mean (3.96) and test value, a one-sample t test was run for C2 (Table 5).

Table 5 One-Sample t Test of C2

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
C2	-7.12	140	<.001	-.24	-.31	-.18

The results showed that the 2-tailed significance value was $p < .001$, indicating the mean and the test value were significantly different. Referring to the interpretation of Likert interval scale in Table 1, in the case of C2, the level of agreement was high (or agree). These results revealed that the final-year undergraduate students in Southern Thailand had a high level of perceptions of advocacy global citizenship, or they highly perceived themselves to be advocacy global citizens.

In conclusion, the above analyses answered research question 1, showing that the final-year undergraduate students in Southern Thailand had a high perception of global citizenship, both cosmopolitan and advocacy types. These perceptions can be discussed in the cultural and educational contexts of this particular region.

In terms of cultural context, Southern Thailand is a rich cultural region with diverse ethnic groups. This dynamic and multicultural environment possibly well prepares students to accept broader worldview and accept citizenship principles (Scupin, 2012). Growing up in this region, students were used to understanding and appreciating the values of different cultures. Therefore, they had an outlook to be cosmopolitan citizens (Winichakul, 1997). The mean of item 11 (I believe that I must be open to cultural differences if I want to be a global citizen)

was 4.49, obviously showing that the students were willing to accept cultural differences and co-operate with other people. Similarly, the mean of Item 8 (I believe that the more I learn about different cultures helps me become a better global citizen) was 4.45, and that of Item 25 (I am interested in learning about the many cultures that exist in the world) was 4.24, indicating that these students had high awareness of increasing their knowledge about other cultures. These attitudes make a possible sign to foster the opportunities for the students to work in an international context in the time of fast globalization which encourage understanding the cultures of different countries (Biccum, 2020).

Furthermore, the influences of religions, with prominent values taught by Buddhism and Islam – the two dominant religions which well coexist in the region (Horstmann, 2011), emphasizing moral values, the community spirit, loving, charity and interconnectedness (Ouyyanont, 2017) could encourage the students to embrace advocacy global citizenship, which promotes social justice and fairness, and solving the world's issues as their responsibility toward society (Biccum, 2020; Dill, 2013; Torres, 2017). This is proven by the fact that the means of Item 16 (I empathize with people from other parts of the world) and that of Item 23 (It is my responsibility to be actively involved in global issues) were high (4.29 and 4.23, respectively).

Regarding education, Southern Thailand has been influenced by both national schemes and local cultural values. The national educational policies and schemes encourage increasing global awareness and multicultural education, preparing students for an interconnected world (EduBright Resources, 2018). The integration of global issues into the curricula would play an important role in preparing students to think beyond their local and national boundaries, producing global citizens through pedagogy and curriculum reform (Biccum, 2020; Dill, 2013). Educated in such environment, the students in Southern Thailand had high level of awareness of being both national and international citizenships, proven by the mean ($M = 4.49$) of Item 12 (I think that it is possible to be a good national citizen at the same time as being a good global citizen). Besides, the students strongly agreed that the moral values that they were taught at home and at school had shaped their characteristics of global citizen. These are shown by the means of Item 14 (I think the moral values that I have learned from my family help me act as a good global citizen), and Item 17 (I think the moral values I have learned from my education help me act as a good global citizen), which were 4.43 and 4.45, respectively. These findings provide very optimistic predictions about the readiness of the students in Southern Thailand for global citizenship (Dill, 2013).

5.2 Southern Thailand students: more strongly as cosmopolitan global citizenship than as advocacy global citizenship

In order to answer research question 2 regarding Southern Thailand undergraduate students perceiving themselves to be more strongly as cosmopolitan or more advocacy global citizens, a paired-sample t test of C1 and C2 was administered. The results were as in Table 6.

Table 6 Paired-Samples t Test

	M	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	td	Sig. (2- tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
				C1 - C2	.17			

The 2-tailed significance value was <.001, indicating that value of the mean of C1 and that of C2 were different. This showed that the students' perception of cosmopolitan global citizenship was different from that of advocacy global citizenship. In this case, the mean of C1 (4.13) was higher than that of C2 (3.96). These results showed that although the perceptions of the students of both types of global citizenship were high, their perception of cosmopolitan type was higher than that of advocacy type. This distinction is significant because it highlights different emphases in the students' understanding and identification with global citizenship.

Reysen et al. (2012) argued that students' global awareness and perception of their normative environment could predict their identification with global citizenship. As discussed earlier, cosmopolitan global citizenship is characterized by a broad, inclusive sense of belonging to a global community, placing emphases on cultural diversity, global awareness and the interconnectedness of people all around the world. It encourages an outlook that values openness, cultural exchange, and a commitment to global cooperation and understanding. The students' higher identification with cosmopolitan global citizenship is in line with a summary by Scupin (2013) stating that Thai society has developed more cosmopolitan forms of identity. Their perception could also be explained by the fact that youth show a greater affinity for cosmopolitan values thanks to the exposure to diverse cultures and global issues through various means of communication and different channels of education (Delanty, 2006).

In contrast, advocacy global citizenship emphasizes more critical and active participation in addressing global injustices and inequalities (Goren & Yemini, 2017). The lower identification with advocacy global citizenship among the students suggests a lesser engagement with these more activist dimensions of global citizenship. This finding could be reflective of the socio-political context in this region, where students might have fewer opportunities or incentives to be involved in global advocacy or where the education system might place less emphasis on political activism compared to cultural understanding (Torres, 2017). Therefore, it is suggested that global citizenship should promote authentic and critical learning, creating opportunities for students to engage in genuine global-local interaction, fostering global solidarity (Kim, 2021). It is also necessary to enhance cross-cultural exchanges and cooperation between higher institutions to ensure students' comprehensive understanding of their global citizenship (Qi & Fangming, 2018).

In conclusion, the perception of undergraduate students in Southern Thailand as more cosmopolitan global citizens than advocacy global citizens might be influenced by their global awareness, educational experiences, and exposure to diverse perspectives. By fostering a sense of global citizenship through education and promoting intercultural competencies, students could develop a more nuanced understanding of their role in the global community.

6. Implications

The study's findings reveal high perceptions of global citizenship among the undergraduate students in Southern Thailand, with a stronger inclination toward cosmopolitan global citizenship. The disparity indicates room to enhance their engagement in advocacy-oriented global citizenship, and a need for more balanced educational approaches. Educators may address this gap by adding more contents related to the two types of global citizenship, and implementing a variety of activities. In terms of education curricula, for cosmopolitan citizenship, themes and topics that encouraging students to appreciate cultural diversity, and international cooperation can be included. Regarding advocacy citizenship, issues such as climate change, social justice, human right – related topics should be contained in the curricula. Furthermore, project-based learning that involves international collaboration and local advocacy efforts could be considered. Besides, raising awareness through debates, promoting digital citizenship, and encouraging critical reflection can enhance a more balanced global citizenship. Activities, such as service

learning, simulations, and partnerships with international organizations can be organized to provide practical experiences for students to engage with global issues. All in all, by creating a balanced approach that highlights both types of global citizenship, educational institutions can nurture well-rounded, more active and responsible global citizens.

7. Conclusion

The findings of this study show that final-year undergraduate students in Southern Thailand hold high perceptions of both cosmopolitan and advocacy global citizenship. These perceptions are deeply influenced by the region's cultural and educational contexts, which emphasize the importance of cultural diversity, moral values, and global awareness. The students' strong identification with cosmopolitan global citizenship indicates their openness to cultural exchange and their commitment to global cooperation and understanding. This inclination aligns with the cosmopolitan properties of global citizenship that values inclusivity and interconnectedness, which is crucial in today's globalized world.

On the other hand, while the students also demonstrate a high perception of advocacy global citizenship, it is comparatively lower than their cosmopolitan orientation. This suggests that, although students are aware of global issues, there is a lesser emphasis on the activist dimensions of global citizenship, such as critical participation in addressing global injustices and inequalities. This discrepancy underscores the need for educational systems to balance the promotion of cultural understanding, fostering a more critical and active engagement with global issues.

In conclusion, the study highlights the importance of integrating both cosmopolitan and advocacy elements into global citizenship education to prepare students for comprehensive participation in the global community. By fostering intercultural competencies and encouraging active engagement with global challenges, educational institutions can nurture well-rounded global citizens who are equipped to contribute to a more peaceful, sustainable, and equitable world. Further research is recommended to explore the impacts of specific educational practices on students' perceptions of global citizenship and to investigate how these perceptions evolve over time and across different cultural contexts.

References

- Allen, I., & Seaman, C. (2007). Likert Scales and Data Analyses. *Quality Progress*, 40(7), 64-65.
- Bartolucci, F., Bacci, S., & Gnaldi, M. (2016). *Statistical Analysis of Questionnaires: A Unified Approach Based on R and Stata*. Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- Biccum, A. (November 19, 2020). Global Citizenship. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.556>
- Bosio, E. & Torres, C. (2019). Global citizenship education: An educational theory of the common good? A conversation with Carlos Alberto Torres. *Policy Futures in Education*. 17(6), 745-760. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210319825517>
- Bowden, B. (2003). The Perils of Global Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 7 (3), 349-392, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102032000098913>
- Catalano, T. (2013). Occupy: A case illustration of social movements in global citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 8(3), 276-288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197913497661>
- Cohen L, Manion L, & Morrison K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Davies, L. (2006). Global Citizenship: Abstract or Framework for Action? *Educational Review* 58 (1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500352523>
- Dill, J. S. (2013). *The longings and limits of global citizenship education: The moral pedagogy of schooling in a cosmopolitan age*. Routledge.
- EduBright Resources. (2018). *The National Scheme of Education B.B. 2560 – 2579 (2017 – 2036)*. <https://edubrights.com/resource/2018/11/27/the-national-scheme-of-education-b-e-2560-2579-2017-2036>
- Flammia, M. (2017). Preparing Students for the Ethical Challenges of Global Citizenship. *Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics*, 10(4), 41-45.
- Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017). Global citizenship education redefined—A systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 170-183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.02.004>
- Habibah, S., Sapriyah. (2021). Global Citizenship Education: A Framework of Civic Literacy in Indonesia. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 618, 625-628. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211223.106>
- Hafner, J. A., Keyes, Charles F., & Keyes, E. J. (2024) *Thailand*. Encyclopedia Britannica <https://www.britannica.com/place/Thailand>.

- Horstmann A. (2011). Living together: The transformation of multi-religious coexistence in southern Thailand. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 42(3), 487-510. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022463411000373>
- Kim, E. (2021). Global citizenship education through curriculum-as-relations. *Prospects*, 51(1-3), 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-021-09554-w>
- Laws, K., & Thanosawan, P. (2018, July, 23-25). DEPISA Questionnaire on Global Citizenship [Conference presentation]. Phranakhon Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315310375308>
- National Statistical Office. (2023). *Statistical Yearbook Thailand, 2023*. Thai Ministry of Digital Economy and Society. <https://www.nso.go.th/public/e-book/Statistical-Yearbook/SYB-2023>
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Osiadacz, E. (2018). Global Citizenship. *Brok Education Journal*, 27(2), 44-47. <https://doi.org/10.26522/broked.v27i2.575>
- Oxfam (n.d.). What is global citizenship? Retrieved May 18, 2022, from <https://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/who-we-are/what-is-global-citizenship>
- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 301-325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393>.
- Ouyyanont, P. (2017). *A Regional Economic History of Thailand*. Cambridge University Press.
- Qi, R., & Fangming, Z. (2018). Research on the Conception, Practice and Enlightenment of Global Citizenship Education. *Advances in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities Research*, 176. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icmess-18.2018.2>
- Pashby, K., Costa, M. D., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, 56(2), 144 – 164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1723352>
- Reysen, S., Larey, L., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2012). College Course Curriculum and Global Citizenship. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning* 4(3), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.04.3.03>

- Salem, I., & Kattara, H. (2015). Transformational leadership: Relationship to job stress and job burnout in five-star hotels. *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 15(4), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358415581445>
- Schattle, H. (2008). *The practices of global citizenship*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Scupin, R. (2012). *Race and Ethnicity: The United States and the World* (2nd ed.). Pearson.
- Scupin, R. (2013). Review essay: Southeast Asia. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 72(2), 423-432.
- Stromquist, N. (2009). Theorizing Global Citizenship: Discourses, Challenges, and Implications for Education. *International Journal of Education for Democracy*. 2(1), 5-29.
- Thanosawan, P., & Laws, K. (2013). Global citizenship: differing perceptions within two Thai higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(3), 293-304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2013.786861>
- Torres, C. (2017). *Theoretical and empirical foundations of critical global citizenship education*. Routledge.
- UNESCO. (2017). The ABCs of Global Citizenship Education. Retrieved December 09, 2019, from www.unesco.org/new/global-citizenship-education.
- Wangkumhang, P., Shaw, P., Chaichoompu, K., Ngamphiw, C., Assawamakin, A., Nuinoon, M., Sripichai, O., Svasti, S., Fucharoen, S., Praphanphoj V., & Tongsimma, S. (2013). Insight into the Peopling of Mainland Southeast Asia from Thai Population Genetic Structure. *PLOS ONE*, 8(11), e79522. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0079522>
- Winichakul, Thongchai (1997). *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation*. University of Hawaii Press.