

Integrating University Values for Global Citizenship: An Analysis of the Meaning of the Seven Character Based Graduate Attributes at Universitas Sebelas Maret

Leo Agung Sutimin¹, Deni Zein Tarsidi^{2*}, Winarno³, Bramastia⁴, Triyanto⁵, Djono⁶, Hieronymus Purwanta⁷, Endrise Septina Rawanoko⁸, Andrea Salsalova⁹

Pusat Studi Pengamalan Pancasila, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

**) Corresponding author: denizein@staff.uns.ac.id*

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the implementation, understanding, and assessment of character values embedded in the Graduate Learning Outcomes (CPL) of Universitas Sebelas Maret (UNS), which include resilience, collaboration, innovation, inclusivity, pluralism, healthy living, and environmental awareness. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach that combines a quantitative survey of 100 students and in-depth interviews with lecturers and representatives from the Institute for Educational Development and Quality Assurance (LPPMP), the research reveals a significant disparity between the values most understood and those genuinely implemented and assessed in teaching practices. "Resilience" emerged as the most recognized character trait among students, whereas values such as "pluralism" and "healthy living" were found to be epistemically marginalized within classroom settings. The analysis also indicates the absence of systematic character assessment tools at the program level and a lack of institutional academic frameworks to pedagogically integrate these values. This phenomenon reflects a value bias in higher education, where character traits aligned with academic capitalism tend to be more prominently promoted than affective and social values. The study highlights the urgency of aligning institutional value declarations, pedagogical strategies, and character assessments, so that character education evolves beyond symbolic slogans into a transformative learning process that shapes students into reflective and ethical global citizens. These findings offer a conceptual contribution to critiques of declarative character learning and call for renewed value-based pedagogical strategies in the context of higher education.

Keywords: University Values, Global Citizenship, Character, Pancasila.

Introduction

In recent years, institutional values in higher education have begun to gain more prominent attention in curriculum development. One concrete form of these values is the distinctive Graduate Learning Outcomes (CPL) of universities, which embody the long-term character and vision of each institution and differentiate one university's developmental trajectory from another. At Universitas Sebelas Maret (UNS), values such as resilience, collaboration,

innovation, inclusivity, pluralism, healthy living, and environmental awareness have been articulated as hallmark CPLs. These values are rooted in the university's identity as a "Pancasila Fortress Campus," which promotes inclusivity, sustainability, and the well-being of its academic community.

However, several studies have indicated that institutional values often remain under-internalized in everyday academic practice. (Barnett, 2011) argued that universities must bring their values to life through academic activities and institutional policies rather than

merely listing them in official documents. Becher and Trowler (2001) similarly emphasized the importance of "cultural embeddedness"—the deep integration of institutional values into the academic culture that shapes campus life. In the context of hallmark CPLs, this means values must be reflected not only in curriculum structures but also in pedagogical strategies and learning assessments.

Yet, as noted by Iqbal et al., (2022), many faculty members struggle to translate institutional values into classroom practice. Rananda (2022) further found that character and value assessments remain a neglected area in many Indonesian universities. Zins et al., (2004) similarly observed that few reliable instruments exist to objectively assess value-based learning, particularly in the affective and social domains.

To date, CPL implementation models have largely focused on cognitive aspects. However, the OECD (2020) emphasizes that higher education must now prepare graduates with social, ethical, and sustainability-related competencies aligned with 21st-century challenges. Trilling & Fadel (2012) also argue that 21st-century skills must be grounded in strong moral values and character—not merely technical expertise.

From another perspective, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2021) and OECD (2025) question the extent to which university values are actually present in students' lived learning experiences. They argue that many graduate attributes remain superficial, embedded only in curricular descriptions without being supported by consistent pedagogical or assessment strategies. The Jubilee Centre, (2017) have proposed solutions through character education models in higher education, though their application remains limited globally and has received little attention in the Indonesian context.

Research by Ridhwan et al., (2020) and Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia (2020) at various Indonesian universities shows that the integration of hallmark CPL values remains fragmented. In practice, many lecturers do not use these values as the foundation for

instructional planning. Conversely, Lickona, (2009) argue that character development in higher education cannot be left to incidental inclusion; it must be deliberately designed into the curriculum.

This gap becomes even more apparent when examining how character education in universities tends to be dichotomous. On the one hand, the normative-structural approach—represented by Ridhwan et al., (2020) emphasizes formulating values in institutional documents and embedding them in formal curricula. On the other, critical-reflective approaches such as those advanced by Andreotti (2021) and Sant et al., (2018) stress the importance of transformative learning based on student experience, intercultural dialogue, and social consciousness. Both approaches offer valuable insights, but there has been little conceptual integration linking hallmark CPL values to pedagogical practices that would allow these values to be meaningfully enacted.

In Indonesia, this divide is exacerbated by the lack of valid, participatory, and contextually appropriate instruments for character assessment (Rananda, 2022; Zins et al., 2004). Assessment of student character development tends to be sporadic, non-standardized, and often reduced to administrative formality. While values such as resilience, inclusivity, and collaboration are included in UNS's hallmark CPLs, there is still no systematic roadmap linking these values to learning outcomes, instructional strategies, and project-based assessments aligned with the ethos of global citizenship education (GCED).

Another gap lies in lecturer capacity and institutional infrastructure. Bernie Trilling & Fadel (2009) notes that many instructors feel uncertain about how to integrate institutional values into their teaching due to the lack of applicable operational guidelines. At the institutional level, Tierney & Lanford, (2018) asserts that policies unsupported by robust structural mechanisms often lead only to symbolic compliance—administrative adherence without genuine cultural transformation.

Method

This study employs a mixed methods approach with a sequential explanatory design, as proposed by Creswell (2009), which emphasizes the importance of integrating quantitative and qualitative data to gain a comprehensive understanding of complex social phenomena. This method was chosen due to the nature of the research topic, which demands an in-depth exploration of the operational meaning of institutional values, as well as their understanding, implementation, and assessment within the context of higher education.

The quantitative approach was used to measure the extent to which students understand the seven hallmark Graduate Learning Outcomes (CPL) values of Universitas Sebelas Maret namely resilience, collaboration, innovation, inclusivity, pluralism, healthy living, and environmental awareness as well as their perceptions of how these values are applied and assessed in the learning process. Meanwhile, the qualitative approach was necessary to uncover the experiences and strategies of academic program administrators in integrating these values into the curriculum and academic activities, including the challenges encountered in practice.

Respondents in this study consisted of two main groups: active students from various study programs who had completed at least four semesters, and heads of twelve study programs from different faculties. Informants were selected purposively, considering their direct involvement in curriculum management and learning processes, following the principles of purposive sampling for meaning- and context-based studies. Quantitative data were collected through closed-ended Likert-scale questionnaires, designed to measure students' understanding of each CPL value, their perceptions of how values are integrated into course activities, and their experiences with character assessment mechanisms. The questionnaire instrument was developed based on UNS's hallmark CPL indicators and validated by experts in character education and curriculum to ensure content validity.

Meanwhile, qualitative data were obtained through in-depth interviews with program heads to explore strategies for implementing character values into curriculum documents

and semester learning plans (RPS), as well as the types of assessments used. Interviews were also conducted with selected students as additional informants to confirm and enrich the quantitative data. Data analysis was conducted in layers: quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (percentages and cross-tabulations) to identify trends in understanding among respondents. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically based on Snelson, (2016) approach, involving open coding, categorization, and identification of key emerging themes related to integration, challenges, and perceptions of CPL values.

To ensure credibility and validity, triangulation across sources and methods was applied, comparing findings from questionnaires, interviews, and limited analysis of three RPS documents from different faculties. All research stages were conducted in accordance with academic ethical principles: participants provided informed consent, respondent identities were kept confidential, and data were used solely for academic purposes. With this approach, the study not only provides an empirical mapping of the understanding and implementation of CPL values but also offers a reflective and contextual foundation to promote character education transformation within the framework of global citizenship education in the university environment.

Result and Discussion

Based on the descriptive analysis of questionnaire data involving 100 students, the level of understanding of the seven hallmark Graduate Learning Outcomes (CPL) values at Universitas Sebelas Maret revealed diverse patterns. The "resilient" character recorded the highest average score (Mean = 3.74 for TGH1), indicating that students relatively understand the importance of personal resilience in facing academic challenges. This is supported by two other items in the same indicator (TGH2 = 3.39; TGH3 = 3.15), although a slight decline in the aspect of stress management (TGH3) suggests a gap between mental resilience and emotional regulation.

The "collaborative" character also showed a good level of understanding (Mean ranging

from 3.41–3.68), with the highest score in the aspect of comfort in working across different backgrounds (KOL2 = 3.68). This reflects a socially supportive campus environment for interpersonal interactions.

For the "inclusive" and "pluralistic" characters, the average scores were relatively high, especially on pluralism-related items such as PLU2 (Mean = 3.84) and PLU3 (Mean = 3.83), indicating that respect for diversity is fairly well embedded among students. However, there is an indication that this understanding is not yet accompanied by systematic pedagogical strategies, as reflected in the relatively low standard deviation, which suggests a lack of variation or critical reflection on these values.

In contrast, the "healthy living" character recorded the lowest scores (SEH1 and SEH2 = 2.81), indicating that this aspect remains a low priority for students. This is also reflected in the high standard deviation (SEH1 = .873), signaling a wide disparity among respondents.

The "innovative" character occupied a middle position with averages ranging from 2.99–3.24. The lowest score appeared on the item related to initiating new projects (INV3 = 2.99), which may reflect weak institutional encouragement in fostering an innovation-oriented culture.

Meanwhile, the "environmentally aware" character revealed two sharply contrasting points: LING1 received a high score (Mean = 3.75), but LING2 dropped significantly (Mean = 2.87), indicating that environmentally friendly practices have not yet become a consistent collective awareness. This contrast opens up a space for reflection that normative understanding does not always align with contextually grounded real practices..

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
TGH1	100	2	4	3.74	.463
TGH2	100	1	4	3.39	.618
TGH3	100	2	4	3.15	.702
KOL1	100	2	4	3.48	.594
KOL2	100	3	4	3.68	.469
KOL3	100	2	4	3.41	.588
INV1	100	2	4	3.24	.653
INV2	100	2	4	3.23	.679
INV3	100	1	4	2.99	.759
INK1	100	2	4	3.65	.539
INK2	100	1	4	3.77	.489
INK3	100	3	4	3.76	.429
PLU1	100	2	4	3.81	.419
PLU2	100	3	4	3.84	.368
PLU3	100	3	4	3.83	.378
SEH1	100	1	4	2.81	.873
SEH2	100	1	4	2.81	.734
SEH3	100	2	4	3.23	.737
LING1	100	2	4	3.75	.458
LING2	100	1	4	2.87	.861
LING3	100	2	4	3.32	.548
Valid N (listwise)	100				

The high level of student understanding of the value of resilience should not be seen merely as a success in internalization, but rather as a reflection of the intensity of exposure to this value in both formal and informal pedagogical spaces. In interviews, lecturers emphasized that resilience is an inherent part of academic narrative construction—marked by repeated phrases such as “you must be resilient,” “college is tough,” and “you need to be mentally prepared.” This pattern aligns with Lemke’s (2001) concept of narrative reinforcement, whereby discursive structures generate dominance of certain values in students’ collective perception. In this context, resilience is not only recognized but reproduced in daily practices through systemic expectations that demand individual endurance. This corresponds with Trilling and Fadel’s (2009) idea of 21st-century core soft skills, which place resilience as a prerequisite for surviving in an uncertain and disruptive labor market.

Conversely, the values of pluralism and healthy living show relatively low levels of understanding. Ironically, these two values hold high urgency in a post-pandemic and diverse society, yet they are marginalized in the pedagogical construct. This gap reinforces Barnett’s (2011) critique of disembedded values, where institutional values exist declaratively in documents but fail to manifest in authentic pedagogical interactions. Even pluralism, a fundamental value in democratic

societies (Nussbaum, 1996), is often not practiced through intercultural dialogue or diverse perspective simulations in the classroom. As Banks (2008) argued, multicultural civic education only becomes meaningful when students are confronted with the "other" through direct experiences of difference.

This failure also signals an epistemological disjunction between knowing, feeling, and doing, as described by Kristjánsson (2015). When students merely know that UNS upholds inclusivity but do not feel or enact it in daily interactions, the value operates only at a cognitive level—neither ethically nor practically. Here, the relevance of Lickona, Schaps, and Lewis's (2021) concept of character education becomes important: true character education must immerse values in the academic atmosphere through modeling, dialogue, and a community of practice.

Furthermore, the dominance of values such as resilience, collaboration, and innovation can also be interpreted as a manifestation of epistemic bias in higher education systems, aligning more closely with market logic and academic capitalism. As critiqued by Giroux (2021) and Marginson, (2014), universities often become sites of neoliberal reproduction, prioritizing productivity, efficiency, and innovation while neglecting affective and relational values such as diversity or holistic health. As a consequence, there emerges a curriculum of omission (Cridland-Hughes, 2015), wherein humanistic values are systematically sidelined in favor of performative academic demands.

In this context, data are not merely statistical figures but ideological reflections of dominant value structures in higher education. The values most understood by students are those most frequently narrated and associated with systemic virtues—values aligned with competition, flexibility, and innovation. Conversely, values requiring ethical depth, social empathy, and affective engagement are marginalized due to their exclusion from academic incentive systems.

Thus, a paradigm shift is needed in character learning strategies. Instead of embedding values as curriculum add-ons, universities must transform them into holistic learning experiences that simultaneously

engage cognition, emotion, and action. Without this shift, UNS's graduate attribute values (CPL) will remain empty symbols, devoid of transformative power to shape reflective, inclusive, and responsible global citizens.

Interviews with representatives from the LPPMP (Institute for Educational Development and Quality Assurance) at UNS revealed that the integration of CPL hallmark values into teaching remains sporadic and largely depends on individual lecturer initiatives. Although most study programs have included character values in course plans (RPS), the form and depth of implementation vary widely. The LPPMP curriculum division admitted that, to date, there is no academic manuscript or official guideline orchestrating how the seven CPL values should be pedagogically translated and systematically assessed. This causes each faculty or study program to operate under autonomous logics with inconsistent approaches in incorporating these values into teaching activities.

This fragmentation aligns with Becher & Trowler (2001) concept of epistemic fragmentation, where disjointed academic cultures result in divergent perceptions and practices of values. In learning contexts, this leads to a disconnect between the explicit curriculum—formal documents that contain values—and the hidden curriculum actually experienced by students in classroom interactions and campus culture.

In many cases, values appear only as affective learning objectives without concrete pedagogical or assessment methods. Malik & Bhatti (2020) noted that translating institutional values into classroom practices is often hindered by faculty members' lack of pedagogical strategies for teaching and assessing values contextually.

Yet, as Lickona, Schaps, and Lewis (2021) emphasized, meaningful character education demands the integration of three pillars: modeling, dialogue, and community. Without a design uniting these, values intended to be lived in the learning environment become disembodied—detached from practice, lingering only in symbols and documents.

These findings offer a critical reflection that universities cannot rely solely on

individual lecturers to internalize values. A curricular instrument is needed to bridge institutional spirit with cross-disciplinary teaching practices. In this regard, drafting an academic document that outlines pedagogical strategies, assessment indicators, and best practices across programs is an urgent necessity. Without this, hallmark values will live only in slogans, not in students' real transformation into global citizens with character.

Although character values like resilience, inclusivity, and collaboration are officially stated in CPL and institutionally recognized as important, assessment of these dimensions still relies heavily on lecturers' intuition and informal observation. This finding supports Zins et al., (2004) and Ridhwan et al., (2020), who found that affective and character aspects are often neglected in higher education assessment due to perceived difficulties in measuring them objectively. This creates what can be called an assessment void—a gap in the education process where values exist normatively but not operationally.

From a pedagogical perspective, this issue is closely tied to the epistemological dilemma of assessing the affective domain. Unlike cognitive aspects, which can be measured with objective tools such as tests or quizzes, character assessment demands a more contextual, longitudinal, and reflective approach. Kristjánsson, (2015) argues that true character assessment requires evaluating across three dimensions: knowing, feeling, and doing—meaning assessments must cover value understanding, emotional engagement, and real-life practices.

However, few universities have systematically adopted rubric-based character assessment approaches. This method, developed in contemporary character education, integrates behavioral indicators, intensity, and frequency as a way to evaluate the extent to which students possess and practice character traits. The absence of such a system at UNS reveals a gap between institutional vision and its operational mechanisms.

A key insight from this section is that the assessment gap is not merely technical, but reflects the university's epistemic stance toward values. When values like resilience or

pluralism are not supported by valid and credible measurement tools, the institution implicitly reproduces an educational model that only assesses what is easy to measure—not what truly matters. This reinforces Giroux (2021) critique of audit culture in higher education, where only quantifiable outcomes are acknowledged, while humanistic values are marginalized due to their assessment complexity.

In the context of Universitas Sebelas Maret as a Pancasila Stronghold Campus, this paradox becomes even more critical. The noble values articulated in its hallmark CPL lose their transformative potential due to the absence of a coherent character assessment system. Hence, it is imperative to develop assessment tools that are not only formative and reflective but also participatory—engaging students in evaluating and nurturing their own character.

Effective character assessment is not merely about evaluating students but guiding and facilitating their self-formation (Lickona et al., 2021). In this framework, assessment becomes an integral part of value transformation into real learning experiences, not merely an administrative add-on in academic evaluation.

One notable finding from the triangulated data analysis is the weak correlation between students' understanding of CPL values and their implementation or assessment in classroom practice. Quantitatively, "resilience" scored highest in student comprehension, but this was not reflected in evaluation dimensions. Student interviews revealed that they rarely felt this value was assessed explicitly or systematically. On the other hand, values with lower comprehension levels, such as "pluralism" and "healthy living," often emerged in extracurricular activities, but still lacked clear evaluative consequences.

This indicates a separation between declarative and evaluative domains in character education. As Kristjánsson Kristjánsson (2015) warned, declarative character learning—value learning that is normative without habitus formation or evaluative consequences—risks producing graduates who recognize values conceptually but lack a praxis orientation to internalize them. In other words, students know the values

but do not feel compelled to embody them in their learning ethos or civic identity.

Here, an epistemic disjunction occurs between understanding (knowing), implementation (doing), and assessment (being accountable). Ideally, these should be integrated in a holistic character education approach. Without consistent pedagogical practice and evaluation, values remain in the symbolic realm rather than in character formation.

This condition underscores the need for conceptual alignment between UNS hallmark CPL values and the global citizenship competency framework outlined by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), (2021), which includes knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values to shape reflective, responsible, and participatory global citizens. Values like resilience, inclusivity, and pluralism are not just institutional attributes, but integral dimensions of 21st-century civic competencies. Yet without holistic and character-transformative evaluation tools, these competencies risk being trapped in what Biesta, (2009) called learnification the reduction of education to an individual cognitive process, rather than the formation of socially responsible subjects.

Thus, these findings reveal that understanding values does not automatically translate into successful education outcomes. Often, the most recognized values are those most frequently uttered, not the most strategically developed. In other words, institutional narratives do not necessarily yield character praxis. Therefore, stronger alignment is needed between CPL value declarations, pedagogical strategies, and assessment systems, so character education does not remain a slogan, but becomes a formational experience that shapes public-minded citizens—aligned with the aspirations of Universitas Sebelas Maret as the Pancasila Fortress Campus (*Kampus Benteng Pancasila*).

Ultimately, the overall findings—from understanding to implementation and assessment of UNS hallmark CPL values—highlight systemic structural and cultural gaps. The values most understood by students are not necessarily those most internalized through learning experiences, but those most

frequently narrated within the context of academic competition. Conversely, values requiring ethical depth, ecological awareness, and openness to difference are displaced from formal learning spaces due to the lack of adequate pedagogy and assessment design.

The fact that there is still no official academic manuscript integrating character values across study programs reinforces the argument that character education at the university level remains sporadic, fragmented, and declarative. It affirms that value transformation is not merely a matter of institutional rhetoric but demands epistemic and pedagogical work that unifies vision, curriculum design, teaching strategies, and assessment systems.

In this context, UNS faces a critical juncture: will it continue reproducing symbolic values or take bold steps to reposition character education strategies into transformative, cross-disciplinary praxis? The affirmation of values in CPL must not stop at the declarative level but move into students' lived experiences through reflective teaching, community engagement, and humane evaluation. Only in this way can character education transcend slogans and become an ethical movement that forms complete university citizens: resilient in adversity, collaborative in diversity, and reflective in humanity.

Conclusion

This study reveals a disparity between the declared values in the Graduate Learning Outcomes (CPL) documents specific to Universitas Sebelas Maret and the actual implementation and evaluation practices at the study program level. Although values such as resilience and collaboration show high levels of student understanding, this is largely driven by narrative exposure and systemic norms rather than structured pedagogical practices. Meanwhile, values like pluralism, healthy living, and environmental awareness tend to be marginalized in both implementation and assessment.

The absence of an integrated academic guideline and the lack of a systematic character assessment instrument are strong

indicators that character education within the university remains fragmented and declarative in nature. These findings reinforce criticisms of higher education's overemphasis on quantitatively measurable values while neglecting the ethical-affective dimensions essential to forming reflective and responsible global citizens.

Furthermore, the study highlights the urgent need for an epistemological and pedagogical reorientation—from an education model that prioritizes cognition and performativity to one that integrates knowing, feeling, and doing. Universities, as institutions for character formation, must go beyond merely articulating values; they must build learning ecosystems that allow these values to be embodied and transformed into civic habitus.

Therefore, the primary recommendation is the development of a cross-faculty academic guideline that includes pedagogical strategies, rubric-based character assessment frameworks, and adaptable best practices for all study programs. Without such efforts, the noble values outlined in the CPL will remain mere institutional artifacts, stripped of their formative power amid the tides of globalization and the moral challenges of the 21st century.

References

- Andreotti, V. (2021). *The Political Economy of Global Citizenship Education*. Routledge.
- Barnett, R. (2011). *Being a University*. Routledge, Foundations and Futures of Education Series, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). Academic Tribes and Territories. In *Cultures* (Vol. 31). The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press. <http://books.mcgraw-hill.co.uk/openup/chapters/0335206271.pdf>
- Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: on the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9064-9>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Cridland-Hughes, S. A. (2015). Book Review: Education and Democracy in the 21st Century. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 39(1), 53–54.
- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2014.04.002>
- Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2020). *Buku Panduan Penyusunan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi Era Industri 4.0 untuk Mendukung Merdeka Belajar–Kampus Merdeka*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI.
- Giroux, H. (2021). Critical Pedagogy. In *Handbuch Bildungs- und Erziehungssoziologie* (pp. 1–16). Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-31395-1_19-1
- Iqbal, M., Najmuddin, N., Rizal, M., & Zahriyanti, Z. (2022). Challenges of Implementing Character Education Based on Islamic Values in the Independent Campus Learning Curriculum (MBKM). *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, 14(1), 757–768. <https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v14i1.4839>
- Kristjánsson, K. (2015). *Aristotelian Character Education*. Routledge.
- Lickona, T. (2009). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. Bantam Books.
- Lickona, T., Schaps, E., & Lewis, C. (2021). *Educating for Character: How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility*. Bantam Books.
- Malik, A., & Bhatti, T. F. (2020). Methodological Challenges and Higher Education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3738537>
- Marginson, S. (2014). University Research: The Social Contribution of University Research. In *The Future of the Post-Massified University at the Crossroads* (pp. 101–117). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01523-1_8
- OECD. (2020). *OECD Learning Compass 2030: Concept Note Series*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- OECD. (2025). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2025*.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2021). *OECD Future of Education and Skills 2030: Learning Compass 2030 Series - Conceptual Learning Framework*. <https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/teaching-and-learning/learning/learning-compass-2030/>
- Rananda, A. (2022). Gagasan Perumusan University Values untuk Penguatan Visi-Misi Perguruan Tinggi dalam Menghadapi Tantangan Global. *Education Journal* :

- Journal Education Research and Development*, 8(2), 206–218.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31537/ej.v8i1.1673>
- Ridhwan, M., Yudhyarta, D. Y., & Yurisa, A. (2020). Integrasi Pendidikan Karakter dalam Mata Kuliah Pendidikan Pancasila di Perguruan Tinggi. *ASATIZA: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 1(2), 198–211.
<https://doi.org/10.46963/asatiza.v1i2.82>
- Sant, E., Davies, I., Pashby, K., & Shultz, L. (2018). *Global Citizenship Education*. Bloomsbury Academic.
<https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474286749>
- Snelson, C. L. (2016). Qualitative and Mixed Methods Social Media Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 15(1), 160940691562457.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915624574>
- The Jubilee Centre. (2017). For character education in schools. *The Jubilee Centre for Character & Values*.
[https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/character-education/Framework for Character Education.pdf](https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/character-education/Framework%20for%20Character%20Education.pdf)
- Tierney, W. G., & Lanford, M. (2018). Institutional Culture in Higher Education. In *Encyclopedia of International Higher Education Systems and Institutions* (pp. 1–9). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9553-1_544-1
- Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2012). *21st century skills: learning for life in our times*. Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.
- Trilling, Bernie, & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st Century Skills: Learning for Life in Our Times*. Jossey-Bass.
- Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (2004). *Building Academic Success on Social and Emotional Learning: What Does the Research Say?* Teachers College Press.