**OARJ** OPEN ACCESS RESEARCH JOURNALS

(RESEARCH ARTICLE)

Check for updates

# Sustainability Literacy: Assessment of knowingness, attitude and behavior regarding sustainable development among students in China

Jinyoung Hwang *

*University of edinburgh MA Social Policy and Economics, United Kingdom.*

**Abstract**

Education is critical to achieving the world's sustainable development (SD). Assessment or measurement is a means to help an education system to accelerate integrating SD content. To have a perception of the gap in relation to the SD action goals, a basic understanding of current students' knowledge, attitudes and behaviors (KAB) needs to be established. The study applied a survey to assess Chinses students' knowingness, attitude and behavior regarding SD. Data were collected from students from all parts of China via an online survey tool, which consists of 887 primary-school students and 1661 secondary-school students. The results indicate a high level of KAB regarding SD among Chinese students, while this sustainability literacy is mainly embodied in the environmental dimension. In general, the results showed the better KAB of primary-school students than secondary-school students, while there was almost no difference between male and female students. Moreover, knowingness and attitude have significant and positive correlations with behaviors. These results constitute a general sketch of Chinese students' sustainable knowledge, attitudes and behavior, which could be employed to monitor China's efforts on education for sustainable development and also to foster curriculum developments and innovations in China.

**Keywords:** Sustainability-Literacy Assessment; Sustainable Development Goals; Education for Sustainable Development; Online Survey

## 1. Introduction

Long-term sustainable development (SD) has increasingly become a key issue worldwide regarding future environmental, political, social and economic development. Despite the huge progress made by many societies, challenges such as poverty, biodiversity loss and climate change still exist, leaving many areas where actions can be taken. For individuals, the current generation needs to develop new capacities regarding SD. Despite the divergence in the usage of different concepts—such as abilities, competencies, and consciousness—generally speaking, an individual's SD qualities are the knowledge, mindset and skills that allow individuals to become deeply committed to building a sustainable future and assisting in making informed and effective decisions to this end (Pauw et al., 2015). A change in individuals' knowledge, attitudes and behavior (KAB) is essential to accomplish SD.

Students take on an extraordinarily crucial role, since they are the primary objects of formal education and change agents of SD through actions and decision making. The past two decades have witnessed increasing recognition and political agreement over the role of education as a major agent to transform the current society into a more sustainable, equitable and socially just one. Education for sustainable development (ESD) is not only one of the 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs), but is also a means to reach other SDGs. Goal 4 in the SDGs, in particular, targets the role of ESD in this respect. The development of adequate knowledge, right attitudes and proficient skills is an important dimension of ESD. With regard to this, many activities are underway related to the ESD policies (Ahamad and Arrifin, 2018). In May 2021, the UNESCO World Conference on Education for Sustainable Development was held in Berlin (online). The conference stressed that, in response to various challenges in the field of SD, ESD supports efforts to equip

---

* Corresponding author: Jinyoung Hwang.

learners with the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes needed to contribute to a more sustainable world (Ajzen, 2001). Although ESD policies and practices are abundant, the monitoring and evaluation of ESD achievements are still weak. UNESCO suggested that it is important to accelerate the improvement of monitoring and evaluation, to provide evidence to support investments in ESD and accelerate the process of ESD.

Measuring people's knowledge, awareness or behavior should always be a first step in the development or evaluation of any kind of program or intervention (Ajzen, 2001). To have a perception of the gap in relation to the SD action goals, a basic understanding of current students' KAB needs to be established. Identifying indicators to monitor KAB that are needed to promote SD is challenging work. An important reason for the difficulty in assessment is that there are very few relevant student-assessment surveys and it is difficult to develop survey items that are culturally relevant but not culturally biased [6]. To the researcher's knowledge, there is limited research in China concerning the KAB of students concerning SD, especially considering all three content dimensions, which are environmental sustainability, social sustainability and economic sustainability (which is interpreted as the planet, people and prosperity content domain in the SDGs). Typically, studies that delve into the field have a focus on the environmental dimension, which addresses more narrow frameworks such as sustainable consumption [7], pro-environmental behaviors (Ajzen, 2001), etc. In recent years, a few studies have moved on from the environmental dimension to the integrated concept of SD which incorporates the environmental, economic and social dimensions. There is still a need for studies focusing on students' psychometric constructs within the broader context of SD, including all the environmental, social and economic dimensions.

This study focuses on an important issue, which is describing Chinese students' sustainability literacy. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, this is the first study to investigate and evaluate Chinese primary- and secondary-school students' KAB regarding the environmental, social and economic dimensions of SD. To achieve that, the researchers developed a culturally unbiased and contextually applicable questionnaire. The underlying idea of ESD is to empower students with SD competences through content with a holistic, interdisciplinary perspective. The study has taken a holistic view of SD into account, rather than separating them into polarities, which was also emphasized in United Nations (UN) documents. Through the assessment, the researchers obtained a general sketch of Chinese students' sustainable KAB, which could be employed to monitor China's progress on ESD efforts, and also foster curriculum developments and innovations in China. Moreover, the evaluation methods and indicators adopted by us can also provide reference for other countries and regions to access the implementation effects of ESD.

## 2. Literature Review

It is difficult to study SD without an account of the UN's SD framework. The UN's goals and targets will still stimulate action over the next ten years and are of critical importance for humanity and the planet (SGs, 2022). In addition, "sustainability literacy" is the combination of knowledge, attitudes and behavior, which is closely related to the UN's SDGs and is also the result of ESD. The 17 SDGs put forward more specific requirements for future development, which means SD has changed from a concept to measurable indicators (SGs, 2022). In this case, the content of ESD has become specific, and it is necessary to establish comparable indicators to monitor and evaluate the achievements of ESD. Regarding the assessment of KAB related to SD, there are scales or surveys measuring students' competences that are based on UNESCO documents.

Understanding global issues (such as peace, poverty, migration, globalization and climate change), events and institutions is essential for developing sustainability literacy (Wang, 2019). The knowledge system of sustainability literacy includes relevant knowledge of social, environmental and economic sustainability. To help learners prepare for the uncertainty of the future, they should be helped to acquire relevant knowledge. A lack of knowledge or having the wrong knowledge may limit pro-SD behaviors. Studies have shown that publics have limited knowledge about SD and its goals. A study conducted by GlobeScan (2016) found that only 28% of people across 13 countries, including India, the UK, and Germany, expressed that they have some or a lot of awareness of SDGs (Wu, 2002). While, in China, awareness of the SDGs is lower than that of the Millennium Development Goals in 2007 (Wu, 2002). Guan et al. (2019) surveyed more than 4000 residents in five cities in China; the results also indicated that knowledge about the SDGs was scarce (Wang, 2019). However, on the other hand, the public's growing awareness of SD is being proven by the fact that youth show higher knowledge than the public average (Visser and Krosnick, 1998). However, the knowledge varies by area. Michalos et al. (2015) revealed that students' knowledge of the social and environmental dimensions of sustainability appears to be stronger than that of the economic dimensions (Vicente-Molina et al., 2013).

Knowledge is not the only factor affecting students' sustainability ability, affective factors also affect their daily behavior decisions (Bamberg and Möser, 2007). Attitudes can help individuals adapt to the environment faster. Attitudes may change over time, and susceptibility to attitude change is greater during adolescence (Torbjörnssona, 2011). Therefore,

attitudes can be cultivated through education; changing attitudes or forming supportive attitudes are important content of ESD. Many international policies and national practices have been implemented to promote students' sustainable attitudes, such as the UNESCO Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning Objectives (Bamberg and Möser, 2007). It is not only because attitudes can be changed through education that it is essential to accomplish SD (Siegel et al., 2018). Students' supportive attitudes vary in different aspects of SD content (Barber et al., 2009). Liu et al. (2020) found that students of a vocational college in China had the most-favorable attitudes towards the educational dimension and the least-favorable attitudes towards the social dimension (Schulz et al., 2023). There are also some gender differences in attitudes toward SD. Male students hold stronger anthropocentric values while biocentric values are more common among female students (Barber et al., 2009). Some empirical studies revealed positive associations between sustainability knowingness and sustainability attitudes. Liang et al. (2018) found that a high level of environmental knowledge was required if environmental attitude is to be strong. However, attitudes are not necessarily related to objective knowledge. A gap between knowledge and attitudes implies that a better-informed public is not necessarily a public that holds supportive attitudes (Bamberg and Möser, 2007).

In addition to knowledge and attitudes, behavior has received the most attention from researchers. Behavior is critical, as only changes in behavior can lead to the achievement of SDGs, and the ultimate goal of ESD is to empower students to make sustainable decisions. Previous studies were inconclusive about the factors robustly associated with behaviors regarding SD or some aspects of SD. The relationship between knowingness/knowledge, attitudes and behavior differs between studies. For example, the correlation between environmental knowledge and behavioral intention was extremely weak for Taiwanese university students. Michalos et al. (2015) indicated that the correlation between sustainability-related levels of knowledge and choices favorable to sustainability is likely to increase with exposure to ESD (Sälzer and Roczen, 2018). Strengthening the knowledge base itself contributes to the adoption of more sustainable choices and actions. However, sustainability behavior may only be related to knowingness (knowledge) and attitudes in limited content dimensions (Rieckmann, 2017), and the correlation between attitude and behavior may be enhanced when attitudes are directed to specific sustainable behavior (Rasool et al., 2021).

For the content domain, environmental sustainability has received the most attention. Although SD policies have been implemented all over the world for decades, people still consider that SD is closely related to the environment or nature resources. There is a dearth of study on students' KAB beyond environmental aspects of sustainability, which view SD as a holistic concept.

## 3. Methodology

This study is based on a quantitative approach to investigate the SD knowingness, attitudes and behaviors of Chinese students. Students from primary schools and secondary schools took part in an online survey in March 2021. The study framework, the questionnaire, and the sample description are described in detail in the following sections.

### 3.1. Study Framework

Many studies were devoted to individuals' knowledge, beliefs, and behaviors regarding SD. Some defined knowledge, attitudes, values, behaviors, etc., as a holistic and integrative concept, such as Olsson et al. (2016), which applied sustainable consciousness to represent a holistic view of SD (Berglund et al., 2020). While there were others that measured KAB separately. Although these studies often interpreted KAB as various subcategories, such as concerns, awareness, intentions and willingness, the three building blocks—knowledge, attitude and behavior—are almost always present (Berglund et al., 2020), as individual's qualities, knowledge, attitudes and behaviors must interact with each other. However, the relationships between the three are ambiguous, and various studies obtain different results. Hence, the researcher performed the assessment separately. For this purpose, a KAB survey was conducted.

The questionnaire items varied between different instruments, which implied that these studies focused on specific contexts. However, in the literature, there is an emphasis on encouraging holism and pluralism for SD [32]. The study focused on more general individual qualities regarding SD, rather than specific topics. In this regard, UNESCO documents have become the benchmark (Biasutti and Frate, 2017). The literature was also anchored by the UNESCO definitions. It is necessary to take these benchmarks as a point of departure.

As stated above, studies in the realm have a focus on the environment dimension of SD. Moving from environmental dimension to all fields, there are studies that attempted the development of measurement and assessment tools (Biasutti and Frate, 2017). In search of potential items that might be included in standardized measures of KAB concerning SD, the researchers were aware that SD was an open-textured concept and it was impossible to incorporate all the issues in the field. In the construction of assessment tools, there are generally two strategies to formulate

assessment questionnaire. One is to form an item pool and make a final list of items for use. Another one is to modify assessment tools that already exist, to make it more consistent with the purpose of the present study. The researchers chose the second one, because it is more convincing to develop a questionnaire based on previous sound studies.

Gericke et al. (2019) applied knowingness to the measurement of students' sustainability consciousness rather than using knowledge. Knowingness could be regarded as recognition of the fundamentals of SD, and it includes many similarities with awareness, for it probes individuals' wakefulness and perceptions. They argued that the term knowledge is associated with objective truth. Knowledge is a complex concept that can be expressed in a variety of forms, not only in the form of truths (Olsson et al., 2016). In addition, knowledge is not always in line with the concept of SD, in which the solution of sustainability issues is complex and context-dependent (Blake, 1999). Although awareness of the problem and recognizing the sustainability issue is the prerequisite for actions, factual knowledge alone cannot make individuals committed to sustainable lifestyles. Affective factors are also very important to empower decision making in everyday life. In studies where two validated scales—the new ecological paradigm (NEP) and the connectedness with nature scale (CNS)—are included, the more effective CNS appears to more strongly predict environmental behavior than the more reflective and cognitive NEP (Michaalos, 2012). There are so many facts about SD and SDGs, the researchers found it difficult to cover all the topics in the field and include sufficiently comprehensive items, without bias, in one questionnaire. However, the concept of knowingness is more suitable to the study since the researchers did not intend to probe factual knowledge about environmental, economic and social issues, but an affective-based knowingness (Michalos et al., 2011).

Attitude represents a summary evaluation of a psychological object captured in such attribute dimensions as good–bad, harmful–beneficial, pleasant–unpleasant, and likable–dislikable (Liu et al., 2022). Attitudes refers to judgments or evaluations regarding ideas, persons, objects, events, situations, and/or relationships (Marcos-merino et al., 2020). There is no consensus on the definition of sustainable attitude. In addition, it is possible for people to hold different attitudes in specific context at the same time, sometimes even contradictory attitudes. Due to the presence of multiple context-dependent attitudes toward social targets, correct responses are not required. Most scholars use self-report scales to measure attitude, which requires the subjects to evaluate something with scores. The implicit assumption of self-reporting scale is that individuals are willing and able to accurately express their attitudes, but this assumption is sometimes not valid. Many scholars have noted that there is a widespread social-desirability bias in self-reported attitude scales. Therefore, in theory, it is difficult to measure individuals' attitudes to SD accurately with self-reporting scales. According to the definition of UNESCO, sustainable behavior is the actions and practices that can promote human wellbeing and SD. Behavior is reflected in many aspects, such as individual consumption and lifestyle, participation in policy making, etc.

## 3.2. Survey Instrument

Knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) surveys (or their offshoots) have long history in describing qualities of populations of interest, and have been extensively used to measure public's knowledge, attitude and behaviors related to issues such as environment protection, etc. A survey based on three subconstructs, which were SD knowingness, SD attitudes and SD behaviors, were used. In addition, there was also a set of standard demographic questions concerning gender, age, and so on, at the beginning of the questionnaire. Each item in the questionnaire relates to a specific subtheme within the UNESCO definition of the planet (environment), people (society) and prosperity (economy) aspects of SD.

The researchers carefully studied the items of knowingness and attitudes in the Sustainability Consciousness Questionnaire (SCQ) that Gericke et al. (2019) compiled. The questionnaire has been validated extensively in the study of sustainability consciousness. In order for the item content to include full range of SDGs, the researchers made some modifications to SCQ-Knowingness, which, generally, were removing or adding items to the original version. When adding items,the researchers kept a consistent narrative. The Knowingness subsection has a four-point format, ranging from Strongly agree to Strongly disagree, and a Don't know option, for it is possible students were not entirely sure about the knowingness items. PISA 2018 showed that global mindedness was a good predictor of attitude (Liang et al., 2018). There were six questions in the students' self-report questionnaire—global mindedness in PISA 2018, and the researchers adapted four of them to measure attitudes. In addition, the researhers developed five questions to measure students' attitudes towards environmental and social issues. These items were derived from the SDGS and the learning objectives of ESD. The attitude sub-section has a four-point format, ranging from Strongly agree to Strongly disagree. Items are provided in the following Results section.

It is hard to observe the real behavior in students' life. For this reason, the researchers measured students' willingness to take actions rather than their real actions. PISA 2018 assessed students' willingness to take actions using a series of

eight yes-or-no statements (Kollmuss and Auyeman, 2002). The items were set for measuring students' global competency through their practices in social activities, international affairs and environmental conservation. Those aspects are consistent with the demand of SD. Hence, the researchers adapted these questions in order to make them more realistic to Chinese students, and added items with the same narrative form to ensure they cover all the SDGs. However, it is important to note that prosustainable behavior is too diverse to measure in a brief self-report scale.

In addition, as an important factor affecting sustainable behavior, the researchers also conducted a survey of self-efficacy among students (since answering these questions required certain knowledge and understanding, only secondary-school students were asked to answer these questions). The 2016 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) divided the behavior of civic literacy into three parts: dispositions, behavioral intentions, and civic participation. Behavioral intentions included individuals' interest and self-efficacy (Guan et al., 2019). According to ICCS, self-efficacy could affect individual's decision making and effort level when completing tasks. Self-efficacy was also an important part of PISA's global competence assessment (Gifford, 2011). PISA 2018 asked students to what extent they think they can complete tasks related to global issues, and the options include: they cannot do it, they have difficulty in doing it, they can do it with a little effort, and they can do it easily. The researchers adapted these questions from PISA 2018 into the questionnaire, and added an item about COVID-19 to evaluate students' self-efficacy. **Figure 1** shows the framework of a survey and questionnaire.



**Figure 1** Framework of survey and questionnaire

The researchers first translated the questionnaire that was for secondary-school students into Chinese. Based on this version of the questionnaire, before collection of primary school data, the researchers improved the language for better understanding for primary-school students. The research team transformed the narrative of the questionnaire into simple statements. After that, five primary school Chinese teachers modified the questionnaire to make it suitable for the reading level of primary-school students. Throughout the process, the researcher's kept meaning of the questions as constant as possible. Two versions of the questionnaire were eventually made: one for primary-school students and one for secondary-school students. In addition, a few sentences were worded negatively for the purpose of identifying careless respondents and the responses were reverse coded during the analysis.

The survey is valid and reliable. As stated above, the items of each construct were from valid questionnaire. Results from the reliability analysis for the scales of knowingness and attitudes constructs and self-efficacy are provided in terms of Cronbach's α. The analysis indicated sufficient reliability of the instrument, with the separate alphas being 0.82, 0.82, and 0.79, which were all above 0.7.

### 3.3. Sampling and Data Collection

The analysis included two main groups of students. One from primary school and one from secondary school. Students entered the study by completing an online questionnaire. The questionnaires were distributed in March 2021 through the professional and influential online survey platform "Questionnaire Star", which is widely used in China. The platform generated a link to the questionnaire and invited qualified samples in its sample pool to fill out the questionnaire. Only when finishing all the questions (which means that for every question, students must choose an option or fill the blank) could students submit the questionnaire. Due to this setting, there was no missing values in the final data collected. However, this may have led to another problem, which is that students choose any answer although they did not feel that way, in order to finish and submit the survey sheet.

Due to the low possibility of owning a cell phone, it was difficult to reach primary-school students directly through the Internet. For this reason, the researchers randomly distributed the online questionnaire in three primary school in Beijing with the help of school administrators. Since a certain level of literacy and comprehension is required to fill out the questionnaire, the sample of primary-school students in this survey was composed of students in grades 3–6. However, using the convenience sample may contribute to the larger proportion of urban students of primary school.

Although the researchers assured their anonymity and requested them to answer the questions by their own, there was still possibility that parents were the real respondents. In addition, there may be carelessly invalid respondents. Overall, a total of 64 nonvalid respondents or inattentive respondents were identified through response time, response length restrictions, and whether consecutive questions gave identical responses.

The final data consists of 2548 students, including 887 primary-school students, 278 middle-school students, and 1383 high-school students (a total of 1661 secondary-school students), as detailed in **Table 1**. In addition, the number of male and female students in the study's sample was approximately equal, but the majority of students lived in urban areas. A reason for this may be that online questionnaire distribution results in barriers for students from rural areas, as detailed in **Figure 2**.



**Figure 2** Description of sample by school level. (a) Gender by school level; (b) household type by school level.

**Table 1.** Description of sample characteristics.

# 4. Results

A five-point format was used for all the questions in the knowingness subsection, and a four-point format was used in attitude subsection. Hence, it is not appropriate to simply add the scores. The researchers presented here the percentage of responses of the strongly agreeing and the total percentage of favorable responses. However, a fair amount of information is lost when neglecting the responses that are unfavorable or neutral (Fisher, 1993). Therefore, the researcher also treats the degree as if they were cardinal numbers so that the researchers can obtain mean scores as summary measures of the responses. The mean scores are calculated as the degree of all response divided by the number of the responses, with 1 being highest and 4 being lowest.

## 4.1. Knowingness

The researchers present students' knowingness of SD both with the means and standard deviations and with the frequencies of the items. To every question, there are students who chosen the Don't know option. Due to it being hardly possible to assign a reliable value to it, the Don't know answers were excluded when calculating the mean values. Since the items are either SDGs or paraphrases of SDGs, the results indicate that students have a good knowingness of SD. The mean values of each item are all less than 2 (1 to 4), meaning that most of the students recognized what it takes to achieve sustainable development. Of these eight items, six items gained more than 90% of agreement or strong agreement. Item number K8 had the lowest mean value and, correspondingly, received the highest level (99%, $n$ = 2548) of agreement or strong agreement.

In addition to that, the results show that, generally, students have better knowingness of the planet content domain than the people or prosperity content domains. For item K6 and K7, which are from the planet domain, 72% and 63% of the students strongly agree with the statement separately. As for the items from the other two domains, for example, item K1 and K2, only 49% and 45% of the students gave the strongly agree answer, and these two were also the questions that most students expressed that they do not know. There were 184 and 128 students expressed that they do not know whether these two items were the content of SD.

## 4.2. Attitude

Students held favorable attitudes towards SD. The mean values of the attitude items are less than 2 and more than 90% of the students agree or strongly agree with the items except one inverted item, A2. Almost all students (99%, $n = 2548$) have affirmative attitude (agree and strongly agree) towards item A1, A9, A7 and A8, and, correspondingly, the mean values of these items are, separately, the lowest. The same with knowingness, two out of four (A8, A9) of these items were the issues in the planet domain. However, in general, students show a positive attitude towards SD, the differences only varied within the agree section.

There are some ceiling effects related to the attitude items, due to social desirability bias, which results in deviation from the true results. The presence of ceiling effects in attitude measurements has been discussed in several studies (Fang et al., 2018). Therefore, the frequencies of strongly agree may present a more realistic result. Only 55% ($n = 2548$) strongly agree that floating people should have all the same rights as the local people. It is contradictory to the result that 74% ($n = 2548$) strongly agree that good education is important to everyone.

For the negative item A2, only 38% ($n = 2548$) of the students thought their behavior had an impact on people from other countries. This indicates how students reflect on their own role in global society. Most students did not see themselves as connected to the global community nor feel a sense of responsibility for others (Davies, 2006). The researchers also think that the result is partially because of students not reading the questions carefully, perhaps even unconsciously ticking.

## 4.3. Behavior

Students were most likely to report that they take actions concerning environmental protection. Emissions-reducing behaviors were almost the most important aspects of individual environmentalism. Similar to the findings of knowingness and attitude, the top three most common actions (B7, B1, B9) are still related to environmental issues.

In addition, above 90% students reported Yes to B6 (93%) and B4 (92%). Including item B7, B1 and B9, above, these actions are those that are either the easiest and most common actions (such as B1), or those that investigated the willingness to take rather than the real behavior. This is perhaps the reason why these items have higher participation rates.

The least common action among students was B3 (49%) (only for secondary-school students). The least common action is what requires active participation or involves forms of active citizenship that adolescents may not be familiar with or that require time and effort. In addition, the results of B2 and B5 indicate that, when regarding financial commitments, students' willingness to take action reduced.

## 4.4. Self-Efficacy

When students have greater confidence in successfully completing a task, they are more likely to set difficult and challenging targets, put in more effort, and are more likely to persevere in face of failure. Conversely, students who lack self-efficacy may perceive that putting more effort into a task is a waste, which, in turn, may reduce their motivation to persevere and make them less likely to succeed.

**Figure 3** showed the self-efficacy of secondary-school students. Self-efficacy questions require students to master environmental, social and economic knowledge. Students may be more familiar with topics widely covered by the media or ongoing events, such as carbon dioxide and global warming, as well as the impact of the COVID-19, than the topics that require specific knowledge. Of course, these questions only reflect the self-efficacy of students, but do not really reflect their knowledge reserves or problem-solving competences. For example, although a high proportion of students thought they could explain the impact of carbon emissions on global warming, how they explained it and how deeply they explained it were not reflected by the questions.

**Figure 3** Self-efficacy of secondary-school students.

## 4.5. Heterogeneity Analysis

In addition, the researchers tried to describe the KAB of students at different school ages and whether there were differences in those of students by gender, as emphasized in the literature. Since the items in the behavior subsection for primary-school students had one less than for secondary-school students (B3), the researchers used the percentage of the number of completed behaviors. As indicated in **Figure 4**, primary students showed relatively better sustainability literacy. Their mean values of knowingness and attitude were lower than middle-school students and high-school students, and they completed more behavior items. However, the difference between middle-school and high-school students is not that obvious.



**Figure 4** Students' knowingness, attitude and behavior of different school level. (a) Students' knowingness of different school level; (b) Students' attitude of different school level; (c) Students' behavior of different school level.

The researchers also similarly described the differences between students of different genders, as presented in **Figure 5**. In general, male and female students did not show significant differences in sustainability literacy. However, the results of the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the responses of male and female students on some items. For example, in the Knowingness dimension, male students were more aware of the role of ending hunger

(K2) and poverty (K3) in SD ($p < 0.01$ and $p = 0.04$). While, for item K4, female students scored significantly lower than males ($p = 0.01$). In the Attitude dimension, in terms of "planet" and "global partnership", female students had more positive attitudes than male students. From the specific items, regarding the rights of individuals to obtain clean drinking water (A1) and good education (A7), the overall attitude of female students was "strongly agree", and the score was significantly lower than that of male students ($p = 0.02$ and $p = 0.01$). In items of climate and biodiversity (A8, A9), the attitudes of female students were also more positive than that of male students ($p = 0.02$ and $p = 0.07$). In the behavior dimension, male students may be more concerned about social issues, where more male students reported that they keep themselves informed about world events (B4).



**Figure 5** Knowingness, attitude and behavior of male students and female students. (a) Knowingness of male students and female students; (b) attitude of male students and female students; (c) behavior of male students and female students.

## 4.6. Relationships between Knowingness, Attitudes and Behaviors

Based on the findings of the three subsections of knowingness, attitudes and behavior, and using the data from the present study, the researchers made an attempt to explore the relationships and the factors that related students' SD behaviors. The researchers added up the scores of each respondent in the three subsections, and used OLS regression to roughly investigate the relationships between knowingness, attitudes and behavior. As mentioned above, adding up respondents' scores was not the best approach, but it could give us some evidence of correlations between variables. In the regressions, the researchers also included some control variables obtained in the survey, including *gender* (dummy, 1 if female), *hukou* (household type; dummy, 1 if urban), and *medu* (highest education of mother; dummy, 1 if bachelor's degree or above).

It is evident that, when no control variables are included, knowingness and attitudes are correlated with behavior at the 1% significance level. The results are robust after adding control variables. The findings support the conclusion that there is a correlation between SD behaviors and SD knowingness and SD attitudes. In addition, the estimated coefficients of control variables indicate that the higher the mother's education level, the better the individual's SD behavior. There is a stronger correlation between primary-school students' SD knowingness and SD behavior.

## 5. Conclusion

The study indicates that environment issues still receive more attention from students than the social and economic domains. Top-ranked responses were to statements directly or indirectly related to the environmental dimension. In the Chinese context where the study was conducted, it is no surprise that students showed a high level of SD concerns, since environmental education and sustainability education had a long history in the Chinese education system. The initial education for SD in China was generally equivalent to environmental education. Since 1996, Green School has been developed in most areas of China (Buckler and Creech, 2014). Even not in China, for many education systems, there is little or no difference between ESD and environmental education (Buckler and Creech, 2014), where students are taught lessons related to energy conservation and nature protection. Even if environmental education is not the main cause, there are normative influences that shape students' attitudes and behaviors. Conservation is a virtue of the Chinese people. In addition, the Chinese traditionally attach great importance to the harmony between man and nature in culture; hence, protecting the environment has always been advocated. Students also might interpret SD as an environment-related concept (Brick and Lewis, 2019). However, this is not to imply that the increased focus on environmental issues is unique to Chinese students. Previous studies also found similar results across countries and areas. Concern for the environment is also strongly emphasized in western European societies (Brick and Lewis, 2019).

In addition, the researchers observed individualistic tendencies among the students. For the top-ranked item A1 and item A7, the researchers use everyone in both sentences to demonstrate that it is the right for everyone to have the access to clean drinking water or good education. The issues involve everyone, especially the students themselves. The reseachers assume the commonality of the two items led to the similarly high positive answers. More evidence appears when comparing with item A6. Since, in China, education resources and medical care is unequal among urban residents and migrant workers, it is important to ensure that floating people have the same access to good education. The result is contradictory, as most of the students agreed that good education is important for everyone. The one possible reason is that, when it comes to issues that involved the respondent his/herself, they might give the more affirmative answer. In addition, a significant number of students did not see their influence on other people around the world. Individuals with a greater sense of personal responsibility are more likely to have engaged in sustainability-responsible behavior (Boeve-de Pauw, 2014). Otherwise, they may have little faith about their behavior making a change to the world, causing barriers to motivating actions.

## Compliance with ethical standards

### Disclosure of conflict of interest

No disclosure of conflict of interest.

## References

[1] Ahamad, N. R., & Ariffin, M. (2018). Assessment of knowledge, attitude and practice towards sustainable consumption among university students in Selangor, Malaysia. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, *16*, 88-98.

[2] Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 27–58.

[3] Bamberg, S., & Möser, G. (2007). Twenty years after Hines, Hungerford, and Tomera: A new meta-analysis of psycho-social determinants of pro-environmental behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 27*(1), 14–25.

[4] Barber, N., Taylor, D. C., & Strick, S. (2009). Environmental knowledge and attitudes: Influencing the purchase decisions of wine consumers. In *Proceedings of the International CHRIE Conference*, Amherst, MA, USA, 29 July–1 August.

[5] Berglund, T., Gericke, N., Boeve-de Pauw, J., Olsson, D., & Chang, T. C. (2020). A cross-cultural comparative study of sustainability consciousness between students in Taiwan and Sweden. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *22*, 6287-6313.

[6] Biasutti, M.; Frate, S. A validity and reliability study of the Attitudes toward Sustainable Development scale. Environ. Educ. Res. 2017, 23, 214–230.

[7] Blake, J. (1999). Overcoming the 'value-action gap' in environmental policy: Tensions between national policy and local experience. *Local Environment, 4*(3), 257–278.

[8] Boeve-de Pauw, J., Jacobs, K., & Van Petegem, P. (2014). Gender differences in environmental values: An issue of measurement? *Environment and Behavior, 46*(3), 373–397.

[9] Brick, C., & Lewis, G. J. (2016). Unearthing the "green" personality: Core traits predict environmentally friendly behavior. *Environment and Behavior, 48*(5), 635–658.

[10] Buckler, C.; Creech, H.; UNESCO. Shaping the Future We Want: UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005–2014); Final Report; UNESCO: Paris, France, 2014; pp. 159–172. Available online: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002301/230171e.pdf (accessed on 15 September 2021).

[11] Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action?. *Educational review*, *58*(1), 5-25.

[12] Fang, W. T., Lien, C. Y., Huang, Y. W., Han, G., Shyu, G. S., Chou, J. Y., & Ng, E. (2018). Environmental literacy on ecotourism: A study on student knowledge, attitude, and behavioral intentions in China and Taiwan. *Sustainability*, *10*(6), 1886.

[13] Fisher, R. J. (1993). Social desirability bias and the validity of indirect questioning. *Journal of Consumer Research, 20*(2), 303–315.

[14] Gericke, N.; Pauw, J.B.; Berglund, T.; Olsson, D. (2019). The Sustainability Consciousness

[15] Gifford, R. (2011). The dragons of inaction: Psychological barriers that limit climate change mitigation and adaptation. *American Psychologist, 66*(4), 290–302.

[16] Guan, T., Meng, K., Liu, W., & Xue, L. (2019). Public attitudes toward sustainable development goals: Evidence from five Chinese cities. *Sustainability*, *11*(20), 5793.

[17] Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the Gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research, 8*(3), 239–260.

[18] Liang, S. W., Fang, W. T., Yeh, S. C., Liu, S. Y., Tsai, H. M., Chou, J. Y., & Ng, E. (2018). A nationwide survey evaluating the environmental literacy of undergraduate students in Taiwan. *Sustainability, 10*(5), 1730.

[19] Liu, X., Chen, Y., Yang, Y., Liu, B., Ma, C., Craig, G. R., & Gao, F. (2022). Understanding vocational accounting students' attitudes towards sustainable development. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, *74*(2), 249-269.

[20] Marcos-Merino, J. M., Corbacho-Cuello, I., & Hernández-Barco, M. (2020). Analysis of sustainability knowingness, attitudes and behavior of a Spanish pre-service primary teachers sample. *Sustainability*, *12*(18), 7445.

[21] Michalos, A. C., Creech, H., McDonald, C., & Kahlke, P. M. H. (2011). Knowledge, attitudes and behaviours. Concerning education for sustainable development: Two exploratory studies. *Social indicators research*, *100*, 391-413.

[22] Olsson, D., Gericke, N., & Chang Rundgren, S. N. (2016). The effect of implementation of education for sustainable development in Swedish compulsory schools–assessing pupils' sustainability consciousness. *Environmental education research*, *22*(2), 176-202.

[23] Pauw, J. B., Gericke, N., Olsson, D., & Berglund, T. (2015). The effectiveness of Education for Sustainable Development. *Sustainability, 7*(11), 15693–15717.

[24] Rasool, S., Rehman, A., Cerchione, R., & Centobelli, P. (2021). Evaluating consumer environmental behavior for sustainable development: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Sustainable Development, 29*(3), 318–326.

[25] Rieckmann, M. Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning Objectives; UNESCO: Paris, France, 2017; pp. 10–11.

[26] Sälzer, C., & Roczen, N. (2018). Assessing global competence in PISA 2018: Challenges and approaches to capturing a complex construct. *International journal of development education and global learning*, *10*(1).

[27] Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., Ainley, J., Damiani, V., & Friedman, T. (2023). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2022 Assessment Framework* (p. 133). Springer Nature.

[28] Siegel, L., Cutter-Mackenzie-Knowles, A., & Bellert, A. (2018). Still 'Minding the Gap' sixteen years later: (Re)Storying pro-environmental behaviour. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education, 34*(2), 189–203.

[29] Stables, A., & Scott, W. (2002). The quest for holism in Education for Sustainable Development. *Environmental Education Research, 8*(1), 53–60.

[30] Torbjörnssona, T. (2011). Attitudes to sustainable development among Swedish pupils. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 316-320.

[31] Vicente-Molina, M. A., Fernández-Sáinz, A., & Izagirre-Olaizola, J. (2013). Environmental knowledge and other variables affecting pro-environmental behaviour: Comparison of university students from emerging and advanced countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 61*, 130–138.

[32] Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Development of attitude strength over the life cycle: surge and decline. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *75*(6), 1389.

[33] Wang, Q.L. New international trends in Education for Ecological Civilization—Interpretation of the UNESCO roadmap for implementing the Global Action Programme on Education for Sustainable Development member states meeting (2018–2019). Environ. Educ. 2019, 12, 49–51.

[34] Wu, Z. (2002). Green Schools in China. *The Journal of Environmental Education, 34*(1), 21–25.