

“What Does it Mean to Be Globally Competent?”

Bill Hunter, Ed.D.

George P. White, Ed.D.

Galen Godbey, Ph.D.

To contribute to the valuable and ongoing debate regarding the definition of global citizenship and global competency, this study proposes a definition developed through the use of a Delphi Technique involving human resource managers at top transnational corporations, senior international educators, United Nations officials, inter-cultural trainers, and foreign government officers. This definition is used as the foundation for the development of a survey to determine the knowledge, skills, and attitudes and experiences necessary to be considered globally competent. The survey was sent to 133 representatives from universities that self-nominated for recognition in the "Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities—Internationalizing the Campus 2003" (NAFSA: Association of International Educators publication) and the transnational corporation human resource officials serving as members of the National Foreign Trade Council's Expatriate Management Committee and Global Mobility Roundtable. Results are reported and discussed, and a proposed curricular plan is presented based on the findings.

Key Words: global competence • global citizen • global-ready graduate • intercultural competence • cross-cultural communication • international education

What Does it Mean to be Globally Competent?

In his classic essay entitled “Essentially Contested Concepts,” W.B. Gallie argued that certain concepts, such as “art,” “social justice,” “a Christian life,” or “democracy,” admit of no fixed and final definition: essentially-contested concepts do not “succumb - - as most scientific theories eventually do - - to a definite or judicial knockout.” His insight is that a final definition for such terms is impossible because virtually every person or organization that might be a party to the definitional process approaches that process with philosophical values or a programmatic agenda very much in mind. As Gallie put it:

In order to count as essentially contested, a concept must possess the four following characteristics: (1) it must be *appraisive* in the sense that it signifies or accredits some kind of valued achievement. (2) This achievement must be of an internally complex character, for all that its worth is attributed to it as a whole. (3) Any explanation of its worth must therefore include reference to the respective contributions of its various parts or features; yet prior to experimentation there is nothing absurd or contradictory in any one of a number of possible rival descriptions of its total worth, one such description setting its component parts or features in one order of importance, a second setting them in a second order, and so on. In fine, the accredited achievement is *initially* variously describable. (4) The accredited achievement must be of a kind that admits of considerable modification in the light of changing circumstances; and such modification cannot be prescribed or predicted in advance. For convenience I shall call the concept of any such achievement “open” in character. Not only that different persons or parties adhere to different views of the correct use of some concept but (5) that each party recognizes the fact that its own use of it is contested by those of other parties, and that each party must have at least some appreciation of the different criteria in the light of which the other parties claim to be applying the concept in question. More simply, to use an essentially contested concept means to use it against other uses and to recognize that one’s own use of it has to be maintained against these other uses. Still more simply, to use an essentially contested concept means to use it both aggressively and defensively.³

Over the last decade, several international educators have proposed definitions for the term “global competence.” The term is also gaining cachet in business, government, and in human resource argot. However, when comparing the definitions proposed (or

assumed) by each, there is little commonality, and in almost all cases, are American-derived.

The authors of this article recognize that the emerging term “global competence” could prove to be contested in a way similar to Gallie’s descriptions. Professionals who teach foreign languages, or who orchestrate inter-cultural educational experiences, or who support international collaboration through Internet 2, or who hire people to represent trans-national companies in other lands, or churches preparing missionaries, or military staff or spymasters considering the requirements for behind-the-lines operatives approach “global competence” with significantly different needs, experiences, and personal and professional interests. They can be expected to offer definitions that arise from their context and reflect their agendas.

Despite, or rather because of, these different constituencies and the lack of a consensual definition of “global competence,” the authors see value in advancing an intellectual core for this construct. As the neo-agrarian social critic Richard Weaver (1984) put it in the title of one of his books, *Ideas Have Consequences*, definitions are ideas in harness. Consensus on the term “global competence” would obviously make conversation more efficient in a world where education, business, governments, and other sectors have to re-think their structures and dynamics in the context of globalization and increased environmental interdependence.

A more pragmatic rationale is the advantage that consensus would bestow upon those who advocate greater federal investments in “soft,” as opposed to “sticky” or “sharp” forms of power. Walter Russell Mead, with a nod to Joseph Nye, defined these terms in his April 2004 article in *Foreign Policy Magazine*:

In his 2002 book, *The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*, Harvard University political scientist Joseph S. Nye Jr. discussed the varieties of power that the United States can deploy as it builds its world order. Nye focuses on two types of power: hard and soft. In his analysis, hard power is military or economic force that coerces others to follow a particular course of action. By contrast, soft power – cultural power, the power of example, the power of ideas and ideals – works more subtly; it makes others want what you want. Soft power upholds the U.S. world order because it influences others to like the U.S. system and support it of their own free will.

Nye's insights on soft power have attracted significant attention and will continue to have an important role in higher educational debates. But the distinction Nye suggests between two types of hard power – military and economic power – has received less consideration than it deserves. Traditional military power can usefully be called sharp power; those resisting it will feel bayonets pushing and prodding them in the direction they must go. Economic power can be thought of as sticky power, which comprises a set of economic institutions and policies that attracts others toward it and then traps them in it. Together with soft power (the values, ideas, habits, and politics inherent in the system), sharp and sticky power sustain U.S. hegemony and make something as artificial and historically arbitrary as the U.S.-led global system appear desirable, inevitable, and permanent.

Although not listed specifically by Mead as a form of “soft power,” international and intercultural personal, professional, and organizational relationships - - “relationship capital,” if you will - - seem to fit most comfortably under that rubric; person-to-person

contact is arguably the most powerful way of exhibiting and sharing a nation's or cultures key values.

Colleges and universities have a special interest in, and capacity to contribute to, soft power - - a form that permits win-win situations through inter-cultural borrowings and synthesis and the global extrapolation of the work of non-profit, humanitarian organizations. "Global competence" as a concept is important because it informs the ways in which we encourage and train people to interact with, and open themselves to, other cultures, and to build the relationship capital that makes the exercise of sharp power less likely.

Indeed, those who are opposed to Mead's easy acceptance of "sharp power" have a special interest in forming intellectual, as well as political, coalitions around a core definition of "global competence": policy critique is always aided by clear alternatives, and, to the extent that "global competence" is a part of the soft-power alternative to sharp power, it needs to have some core meaning.

So the challenge to define "global competence" has run in tandem with the rapidly developing, critical need for colleges and universities to internationalize their curricula and the college experience in general. One distinct outcome of this internationalization effort over the last four years is the creation, by more than a dozen American colleges and universities, of curricula that claim to produce students who are "globally ready" or "global citizens," duly prepared for the global workplace and our multicultural society. Upon completion of these programs, students receive a special designation on their transcripts, earn a certificate, or secure other "proof" of their new stature. While this is an encouraging sign of institutional recognition of the value of

inter-cultural/international activity, are universities really producing globally competent students? And if they do, how would they know that students are globally competent?

Proposed Definition

Hunter (2004) facilitated extensive discussion with representatives from multinational businesses, human resource managers of transnational corporations, senior international educators, United Nations and embassy officials, and intercultural specialists, and formulated an agreed-upon definition for “global competence.”

According to the international panel of experts, a working definition for the term global competence is: “Having an open mind while actively seeking to understand cultural norms and expectations of others, leveraging this gained knowledge to interact, communicate and work effectively outside one’s environment,” (Hunter, 2004).

While the authors offer this empirically-based description as **one** plausible, working definition of global competence, we are mindful of Gallie’s insights. Consequently, we see it as useful starting point, a formulation that can be customized to fit institutional mission and character. For example, a Catholic institution might feel the need to add the phrase, “for the purpose of promoting human solidarity” to the end of the above definition to be consistent with Vatican teachings on the threats and opportunities posed by globalization. Others may argue that this definition focused upon intercultural competence, which they might maintain is part, but not the whole, of global competence. Consequently, they might add requirements related to the savvy use of technology or other elements of the geographically-distributed work paradigm of globalization.

In sum, this article solicits active engagement from the reader, in the hope that from the various possible definitions of this important term, consensus, or at least a well-mapped community of different, but complimentary, meanings will emerge.

Background and Goals of Study

While the increasing number of new global curricular programs being offered by universities is an encouraging sign of institutional recognition of the value of inter-cultural/international activity, are these university programs really producing globally competent students? And if they do, how would they know the students are globally competent? This study sought to answer both questions.

Little research exists with the expressed purpose of defining the term “global competence” or of identifying the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences necessary to become globally competent. Within this limited body of research, there is no consensus, regarding the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences necessary to become globally competent. Cummings (2001), summarized the current body of knowledge as being “somewhat sporadic, non-cumulative, and tends to be carried out by national organizations as part of advocacy projects” (p. 2). The 2000 American Council on Education report “Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education” concurred, suggesting that “International education at U.S. colleges and universities is a poorly documented phenomena (sic)” (p. 4).

Several of the current global competence programs offered by American universities were created as the product of staff consensus as opposed to an evolutionary process based on grounded research.

To assist universities in determining the level of preparedness of globally competent graduates, a study was undertaken to develop a working definition of global competence. Participants in the study, human resource managers of transnational corporations, United Nations officials and diplomats, and international educators at higher education institutions, were asked to identify the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences associated with being globally competent.

The ultimate purpose of the study was to enable higher education officials to create a curriculum and supporting activities designed to assure that college graduates are globally competent.

Historical Perspectives on Global Competence

American educators have done little to standardize global education within U.S. borders. Formal global education programs remain a scarce commodity, available only to a handful of forward-thinking universities that offer such educational opportunities.

There is a plethora of commentary, spanning decades of research and writing, regarding the purported American university graduate's lack of global education and skills enabling them to be a "global ready graduate" (Godbey, 2002). Merryfield (1995) noted her significant concern that over the last two decades, American schools were not sufficiently preparing their graduates to become part of the global workforce. Deardorff (2004) concurred, suggesting few American universities enable the maturation of interculturally competent students as an output of internationalization initiatives. In parallel conjecture, Oblinger, at a presentation in 2002, cited a report issued by the (ACE) (1988), concluding that less than seven percent of all higher education students achieved the basic standards of global preparedness, which the ACE report defined as "four or

more courses of international studies and a certain number of years of foreign language” (p. 7). Green (2000) arrived at a similar conclusion, stating few American college graduates are competent to function in different cultures, speak another language, or have any significant understanding of the world beyond U.S. borders.

Lacy (as cited in Gliozzo, 2002) candidly assessed the American educational system’s inability to produce graduates who are well prepared for the global workforce: “Despite...the need for undergraduates to be globally competent or able to function in a multicultural and shrinking world, the level of international learning in U.S. colleges and universities remained disturbingly low” (p. 17). Sutton (1999) shared Lacy’s concern, stating that American college students demonstrate a low level of both knowledge of and interest in international affairs or global issues. Beyond a general understanding of history, geography and economics, Gliozzo (2002) noted that, “Americans still lack the most elementary knowledge and skills necessary to function effectively in multilingual and multicultural situations” (p. 17).

The Need for Globally-Competent Citizens

The ACE (1998) stressed that, “America’s future depends upon our ability to develop a citizen base that is globally competent ...The United States needs many more people who understand how other peoples think, how other cultures work, and how other societies are likely to respond to American action” (p. vii). As if to foreshadow the events of September 11, 2001, the ACE report stated, “American diplomacy and national security depend on access to scholars with advanced training in the languages and cultures of the world. When crises erupt, it is too late to create the expertise that could have forestalled or better managed them” (p. 5). To help avoid such cataclysmic

occurrences, the report called for new partnerships among higher education, business, and governments at the federal, state and local level to ensure a globally aware and competent citizenry. Two years later, ACE News (2000) declared that while the majority of higher education officials believe that mastery of international concepts and skills is an important component of an effective college education, and that internationalization as an institutional concept was worthy of campus-wide integration, most graduates were still ill-prepared to face the global marketplace of employment and ideas.

Suggesting that relatively few undergraduates gain international or intercultural competence in college, ACE asserted in 2000 that, “Broad curricular internationalization is lacking; postsecondary graduates are poorly informed about other countries, people, and events; and offerings,” (p. 3). To combat these inadequacies, the ACE and 33 other American-based higher-education groups proposed in 2002 that the federal government adopt a national agenda on global competence, stating, “The global transformations of the last decade have created an unparalleled need in the United States for expanded international knowledge and skills. Over the last several decades, however, expanding needs, rising costs, and declining investments in international and foreign-language training have led the United States to a dangerous shortfall of individuals with global competence” (p. 23). The federal government never adopted the agenda.

The report of The Coalition for the Advancement of International Studies, entitled “Spanning the Gap: Toward a Better Business and Education Partnership for International Competence” (1989) stated, “Corporations require global competence to manage production and markets. The report claimed that eighty-six percent of corporations responding stated they will need managers and employees with greater

international knowledge in the decade ahead” (p. 7). Dosa (1993) provided a rationale for the internationalization of American academic institutions, stating that a case can be made based on rapidly expanding markets for information resources managers worldwide. As new markets are opening up, Dosa reported, there is a parallel increase in the need for skilled information data handling and by globally competent employees. Orkin (in Ligos, 2000), principal at Global Training Systems, a global management-consulting firm in New Jersey, concurred with Dosa, suggesting “the demand for experienced globetrotters ... is soaring as more companies expand abroad...if you’ve got global skills, you’re definitely seen as a hot ticket” (p. 3) Orkin, however, did not define the term “global skills.”

Defining “Global Competence”

An international education initiative, known as global competence, was first noted in 1988 in a report published by the Council on International Education Exchange. The publication, known in international education circles as the “Magna Carta” on the concept of global competence, called upon American universities to send students on exchange programs to universities abroad where Americans are not the majority population and where English is not the dominant language. The report also suggested that students go abroad for three months or more, particularly to countries not normally traveled to by Americans. Lambert (1996), considered by many as the father of the global competence initiative, identified a globally competent person as one who has knowledge (of current events), can empathize with others, demonstrates approval (maintains a positive attitude), has an unspecified level of foreign language competence and task performance (ability to understand the value in something foreign). Despite his joke that

a globally competent person must be the person who wins “Jeopardy” by answering all questions relating to anywhere outside the U.S., Lambert poignantly queried if it were the depth of regional knowledge or a more generalized knowledge base that enabled someone to be globally competent.

Since the publishing of the Council’s report in 1988, a variety of American and European educational scholars and committees have also proposed definitions for the term “global competence” and postulates regarding the required knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences necessary to become globally competent. Swiss Consulting Group (a transnational management consulting firm with more than 20 years of experience) in its Global Competence Report – 2002, defined global competence as “the capacity of an individual or a team to parachute into any country and get the job done while respecting cultural pathways” (p. 4). The Report took the next step and identified global competence’s required skill set as “intercultural facility; effective two-way communication; (sic) diverse leadership; systematic best-practice sharing; and a truly global strategy design process” (pp. 5-6).

The Stanley Foundation, which supports research pertaining to global education, considers global competence to include “an appreciation of complexity, conflict management, the inevitability of change, and the interconnectedness between and among humans and their environment. Globally competent citizens know they have an impact on the world and that the world influences them. They recognize their ability and responsibility to make choices that affect the future” (Internet, 2003).

In a related study, twenty-three community college officials and representatives of government agencies met at a conference convened in 1996 by the Stanley Foundation

and the American Council on International Intercultural Education (ACIIE). The conference, titled “Educating for the Global Community: A Framework for Community Colleges,” sought to define the term “globally competent learner.” Following several days of debate using a process similar to a Delphi Technique (a non face-to-face technology mediated dialogue that allows for the synthesis of ideas or concepts) , the participants determined that a globally competent learner is one who is “able to understand the interconnectedness of peoples and systems, to have a general knowledge of history and world events, to accept and cope with the existence of different cultural values and attitudes and, indeed, to celebrate the richness and benefits of this diversity” (p. 4). Recommendations regarding institutional requirements included references to global education in the mission statement, revising accreditation criteria to acknowledge the importance of global competence, development of a comprehensive global competence education program on campus, and providing support for such educational initiatives.

Cross-cultural awareness and interaction are also key aspects of becoming globally competent, according to Curran (2002). Curran suggested that global competence is the ability to become familiar with an environment, “going with the flow;” and reflection upon completion of a particular activity within a new culture. Curran stated that familiarity with a new environment meant being aware of one’s own personal characteristics, strengths and weaknesses, cultural biases and norms, motivations and concerns – all of which are considered essentials that can facilitate intercultural interaction and provide sources of continual learning. “Going with the flow,” Curran stated, meant patience, tolerance for ambiguity, and acceptance for not knowing all the

details of a situation at any given time. Taking a moment to reflect on a new culture, Curran suggested, “constituted mindfully considering the culture on its own merit, without judgmental comparison to what one may already believe,” (Internet, 2003). The concept implied gaining new ideas from sources one might otherwise neglect.

Wilson and Dalton (1997) took a tangential perspective on Curran’s work. They concluded that perceptual knowledge (open-mindedness, resistance to stereotyping, complexity of thinking, and perspective consciousness) and substantive knowledge (of cultures, languages, world issues, global dynamics, and human choices) were integral components of global competence.

Although not formally attempting to define global competence, William D. Kirby, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard, noted his institution bears “a responsibility to educate its students to be knowledgeable and responsible as they go out into the world – to know languages, to know the culture, the economics and policies of the countries they will visit, to interact in a knowledgeable way,” (Rimer, 2004).

This lack of concurrence, on the definition of, or the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences required for global competence, has led to a free for all development of certificate programs that lack sound research foundation.

Methods

This study was conducted using a dual method, descriptive research approach that is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. A Delphi Technique was implemented to determine a definition for the term “global competence,” and a survey, which included questions seeking both qualitative and quantitative answers, was distributed to determine the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences necessary to become globally competent.

Delphi Technique

There were 17 participants in the Delphi Technique, who represented an array of perspectives, included human resource managers at top transnational corporations, senior international educators, United Nations officials, intercultural trainers, and foreign government officers.

Survey

From the literature, Hunter (2004) developed a survey instrument known as “Determining Global Competence,” that was distributed to each of the 133 representatives from universities that self-nominated for recognition in the “Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities – Internationalizing the Campus 2003” NAFSA: Association of International Educators publication, and each of the transnational corporation human resource officials serving as members of the National Foreign Trade Council’s Expatriate Management Committee and Global Mobility Roundtable (approximately 40 members total). Those transnational human resource officials holding membership in the Expatriate Management Committee represented companies sending 500 or more employees abroad each year. Those transnational human resource officials holding membership on the Global Mobility Roundtable represented companies sending between 50-200 employees abroad annually. The two groups were chosen because of their direct role in either educating or hiring globally competent individuals. A total of 54 responses were received, as presented in Table #1.

Findings

Clarifying Terms

At the conclusion of three rounds of debate, the Delphi Panel concluded that the definition of the term “global competence” was “having an open mind while actively seeking to understand cultural norms and expectations of others, leveraging this gained knowledge to interact, communicate and work effectively outside one’s environment.” This definition demonstrated the inevitable link between thought and deed, and implied that in today’s driven society, learning must result in productivity and capability. This conjecture runs parallel to the business model that any investment in an employee (professional development) or system upgrade, should result in an increase in productivity, speed, etc., or reduce the cost of production. The definition posed also recognized the importance of positive “output” and implied the need for a tangible point of measurement, again, in line with today’s business model.

Survey Results

For decades, students at American colleges and universities seeking to expand their cultural horizons and improve their educational and professional opportunities embarked on a semester abroad, most often to the United Kingdom, France, Italy or more recently, Australia. The students make this trek abroad with the intention of gaining greater educational, cultural, linguistic and social insights, an updated version of the 18th Century “Grand Tour” that young continental European and British aristocrats took to certify themselves as sophisticates, if not cognoscenti. Many of those choosing to study abroad often participated in foreign language courses while overseas or had previous exposure to a second language while at the home university. Students undertake this

“twin-pack,” international travel and the ability to speak a second language, with the aspiration that future employers will consider them on a higher plane than college graduates with similar degrees and lesser experience. The student’s conjecture was likely supported by faculty advisors who postulated that a semester-long international experience and foreign language capability would enable the student to be considered “globally competent” and/or a “global ready graduate.”

Study abroad and second language acquisition have long remained perceived curricular necessities for the would-be global ready graduate seeking employment with transnational corporations, international aid and development organizations, and for potential placement abroad. Despite the concurrence of perception within the higher education community, the results of this study noted that language learning and travel abroad are not necessarily at the core of what it takes to become globally competent, as presented in Table #2.

This study’s findings also contradict the foundation of most recently launched global competence and global citizen certificate programs, which focus directly on semester-long (or shorter) study abroad programs and the importance of learning a second language.

The results of Hunter’s study (2004) noted that the most critical step in becoming globally competent is for a person to develop a keen understanding of his/her own cultural norms and expectations: a person should attempt to understand his/her own cultural box before stepping into someone else’s. This can be accomplished by participating in a series of self-reflective activities that focus upon one’s cultural barriers and boundaries, seeking to clarify personal cultural context. A primary example of these

activities is “The Otherness Experience,”© created by (Hunter and Grudzinski-Hall, 2004), which consists of seven short multi-media, multi-sensory, interactive and reflective simulations intended to engage participants in uncomfortable, controversial, yet realistic experiences common to our present-day world.

Once a person establishes this self-awareness, the research then recommends the exploration of cultural, social and linguistic diversity, while at the same time developing a non-judgmental and open attitude toward difference. This enhanced understanding of others can be reached by participating in multicultural affairs courses or cross-cultural simulations, directly experiencing cultures outside one’s own box (which can include study abroad, but can also be accomplished locally by visiting unfamiliar cultural surroundings) and by extensive foreign language training.

The research was critical of study abroad programs requiring less than a semester in length, noting such a brief cultural injection did not directly lead to one becoming globally competent.

The inward and outward discoveries are not intended to be mutually exclusive. It is recommended that both steps be done in tandem, and most importantly, begun in middle school or earlier, with progressively more challenging exercises and intense experiences occurring through the university years.

The research then noted that in order to become globally competent, one must establish a firm understanding of the concept of globalization and of world history. It is here that the recognition of the interconnectedness of society, politics, history, economics, the environment, and related topics becomes important. This knowledge can be attained within a higher educational setting, but may also be acquired outside this

formal setting. Curiously, the findings noted that earning a bachelor's was not essential to becoming globally competent. This conclusion comes despite the fact that all those responding to the survey had earned at least a bachelor's degree in pursuit of their globally focused careers. These findings parallel The Stanley Foundation and ACIIE's (1996) third stage of global competence development, which requires the learner to gain a heightened awareness of history and world events, particularly as they relate to politics, economy and geography.

In a similar contradiction to commonly perceived practice, respondents did not suggest computer literacy/capability was critical to becoming globally competent.

Finally, once the previous base points have been reached, the leveraging component imbedded in the definition comes to the forefront. A globally competent person must be able to identify cultural differences to compete globally, collaborate across cultures, and effectively participate in both social and business settings in other countries. This finding parallels The Stanley Foundation and ACIIE's (1996) second stage of global competency development, which included the enhancement of intercultural experiences and advocated the learner have direct experiences with people from other cultures.

Conclusion

This study's findings correlated broadly with previous research; however, it advanced understanding of this key concept by the size of the sample and scope of those surveyed, and determined in more elaborate detail the components proposed as the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to become globally competent. The definition proposed here is put forth as a "working definition." As such, continuing research has

already begun on this evolving topic, particularly as it relates to the experiences necessary to become globally competent. It is also recommended that current global citizen/global competence curriculum should be reconsidered, based on the findings.

Table #1

Transnational Corporation Human Resource Manager Respondent Regional Breakdown

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N. East	5	38.5	38.5
	Midwest	5	38.5	77.0
	W. Coast	1	7.7	84.7
	Outside U.S.	1	7.7	92.4
	Total	12		
Missing		1	7.7	
Total		13	100.0	

International Educator Respondent Regional Breakdown

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N. West	3	7.5	7.5
	N. East	9	22.5	30.0
	Midwest	9	22.5	52.5
	W. Coast	4	10.0	62.5
	South	3	7.5	70.0
	M. Atlantic	4	10.0	80.0
	Hawaii	2	5.0	85.0
	Outside U.S.	1	2.5	87.5
	S. East	4	10.0	97.5
	Total	40		
Missing		1	2.5	100.0
Total		41		

Table #2

Summary of Respondent Mean Scores

	GROUP	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q1A An understanding of cultural norms and expectations of others	business educator	13 41	1.15 1.32	0.38 0.52	0.10 8.14E-02	-1.24	28.02	.227
Q1B An understanding of one's own cultural norms and expectations	business educator	13 41	1.15 1.29	0.38 0.46	0.10 7.19E-02	-1.10	24.51	.227
Q1C An understanding of the concept of "globalization"	business educator	13 40	1.77 2.00	0.60 0.78	0.17 0.12	2.30	52	.026
Q1D An understanding of the role of supranational entities	business educator	13 41	2.46 2.22	0.66 0.82	0.18 0.13	-0.97	51	.227
Q1E Knowledge of current world events	business educator	13 41	1.69 1.34	0.48 0.48	0.13 7.50E-02	0.97	52	.399
Q1F Knowledge of world history	business educator	13 41	2.00 1.63	0.58 0.58	0.16 9.08E-02	1.99	20.32	.060
Q2A Speak English and at least one other language	business educator	13 41	2.69 2.05	0.75 0.95	0.21 0.15	2.23	52	.030
Q2B To be linguistically and culturally competent in at least one language and culture other than one's own	business educator	13 39	2.62 1.69	1.12 0.73	0.31 0.12	2.78	15.55	.014
Q2C Successful participation on project-oriented academic or vocational experience with people from other cultures and traditions	business educator	13 41	1.85 1.95	0.90 0.97	0.25 0.15	-0.35	52	.731
Q2D Computer capability (word processing, Internet, etc.)	business educator	13 41	1.92 2.44	1.04 1.00	0.29 0.16	-1.61	52	.114
Q2E Ability to assess intercultural performance in social or business settings	business educator	13 41	2.08 1.93	0.64 0.69	0.18 0.11	0.70	52	.488
Q2F	business	13	1.46	0.52	0.14	-1.34	52	.186

	GROUP	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Ability to live outside one's own culture	educator	41	1.76	0.73	0.11			
Q2G	business	13	1.31	0.48	0.13	-0.83	51	.410
Ability to collaborate across cultures	educator	40	1.45	0.55	8.73E-02			
Q2H	business	13	1.46	0.52	0.14	-1.39	52	.169
Ability to identify cultural differences in order to compete globally	educator	41	1.73	0.63	9.89E-02			
Q2I	business	13	1.69	0.85	0.24	1.21	13.34	.247
Effective participation in social and business settings anywhere in the world	educator	40	2.13	0.79	0.12			
Q3A	business	13	1.15	0.38	0.10	1.21	13.34	.247
Recognition that one's own world view is not universal	educator	41	1.02	0.16	2.44E-02			
Q3B	business	13	1.46	0.66	0.18	1.65	14.30	.121
Willingness to step outside of one's own culture and experience life as "the other"	educator	41	1.15	0.36	5.59E-02			
Q3C	business	13	1.46	0.88	0.24	-.54	52	.593
A non-judgmental reaction to cultural difference	educator	41	1.63	1.04	0.16			
Q3D	business	12	1.50	0.67	0.19	.06	51	.952
Willingness to take risks in pursuit of cross-cultural learning and personal development	educator	41	1.49	0.60	9.32E-02			
Q3E	business	13	1.38	0.51	0.14	-.17	52	.870
Openness to new experiences, including those that could be emotionally challenging	educator	41	1.41	0.59	9.22E-02			
Q3F	business	13	1.46	0.52	0.14	.37	52	.712
Coping with different cultures and attitudes	educator	41	1.39	0.63	9.80E-02			
Q3G	business	13	1.38	0.51	0.14	-2.54	38.84	.015
Celebrating diversity	educator	41	1.90	0.94	0.15			
Q4A	business	13	2.92	1.12	0.31	.68	52	.514
It is important to have experienced culture shock in order to become globally competence	educator	41	2.71	1.01	0.16			
Q4B	business	13	2.23	0.93	0.26	-1.76	51	.085
Regular interaction with at least one foreign business culture	educator	40	2.75	0.93	0.15			
Q4C	business	13	3.31	1.03	0.29	.200	52	.842

	GROUP	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Speak another language more than 25% of the time	educator	41	3.24	0.99	0.16			
Q4D	business	13	2.85	1.07	0.30	1.01	52	.316
Knowledge and experience gained from multiple short- term trips abroad to a variety of countries	educator	41	2.54	0.92	0.14			
Q4E	business	13	2.62	1.12	0.31	1.10	52	.28
Knowledge and experience gained from a single, long- term experience abroad (6 months or longer)	educator	41	2.24	1.04	0.16			
Q4F	business	13	3.54	0.88	0.24	1.37	52	.18
Earning a bachelor's degree or its equivalent	educator	41	3.10	1.04	0.16			

References

Coalition for the Advancement of International Studies (1989). *Spanning the Gap: Toward a Better Business and Education Partnership for International Competence*. Washington, D.C.: Coalition for the Advancement of International Studies.

Commission on International Education (1998). *Educating for Global Competence: America's Passport to the Future*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Cummings, W. (2001). *Current Challenges of International Education* (No. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464523). Washington, D.C.

Curran, K. (2003). *Global Competencies that Facilitate Working Effectively Across Cultures*, 2003, from <http://content.monster.com.sg/management/5808/>

Deardorff, D. (2004). Internationalization: In Search of Intercultural Competence. *International Educator*, 8(2), 13-15.

Dosa, M. (1993). Recruitment of International Students. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 34(2), 99-112.

Foreign Policy. *America's Sticky Power*. Online: <http://www.foreignpolicy.com>. (March/April 2004)

Gliozzo, C. (2002). An Agenda for International Education. *IIE Networker*, 17.

Godbey, G. (2002) Personal Communication. Allentown, PA.

Green, M. (2000). *Toward Comprehensive Internationalization: An ACE Initiative for Undergraduate Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Hunter, W. (2004). "Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Experiences Necessary to Become Globally Competent."

Ibid., pp. 130-131

Ibid., p.125

Lambert, R. (1996). Parsing the Concept of Global Competence, *Educational Exchange and Global Competence*. New York, NY: Council on International Educational Exchange.

Ligos, M. (2000). The Foreign Assignment: An Incubator, or Exile. *New York Times*, p. 3.

Merryfield, M. (1995). *Teacher Education in Global and International Education* (No. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED384601). Washington, D.C.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (2003). *An International Education Agenda for the United States: Public Policy, Priorities Recommendations*. Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Oblinger, D. G. (2002, August 16). *The Web, WAP, and a World View*. Paper presented at the Learners without Boundaries, Colleges without Walls Conference, Metropolitan State College of Denver.

Rimer, S. (2004, April 27). Committee urges Harvard to expand the reach of its undergraduate curriculum. *New York Times*. Retrieved May 10, 2004, from <http://www.nytimes.com>

Sutton, M. (1999). Global Education and National Interest: The Last Fifty Years. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13, 1-18.

Swiss Consulting Group, (2002). *Global Competence Report*.

The American Council on International Intercultural Education Conference (November 15-17, 1996). *Educating for the Global Community, A Framework for Community Colleges*. Paper presented at the Stanley Foundation and The American Council on International Intercultural Education Conference, Warrenton, VA.

The Importance of Language, Max Black, editor, Cornell University Press, 1962, pp. 121-146.

Weaver, R. (1984). *Ideas Have Consequences*. University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, M. S., & Dalton, M. A. (1997). *Understanding the Demands of Leading in a Global Environment: A First Step. Issues and Observations*.

Figure 1: Global Competence Model, Hunter (2004)

