



2011 Conference

# The Global Competence Debate 2.0

02/21/2011

Hans de Wit

Professor of Internationalization of Higher Education,  
School of Economics and Management,  
Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences,  
The Netherlands

Co-Editor Journal of Studies in International  
Education

Competition & Collaboration in the Global Transformation of Higher Education

# The Global Competence Debate

- A shift from activities to competences is evolving in international education
- This is in itself a positive development as it moves the focus from the *how* (instruments) to the *why* (objectives)
- Over the past years international educators have focused too much on activities such as mobility, study abroad, international classrooms, as goals in themselves

# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- We have assumed for a long time that these activities or instruments were good in themselves, and
- We assumed that by undertaking them students would automatically develop competences related to these activities, without any proof if they have
- For that reason, the shift in focus from the how to the why is a positive development.

# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- In Europe, this shift was stimulated by the ‘*internationalization at home*’ movement, the end of the nineties.
- This movement has similarities to developments in the USA (*internationalizing the campus*), Australia (*internationalizing the curriculum*) and also developed momentum elsewhere.

# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- The addition '*at home*' indicates that the process is not something that takes place 'far away' but takes the local, multi-cultural conditions as a focus and point of departure.
- It places educational developments in internationalisation in a broader context by *linking the international and the intercultural dimension*.
- Moreover IaH claims that everyone, both the mobile and non-mobile students, are entitled to *an education that prepares them for a globalized living and working environment*.
- And last but not least, it raises the question of how to benefit from *local diversity*.

# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- The IaH movement – although relevant for the shift in focus from the how to the what – has the risk of evolving from a movement into a dogma and by that in losing its function to inspire change
- And we see signs that it also becomes more instrumental: international classroom, teaching in English, than outcome and competence focused.

# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- The shift in focus from activities and instruments into outcomes and competences is an important one.
- But in this new focus we see a risk of inflation of terminology and of unclear and vague notions.

# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- We see a *lot of terms*: global competence, intercultural competence, intercultural sensitivity, international competence, multicultural competence, transnational competence, global citizenship, etc.
- These terms, like the traditional terms in international education, are used as *synonyms* to internationalisation of the curriculum and IaH, and *without clear definitions and ways how to assess them*.



# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- *What are the similarities and differences between these terms?*
- For what purpose are we using them?
- *Is there common understanding in the outside world (the professional field) about their meaning, content and need?*
- Does every student, graduate and faculty require the same type and level of competence?
- *And how do we assess them?*

# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- ***What do we see in connection to these questions?***
- A great number of studies, relevant to get a better understanding
- The emergence of a testing industry: IDI, Global Competence, IRC, BEVI, etc.
- But most of all, a very superficial use and lack of clear definitions and demarcations.

# The Global Competence Debate

2011 Conference

- I will provide two Dutch experiments how we try to address these issues, without claiming that they are the perfect answer to the questions raised:
- The Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences plan to internationalize the curriculum
- The Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Agency pilot scheme for a certificate 'distinguished feature internationalization' for degree programs

- **Institutional Priorities for Internationalisation:**
- Internationalisation of the curriculum
- Mainstreaming of internationalisation
- Cooperation with the University of Amsterdam and the City
- Specific implementation by the schools and programmes
- The Central role is primarily focussed on providing a central frame, facilitating, monitoring and stimulating.

## Main objective is the internationalisation of the curriculum

2011 Conference

- A **basic** choice to provide *all students* with a minimum option of 30 study points with a focus on European and global developments in their profession, plus development of basic skills of English and intercultural competencies
- An additional choice for students for a **plus** option, in which 25% of their curriculum is interculturally and internationally oriented: at least one foreign language; at least one semester abroad for study and/or placement; one group tour abroad; and options for international classroom experience.
- A complete **international** option, in which the whole programme is offered in English within an international classroom with international students and staff; a semester abroad; two foreign languages; two study projects and/or study tours.

## This policy will be guided by the following instruments

- A portfolio in which the intercultural and international competencies in these three options will be monitored and assessed.
- A target of 10% in 2015 and 20% in 2018 of students at HvA which have chosen the plus or international option, also in the context of the Excellency project.
- A contribution to the development of global citizenship by the development of the plus and international option.

- 21 pilot programmes have been assessed for the distinctive (quality) feature ‘internationalisation’ over the past 6 months.
- Six standards were reviewed on internationalisation: vision/mission/policy; learning outcomes; teaching and learning; students; staff and services.

- State of internationalisation at the programme level in Netherlands and Flanders overall appears to be “satisfactory” to “good” (no cases of “excellence”, 3 “unsatisfactory”), at least for the programmes which applied.
- The overall quality applies in particular to the standards: *students, staff and services* and to a certain extent to the *teaching and learning process*, less to the two key standards: *vision/mission/policy* and *learning outcomes*.
- On individual standards, many cases of good practice and excellence have been found, only very few unsatisfactory cases.



## NVAO Pilot Scheme 3

2011 Conference

- Far less cases of “good” or “excellent” were encountered with respect to the *internationalisation vision/mission/policy* or *intercultural and international learning outcomes* than to the other standards.
- While more and more **institutions** have internationalisation policies, and have placed internationalisation in their vision and mission, many **programmes** still appear to lack an *explicit vision/mission/policy* with respect to internationalisation
- Many programmes take an *implicit* or *instrumental* approach to internationalisation: “*we are international by name or nature*”, “*we have international students*”, “*we teach in English*” or “*we send 15% of our students abroad*”, “*we breath internationalisation*” etc. and by that “*We are internationalised*”.

## NVAO Pilot Scheme 4

2011 Conference

- Many programmes have not or only implicitly thought about the *intercultural and international learning outcomes* and even less have made explicit how to assess these.
- Also in this case, most programmes have an implicit or instrumental approach to these learning outcomes.
- There are, though, some good practices to be noted, where the programme has been able to develop more explicit and programme related policies and learning outcomes.
- It is the intention that the pilot will move to the European level, under the umbrella of the European Consortium for accreditation (ECA), in 2011.



2011 Conference

# The Global Competence Debate 2.0

## **Global Competence and Global Consciousness: A Conceptual Framework of Global Learning Outcomes**

Herrera, S.W. (2008) *Effectiveness of study abroad in developing global competence and global consciousness: essential outcomes for internationalizing the curriculum*. Dissertation. University of Florida

Susan W. Herrera, Ph.D.

02/21/2011

# Impact of Globalization

- 21<sup>st</sup> century Globalization has produced a complex, interconnected and interdependent world, a new global system:
  - Accelerated by technology
  - Local, national and global impact
  - Economic, political, social, cultural implications
  - Challenging the role of higher education

# Globalization and higher education

- Institutions of higher education are faced with the challenge and opportunity to:
  - Prepare students across disciplines to perform their professions in a globalized world.
  - Prepare students to understand the multifaceted impact of globalization on societies, cultures, the environment, and humanity as a whole.

# Globalization and higher education

- Colleges and universities must seek to provide curriculum and experiences that ensure the development of global competence and global consciousness (ACE, 1998; Gacel-Avila, 2005; Green, Shoenberg, 2006; Obliger & Verville, 1998; Robertson, 1992).
- However, reports indicate that few universities are successfully preparing globally-ready graduates who can enter the global workforce successfully (Deardorff, 2004; AAC&U, 2007; ACE, 2002)

# Internationalization and globalization

- Internationalizing higher education has been defined as “any **systematic** effort aimed at making higher education **more responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy, and labour markets**” (van der Wende, 1997)

# Internationalizing the curriculum

- Internationalizing higher education includes various approaches (deWit, 2002; Knight, 2004).
- Internationalizing the curriculum is one of the essential approaches used to internationalize the disciplines. Various models exist such as:
  - Adding international majors or minors
  - Infusing courses with international content
  - Study abroad
  - Others(Siaya, Hayward, 2003; Mestenhauser, 1998; Ellingboe, 1999; Tonkin, 2006)
- ***How can systematic means of measuring the effectiveness of an internationalized curricula be created?***



- The American Council on Education addressed the importance of a macro [systematic] perspective of internationalizing the curriculum that is based on establishing institutional global learning outcomes and assessment measures (Olson, Green, Hill, 2006).
- An outcomes-based approach helps institutions assess whether their international programs and curricula result in greater global learning by:
  - Establishing learning goals
  - Providing learning opportunities
  - Assessing student learning
  - Using the results
- Global learning outcomes can be grouped within a learning domain framework (knowledge, skills, attitudes) to facilitate assessment of student learning and allowing seamless integration into existing outcomes structures (Olson, Green, Hill 2006)

# What are “global learning outcomes”?

- Global competence, intercultural competence, global citizenship, global consciousness, and other terms have been used to label constructs that can represent outcomes of internationalization efforts.
- Several studies have been conducted to define these constructs, and determine the factors that could constitute means to develop and assess the results of internationalization efforts (Deardorff, 2006; Herrera, 2008; Hunter, 2004)



2011 Conference

# Global competence and global consciousness: A framework for global learning outcomes

- Herrera's dissertation (2008) sought to establish the constructs of global competence and global consciousness as valid, comprehensive, and holistic global learning outcomes that can serve as a framework for internationalizing higher education and the curriculum across disciplines.
- Also developed and piloted 2 assessment instruments to measure effectiveness of study abroad in developing global competence and consciousness.

Herrera, S.W. (2008) *Effectiveness of study abroad in developing global competence and global consciousness : essential outcomes for internationalizing the curriculum* . Dissertation. University of Florida.

# Theoretical framework

*The Herrera 2008 study was guided by an integrated theoretical framework that includes:*

1. Globalization theories (Robertson, 1992; Robertson, 2004)
2. Culture theories (Nieto, 2004; Hofstede, 2001)
3. Cultural development theories (Bennett, 1998; Pedersen, 1988).

# Global competence

- **Global competence:** The ability to *function effectively, from an economic, political and social perspective*, in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world that is accelerated by technology. Hunter (2004) adds that global competence means “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 own environment” (p. 101) (Herrera, 2008).

# Global competence: Knowledge, skills/experiences, attitudes

Knowledge	Skills/Experiences	Attitudes
1. Cultural self-awareness	1. Effective use of professional skills in other cultural environments	1. Recognition of/and or interest in multiple worldviews
2. Awareness of the culture of others	2. Collaboration and teamwork across cultures	2. Acceptance of and/or sensitivity toward cultural differences
3. Understanding globalization	3. Effective use of cross-cultural skills and strategies	3. Openness to new experiences
4. Knowledge of current world events	4. Effective assessment of cross-cultural situations	4. Willingness to take risks to learn more about other cultures
5. Knowledge of world history	5. Successfully living in a culture different from one's own.	5. Possessing a long-term orientation
6. Knowledge of world geography	6. Willingness and/or ability to speak a foreign language	
7. Professional knowledge		(Herrera, 2008)

- **Global consciousness:** The ability to *understand the impact of globalization on humanity serving to mitigate the market forces of globalization*. It seeks to understand world history, the complexity of the human condition, global environmental challenges, the development of skills to manage complex and diverse societies, the creation of different types of solutions, and the visualization of new ways of understanding our own society (Robertson, 2004) (Herrera, 2008).

# Global consciousness: Knowledge, skill/experiences, attitudes

Knowledge	Skills/Experiences	Attitudes
1. Understanding of globalization's impact on the world	1. Ability to communicate effectively across cultures	1. Respect for human rights
2. Understanding world history and politics	2. Ability to cope with ambiguity	2. Desire/willingness to be a global citizen
3. Understanding of the human condition	3. Ability to understand and manage complex problems and issues	3. Desire/willingness to improve the human condition
4. Understanding the concept of empowerment	4. Ability to transcend nation-state thinking to global thinking	4. Valuing diversity
5. Understanding global environmental challenges		
5. Societal/historic self-awareness		
6. Understanding the nature of multicultural societies		(Herrera, 2008)



# Framework

2011 Conference

## Herrera Model for Educating the Next Generation of Global Professionals



(Herrera, 2008)

- Professional excellence is reflected in the standards of excellence required by individual professions. These standards of excellence form an integral part of existing curricula and are reflected in the learning outcomes for the profession. Global competition and the need for global collaboration demand that graduating professionals excel in their professions by meeting or exceeding the standards of the profession (Friedman, 2005; Oblinger & Verville, 1998; AACSB, 2003; ABET Engineering Criteria, 2000) (Herrera, 2008).

# Application

- Global competence and global consciousness as global learning outcomes can be a *starting point* for educators across all disciplines to conceptualize a holistic approach for internationalizing their curricula by assisting them in:
  - Establishing measurable learning outcomes across programs and courses
  - Providing learning opportunities aligned with the outcomes
  - Assessing student learning aligned with the outcomes
  - Using the results to improve the ability of their students to excel in their professions in the new global paradigm and contribute to the increased sustainability of humankind.
- *Further study can include:*
  - *Refining definitions and the factors that are described in this study for global competence and global consciousness in European, Asian and other cultures outside of the United States.*
  - *Application of these global learning outcomes to internationalization approaches across various disciplines and programs.*

*(Herrera, 2008)*

## **AIEA Session (Case # 1523551): The Global Competence Debate 2.0**

Monday, February 21, 2011: 12:30 - 1:45 p.m.

Chair: John D. Heyl. Presenters: Susan W. Herrera, Hans de Wit.

This session focuses on different perspectives on a concept that has gained currency among international educators: Global Competence (GC). The new paradigm of 21<sup>st</sup> century globalization has made this term a buzzword among higher education leaders and international educators who seek to prepare students for a global era. As such, there have been many attempts to define these competencies, find means for educating students to achieve these competencies, and utilize these competencies to identify discrete and measurable outcomes for internationalizing higher education.

Susan Herrera puts it this way: “I propose that higher education in the context of 21<sup>st</sup> century globalization is tasked with preparing students to conduct their professions in the new paradigm of globalization. This paradigm has created a complex, interconnected and interdependent world, which is accelerated by technology and has an impact at local, national and global levels. The new generation of global professionals must be globally competent. That is, they must be able to function effectively in a globalized world, regardless of their disciplines, or geographic locations. However, global competence alone is not sufficient. I propose that higher education is not only tasked with preparing students to be effective in this new paradigm, but they must carefully prepare students to understand the multifaceted impact of globalization on societies, cultures, the environment, and other factors. The constructs of global competence and global consciousness are separate - but complementary and holistic - concepts that together can form a framework for measurable learning outcomes.” Dr. Herrera will discuss research from her dissertation which sought to identify factors for the constructs of global competence and global consciousness, and propose a model for internationalizing the higher education curriculum. She will discuss the theoretical framework that serves as the foundation for this model and introduce the factors of global competence and global consciousness within the learning domain framework of knowledge, skills, and attitudes as a useful foundation for incorporating and measuring these learning outcomes across disciplines. While global competence and global consciousness as defined in this context would need to be further studied outside of the western/U.S. context of higher education, this framework provides a starting point for educators across disciplines to conceptualize a holistic approach for internationalizing their disciplines.

Hans de Wit observes the following: “Global Competence as a topic of debate and discussion has become increasingly relevant in the field of international education, not only in the U.S. but also in Europe and other parts of the world. Whereas it is common in the U.S. to refer to global competence and global citizenship, these terms only recently have entered the debate in Europe, where more commonly we talk about ‘international competencies’ and more recently ‘intercultural and international competencies,’ terms also present in the U.S. We have an inclination to use these terms on a regular basis but one can wonder if we all have a clear and common idea about the meaning of these terms, the similarities and differences between them, for what purpose we are using which one, and how to assess them. Also we assume without clear foundation that there is a common understanding by the outside world (the professional field) about the meaning, contents and needs of terms like global competence or global citizenship. In my presentation I will provide a critical view on the inflation of these terms, the relevance of a clear understanding of terms we use, their meaning and content, and how we attempt to apply them in a case study of the Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences, in the Netherlands, as well as in a pilot project ‘distinguished feature internationalisation’ of the Dutch Flemish Accreditation Agency.”

We look forward to an active discussion involving the presenters and attendees. Join us!

### Some Relevant Readings:

- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2007). *College learning for the new global century*. Washington, DC: National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise.
- Bikson, T.K., Treverton, G.F., Moini, J. & Lindstrom, G. (2003). *New challenges for international leadership—Lessons from organizations with global missions*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Cant, A.G. (2004, September). Internationalizing the business curriculum: Developing intercultural competence. *Journal of the American Academy of Business* 5(1/2), 177-182
- Chanda, N. (2002, November). Coming together: Globalization means reconnecting the human community. *YaleGlobal*. Retrieved February 22, 2006, from <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/about/essay.jsp>
- Cuddy-Keane, M. (2003, September). Modernism, geopolitics, globalization. *Modernism/*
- Deardorff, D. (2006, Fall). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(5), 241-266.
- Deardorff, D. (Ed.). (2009). *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: SAGE Publications.
- de Wit, H. (Ed.). (2010). Measuring Success in the Internationalisation of Higher Education. Occasional Paper 22, EAIE, Amsterdam *Modernity*, 10(3), 539-557.
- Falk, R. (1998, February). Global civil society: Perspectives, initiatives, movements. *Oxford Development Studies* 26(1), 1-11.
- Gacel-Avila, J. (Summer 2005). The internationalization of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(2), 121-135.
- Harris, P.R., Moran, R.T, & Moran, S.V. (2004). *Managing cultural differences—Global leadership strategies for the 21st century*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Herrera, S. (2008). *Effectiveness of study abroad in developing global competence and global consciousness : essential outcomes for internationalizing the curriculum*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville. Full text at <http://purl.fcla.edu/fcla/etd/UFE0022495>
- Hill, L.H. (2000). *Global consciousness of human resource development and organization development practitioners*. Virginia Commonwealth University. Retrieved June 30, 2006, from <http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca/aerc/2000/hill11-final.PDF>
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Hunter, B., White, G. P. & Godbey, G.C. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10, 268-285.
- Jokinen, T. (2005). Global leadership competencies: a review and discussion. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 29(2/3), 199-261.

- Koehn, P.H., & Rosenau, J.N. (2002). Transnational competence in an emergent epoch. *International Studies Perspective* 3(2), 105-127. Lessem, R., & Palsule, S. (2002). From local identity to global integrity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 23(4), 174-185.
- Lohmann, J.R, Rollins, H. A. Jr., & Hoey, J.J. (2006, March). Defining, developing and assessing global competence in engineers. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 31(1), 119-131.
- Mestenhauser, J. A. (1998). Portraits of an international curriculum an uncommon multidimensional perspective. In J.A. Mestenhauser & B.J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum internationalizing the campus* (pp. 3-39). Phoenix, AZ: The American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity—The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity-A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Olson, C.L., Green, M.F., & Hill, B.A. (2005, November). *Building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Pedersen, P. (1988). *Handbook for developing multicultural awareness*. Alexandria, VA: American Association of Counseling and Development.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Social theory and global culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Robertson, R. (2004). The historical context and significance of globalization. *Development and Change* 35(3), 557-565.
- Robertson, R. (2004). *The three waves of globalization—A History of a developing global consciousness*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Schuerholz-Lehr, S. (2007). Teaching for Global Literacy in Higher Education: How Prepared Are the Educators? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 180-204.
- Siaya, L., & Hayward, F.M. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Singer, P. (2002). *One world—The ethics of globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Stepnisky, J. (2005, June). Global memory and the rhythm of life. *The American Behavioral Scientist* 48(10), 1383-1402.