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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation was to survey community college students in order to evaluate their perceptions of the awareness and significance of global-mindedness or worldview of interconnectedness to the global community. The sample of participants included students at a 4-year community college in Florida. The results can be valuable and informative as a needs assessment in curriculum reforms to provide more globally minded courses and programs; consequently, better prepare graduates to compete in the global job market.
Chapter 1: **INTRODUCTION**

"No man is an island, intire of itselve; every man is a peece of the Continent, a part of the maine“ (John Donne, 1572 - 1631), *Devotions XVII*. Four hundred years ago, inconceivable of how interconnected our entire planet is today, Donne realized even in his own limited surroundings the important significance and necessity of working together as a community! Today this unprecedented interconnectedness is impossible and in some arenas fatal to ignore.

The millennium has revolutionized life, as it was formerly known. With transportation and communication at what had been previously designated "warp speed" "the world has become flat“ (Friedman, 2005). The new millennium has brought with it transformation through globalization. Countries, companies, economies, societies, and individuals are no longer as autonomous as they once were. Advances in technology have changed international interactions in communication, travel, business, science, and medicine. From economists’ perspective, globalization has previously, is presently, and will continuously accrue positive effects on all U.S. economic dimensions including innovation (Karoly & Panis, 2004). “The consensus among economists is that globalization has had and can be expected to continue to have, at the aggregate level, a favorable effect on income, prices, consumer choice, competition, and innovation in the United States” (Karoly & Panis, 2004, p. xxx). Thus, globalization is a pertinent issue that cannot be ignored if institutions of higher education are to prepare students
successfully for participating and succeeding in a global society. In order to accomplish this daunting task, there will need to be reforms in college curricula based on inclusion of global-minded perspectives listed on page 7 of this chapter. Community colleges have the responsibility of providing a global education for their clients if they are to achieve their purpose of supplying the needs of their communities and demands of the global economy. “The ‘payoff’: globalizing our students and our communities has direct economic benefit and reduces the inevitable fear created by the ongoing internationalization of business” (Bakke & Tharp, 1996, p. 1).

**Background**

Dr. James Sheehan, Professor at Stanford University in California stated the world had already become globalized by the end of the 19th century through the interaction of the society of states that had to learn to live in the world due to the need for community and cooperation. The principle of sovereignty required the society of states to maintain preeminence at home and independence abroad while the economy advanced the birth of an international culture (Sheehan, 2008). A modern example of this shift in interaction and community cooperation is that worldwide migration has doubled in the past twenty-five years (Karoly & Panis, 2004, p. xxix).

On the other hand, opponents or skeptics of globalization note the empirical evidence that international trade in goods and services remained at the same level in 2000 as it was in 1900. Moreover, the increase in domestic students in higher education has been substantially greater in almost every country than the increase of international students and a decrease in the number of international students in higher education since 1960 (Scott, 2006, p.13). “Both of these examples illustrate the dangers of
jumping to the conclusion either that globalization is a new and dominant phenomenon in the world economy and in the world society, or that internationalization is among the most significant development in higher education, when neither is true” (Scott, 2006, p. 13).

Recently in the two decades following the fall of the Berlin Wall, 1990-2008, increasing globalizing is evident in the fact that trade increased 133 per cent and the economy grew from $23 trillion to $54 trillion globally (McCrum, 2010).

_The visible impact at the local level of a worldwide economy and the international mobility of capital, jobs, labor, and technology has taken market competition from the local and national to the global level. Rapid political and socio-economic changes – forced by more diverse world actors, issues, and problems – challenge our ability to acquire information on a wide array of nations, economies, cultures, and languages. The complexity of community and world problems demands a wider array of problem defining and – solving perspectives that cross-disciplinary and cultural boundaries (Hudzik, p.1, 2004)._ 

The United States is no longer the beacon of light from its western Atlantic light house beaming for the rest of the world to look toward or up to as the leader of free enterprise. Most notably, the U.S faces stiff competition from China followed by India, with Brazil and other countries following in hot pursuit melting all previously anchored boundaries in all areas of life (Friedman, 2005; Kamdar, 2007; Zakaria, 2008). Furthermore, the repercussions of globalization have initiated demands on U.S. national political, economic, and social competencies to put the insular perspectives in the past if it is to remain as one of the foremost leaders of the global community (Gold, 2007; Karoly & Panis, 2004: May, 2007; Obama, 2009; Selby & Pike, 2000; Spellings, 2010). The U.S. can no longer spend time “navel gazing”. It has to look at the big global picture and its changing role because of it.
This century the international culture has transformed into a competition including numerous players in multifarious areas besides the economy. One such area is education. Education is one aspect of life that has evolved and continues to evolve, apparently never to revert to its former self. Education is not immune to global changes and needs to react and restructure to meet the needs of the global demands to remain competitive.

The case to internationalize higher education is unimpeachable. National borders are increasingly porous. Easier worldwide communication, travel, migration, trade, and the global dispersion of cultures shape local contexts and challenge higher education to ‘cross borders’ in its missions of knowledge creation and knowledge dissemination (Hudzik, 2004 in Stohl, 2007, p. 366).

It is imperative there is a beginning to the end of the national, self-esteem building patriotism the U.S. has relied so heavily on for its short life as an independent country. In order to take action and participate in the global phenomenon, the U.S. needs to examine how it is preparing itself through preparing its peoples to actively engage in the global community. As illustrated above by Hudzik, this preparation begins with education. The traditional only U.S. History, Geography, and Economics course requirements, exacerbated by a lack of foreign language requirements need to be history and reinforced/improved/supplemented with courses that provide an awareness, and appreciation for other cultures’ languages, histories, and ideas. Ignorance can no longer be an excuse when access to a globally-minded multi-cultural education is so readily available. “Meeting the needs of the future workforce in terms of skill and the capacity for lifelong learning will require an education and training system that is up to the challenge” (Karoly & Panis, 2004, p. 205).
As further evidence of the widespread recognition in higher education worldwide for emphasis on global education, the following mission statement was developed in 1995. “To ensure the survival and well-being of our communities, it is imperative that community colleges develop a globally and multi-culturally competent citizenry.” (ACIIE, p. 1, 1995). It was the product of work at the *Building the Global Community: the Next Step* Conference in 1994, representatives from twenty-four community colleges, governmental and nongovernmental (NGOs) representatives, and representatives from industry, with The Stanley Foundation and the American Council on International Intercultural Education (ACIIE). The objective was to address the need for implementing global education in US community colleges’ curricula, campus environment, and communities.

**Rationale**

“Global education is too important to delay, too vital to be ignored, and too urgent to be frustrated by indifference or ignorance” (Bakke & Tharp, p. 11, 1996).

It is no longer either an option or a recommendation that institutions of higher education internationalize. A fundamental component of a globally competitive career is the strength to cross not only linguistic, but also cultural borders (Francois, 2010; Olney, 2008; Van de Water, 2000). The superior mono-lingual and culturally insular attitude of countries like the United States is impotent in the global community. Americans are shocked and in some cases outraged by statistics that report a drop in U.S. educational standings (Engberg & Green, 2002; Friedman, 2005). However, an emotional response is no solution to the fear of failing as a world leader. The U.S. needs to take a proactive stance. There is a sense of urgency that Americans enter into the race to go global
before they are completely left in the dust by Europe, Asia, or other competitive countries. To be an effective competitor and informed citizen in the global economy, the U.S. has an obligation to provide students with a world-class education that surpasses the superficial “boutique multiculturalism” (Fish, 1999 in Kumaravadivelu, 2008) or superficial cultural sensitivity that is so prevalent in education today.

Besides their academic skills, U.S. graduates need to bring the tools of global competence, cooperation, and responsibility with them to the workforce (Karoly & Panis, 2004; Kumaravadivelu, 2008; Obama, 2008; Olson et al., 2006).

Based on a review of the literature, a succinct but comprehensive outline of characteristics to address the need of globalization that higher education should instill in its graduates is as follows:

a) a sense of responsibility to and concern for the world community,

b) an understanding of and appreciation for the diversity of cultures on earth,

c) a sense of efficacy in addressing global problems,

d) an ability to analyze problems of resource management and global decision-making through a non-ethnocentric lens, and,

e) an understanding of the interconnectedness of the global system (Hett, 1993; Oka, 2007; Theilin, 2004; Zook, 1947).

**Statement of the Problem**

For the first time in the recent years of its short history, the United States finds itself struggling to keep up the pace as an international leader in academia (Hirsch, 1987; Hudzik, 2006; Spellings, 2010). It is not that the U.S. has necessarily diminished in its intellectual and economic abilities so much as other countries with enormous
amounts of resources and people are presenting themselves as worthy opponents for the title of world power (Zakaria, 2008). After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, astonishing achievements evolved around the globe in banking and economics, culture and the English language (McCrum, 2010). No longer can the positive self-confident attitude of "we're number one" sustain the U.S. as a key player around the world in education. In 2011, the current generation and future generations of students will need to not only know their specific discipline, but will need inter-cultural competence as well if our U.S. graduates intend to compete in the global workforce (Karoly & Panis, 2004; Olson, 2006; Van de Water, 2000). Globally competent graduates can prevent graduation day from turning into desperation day due to dismal job prospects.

As Oka (2007) describes, we need to "see beyond the neoliberal market agenda of industrialism and profit" with "a promotion of genuine international collaborations and partnerships, and an engagement with the global that contributes to ethical, sustainable and equitable futures should be the major mandate of the 21st century university.” In addition, Zakaria, (2008) criticizes the Bush “New World Order” of being the icon for all other countries to admire and emulate with its Western view maintaining a worldview through a western perspective. Ironically, the U.S. spent approximately sixty years promoting free trade and markets around the world (Zakaria). However, in a 2007 Global Attitude Survey of forty-seven countries by the Pew Research Center, the U.S. attitude in support of free trade dropped to dead last. Now that there are other world powers involved, the U.S. has become suspicious of free markets, trade, immigration, and changes in technology (Zakaria, 2008, p. 47).
As an example of this dynamic, one precarious international relationship is between the U.S. and China. Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton stated it is presently at a "critical juncture" and admonished China for its violation of human rights. In addition, she recommended President Hu Jintao enact political reforms, so it can accept its responsibility as a world power. Moreover, she implored both China and the U.S. to establish a "positive, cooperative, and comprehensive relationship" (Clinton, 2011).

The demands of the new millennium on higher education are to turn the page on archaic perspectives and provide globally relevant instructors to prepare globally competent learners. “Meeting the needs of the future workforce in terms of skill and the capacity for lifelong learning will require an education and training system that is up to the challenge” (Karoly & Panis, 2004, p. 205). Inadequacies of the traditional U.S. higher education curriculum have been recognized and criticized for being “Eurocentric” woefully lacking in an obligation to educate citizens for the demanding vicissitudes of a globally connected world (Burke 2008; Hett, 1993; Oka, 2007; Thelin, 2004; Zook, 1947). The U.S. prides itself on being a democratic nation empowering its citizens with the right to vote. Notwithstanding, fundamental changes in the educational system are imperative if U.S. citizens are to be prepared for survival as globally competent citizens (Bakke & Thorpe, 1996; Hirsch, 2009). Professor emeritus of education at the University of Virginia, E.D. Hirsch criticized this lack of preparation on the U.S. government’s part in his book Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know (1987).

*Just having the right to vote is meaningless if a citizen is disenfranchised by illiteracy or semi literacy. Illiterate and semiliterate Americans are condemned not only to poverty, but also to the powerlessness of incomprehension. Knowing that they do not understand the issues, and feeling prey to manipulative oversimplifications, they do not trust the system of which they are supposed to be the masters. They do not feel*)
themselves to be active participants in our republic, and they often do not turn out to vote (Hirsch, p. 12).

In this quote Hirsch explicitly describes the vital role of literacy in preparing learners for a productive future. Literacy empowers and gives the voiceless a voice. Without fundamental literacies, U.S. citizens feel powerless to compete successfully on a national or even local level. Therefore, in a global society, it is all the more urgent to provide citizens with the education they need to succeed in a globally competitive environment.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore and identify community college students’ perspectives toward globalization. Students were asked to respond to a survey that measures global-mindedness to determine to what degree the students at the college in the study score on the Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) (Hett, 1993). This instrument, (GMS) designed by the late E. Jane Hett, Ed.D. at the University of California, San Diego, and discussed in her dissertation, “The Development of an Instrument to Measure Global-Mindedness” uses five theoretical dimensions that are identified for the Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS). The five dimensions are: Responsibility, Cultural Pluralism, Efficacy, Global centrism, and Interconnectedness.

Once the data were analyzed, strengths and weaknesses were identified by observation of where students scored high or low in one or more of the five dimensions. A data analysis of students’ responses examined student demographic differences such as age, gender, second language and travel abroad experience. From this information a needs assessment can be initiated to determine the possibility of eventually restructuring areas of college curricula to promote a more "global-minded" perspective
in courses. The rationale behind the curriculum reform would be to promote global competence to empower students for competing in the global job market as well as become better-informed and productive members of society.

**Framework**

The theoretical framework of this study is based on Hett’s (1993) Global-mindedness Scale (GMS) located in Appendix 2, as well as Knight and de Witt’s international competency scale, and other globally competent research referred to in the Chapter 2 Literature Review that act as the educational template for this study. Focused on identifying and measuring attitudes and awareness of global-mindedness that are characteristics of a globally competent learner, the procedures of the study were limited to the specific dimensions outlined in the GMS and the student demographic profile in Appendix 2.

The characteristics of a globalized institution are providing internationalized curricula taught by faculty with international experience and/or expertise, study abroad opportunities, world language acquisition, and interaction with international students (Green, 2003; Hendrix, 1998 in Oka 2007; Zook, 1947). See Figure 1. Furthermore, a 2009 study examining the relationship of internationalized variables and the quality of higher education indicated a positive relationship between internationalization and the quality; competitiveness, satisfaction, stability and reputation of an institution of higher education (Jang 2009 in Sullivan, 2011).
Based on the literature reviewed for this study, a graduate of a globalized institution of higher education is one who is competitive and knowledgeable about international cultures, has world language skills, has studied abroad and has had significant contact with international students and events (Bakke & Tharp, 1996; Hett, 1993; Oka, 2007; Selby & Pike 2000; Theilin, 2004). Such a person would be globally competitive (culturally, economically, and intellectually) in the emerging globalized world. Once a learner is provided with a globalized education, he or she has the tools and resources to be a global-minded learner who becomes a globally competent graduate prepared to face the competition in a global economy. See Figure 2.
Research Questions

Based on responses to the 30 statements of Hett’s (1993) Global-mindedness Scale (GMS) the research questions which were examined in this study are as follows:

1. To what degree do the students at this 4-year institution of higher education rank as globally-minded learners; i.e., identify with the relevance of social responsibility, cultural pluralism, personal efficacy on outside events, global-centrism, and interconnectedness based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

2. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between males and females based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

3. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students with and without travel abroad experience based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?
4. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are monolingual English speakers and students who know another language besides English based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

5. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between upper and lower academic rank students based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

6. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are digital natives (computer savvy) and digital immigrants (computer novices)? (Prensky, 2005).

**Additions**

The inclusion of questions on the student demographic profile related to “digital natives” and “digital immigrants” were selected based on Prensky’s premise (2005) that age and digital technology affinity are often related. In 2011, this is not unequivocally accepted nor denied. Therefore, years of using technology and comfort using types of technology are represented in separate items. The results to these responses were used to characterize the study sample. However, the results also enabled comparisons of the GMS score to those with greater and lesser technology use and experience.

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions are related to the impetus of this research:

1. Two and four-year community college students have deficiencies in their perceptions of and attitudes toward other cultures.

2. Two and four-year community college students are not being sufficiently prepared to compete in a globally competitive environment.
3. Two and four-year community college students are at a disadvantage to compete with their contemporaries in other “first-world” countries.

4. Global curricula may assist community college students in global competition as well as instill an appreciation for diverse global perspectives.

5. With an increase of global-mindedness, students will ultimately be better prepared to be workforce employees that are more productive.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions of terms are given to clarify language used in this study.

Bologna Declaration Agreement: A declaration by the 29 original members of the European Union for education reforms to update curricula and eliminate outdated degrees, as well as, facilitate attainment of higher education degree programs among the nations in the E.U. by creating a cohesive accreditation system resulting in an erasing or expunging of the limitations of borders, in a sense (ec.europa.eu).

Boutique Multiculturalism: A term to describe superficial cultural sensitivity. It has been defined as to “admire or appreciate or enjoy or sympathize with or (at the very least) ‘recognize the legitimacy of’ the traditions of cultures other than their own. Boutique multiculturalists will always stop short of approving other cultures at a point where some value at their center generates an act that offends against the canons of civilized decency as they have been either declared or assumed” (Fish, 1999 in Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 109).

Competency: An ability, a skill, a knowledge, or an attitude that can be demonstrated, observed, or measured (Bakke & Tharp, 1996, p. 3).
Cosmopolitanism: A dominant scientific tradition and method expressed by means of technology, iconic figures, local culture initiated in southern Europe. The tradition then spread throughout Europe to its Diaspora, the U.S. “Cosmopolitanism aspires to universality; liberal, secular and individualistic values; popular mass media culture” (Castells in Scott, 2006, p. 14).

Cultural Pluralism: “An appreciation of the diversity of cultures in the world and a belief that all have something of value to offer. This is accompanied by taking pleasure in exploring and trying to understand other cultural frameworks” (Hett, p. 143, 1993).

Efficacy: “A belief that an individual’s actions can make a difference and that involvement in national and international issues is important” (Hett, p.143, 1993).

Erasmus Mundus: Expanded Regional Action Scheme launched in 1987 to erase regional and national borders in order to internationalize undergraduate programs to meet the challenges of preparing European citizens for competition in a global society (Helguera-Balcells, 2008).

Global-mindedness: A worldview in which one’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviors, reflect a sense of connection to the global community, as well as a sense of responsibility to and respect for its members, their environment, rights, and freedoms. (Hett, 1993; Oka, 2007; Selby & Pike, 2000).

Global competence: Knowledge related to the interconnectedness of world events, history, and culture as well as attitudes and skills that enable one to be successful in cross-cultural settings (Bakke & Tharp, 1996).
Global perspective: Ability to consider and integrate the interdependence of international and local actions and their impact on the rest of the world (Bakke & Tharp, 1996; Muessig and Gilliom, 1981 in Hett; Oka, 2007; Theilin, 2004; Zook, 1947).

Global Responsibility: A deep personal concern for people in all parts of the world which surfaces as a sense of moral responsibility to try and improve conditions in some way (Bakke & Tharp 1996; Oka, 2007; Theilin, 2004; Zook, 1947).

Globalization: "Focuses on social change and promotes problem solving by focusing on societal changes and emphasizing solutions to society's problems." It’s an "affirmation of common unity between diverse peoples" (Hendrix in Oka, 2007, p. 305).

Glocalization: The opening of one’s culture to accept and/or include foreign influences and ideas (Friedman, 2005, p. 324).

Interconnectedness: As opposed to global ignorance which is no connectedness (Hayword, 2000 in Oka, p.2).

Internationalization: The study of nations, cultures, geographic areas, international organizations and diplomacy and values diversity, national identity and culture, but does not produce “homogenization of culture” (Knight, 1999, p. 2005).

Transnationalism: The sense of across nations and does not specifically address the notion of relationships. Transnationalism is often used interchangeably and in the same way as cross-border (Knight, 1999).

Worldview: Perspective of understanding the world; in this study with respect to the extent of global-mindedness based on five theoretical dimensions: responsibility, cultural pluralism, efficacy, global centrism, and interconnectedness (Hett, 1993).
Limitations

Due to the convenience of the sample and its unique demographics, the findings may be limited to the particular student population of a four-year community college on the central west coast of Florida and not widely generalizable. However, we can transfer findings to other similar populations of community college students throughout the United States.

Educational Significance

The educational significance of the study was to identify students’ levels of global competence. Scores based on the five underlying dimensions of the Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) reflect students’ level of interest in and preparation for participation in international programs at the college. The results of this study may be helpful in targeting areas of curricula and programs lacking a global-minded perspective. This information may be used in needs assessment to design future curricula and academic programs that would be instrumental in graduating globally competitive students; thus, producing global-minded citizens. Moreover, students with these global perspectives would possibly incorporate the skills acquired in their community college courses into their everyday lives and local communities to not only survive, but also to be a positive influence in a progressively “flat world”. “...a new world order that empowers hitherto excluded peoples of our and other nations to contribute their experience on an equal footing to our collective understanding of ourselves, society, and the world” (Hill, 1991, p. 156).

Furthermore, the information gleaned from this study may assist in reforms in administrative policy such as earmarking money for international programs as well as
offering support and incentives for faculty to include global perspectives in their courses and participate in teaching and research abroad. If the goal of community colleges in the U.S. is to prepare students for the workforce, it is imperative institutions prepare them for a globally competitive workforce. “The relevant point is that a student who graduates without a basic understanding of global issues and without the ability to interact effectively with people from other countries and cultures is not adequately prepared for a professional career” (Van de Water, 2000, p. 61).

**Chapter Summary**

Chapter one introduced the topic for the study and its background. It described the characteristics of a globalized institution and of a globally competent learner. It also introduced the statement of the problem and its purpose, to identify students’ level of global awareness with the possibility of directing future curricula design to promote global competence. Chapter one presented the framework of the study and the research questions for the study.

The chapter concluded with definitions of key terms and the educational significance and limitations of the study. Lastly, the educational significance of the study discussed the need for institutions of higher education to prepare students for a globally competitive world.
Chapter 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

The literature review presents the driving forces behind the need for preparing globally competent graduates; what has been done, what is yet to see fruition. This chapter includes some background on the history of higher education curriculum reform in the beginning of internationalization with the establishment of the Truman Commission following World War II (Zook, 1947), the U.S. Department of State’s Fulbright Program (iie.org/Fulbright) for scholars and more recent initiatives; such as, the Lincoln Commission Fellowship (nafsa.org) and International Education Week (iew.state.gov). It explores current trends in the European Union as a possible model to examine and learn from. There is also an overview of some of the challenges: inadequacies in U.S. literacies, increased global competition, faculty involvement, and the need to provide more internationalized curricula to produce more globally competent graduates. One of the components addressed in internationalized curricula is study abroad programs; as such, their relevance, progress and concerns are included in this literature review. As this study concerns global-mindedness in community colleges, perspectives on the evolving mission of U.S. community colleges are offered. Consequently, a basis of understanding and the perceived importance of preparing globally competent graduates will be established. Moreover, this basis will provide further support for the study as students’ degree of global-mindedness are
assessed as a spring board for possible curriculum reforms to provide global-minded programs of study in higher education.

**Background on Higher Education Reform**

Some people mistakenly identify the origin of globalism with the new millennium, or the Obama administration. However, the idea of the United States being a part of and competing in a global economy is not only a recent political concern, but something both major U.S. political parties agree on. A member of the opposing political party formerly in power recently recognized the importance of the U.S. being a key global player. As recently, as a March 2010, in a National Public Radio interview, Margaret Spellings, former Secretary of Education with the Bush administration expressed her opinion of the urgent need for national action in internationalizing U.S. education “Our need to educate everyone to much higher levels is very acute and is a national security issue. It’s a national economic issue. In a global knowledge economy, we must do a better job as Americans, if we want to lead the world as innovators. And I think people understand that that's a national imperative” (NPR, 3/17/2010). Although her approach may be slanted with a “western is better” perception, Spellings’ motivation and perspective resonates as one to maintain the U.S. as the first place leader in all global arenas. Contrary to Spellings, other motives for a global-initiative, such as educating for understanding have been to promote an internationally harmonious environment.

**Higher Education Reform**

This idea of educating for understanding is not a new initiative. After the end of World War II, the U.S. government became acutely cognizant of the fact that its lack of knowledge about and isolation from other countries had been a detriment to national
security. “The United States emerged from the war seeing itself as the world’s beacon of democracy…” (Schrum, 2007, p. 278). A reaction to the country’s involvement in World War II was the awareness for the need to become more familiar with and better understand other cultures. Not only was a principal goal of Truman’s Commission to “bring to all the people of the Nation education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living, but also, education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation” (Zook, 1947, p. 8). As the success of democracy has always been a companion of publicly funded institutions of American higher education, (By the People, 2007) the U.S. federal government responded accordingly to the devastation of the war and its threat to democracy with reforms in higher education. In an effort to prevent another catastrophic world war, form alliances, and advance democracy, education was seen as a key component to establishing an exemplary model of democracy (Rupp, 1999, Schrum 2007). With this inextricable connection between democracy and education, there was a sense of urgency for reform in American education, especially in the proliferation of democratic rhetoric (Rupp, 1999, Schrum 2007).

With the need for reforms in higher education at a critical level, Truman’s Commission on Higher Education was a response to the dire need for reform. In order to accomplish this mission, federal government agencies designed a national plan that resulted in our 33rd President, Harry S. Truman’s (1945-1953) Commission on Higher Education. In July of 1946, President Truman invited thirty prominent educational and civic leaders, including former First Lady, Eleanor Roosevelt, to serve on the Presidential Commission on Higher Education Committee, creating the first official body to address
federal higher education policy. Truman asked the Commission to broadly consider higher education’s role in democracy and how reforms would accomplish a proliferation of democracy at an optimum (Reuben, 2007).

**The Beginning of Global Initiatives in Higher Education**

Another catalyst in curriculum reform was the Commission’s goal of broadening the provincial attitudes reinforced in traditional liberal arts colleges. This perspective is seen in the following statement by Zook, 1947.

> For effective international understanding and cooperation, we need to acquire knowledge of and respect for, other peoples and their cultures—their traditions, their customs, and attitudes, their social institutions, their needs and aspirations for the future. We must learn to admit the possible worth of human values and ways of living and that we ourselves do not accept international understanding (p. 17).

George Zook was the president of the American Council on Education at this point in U.S. higher education reform. A Columbia professor, Zook, chaired the Commission and after sixteen months on December 11, 1947 submitted his six volume report *Higher Education for American Democracy, A Report of the President’s Commission on Higher Education*, to President Truman. The six volumes of the report are:

I. Establishing the Goals

II. Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity

III. Organizing Higher Education

IV. Staffing Higher Education

V. Financing Higher Education

VI. Resource Data
At this time, the ubiquitousness of the radio and airplane was credited as creating the need for a preparation for “world citizenship”, yet the commission reports higher education was sorely suffering in areas of inadequate and prejudice textbooks and certain geographic area studies, as well as a lack of competent educators trained in Eastern and Middle Eastern civilizations (Zook, 1947). The Commission had the foresight to recognize how crucial the understanding of the “Orient” and U.S.S.R. were and education for a better understanding of them needed to be included in the curriculum.

According to John Thelin in *A History of American Higher Education*, part of Truman’s directive for the commission was to concern itself with “…the adequacy of curricula, particularly in the fields of international affairs and social understanding…” (Thelin, 2004, p. 268). It is interesting to note that Volume One of Zook’s report, “Establishing the Goals” is divided into five chapters, the first of which is “Education for a Better Nation and World”. Its sub heading, “Toward International Understanding and Cooperation” remains applicable to the current topic of globalization and higher education’s role in preparing globally-minded learners. Furthermore, one of the Commission’s basic outcomes of general education to contribute to personal life and social order was “to recognize the interdependence of the different peoples of the world and one’s personal responsibility for fostering international understanding and peace,” (emphasis mine) (Schrum, 2007, p.287). During Zook’s leadership, the key word was “international” which can easily be substituted with today’s buzz word “global”.
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Other examples from Zook’s report of the urgent recognition for higher education reforms in the past that remain relevant in the present to instill a more international outlook or global perspective included in Zook’s more than half a century old report are:

“.....citizens must bring informed minds and a liberal spirit to the resolution of issues growing out of international relations is imperative.” (p.15)

American higher education institutions “will have to help our own citizens as well as other peoples to move from the provincial and insular mind to the international mind.” (p.15)

Zook also forewarned of the need to create a dynamic unity among the diverse American groups, “so as to make of the national life one continuous process of interpersonal, intervocational, and intercultural cooperation.” (p. 84 (b))

As well as, Zook recognized the need for a “fundamental shift in the orientation of American foreign policy” “...the Nation’s traditional isolationism has been displaced by a new sense of responsibility in world affairs” (Zook, p. 84 (c)).

Emphasized the importance of foreign language study as well as providing opportunities for discussion of issues vital to national life and international relations (President’s Commission, Vol. 3, p. 60).

America’s role in this and other agencies of international cooperation requires of our citizens a knowledge of other peoples – of their political and economic systems, their social and cultural institutions-such as has not hitherto been so urgent” (Zook in Smith & Bender, 2008, p. 84).
Although these ambitious initiatives are more than half a century old, they continue to resonate loud and clear with the initiatives of the new millennium. Zook’s initiative for “world citizens” dovetails with this century’s globally competent learner. According to the literature reviewed, globally-minded learners are those who: cooperate and appreciate other cultures, think on a global level as opposed to provincial or western is better, a sense of responsibility for others, value and possibly have competence in a second language, have knowledge of global cultures (Hett, 1993; Oka, 2007; Theilin, 2004).

Zook’s goals may have seemed lofty, unattainable ideals in his time; nevertheless, the significance of Truman’s Commission on Higher Education in 1947 was unprecedented in its objective to internationalize education (Burke, 2008). The first volume of the Commission’s report emphasizes the ideals of moving toward a fuller realization of democracy. The report addresses the need to focus on international-mindedness, noting: “that citizens be equipped to deal intelligently with the problems that arise in our national life is important; that they bring informed minds and a liberal spirit to the resolution of issues growing out of international relations is imperative” (Burke, 2008). This goal is perpetuated all the more so in today’s “flat world”.

**Shortcomings in Implementation of Internationalization**

Although former President Truman’s Commission was initiated more than sixty-years ago, we continue to fall short. Truman’s Commission was charged with promoting achievement of harmony and cooperation among different races through mutual acceptance and respect. This mindset was perceived as integral to international peace
and prosperity, and one that depends on beginning at home. Sadly, the Commission does not appear to have excelled in this aspect as achieving this goal continues to be a work in progress.

**The Fulbright Program**

The Fulbright Program was an offspring of President Truman’s Commission on Higher Education. As far back as some sixty-five years ago, J. William Fulbright (1945) declared education was the key to crossing the borders of limited insight, acumen, and compassion. Thus, Fulbright established an exchange program for scholars in the areas of education, culture and science to fulfill his vision of fostering the promotion of international goodwill (Stohl, 2007). While a commendable project, The Fulbright Program’s goal was not entirely a global-minded one, rather it was initiated with the main purpose of strengthening and justifying America’s dominant role in the Atlantic Alliance with Europe. Furthermore, an emphasis was made on significantly including the Netherlands as a neutral mediator in international diplomacy and scholarship (Rupp, 1999). Since the establishment of the Fulbright program almost 60 years ago, mobilizing support for international education initiatives has been framed in terms of national security defined first in terms of traditional political and military security, and then economic security and competitiveness (Stohl, 2007).

**Boutique Multiculturalism**

Toward mirroring, a less than genuine appreciation for diverse cultures is reflected in the K-12 public schools inclusion of multicultural awareness into the curriculum. This more recent response to promote global competence for students in educational institutions from K-12 and beyond has been the implementation of
celebrations of cultural diversity. Unfortunately, these typically monthly events and rituals have created superficial multiculturalism in the forms of Vietnamese Tet, Black History Month, Chinese lantern festival, Hispanic Heritage month in October, followed by Native American Heritage month in November. Literary critic Stanley Fish (1999) labeled this weak attempt at cultural recognition “boutique multiculturalism” (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). Perhaps the most transparent example of a “boutique multiculturalism” cliché is Mexican Cinco de mayo celebrated in May to "honor" Mexican culture. Ironically Cinco de mayo is a minor event that is not even celebrated in Mexico. As a result, this aim at increasing global awareness and appreciation is one representation of the negatively perceived cultural impact of cosmopolitanism that globalism has in ‘mass’.

Another example of a controversial result of a global economy is the prolific spread of brands by the mass media. The influence of the mass media and the spread of world ‘brands’ such as Coca-Cola and McDonalds can put a negative spin on globalization. For some countries, there is a concern about how to become globalized without becoming westernized (Zakaria, 2008). The reality is “the interaction between ‘global’ cosmopolitanism and ‘local’ cultures is a complex, and two-way, process in which each influences the other” (Scott, 2006, p. 17). Unfortunately, some critics of U.S. education maintain that most Americans remain geographically ignorant of the world around them, disinterested in learning another language, and insular in their cultural understandings and interests (Hirsch, 1987).

**Literacies**

Too many Americans have failed to achieve the national standards set by the Commission. American higher education has not been preparing its graduates for the
challenges of globalization; moreover, neither are American graduates ready to take advantage of the opportunities globalization offers them (Hudzik, 2003). Evidence of this trend can be found in a number of cross-national comparative studies that document how U.S. students lag behind their counterparts from other countries in using higher-order, analytical and critical thinking skills“ (Halpern, 1997 in Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 59).

Possibly some, if not many of these inadequacies can be attributed to literacy. It is astonishing and discouraging to view the data that as a powerful leader of the free world, the U.S. has a dismal literacy rate of only two thirds of its citizens with the average level being lower than an acceptable standard. Furthermore, even the best and brightest U.S. graduates aren’t maintaining the same level of verbal skills as their predecessors. “... despite breathtaking advances in the technology of communication, the effectiveness of business communication has been slipping, to the detriment of our competitiveness in the world” (Hirsch, 1987, p.5). Literacy is diminishing at the time the demand for effective literacy is increasing.

Bakke & Tharp (1996) ascribe “having a general knowledge of history and world events” as one of the characteristics of a globally competent learner, yet another area of literacy where shortcomings are apparent in Americans is geographic literacy. According to the National Geographic- Roper Poll (2002) in their Global Geographic Literacy Survey, which encompasses more than 3,000 18-24 year olds in 9 countries, U.S. students score below other developed nations in areas of international knowledge, awareness, and competence. For example, almost 30 percent of survey participants were incapable of finding the Pacific Ocean while 56 percent could not locate one of the
world’s largest countries, India. In addition, despite the proliferation of news about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, approximately 85 percent of American 18- to 24-year-olds were unable to locate either country on a map. Improvement was noted in the 2006 Poll, yet only 37% of the 510 American youth who participated in the survey identified Iraq correctly on a map (National-Geographic-Roper).

Not only in this poll, but in dozens of other reports and studies, Americans reveal a woeful lack of basic knowledge about world affairs and skills in cultural exchange, mobility and languages (Hudzik, 2004). It is significant to note that the conductors of the Global Geographic Literacy Survey suggest poor performance scores could be related to “educational experience, (including taking a geography course), international travel and language skills” (National Geographic-Roper, 2002).

Two other dimensions of a globally competent learner are expertise in another language, culture, and/or country (Bakke & Tharp, 1996) and participation of quality study abroad programs National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) established in 1948, presently known as NAFSA: National Association of International Educators. Nevertheless, Green (2003), in The Challenge of internationalizing education: Global Learning for All found that:

- Foreign-language enrollments as a percentage of higher education enrollments have declined from 16% in the 1960s to a current average of fewer than 8%.
- Only 6% of all language enrollments are in Asian languages, with fewer than 2% in Arabic and Hebrew combined.
- The percentage of 4-year institutions with language degree requirements for some students declined from 89% in 1965 to 68% in 1995.
• Only 3% of U.S. students study abroad before they graduate. The 143,590 who did in 1999 to 2000 constituted less than 1% of postsecondary enrollments.

• In the 1980s, only 14% of students took at least four credits of internationally focused coursework (p. 6).

These deficits are evident in the National Geographic-Roper Poll (2006). American youth, ages 18-24 lag behind their global peers in yet another dimension of global competence. Almost 90% do not correspond regularly with someone from another country and only 2% have a passport. This survey revealed that 62% of those surveyed don’t speak a foreign language fluently and less than half even consider it important.

A personal anecdote that continues to haunt me to this day occurred in a Curriculum and Instruction course taken for my doctoral degree program. Creating a simulated curriculum design project for a university degree program on the west coast of the U.S. was the assignment given. In my group of 4 peers, I was outvoted 3 to 1 to not include learning another language be a requisite in the program. Comments ranged from, “It shouldn’t be necessary because it won’t be useful” to “You can’t really learn a language in courses so there’s no reason to invest time!” This attitude is mindboggling to me!

Science, Technology, Engineering and Medicine (STEM)

According to the National Science Board (NSB), U.S. graduates are losing their competitive edge in the area of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Medicine (STEM) statistics revealed some alarming trends. The percentage of U.S. scientific papers dropped ten percent from 1992 to 2004. ‘The percentage of American papers published in the top physics journal Physical Review has fallen from 61 percent to 29 percent since 1983’ (Friedman, 2005, p. 269). World industrial patents have been increasingly
awarded to Asian countries, while the number awarded to the U.S. has decreased. Moreover, according to the NSB (2004), thirty years ago, the U.S. ranked third in the number of science degrees of 18 to 24 year old graduates, but this distinction has dropped to seventeenth place. The NSB also reported the requirement of having science and engineering skills for jobs in the U.S. work force is increasing annually at almost 5 percent. The problem is exacerbated because fewer students in the U.S. are majoring in science and engineering (Friedman, 2005).

Another measure that U.S. graduates are falling behind their STEM contemporaries is according to the National Science Foundation NSF (NSF) the number of U.S. science and engineering doctorates in the U.S. peaked at 41,000 in 2007 (nsf.gov). While approximately 31 percent of bachelor’s degrees awarded in the U.S. are in science and engineering, a staggering 60 percent are awarded in China, 41 percent in Taiwan and 33 percent are awarded in South Korea. Russia awards five times as many engineering degrees alone as the U.S. (Friedman, 2005, p. 258). Furthermore, two countries—India, with 56,680 foreign science and engineering graduate students, and China, with 36,890—accounted for more than half of the foreign science and engineering graduates in the United States in April 2009 (nsf.gov).

Figures from the National Science Foundation statistics of 2004 reported 70,000 engineers graduated from the U.S. in comparison to 950,000 Chinese and Indian graduates. The encouraging news is although these statistics appeared woefully intimidating to Americans, car mechanics and repairmen were included in the Chinese and Indian numbers, so the 950,000 number is “wildly off the mark” as the U.S. does indeed graduate more engineers than either country per capita. Where the U.S. needs
to be concerned in this area is increasingly stringent student immigration policies initiated after the September 11th, 2001 attacks that discourage the international student engineer population from studying in the U.S. (Zakaria, 2008).

Besides the increase in demand and decrease in the supply of science and engineering graduates, the U.S. is further threatened by the quality of its graduates. Ambition and competition are not necessarily associated with the American workforce. Companies are outsourcing not just for competitive prices, but increased productivity (Friedman, 2005). Americans also fall behind other countries when comparing test scores, especially math. In a 2004 Trends in International Math and Science Study involving approximately 500,000 students from 41 countries, American students paled in comparison to their international counterparts. For example, among eighth graders, 44 percent of Singapore’s students scored at the highest level in math and 38 percent of Taiwan’s students did so. However, a mere 7 percent of U.S. eighth graders scored at the highest level (Friedman, 2005, p. 272).

More recently, in response to a report by The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) that revealed 25 percent of American high school senior aren’t reading at a basic level, U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan stated, "Today's report suggests that high school seniors' achievement in reading and math isn't rising fast enough to prepare them to succeed in college and careers" (Clariborne, 2010). This is devastating news for America’s pride of being a leading competitor in our global economy. The demand for globally competent graduates is increasing all the while the supply is decreasing as indicated in this report, requiring a longer period of time to produce the supply needed. This news directly affects community colleges, the gateway
to higher education, as one of their roles has been to prepare students for more advanced degrees. With their open door policy, community college have a momentous task of bringing underprepared students up to level, so they can begin taking their general education courses.

According to the dean of communications at the four-year institution in this study, 30 percent of students’ writing placement scores were below level, 40 percent placed below the college reading level, and 80 percent of incoming students scored below the standard level in math. (Personal communication October 26, 2010) Community colleges indeed face a staggering challenge of preparing the unprepared and are under increasing pressure to provide and produce competent graduates. U.S. college completion rates have dropped from first to twelfth place (Andrea Mitchell, MSNBC, September 12, 2010).

Another example that the goal of the first chapter of Zook’s report “Toward International Understanding and Cooperation” has yet to be met can be seen as recently as 2004, when former U.S. secretary of state Colin Powell reiterated the need for international understanding. “The more we know about each other, the more we learn about each other, the more we engage on differences that we have between our societies and between our social systems and between our political points of view, the better off we are. The more dialogue we have at every level, and especially at the academic level, where opinion-makers are located...the better off we are.”

**Globalization and Global Competency**

A tongue-in-cheek definition of globalization (Longworth, 2004) is Princess Diana’s death. Longworth explains it is a suitable definition because it involved
an English princess with an Egyptian boyfriend who crashed in a French tunnel, riding in a German car with a Dutch engine, driven by a Belgian who was drunk on Scottish whisky, followed closely by Italian paparazzi, on Japanese motorcycles, treated by an American doctor, using Brazilian medicines. This is an example of how inextricably linked our planet has evolved in trade and economics. On the human level, a globally competent person is one who perceives the world as a whole and themselves as a part of the whole. Hett (1993, abstract) labeled this perception as global-mindedness and defined global-mindedness as "a worldview in which one sees oneself as connected to the global community and feels a sense of responsibility to its members. This commitment is reflected in the individual's attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors".

In “Whatever happened to Globalization?”, Richard Longworth (2004) Executive Director of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations’ Global Chicago Center at the University of Chicago International and Area Studies Multimedia Outreach Source (CHIASMOS) defines globalization as:

- Globalization is the increasing integration of national economies.
- It describes the increased mobility of services, goods, labor, technology and capitol throughout the world.
- The ability of an entrepreneur to borrow money wherever he can get the best terms invested anywhere in the world where the conditions, raw materials, the labor best produce anything and sell it anywhere around the world using the modern miracles of communication.

The crucial need to address the phenomenon of globalization in higher education has reached a relatively unprecedented critical level. In the haste to respond to the
demands for a solution to the broadening and increasing in number of gaps various reactions however sincere, have been misguided. Some proponents of globalization in curricula have pushed their agenda to the point of cultural assimilation, an adoption of the dominant culture’s behaviors, values, beliefs and lifestyle to the extent of losing one’s native culture (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p.4). Others not as strongly committed to globalized curricula have only half-heartedly promoted cultural pluralism which exhibits a “superficial knowledge of, and shallow interest in, various cultural communities” in a multicultural society. Still others concerned about too much assimilation of “the other” culture combined with a fear for a loss of their own have relied on cultural hybridity, a ‘third culture’ or ‘third space’ that doesn’t permit the native or second culture to completely influence their values or belief system. Kumaravadivelu (2008, p. 5) defines culture hybridity as requiring one to live “in a state of ambivalence, a state of in-betweenness….dangling in cultural limbo”. This is a far cry from the interconnectedness and responsibility of a global-minded view that distinguishes it from simply global awareness (Bakke & Tharp 1996; Hett, 1993; Oka, 2007; Theilin, 2004, Zook, 1947).

In 1981, Muessig and Gillion established six components of global education that global competent learners should be charged with. They are as follows:

1) An ecological view of the world,
2) Unity of diverse cultures,
3) “Interdependence of human relationships”,
4) Multiple loyalties,
5) Human rights,
6) Futurism (Hett, 1993, p. 9)
These six components both support and influence fellow proponents of global education. Both Fulbright’s (1945) and Zook’s (1947) foundations for promoting international understanding and goodwill support an ecological view of the world. Furthermore, Lefrere (2007) supports Muessig and Gillon’s charge through his idea of a "global citizenship" which is a worldview of ethical responsibilities to internationally underrepresented groups through understanding and tolerance. Lefrere echoes the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (2000) "of a collective responsibility for all individuals, especially the most vulnerable” with his idea of "global citizenship”. Muessig and Gillon’s proposed plan of preparation for globally competent learners corroborates the conclusion of the conferees at the Educating for the Global Community: a Framework for Community Colleges who defined global competency as follows:

Global competency exists when a learner 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 (Bakke & Tharp, 1996, p. 4).

Furthermore, the conferees defined the globally Competent Learner as one whom:

1. Is empowered by the experience of global education to help make a difference in society.
2. Is committed to global, lifelong learning.
3. Is aware of diversity, commonalities, and interdependence.
4. Recognizes the geopolitical and economic interdependence of our world.
5. Appreciates the impact of other cultures on American life.
6. Accepts the importance of all peoples.
7. Is capable of working in diverse teams.

8. Understands the nonuniversality of culture, religion, and values.

9. Accepts responsibility for global citizenship. (Bakke & Tharp, 1996, p. 3)

There is a ripple effect in the changes brought about by internationalization and globalization. Higher education is becoming more internationalized. Meanwhile, globalization is the change agent of internationalization (Knight, 2004). With these definitions of global competency in mind, although they share similar characteristics, there is a difference in global and international perspectives. What exactly is globalization and how does it differ from internationalism?

“Internationalisation is one of a series of vital forces shaping and reshaping modern higher education systems. It is part, a key part, of the wider ‘access’ agenda-mass participation in these much more diverse systems” (Scott, p. 13, 1995). Proponents of internationalization attribute increased quality of higher education systems due to enhanced instruction, research, and service in an international dimension (Knight & deWitt, 1997). In Globalizing the Curriculum, (Hendrix, 1998 in Oka, 2007) clarified both international and global education curricula include the study of nations, cultures, geographic areas, international organizations and diplomacy, but the difference is globalization includes another facet as it “focuses on social change and promotes problem solving.” Each country’s culture, history, priorities, and traditions are uniquely affected by globalization (Knight & deWitt). “International reinforces the idea of interaction between individual countries, in contrast; global is a worldwide perspective that doesn’t underscore national scope and concept” (Knight, 1999). A global perspective is an awareness of and appreciation for interconnectedness or common

This unity is visible in the United Nations’ 8 Millennium Development Goals for 2015 located in Appendix C. After its number one goal to “Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger”, its second goal is to “Achieve universal primary education”. The goal is to “ensure that, by 2015, all children everywhere will be able to complete primary schooling.” Latin America, with Brazil in the recent past entering global competition, currently boasts progress in achieving this goal of primary education access from 88 percent in 1990 to 95 percent (Justo, 2010). Although it is not striving to tackle the inequalities that persist in higher education, it is significant to note that the United Nations recognizes the interdependence of education and how it is in the best interest for all on our planet.

Global Competition

The United States has been facing stiff competition from China and India in being a world leader on scientific, financial, and economic levels (Friedman, 2005; Lynn & Salzman, 2007; Zakaria, 2008). One reason this race to stay ahead in the global game will continue to be increasingly challenging is due to the generation of baby boomers who are planning their eminent retirement leaving a gap in their replacement. Another reason the U.S. is in risk of being surpassed, as a preeminent world leader is other nations continue to increase funding of education, especially science and engineering (Friedman, 2005).
Changes in the Players of Higher Education

"India and China can together reshape the world order." Indian Prime Minister Singh (2005) to Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao (Kamdar, p.7, 2007).

Last century, countries formerly considered to be competitively nonthreatening in education or economy, such as Brazil, Russia, India, and China have become formidable opponents. They are a force to be reckoned with in the twenty-first century, especially in the area of technology; consequently, American institutions of higher education need to respond to the global stimulus by offering students an education that goes beyond the borders of the nation. Technology may open the door, but it is the human connection that will keep the door from closing. According to Jack Van de Water, Dean (Emeritus) of International Programs at Oregon State University, "we are in the midst of the transition of universities from primarily provincial institutions of learning to institutions that prepare students for ‘knowledge based’ and ‘borderless careers’ in an international or global context" (Van de Water, 2000, p. 59). Traditional education programs and institutions will need to be redesigned and restructured with an interdisciplinary and international collaboration perspective. The future U.S. graduate needs to be equipped with global literacies to meet the expectations here unforeseen of global jobs that demand a foundation in awareness of global issues that is enhanced with an ability to interact effectively among other nationalities and cultures (Karoly & Panis, 2004; Olson, 2006; Van de Water, 2000). U.S. graduates will not be competing for jobs with fellow classmates or even counterparts at the state or national level, but graduates from all around the globe.
The Indian Renaissance

Offering the U.S. some stiff competition is India. India is a world microcosm with its 1.2 billion people, fifty percent under the age of twenty-five. This number is further augmented by its 20-million Diaspora, making it not only the largest democracy in the world, but one of the most diverse with twenty-two official languages including three hundred and fifty million English speakers (Kamdar, 2007). In *Planet India*, Kamdar reveals that it was none other than Indian CEO of Infosys, Nandan Nilekani, who became an international celebrity and made Tom Friedman a “household” name after giving Friedman the idea to write *The World is Flat*. India has been acquiring companies around the world, including Mittal Steel from France, American tea companies Tetley and Good Earth, and Eight O’clock Coffee to name just a few. The CEO of PepsiCo is Indra Nooyi, an Indian-American. India’s acumen in information technology and scientific innovation has propelled it to the forefront of research and development. India is a pivotal player in a myriad of global issues; such as cures for pandemics, the war against terror, the energy crisis and global warming. Moreover, India has entered the global competition and become a rival in areas such as, animation, media, publishing, and broken through the mainstream entertainment industry barrier with its 2009 academy award-winning movie, *Slumdog Millionaire* (Kamdar).

In November 2010, President Obama visited India and signed the Obama-Singh 21st Century Knowledge Initiative, a commitment to strengthen US-Indo educational and economic partnerships (IIE, Open Doors, 2010). In a report by the Institute of International Education (IIE) in the 2009/10 academic year, the number of Indian students studying in United States colleges and universities totaled 105,000 or 15% of
all international students studying in U.S. institutions of higher education (11/15/2010). See Appendix E for a global panorama of international students’ countries of origen.

Kamdar (2007) predicts, “As India, a rising civilizational giant, gains economic and political power, its cultural clout will increase as well. One day soon, when a critical mass of the talent, the money and the market is in Asia, a tipping point will be reached, and India will move from joining the game, or even winning the game to inventing new rules for new games” (p. 96). With its staggering demographics of population and youth in comparison to the U.S., India is certainly a contender for becoming a world power overshadowing the U.S. The possibility of the Indian Diaspora migrating, along with a decrease in Indian students seeking a U.S. education, could make the threat of a U.S. “brain drain”, emigration of educated professionals, particularly STEM, a stark reality.

**Technology**

One of the catalysts that has played an integral part in this present global evolution is the internet. In December 2000, Bill Gates, Chairman of Microsoft, in McCrum stated, “Because it amplifies our potential in so many ways, it’s possible that the long-term impact of the Internet could equal that of electricity, the automobile and the telephone all rolled together.” Any invention as powerful as that is bound to be limitless in its effects on civilization.

One response in higher education to the phenomenon of globalization has been to create institutions that are more “borderless” through the implementation of online teaching. The explosion of the use of technology as a vehicle to provide education without borders has opened doors where seemingly only walls existed before. Growing access to distance learning has significantly expanded and enriched student exposure to
global issues (Bakke & Tharp, 1996). The ubiquitous phenomena of online courses and institutions show no signs of slowing down. According to Karoly & Panis (2004), technology has certainly been an impetus for some institutions to increase their internationalization, but is not the quintessential answer in and of itself. Even with acquiring the targeted skills of collaborating with diverse cultures in a range of languages, “the human factor is likely to remain paramount” (Karoly & Panis, 2004, p. 201). Consequently, another avenue less travelled must be taken to educate globally competent learners with a mission to explore strange new worlds, to seek out new life and new civilizations, to boldly go where higher education has never gone before!

Today’s institutions of higher education are no longer competing on a continental basis, but are facing competition in areas of research, programs, and employment from around the world. The internet has opened doors where there were previously none. With the proliferation of online courses and degrees presently offered in higher education, the former “community” college no longer focuses on meeting the needs of its surrounding community. For example, the 4-year Florida college in this study eagerly joined the cyber world in 2000 to provide education for not only local clientele unable to pursue a degree in traditional course scheduling or setting, but went borderless and to serve students across the U.S. and abroad. In the spring of 2010, approximately 15,000 students were enrolled in at least 1 online course, and half of those were enrolled in only online courses (ecampusfacts, 2010). In this arena, this particular institution of higher education is responding to remaining a key player in the competition for students; however, this action alone does not eliminate the competitiveness of other
institutions providing more and/or better programs that give their graduates the tools they need for being competent in a global society.

"World-mindedness’ is no longer a luxury, but a necessity for survival in the new century; encountering diverse viewpoints and perspectives engenders, too, a richer understanding of self; personal discovery is critical to self-fulfillment and to the generation of constructive change on a global scale” (Selby & Pike, 2000). Institutions must provide students with globalized programs that include internationalized curricula, faculty with international experiences, study abroad opportunities, international exchange opportunities that promote awareness and respect for other cultures. Graduates who are equipped with a global-minded perspective will be able to not merely survive, but achieve success once outside of their academic life when they have the essential skills that put their degree to use. With the phenomenon of globalization, the prospects of earning a piece of paper that doesn't open doors to employment opportunities will be more dismal than ever for those who keep their head in the sand of last century.

A Current Response to Globalization

The United Nations with its declaration on September 8, 2000 of Eight Millennium Development Goals initiated another indication that the millennium brought with it a perspective of global awareness. The United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals are listed in Appendix C. One of the U.N.’s values and principles states, “We recognize that, in addition to our separate responsibilities to our individual societies, we have a collective responsibility to uphold the principles of human dignity, equality, and equity at the global level. As leaders, we have a duty therefore to all the world’s people,
especially the most vulnerable and, in particular, the children of the world, to whom the future belongs” (UN.org). This principle is representative of several of the theoretical dimensions of global-mindedness; interconnectedness, global centrism, and responsibility.

**Current Trends**

In the 1990s ‘Generation Y’ transformed local economies and began outsourcing with the birth of broadband. Indigenous English-speakers in countries on the other side of the globe, such as, India, grabbed at the brass ring of previously nonexistent opportunities (McCrum, 2010). Because of this broadening of the horizon, research indicates a projected 300,000 jobs are expected to move overseas by 2015. However, this number represents a mere 0.2 % of all jobs in the U.S.; furthermore, most of these jobs are eliminated based on consumer preference and technology, not globalization (Dellow & Romano, 2006). Putting aside the disputable role that outsourcing and offshoring play in their effects on individual countries’ economies, globalization offers an opportunity for experts and institutions of higher education to put their heads together for collaboration on social and environmental concerns.

For example, the incendiary topic of Global Warming is not an isolated threat to particular nations or continents, but a global issue that will take global cooperation to improve.

*The role of higher education institutions in the production and distribution of knowledge should not be minimized. Given increasing interdependence among nations, it is clear that there are global issues and challenges that cannot be addressed at the national level only. International and interdisciplinary collaboration is key to solving many global problems such as those related to environmental, health and crime issues* (Knight, 2005, p. 52).
The global perspective of interconnectedness provides even more evidence for the need to educate graduates with a global-minded perspective. The theoretical dimensions of cultural pluralism and interconnectedness are the first step. Once an appreciation for diverse cultures is instilled in higher education learners, the second step in developing a global-minded perspective would be efficacy. As students realize although they are only one individual among millions, yet believe their involvement is important and their small contribution can make a difference in the world, a sense of responsibility for all people can develop so that they will support globally-minded judgments and decisions of the theoretical dimension globalcentrism. This worldview of global-minded perspective includes the dimension of a futurist; one who is capable of looking at the long-term consequences as opposed to immediate solutions.

The European side of the Atlantic has recognized this and is already making progress in its higher education reforms while the American side of the Atlantic is still debating the needs and merits for reforms.

**The European Union**

The other side of the Atlantic has taken the lead in quality higher education reforms. Europe has broadened its perspectives from an ego centric continent of national and regional pride to a mindset of Europe as a whole. “Mundus” is the Latin word for world and represents the global outreach of the program. “It provides a response to the challenges European higher education is facing today: preparing European citizens for life in a global, intercultural and knowledge-based society and enhancing the quality and world-wide attractiveness of European higher education” “The Erasmus Mundus has opened the door to the removal of regionalist and nationalist
barriers” (Huelguero-Balcells, p.1, 2008). Even though Europe’s higher education system is unified with European students in mind, the Bologna Declaration is a response to meet the increasing demands of an international student market that expects graduates to be empowered with global citizen skills that will provide a competitive edge in global markets (Huelguero-Balcells, 2008).

The Bologna Declaration Agreement was established on June 19, 1999. It is a declaration of the 29 original members (now 49 members) of the European Union. Its purpose is to facilitate higher education in the European Union (E.U.) through a more homogeneous course of study that would result in a more cohesive accreditation system among its members (Huelguero-Balcells, 2008). Its objective is to eliminate or diminish many of the difficulties of transferring academic institutions’ credits and ultimately degree programs and create solutions that will close the gaps found in the present system.

This erasing of the international higher education boarders produces a sense of educational transnationalism and promotes global citizenry. Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, and Germany are leaders in this reform as they are in the final stages of the completion process. Not all members have been able to accomplish the reforms of the agreement at the same speed. Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Georgia, and Greece find themselves in the middle of the reforms, while Ireland, Italy Malta, Portugal, and Spain have fallen behind in the reformation process. Regardless of their place, at least they’re in the race and are persevering in the reform process to provide a higher education that is global-minded. Adelman, 2008 in McMurtrie applauds the success that some of the participants have achieved in “clarifying the purpose” or defining each step
toward a degree, and of “keeping people within the system.” For instance, an overwhelming majority of Swiss and German undergraduates later pursue master’s degrees. Shortly after the Bologna Declaration in March 2000, the Lisbon Strategy or Lisbon Agenda followed with the goal of making the E.U. “the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion, and respect for the environment by 2010.”

**Scotland and China**

One European country recognizing the transformation of China as a world leader in the twenty-first century and the importance of forming an alliance in education is Scotland. “Global citizenship makes connections across learning and joins up approaches to ethos, learning and teaching, curriculum planning and recognizing achievement. All curriculum areas can contribute to developing the skills, attributes, and knowledge that will create active global citizens” (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2009). Consequently, Scotland’s curriculum for excellence in international education aims to transform Scotland’s traditional education. Its goal is to provide a meaningful and enriched curriculum that offers more options for 3 to 18-year old students. Its four objectives are to enable each young person to be a successful learner, a confident individual, a responsible citizen and an effective contributor to society (2009). These objectives complement the higher education reform goals set out by the Truman Commission (Zook, 1947) as well as the characteristics of a globally competent learner (Bakke & Tharp, 1996).
China is an integral part of Scotland’s curriculum; therefore, Scotland established a relationship with China in 2007 that has added Confucius classrooms to the curriculum. The objective being to create citizens with a better understanding of their place in the world as well as acquire skills that are necessary for 21st century learners. Such skills promote having a better understanding of and appreciation for diverse cultures as well as becoming more responsible citizens. Its Confucius Classrooms are local hubs, in Scottish schools or colleges. These hubs support innovative teaching and learning of Chinese language and culture in primary and secondary schools, as well as for the local community. In 2009, 50 students and nine staff participated in a 3-week immersion program in Beijing. In 2010, seven of the Classroom Hubs linked with schools in the city of Tianjin.

Fortunately, on the other side of the Atlantic, U.S. public schools are catching onto the importance of incorporating Chinese in the curriculum. Chinese is quickly replacing French as the language to learn. An estimated (2008) 50,000 public school students are learning Chinese. In Pinellas County Florida, Chinese is being taught at a middle school in St. Petersburg. Parents and educators are proponents of including this more relevant language in the public school curriculum. The demand is such that the supply of teachers is dwindling. In a demonstration of global-mindedness the Confucius Institute at the University of South Florida is working with the Florida Department of Education to expedite the teacher certification process as well as organizing teacher exchange programs.

On the other hand, in some areas of the United States, the idea of Chinese awareness and appreciation in public schools is not receiving the same warm welcome.
China’s Confucius Institute has recently been introducing Chinese Language classes in Southern California school districts, but not without opposition (Robelson, 2010). Because the Chinese government is funding the culture and language instruction in public schools, opponents feel threatened that it is compulsory propaganda because it is being offered as part of the curriculum instead of an extra-curricular activity.

**China and Berkeley**

It’s not somebody else’s problem or only those with the most power who are to be considered; there needs to be a global ethos. Shannon May, (2007) a graduate fellow in anthropology at the University of California Berkeley argued in her keynote address, *China’s Environment: What we know and how do we know it?* that there needs to be a culturally pluralistic perspective with a futuristic focus. Her arguments reiterated the sentiments of a need for global citizenship (Lefrere, 2007; Zook, 1947). For example, May’s worldview of tackling global warming is one of not focusing on the national or global solution, but one of examining the burdens being placed on individuals in relatively unknown places as a result of dominant countries reaping all the benefits of industrialization. May’s comments and concerns corroborate the need for global-mindedness, especially in the dimensions of interconnectedness, futurist, and efficacy.

This attitude of embracing a global perspective is a challenge that cannot be met when initiated in a hierarchy from the top down, rather the bottom up. Only by beginning with the individual, meaning all individuals, can global-mindedness: a concern and value for all people and their diverse cultures in all parts of the world instill that sense of interconnectedness that produces global centrism and follows with the efficacy to get involved and make a difference in our global society. This is the
responsibility of our education system. There have to be reforms that address global issues to prepare globally competent graduates who become globally successful competitors.

In 2005, the University of California at Berkeley began its Berkeley China Initiative (BCI), an organization with 280 faculty and graduate students that brings together colleagues across the campus who otherwise might not even meet each other. The members of the organization work together along with the community on a regular basis to explore fresh and exciting ways of including China in globalization efforts at Berkley (Gold, 2007). Its mission is to strengthen research and teaching about China across all disciplines and professions, forge new international partnerships and enrich life by communicating these results (Gold, 2007). Tom Gold associate dean of area and international studies asked, “Has China claimed sovereignty? When it comes to the environment, the internal is external.” Therefore, it is no longer possible to maintain sovereignty and remain autonomous in areas once considered so” (Gold, 2007). According to Golay (2006) there is a metamorphosis in our structures and institutions that is erasing borders and crossing lines in an unprecedented interrelatedness of all peoples and nations. The new millennium has brought with it the need to have a new worldview, in other words, be global-minded.

The United States

As the U.S. higher education system is in dire need of updates to better meet the needs of its students to be competitive in a global society, Bologna’s international initiative is a potential wealth of ideas for the U.S. to emulate on a national level if it is to remain competitive in higher education around the globe. The Institute for Higher
Education Policy reports that the United States could learn a lot from Europe in its pursuit of integrity in academe (McMurtrie, 2008). In the report, *The Bologna Club: What U.S. Education Can Learn From a Decade of European Reconstruction*, the research analyst Clifford Adelman, 2008 in McMurtrie states the “Bologna Process offers some common-sense solutions to the struggle to define what students should be learning and to create a better pathway through the higher-education system.” The Europeans have a much more seamless system of connecting their intermediate credentials, equivalent to U.S. associate degrees, to their bachelor’s degrees than the U.S. does. By imitating the Bologna Process’ system of more homogeneous degree requirements and including credit reciprocity across state borders, the U.S. could follow in Bologna’s footsteps and increase the number of graduates in higher education. The state of Florida is one of the U.S. states that has auspiciously done so within its borders. The mission statement of the Florida Department of Education (2011), “To facilitate the efficient and effective progression and transfer of students through Florida’s K-20 education system” reflects its endeavor to clear paths instead of place road blocks along the journey of graduation. The Florida Department of Education’s Articulation Coordination Committee is in charge of assisting students to navigate more seamlessly between institutions and levels of education. Articulation is established between and among school districts, universities and community colleges. One of the ways it accomplishes this goal is through its Statewide Course Numbering System established in the 1960s.

Other states can benefit from following Florida’s lead by designing a more cohesive accreditation system both internally and externally. Students need higher
education’s support as opposed to the current far too common practice of discouraging transient students with added requirements due to not accepting another state’s college or system’s course code number. These additional demands can result in students repeating information previously studied and delaying, diminishing, or even extinguishing graduation goals.

**Federal Involvement.** The U.S. government does have several initiatives in place, such as, former President Clinton’s International Education mandate, former President G. W. Bush’s International Education initiatives and the Lincoln Commission Fellowship (Huelgero-Balcels, 2008). The Lincoln Commission’s Report is a result of the vision of the late senator from Illinois, Paul Simon. Its’ motto: *Global Competence & National Needs*. Its’ decree:

*What nations don’t know can hurt them.*
*The stakes involved in study abroad are that simple, that straightforward, and that important.*
*For their own future and that of the nation, college graduates today must be internationally competent* (NAFSA).

This decree echoes the hindsight recognized by the Fulbright Program (1945) and by Zook (1947) and other committee members of Truman’s Commission on Higher Education after the end of World War II. What nations do not know about their neighbors can indeed be detrimental. Perhaps world wars could have been avoided if there had been a better understanding, appreciation, and respect for diverse cultures, societies, and their histories. Therefore, study abroad programs in higher education are one vehicle to achieve the vital global-minded education that results in globally competent graduates.
The Lincoln Commission’s Report. It is unmistakably clear that The Lincoln Commission values study abroad as more than a tourist on vacation experience as an outside observer in another culture. It is obvious that the commission esteems the inestimable life changing effect of immersing oneself in another culture. The Lincoln Commission’s Report (2005) outlines the current position of study abroad, the challenges that lie ahead, and makes detailed recommendations for a national undergraduate study abroad fellowship program to dramatically increase and diversify study abroad participation in the United States.

The goals of the program outlined in this report are to:

1. Create a more globally informed American citizenry;
2. Increase participation in quality (emphasis mine) study abroad programs;
3. Encourage diversity in student participation in study abroad;
4. Diversify locations of study abroad, particularly in developing countries;
5. Create an innovative partnership with higher education to open more doors for study abroad;

The Lincoln Commission’s Report’s objective is to produce globally-minded citizens who have surpassed their provincial and insular ways of looking at the world. On the road to achieving global competency, participation in study abroad programs is indispensable (Bakke & Tharp, 1996; Anayso, 2007; Francois, 2010; and Hett, 1993). Thus, it is not surprising that a thrust of the Lincoln Commission is to meet national needs of globally competent graduates through its study abroad initiatives.
Other U.S. Initiatives. The U. S. American Council on Education (ACE), established in 1918, (www.acenet.edu) has identified wide public support from both faculty and students for closing the gap between the demand and the reality of the internationalization of U.S. higher education, but the actions are not speaking as loudly as the words (Green, 2003). As recently as June 9, 2009, a coalition of over 40 organizations, including NAFSA (Association of International Educators), sent a letter to the U.S. House of Representatives in support of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011 (H.R. 2410), which includes the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2009. The letter asks the House to pass the legislation that will vastly improve the global knowledge base of our college graduates, advance our nation’s economic networks, and serve vital diplomacy and security needs worldwide (www.NAFSA.org). This legislation is extremely encouraging in the move to reform higher education to prepare U.S. students to be more globally competent learners and therefore, more successful globally competitors. Unfortunately, the federal government does not have the authority to forcibly require its institutions to include internationalization in their curricula. Thus, the impetus has to come from within each individual institution of higher education. Traditional education needs to be replaced with a more comprehensive experience that includes intercultural competence, so students earn a degree in “Global Citizenship” where as a part of their ethical responsibilities to internationally underrepresented groups, students learn global understanding and tolerance (Lefrere, 2007).

International Education Week. The new millennium greeted the beginning of International Education Week, a joint initiative of the U.S. Department of State and the
U.S. Department of Education. The annual initiative held in November is now celebrated in more than 100 countries worldwide. International Education Week “is an opportunity to celebrate the benefits of international education and exchange worldwide, as well as to promote programs that prepare Americans for a global environment and attract future leaders from abroad to study, learn, and exchange experiences in the United States.” The website encourages all interested individuals, institutions, businesses to be involved. It lists events, facts, links, has photo posting opportunities and 3 test your I.Q. quizzes on continents, cultural geography, and physical and cultural geography. A fact sheet is included in Appendix D.

Watson Fellowship Program. A proponent of the inestimable value of travel abroad was the late president of IBM, Thomas J. Watson Jr.. Inspired by his personal experience and growth, Watson Jr. began the Watson Fellowship Program in 1961 with the goal of bringing a sense of realism about recognizing our problems and solving them. Since, its beginning, the foundation has awarded $29 million in fellowships to graduates to fund their dreams of spending a year abroad. It is has a rigorous application and arduous selection process, but the reward is a priceless experience of global discovery. The foundation’s philosophy is the $25,000 award to each student is “an investment in a person, not an investment in a project” (Anayso, 2007). The fellowship’s website entices college graduates with the offer of “a year of independent, purposeful exploration and travel -- in international settings new to them -- to enhance their capacity for resourcefulness, imagination, openness, and leadership and to foster their humane and effective participation in the world community.”
As a result of Thomas J. Watson Jr.’s personal experience, more than a thousand fellows have left the comforts of home and the confines of the traditional lock-step higher education programs. Through their educational proposals to explore and improve medicine, environment, anthropology, etc., Watson fellows in turn develop a sense of cultural pluralism (appreciation) and interconnectedness and return to their homeland with a heightened sense of responsibility for other peoples, global centrism and efficacy.

**Study Abroad**

Reports by (Fulbright, 1945), (Zook, 1947), the Simon Study Abroad Act (2009) as well as others proclaim study abroad’s invaluable contribution to preparing globally competent learners. In Hett’s (1993) research measuring students’ global-mindedness, students who spent more than nine weeks abroad scored significantly higher on the Global-Mindedness Scale than students who had participated in short term travel and those who had never travelled outside the U.S. In a 2006 study (Golay) using Hett’s Global-Mindedness Scale, a statistical significance on the dimensions of cultural pluralism and overall global-mindedness was noted for participants in a semester study abroad program in comparison to no significant differences for students who did not participate in a study abroad program.

A ten-year U.S. study of 35 institutions of the University of Georgia System beginning in 2000, reported impressive differences in students who participated in study abroad programs and those who didn’t. Students who studied abroad demonstrated improved academic performance which included increased knowledge about diverse cultures; moreover, graduation rates also improved. Another advantage of study abroad
experiences was that at-risk students’ academic performance benefitted as well (7/13/10).

**Progress in Study Abroad**

Nearly half a century after the Watson Fellowship was established, some of the traditions in study abroad programs are even more so than before breaking out of their comfort zone. For decades, the majority of study abroad programs have been European focused with England in particular being a top destination allowing students to experience cultural differences without facing the challenge of doing so in another language. However, this practice appears to be one of last century. According to a U.S. Student Mobility Report, “Open Doors” (2010) by the International Education Institute, there is an ongoing increase in U.S. students studying in Latin America. This trend is unprecedented news as fifteen of the top twenty-five international study abroad destinations for U.S. students are in Western Europe. Some positive observations for increased global competence are in nineteen of the top international destinations, English is not the first language; for example, study abroad in South Korea has increased by twenty-nine percent (Angarita, 2010). However, the United Kingdom continues to reign as the number one location for U.S. study abroad. It is interesting to note that a discrepancy exists within the United Kingdom as well because the number of international students who choose to study in the U.K. (500,000) outnumbers the number of British students who study abroad (15,000-20,000) by 25:1 according to a 2008 report by Martin Davidson, chief executive of the British Council (Inside Higher Ed, June 4, 2010).
Latin America

In Latin America, Peru leads the continent with an increase of thirty-two% of U.S. students in study abroad programs, followed by Chile with an increase of twenty-eight%, Argentina with fifteen%, and Costa Rica in tenth place of the number of U.S. students studying abroad with an increase of 4.4%. Mexico, American Students’ eighth favorite destination is the only Latin American country that saw a decrease with 9,928 students between 2007 and 2008 and 7,320 students in 2009 most likely as a result of U.S. State Department warnings about safety (Angarita, BBC Mundo, 2010).

Some of the considerations for the increase in Latin American study abroad programs were the popularity of studying ecotourism and an increased interest in international trade with Latin America because of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Moreover, students with a desire to learn Spanish find studying in Latin America a bargain compared to Spain. Another reason for the increase in American students heading south of the border is with the goal of attending medical school. The Caribbean alone from Aruba to Trinidad and Tobago has 17 medical schools (Wikipedia.org). One of these includes Cuba’s Latin American Medical School. According to 2004 statistics, an enrollment of 30,000 was predicted for 2007 with 10,00 of these coming from 29 different countries. The Cuban government pays complete tuition and room and board for up to 500 disadvantage students annually. Students make a commitment in return to serve in impoverished areas for a time upon graduation. Furthermore, in 2004, Secretary of State, Colin Powell made an exception for 80 U.S. students to continue their medical studies in Cuba because they were unable to pay for the exorbitant cost of U.S. medical school (Wickham, 2004).
The director of International Education Institute, Peggy Blumenthal, predicts the number of U.S. study abroad students will only continue to increase because to put it in the words of satisfied student participants, "It’s the best thing I’ve done in all my life" (2010).

**The "100,000 Strong Initiative"**

The year 2011 begins with U.S. Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton urging higher education leaders to endorse the "100,000 Strong Initiative". She challenged leaders to double their current number of study abroad students to China. The goal of this initiative by President Obama is to multiply the number of American students studying in China to 100,000 in a period of four years. This federal initiative recognizes the importance of U.S. and Chinese relations in our global community. To establish global centrism and interconnectedness between the U.S. and China, President Obama is aware of the need for educating a cadre of globally competent Americans who are cognizant of not only Chinese history and culture, but also language; thus addressing the globally competent component of second language acquisition (Bakke & Tharp, 1996; Zook, 1947).

**Study Abroad Concerns**

While the offering of study abroad and international exchange opportunities is an admirable and an essential component of preparing globally competent learners, it does not come without any caveats. There are risks that study abroad programs may have their foundations in being money making prospects for an institution and/or in looking good on paper, but providing little substance in acquiring values of and appreciation for the host culture.
Akin to the U.S. economic benefits from international students, almost $20 billion in annual revenue from tuition and living expenses (U.S. Open Doors Data 2011), study abroad programs are a counterpart in contributing to a state’s and institution’s revenue. Consequently, the objective of genuinely providing students with an educational opportunity that exposes them to diverse cultures and awareness of countries’ interdependence may get lost in the temptation of monetary gain. One such example was reported about a professor in Washington State who fleeced his students participating in study abroad programs for at least $50,000 (Perry, 2009). Likewise, the British Council admonished its universities for viewing their international programs as little more than a means to make money and international students as “cash cows” (Inside Higher Ed, 2010).

A step in the right direction can be inferred from a 2005 report that indicated an increase in study abroad programs in the U.S.; however, closer observation of the programs and participants involved revealed the programs were of a limited involvement of eight weeks or less. (Kehl & Morris, 2007, p. 67) “There is a proliferation of short term, self-supporting study abroad programmes that often do little more than expose students to another country without giving them an in-depth understanding of the language or culture” (Van de Water, p. 61, 2006). Possibly related to the travel or vacation abroad mentality of some short-term programs is inappropriate behavior due to new-found freedom. A disappointing study by the University of Washington published in *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* reports that undergraduates in study abroad programs double their alcohol consumption. This is a serious concern because students
are a greater risk for violating unfamiliar laws and customs; moreover, this behavior does not promote positive impressions of Americans (Inside Higher Ed, 2010).

In a fall 2007 survey by the Institute for Higher Education Policy of more than 530 universities, 64% from Europe, virtually every institution was interested in participating in study abroad programs with American students; however, most programs offered were for a full academic year or semester. Approximately, 20% offered programs of two months or less. This is a disconnect with U.S. study abroad students in that 53% take part in short-term programs. Only 37% study abroad for a semester, and a mere 6% participate in yearlong programs. (McMurtrie, 2008) Institute for Higher Education Policy president, Allen Goodman, perceives this as not an issue of increasing numbers of participating students and countries, rather how many Americans are interested in genuinely experiencing the host culture as opposed to enjoying themselves on a vacation trip abroad. (Goodman in McMurtrie).

Although internationalization began in the 1980’s more than twenty years later, a survey by the American Council of Education revealed an alarming disparity. In spite of 70% of Americans expressing study abroad programs being a requisite for undergraduates only 2% of students actually participated in study abroad programs when 50% had indicated a high interest when surveyed in high school. According to a survey conducted by the Forum on Education Abroad (2009) from 165 responses of its 400 members, the results reveal that approximately two-thirds reported a decrease in student participation in study abroad programs due to the downturn in the economy which suggests the economy is another reason for diminished participation in study abroad programs. The percentage of colleges facing budget cuts in 2009 was 60%
The information gathered in these various studies and reports suggests the omnipresent issue of money, as in costs for participating in and funding for offering programs continues to be a detriment to achieving the study abroad objectives in higher education. Nevertheless, it is urgent that higher education continue to strive for its goals of involving a much larger number of that 70% of students who express a desire to participate in study abroad as well as provide serious programs where students can immerse themselves in another culture in order to become empowered by their experience abroad.

**Community Colleges and Globalization**

“International education (IEd) involves multiple constituencies, diverse systems of knowledge, is future-oriented, and calls for educational reform, for change of thinking, and for re-alignment of present educational practices” (Mestenhauser, 2006). Recognizing the need to respond to the global changes the U.S. is facing, the rapporteurs at the 1996 *Educating the Global Community: A Framework for Community Colleges* Conference, illuminated progress that had been made in community colleges’ efforts to prepare globally educated citizens in areas such as partnerships with business and industry, faculty development, curriculum enhancement, and diversity. Their enumeration of progress was not limited to students, faculty, or the college ethos, but included community college CEOs and trustees who received a global education from exposure to campus projects, media, diversity in the student body, and variations in local business demands. According to Green (2002), characteristics of global institutions of higher education include: study abroad programs, international student exchange, world language education, world perspectives in social sciences, foreign policy,
economic issues and humanities, faculty with international backgrounds/experiences/bilingual abilities, and student activities that promote multicultural awareness!

Federal Response to Community Colleges

In October 2010, the federal governments declared its involvement in and support for community colleges as a key to improving U.S. standings as a leader in the world’s economy. The community college holds the key to unlock the wasted potential of American college graduates. At an unprecedented White House Summit on Community Colleges, President Obama announced, “additional, private funding for cash-strapped community colleges in an effort to bridge the growing degree gap between the United States and other nations.” The president declared the drop in rank from first to ninth in the world of the percentage of American college graduates lost opportunities as well as a threat to the U.S.’s rank as a leader in the world’s economy.” The Department of Education reports approximately 30% of students complete two-year associate degree programs, and they do so in 3 years. The president has a goal of achieving an additional 5 million college degrees in the next decade. The purpose of the summit was to discuss additional funding to support community colleges’ role in contributing to the U.S. work force. Because of the recession, U.S. community colleges have faced the dilemma of serving an increase in enrollments by 24% while cutting back course offerings and limiting enrollments. However, in the arena of global education, John K. Hudzik, vice president for global engagement and strategic projects at Michigan State University and current president of NAFSA: Association of International Educators offered some encouraging news. Although the financial crisis has had an impact on international
education and students are more cost conscious when making decisions, the economy is only one factor in student mobility, and the fact that higher education is shifting to more of a globally traded commodity increases competition which in turn decreases its costs (Redden, 2009). Furthermore, predictions are that by 2020, the number of students participating in global higher education will increase to 200 million.

**Global Reforms in Higher Education**

As institutions of higher education react to the changes of a global society, vital reforms in curricula and degree programs are imperative if students are expected to be prepared to compete globally. To succeed professionally in a global workforce, one must possess the knowledge of history and world events to be able to compete against as well as be able to cooperate with diverse teams. One must be able to analyze problems of resource management and global decision-making through a non-ethnocentric lens of futurism (Bakke & Tharp, 1996; Hett, 1993; Oka, 2007; Van de Water, 2006).

What exactly are the changes that need to be made to produce globally competent learners? A global-minded institution needs to have specific benchmarks in place. Higher Education’s role is to provide educational experiences that combine a knowledge base with an affective component. This foundation will foster a sense of interconnectedness or interdependence of commonalities along with an awareness, acceptance, and appreciation for diverse peoples and cultures, as well as create a more globally informed American citizenry (Bakke & Tharp, 1996; Hett, 1993; Lincoln Commission, 2005; Muessig & Gilliom, 1981; Zook, 1947). Consequently, students will have a general knowledge of world history and events such as politics, economics and
geography; expertise in another language, and be empowered to work in diverse teams, accept a moral responsibility for global citizenship and human rights with a motivation to make a difference in society (Bakke & Tharp, Hett, Lincoln Commission, Muessig & Gilliom, Zook).

Community college leaders and other representatives at the *Educating for the Global Community Conference* corroborated these expectations for higher education’s role in preparing global competent students in its “Four Developmental Stages” of an educated person in a global society germane to all levels regardless of educational institution (Bakke & Tharp, 1996, p. 3). Figure 3 provides a visual of the 4 developmental stages.

1. Recognition of global systems and their connectedness, including personal awareness and openness to other cultures, values, and attitudes at home and abroad.
2. Intercultural skills and direct experiences.
3. General knowledge of history and world events—politics, economics, geography.
4. Detailed area studies specialization: expertise in another language, culture, country.

Although the four stages vary in their emphasis or sequence, general to specific or specific to general, and may not be a linear progression, the first stage of recognition of interdependence is crucial (Bakke & Tharp, 1996). According to Selby and Pike (2000), the requisite values, such as, acceptance and appreciation for rights and freedoms or cultural pluralism, an ecological view of the world, social responsibility, intrinsic value
Specialization

General Knowledge

Intercultural Experiences

Recognition of Interconnectedness

An institution of higher education, the University of South Florida in Tampa has already expressed its commitment to global education and has set the wheels in motion for providing globalized programs for its students. Linda Whiteford, (Erskine, 2009) Associate Vice President for Global Strategies – Office of the President Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Strategic Initiatives – Office of the Provost, University of South Florida, Tampa, states, “Of course a global education provides students with a competitive advantage in the marketplace and enables them to be successful in a global economy.” Moreover, Whiteford recognizes the lifelong
learning that goes beyond the limits of the classroom that is gained from a global-minded education, as she states, “Global experiences also make us more tolerant, more generous people. To know about the world outside our own borders by experiencing it first-hand and understanding how other people live enriches us as human beings.” Therefore, a curriculum that educates learners to be globally competent not only prepares students for the global job market, but instills an appreciation and respect for other peoples and cultures and the planet that are inextricably linked with lifelong ripple effects that resonate with making the planet a better place for everyone.

**Change in Community College Mission**

Traditionally community college education has focused on general education requirements and intensive courses in one’s major. However, in 1994 and again in 1996, more than twenty community college educators and other representatives convened for the *Building the Global Community* and *Educating for the Global Community Conferences* in Warrenton, Virginia (Bakke & Tharp). The first conference produced its mission statement, “to ensure the survival and well-being of our communities, it is imperative that community colleges develop a globally and multiculturally competent citizenry.” The second conference defined the developmental stages of a globally educated person and the globally competent learner. Furthermore, at the reconvening, institutional requirements were established for “global education to be embedded in the very fabric of US community colleges” beginning with the board of trustees. The series of steps proposed are:

1. Secure college CEO and Board of Trustees commitment.

2. Not only include global education in a college mission statement, but make it a priority.
3. “Review and revise accreditation criteria to acknowledge the importance of global competency” (p. 5).

4. “Develop and implement a comprehensive global education program on campus” (p. 5).

5. Conduct a needs assessment for local businesses and other interested in global education and commerce.

6. Allocate resources, faculty release time and research and development of curriculum, exchanges, and activities.

7. Provide support and incentives for international initiatives, both on and off campus.

8. Provide instructional, academic and career counseling student services that promote equal access to global education.

By the last decade of the twentieth century, the traditional community college focus had morphed into curricula output or outcomes instead of curricula inputs. (Levin, 2000 & 2001) No longer was its purpose on individual and community enrichment, but rather workforce preparation. Surprisingly, not everyone involved in community college education was cognizant of or supportive of the changing needs.

According to Genelin in a 2005 survey of 56 academic administrators, 576 full-time technical faculty, and 84 full-time general education faculty at 9 technical colleges in Minnesota, “the second most frequently identified barrier to successful implementation of global education initiative by technical faculty and general education faculty was the perception that global education initiatives did not fall under the mission of the technical college and are not needed.” The responses to the item of the survey, “Preparing globally competent learners should be part of our college’s mission”, resulted in administrators with the highest mean score (4.20), general education faculty following
with a mean score of (4.18) and technical faculty giving the initiative the lowest priority (3.79).

A study of seven community colleges in the Pacific Rim, (Levin, 2000) was conducted in an effort to explain globalizing forces’ effects and how the process of globalization affects college behaviors. The findings suggested the previous college mission had become antiquated. Before the turn of the century the traditional community college’s mission had already redirected its focus to addressing the needs of the global economy (Levin). “The observation and articulation within community colleges of a globally competitive environment, economic in nature and capitalistic in ideology, opened the doors to more business-oriented practices and a corporate-style of management” (Levin). Surprisingly, an astounding majority of administrators and faculty were adamant there had been no changes in their community college’s mission during the 1990s even though alterations in colleges’ mission had occurred in areas such as increased distance education for remediation, four-year degree granting programs, and increased focus on multi-culturalism and diversity. Levin (2000) observed that the colleges participating in the study had transformed their approaches in administration, the hiring process, eliminating former discriminatory practices incorporating diversity in curriculum and instruction, and awareness of students’ diversity and commonalities to a more culturally pluralistic one. Colleges were independent in their motivation to include a global perspective; for one it was a response to a large immigrant population, for another it was to actively practice policies formerly put in place, but dormant. Another of the community colleges in the study responded with the most dramatic initiative that changed their community by addressing its “changing pedagogy”. This particular
community college incorporated learning communities, typically social sciences, foreign policy, economic issues, and humanities with curricular themes that have a multicultural focus, one of the essential characteristics of a global institution, in order to prepare its graduates for competing in the global workforce, (Green, 2002; Levin, 2000). This initiative lead to multiculturalism permeating the institution’s formal governance, which began to include formerly, excluded voices and ethnicities.

It is evident the inextricable link between the college curricula and the community is an unconditioned response that changes to meet the needs of society rather than the expectation of society to align itself with lofty, scholarly ideals of higher education curricula. Globally competent learners rely on higher education to provide the necessary curricula and programs to empower them with a sense of interconnectedness, cultural pluralism, global centrism, responsibility, which lead to efficacy (Hett, 1993; Muessig & Gilliom, 1981, Zook, 1947). To accomplish this admirable goal and supply the demand for globally competent learners, traditional education needs to be replaced with a more comprehensive experience that includes intercultural competence, so students earn a degree that includes “global citizenship” where as a part of their ethical responsibilities to internationally underrepresented groups; students learn global understanding and tolerance (Lefrere, 2007). Those who interact in global settings will be expected to have acquired the ability to collaborate and interact in diverse culture and linguistic settings. “Individuals who can exploit diversity to generate new knowledge about customers, suppliers, products, and services will be more likely to succeed in a competitive environment” (Karoly & Panis, 2004, p. 201).
In a recent study (Olney, 2008), that surveyed 143 businesses and industries across the bay from the community college in this study, the employers of this region expressed the importance of community college students and graduates having knowledge of other countries, cultures and their languages. “Appreciation of Cross Cultural Differences and Foreign Language Skills were rated significantly (p≤.05) higher in importance than other international skills” (p. viii). This competency was in a sense perceived to be an expectation of executives for their employees as opposed to an optional benefit if a business were to remain a competitive.

Given these societal changes, higher education has two fundamental responsibilities to help ensure the continued well-being of the nation today: to provide graduates and the nation at large with the skills needed to be effective in a global, increasingly competitive economy, in which corporations reach across nations and geographical divides in search of new markets, more efficient production, and less costly labor; and to close the achievement gap between those students in this country who are advantaged—educationally, culturally, and economically—and those who are not (McCarthy, 2007).

The advances in technology dovetail with increasing globalized trade have resulted in outsourcing and a loss of jobs for some along with new job opportunities for others (Romano & Dellow, 2009). Community colleges in the U.S. are expected to meet the need for preparing students for jobs with higher-level skills; such as, the ability to work in teams, communicate in a diverse labor force and think critically to solve problems. Studies of future labor markets indicate the challenge U.S. institutions face is not a shortage of jobs rather preparing skilled workers to meet the requirements of new jobs created by the global economy (Romano & Dellow, 2009).
One of the most common solutions to job loss is to educate people to the highest possible level and community colleges has the ability to prepare globally competent graduates who can compete in a global workforce whether they remain at home or acclimate abroad (Romano & Dellow, 2009). It is not surprising that President Obama’s response to the current U.S. unemployment crisis was to raise the bar for every American’s education,

\textit{... to commit to at least one year or more of higher education or career training. This can be community college or a four-year school; vocational training or an apprenticeship. But whatever the training may be, every American will need to get more than a high school diploma} (Obama, 2009).

**Challenges**

Sadly, one obstacle in achieving “global-mindedness” in higher education is that Americans have garnered the reputation for being the least knowledgeable about, or interested in, international affairs. The stereotypical “ugly American” abroad mentality of “chronic disinterest in the rest of the world” (Green, 2002, p. 11) is antiquated and needs to be annihilated.

Many corporations generally rely on colleges and universities to prepare students with domain skills and the knowledge and attitudes essential for doing business in the corporate arena. In a 2008 study by Olney, businesses in the Tampa Bay area of Florida expressed the importance of hiring employees who spoke another language besides English. This revelation contradicts the dated American attitudes of everyone else needs to learn English, as in the vernacular “Speak American!” Moreover, the pursuit of studying a “foreign” language for recreational purposes or out of necessity to meet
educational requirements does not prepare U.S. graduates for the global workforce and can eliminate them from the competition in a global society.

The national attitude of English as the universal language continues to be alive and well in the twenty-first century. This attitude perpetuates the belief that learning a second language is unnecessary. More specific to this study, a degree of ethnocentricity seems to persist in community college students in the central west coast of Florida. In my personal experience as a language professor, students’ comments regarding appreciation of other cultures or languages have been incredulous to me. Besides the quintessential, “I’m only studying another language because it’s required!” there have been statements such as:

1. “I’m never going to use this.”
2. “There’s no need to study another language because there are translators conveniently available.”
3. “People should learn English because it’s spoken everywhere.”
4. My personally most astonishing, “There’s no need to travel abroad when you can go to Las Vegas. They have all the famous world icons there!”

Clearly, some community college students would benefit from globalized curricula that reflect global interdependence. It may seem paradoxical, but Kumaravadivelu explains the importance in awareness of one’s own culture as well as others. “In understanding other cultures, we understand our own culture better; in understanding our own, we understand other cultures better” (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 6).

Higher education needs to take the initiative to educate students to think outside of the box or think outside of their nationality; or in some extreme cases, think outside
their county or neighborhood. This generation and future generations of students will need to not only know their specific discipline, but have graduated with intercultural competence as well. According to Oka, (2007) University of Toronto, there is a need for reform in traditional curricula to include an “understanding of how the global is understood and taught.” Some critics point at the Fulbright Program, Carnegie Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation as veiled propagation of the “American Way” instead of promoting reciprocity of other cultures, histories, and interdependencies (Rupp, 1999).

Presently, even in courses with an objective of increasing global-mindedness or an awareness of what it means to be a global citizen, students learn the global is framed through a Western lens—a practically focused, comparative approach to "here" and "there" creating a U.S. exceptionalism mentality (Oka).

Although some institutions of higher education already pride themselves on providing their students with a global education, the reality is even these efforts are tainted with a Western worldview that tends to perpetuate the “Western is superior” perspective (Oka, 2007). A possible impetus indicative of this present perception in American culture is the “…American ethos favors the individual in competition. When issues of global foreign policy were brought to Washington, the American response was often strictly American” (McCrum, 2010, p. 231). This insular mentality may have worked for the U.S. in the past, but in a global world, it is antiquated and inadequate to level the playing field for U.S. graduates to compete with graduates from around the world. Consequently, it is exigent for institutions that plan to stay in the game to broaden their playing field and restructure from the bottom up or find themselves left
behind, or even worse, eliminated from the competition in adequately preparing graduates for the world they will be living and working in.

Because the U.S. has been a super power on the international scene for many years, there has been a tendency to esteem its achievements while minimizing the value of the contributions of other nations. "Historically comparative analysis has suffered from both moral ethnocentrism (using terms and concepts to contrast Other societies with something better-located in the West) and oversimplification ("compressing rich worlds of variability and complexity into gross and unappreciative categories" [p. 648]) which use the Western experience as the point of origin and reference" (Smelser, 2003 in Oka, 2007).

Our current economic and education status is a big dose of reality rousing us to conscientiousness that those dated world views are not applicable to the present. Evidence of a reluctance to embrace a global-mentality can be found in the statistic that only 20% of U.S. universities require study of a foreign language as a graduation requirement. Additionally, of the only 3% of U.S. students who do participate in study abroad programs, 40% of those choose to go to the United Kingdom, Italy, and Spain (Altbach, 2004). Nevertheless, the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln study Abroad Fellowship Program cites one of the top reasons a student should study abroad is economic competitiveness (2005 p. vi). The gap is glaring between global policies and institutional commitment to practices. M.W. Apple refers to this in the book, *Ideology and Curriculum* as "atrophication of collective commitment" (Apple, M. 1990 in Oka, 2007).
Faculty Involvement

According to research by the American Council on Education, The Unifying Voice for Higher Education (ACE), to gain and maintain a global edge an institution needs to begin with its faculty because faculty are the foundation of an institution. Haari 1981 in Francois, 2010 vehemently emphasized the importance of faculty in the degree of internationalization of a campus stating the globalization of an institution begins from the top down. The leadership of an institution and the competence of the faculty combined with a commitment by both are more important than an institution’s size, location or budget.

In a 2006 study, Golay, indicates some corporate communities have expressed concerns about higher education’s ability to prepare future employees to live, work and communicate in a globalized economic environment. Institutions have to broaden their national focus to incorporate a worldview into their curricula, instruction and degree programs. Characteristics of a worldview include study abroad programs and international student and instructor exchanges; moreover, faculty have international backgrounds and/or experiences and bilingual fluency. Thus, a global curriculum and student activities are enriched with world perspectives in the areas of social science, foreign policy, economic issues, and humanities that promote multi-cultural awareness (Green, 2002). Unfortunately, Green reported that 75% of students responded that faculty only sometimes or never relate course material to larger global issues and events (Green, 2005, p. 21).

There is a multiplier effect in international education and it carries the possibility, the only real possibility, of changing our manner of thinking about the world. For every
university professor whose outlook has been broadened by study in another country many thousands of student gain some measure of intercultural perspective (Fulbright, 1989, p. 231). As those who have direct contact with the clients or students, it is essential to begin with the faculty to disseminate the ideals of being a productive citizen in a global society. Indeed, faculty as the designers and facilitators and especially, instructors of online teaching themselves can be the pioneers in internationalizing instruction.

In teaching, the diversity of the global is represented on a micro level by the differing ways it is conceptualized across disciplines, what is emphasized in the classroom, pedagogical strategies used and the knowledge relied upon. The uniformity exists on a macro level in that the global is generally understood, taught, and originates from a monolithic, Western perspective that correlates with a neoliberal agenda (Oka, 2007, p. 243).

It is paramount to consider the impact that faculty can have on students; moreover, what impact faculty's understanding of the global will have on the future of teaching and learning.

In a study using the Hett Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) "Motivational Factors and Worldview Dimensions Associated with Perceptions of Global Education Initiatives by U.S. College Professors" (Francois, 2010) from a population of 500,000 full-time U.S. college professors, a random sample of 1,400 was selected with a final return rate of 418 responses. The results suggest U.S. College Professors value global education initiatives and would like to see them implemented in higher education. The highest mean scores regarding the overall perceptions of global education initiatives by U.S. college professors were:
• Study abroad and international exchange opportunities, special and general education courses with an international/global focus, and foreign language courses should be available to students at their college;
• Preparing globally competent learners should be part of their college’s mission;
• Study abroad and international exchange opportunities should be available to faculty.
• Their college should provide opportunities for students and faculty with international/global experience to share their experience with the college community.
• An institution-wide task force/committee to advance global education initiatives should be in place at their college.
• All students at my college should be required to complete at least one course (general education course) with an international/global focus.
• My college should provide opportunities for faculty with international/global experience to share their experience with the college community. (Francois, 2010).

Also included in the findings, (Francois, 2010, p. 178) related to the worldview of U.S. professors were ten dominant beliefs from responses to the thirty questions to the Global-mindedness Survey:

1. The United States is enriched by the fact that it is comprised of many people from different cultures and countries.

2. Americans can learn something of value from all different cultures.

3. It is important that we educate people to understand the impact that current policies might have on future generations.
4. I generally find it stimulating to spend an evening talking with people from another culture.

5. I often think about the kind of world we are creating for future generations.

6. It is important that American universities and colleges provide programs designed to promote understanding among students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

7. I enjoy trying to understand people’s behavior in the context of their culture.

8. It is very important to me to choose a career in which I can have a positive effect on the quality of life for future generations.

9. I think of myself, not only as a citizen of my country but also as a citizen of the world.

10. My opinions about national policies are based on how those policies might affect the rest of the world as well as the United States.

Seven of these ten fall into the theoretical dimension of “cultural pluralism, defined by Hett (1993) as a sense of appreciation, respect, and value of cultural diversity. Hett (1993) argued that cultural pluralism is an adaptive stage of intercultural sensitivity, involving the existence of at least two cultural frames of reference. The findings of this study seem to confirm such theorization given the fact that more than 70% of the participants who completed the survey have lived in another culture, in addition to that of the United States. Other findings in the study confirmed that cultural pluralism was a significant predictor of favorable perception of internationalizing the curriculum at a postsecondary institution.

Recommendations (Francois, 2010; Green, 2003; Mestenhauser, 2006; Stohl, 2007) for faculty involvement include:
• The creation of faculty fellowships on time-release rotating basis to work in international offices to acquire experiences with administration of international education.

• Initiation of faculty development programs in order to insure that individual faculty members and their governing structures have the conceptual insight and practical knowledge about international education.

• Establishment of new task-forces or ad-hoc committees, where faculty fellows can be given the responsibility for coordinating the work of these committees.

• Sponsoring of periodically significant invitational international conferences on selected topics in order to:
  - produce publications,
  - encourage wide participation,
  - place the institution on the map as leader in a given field and
  - utilize the publicity leading to that conference to educate larger public about the international character of the institution.

• Encouraging faculty to develop interdisciplinary, intercultural and multicultural teams that would help conceptualize international education and translate important concepts for application to other disciplines.

  Recommendations for faculty interaction with students include:

• Enhance student motivation by making courses and programs challenging, interesting, stimulating and the learning – rewarding.

• Motivational policy in which faculty help students understand how international material relates to previous knowledge.
• Insure that the curriculum reflects adequate levels of complexity from introductory to advanced levels and provide students with integrative experiences.

According to Mestenhauser’s theoretical perspective (2006) faculty should encourage educational approaches that have multiple objectives:

1. learning the subject matter and cooperative skills (service learning)
2. cross cultural communication skills
3. understanding experiences of diverse students
4. integrating these diverse students in campus life

It is significant to note that the lack of faculty involvement in providing global-minded instruction has little to do with competence or interest. It seems the biggest obstacle for including faculty in the participation of designing courses with a global perspective or worldview is lack of time, which ultimately is a result of a lack of funding. Stohl (2007) a strong proponent of faculty involvement declares they need to be recruited, recognized, and rewarded.

A study of leaders of global initiatives (Caligiuri, 2006) suggests that intercultural training or developmental experience can produce leaders who are effective in performing global tasks and activities. There is one caveat; however, the development of global effectiveness in leaders is dependent upon the individual’s aptitudes; knowledge, skills, abilities, and personality characteristics which is basically the same effectiveness as with any training.
Chapter Summary

Chapter two presented an overview of scholarly documents and published research by experts about initiatives, perspectives, strategies, implementation, both national and international, and some of challenges in providing an internationalized curriculum in higher education with the goal of producing globally competent graduates for competition in a global environment. This chapter included a brief history of education reform as well as revealed the impacts of globalization on higher education, specifically community colleges and the needs and challenges of accomplishing a goal of preparing higher education students for the demands of our changing global society.
Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter outlines the research methodology used in the study *Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four Year Community College in Florida* and includes a rationale of the methods and participants of the study in an effort to quantify student global-mindedness at a community college in Florida. The focus of the study consisted of an analysis of community college students’ responses to an instrument, the Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) that measures global-mindedness designed by the late E. Jane Hett, Ed. D. with additional questions. The results of the GMS responses are supplemented by a student demographic profile. These responses are essential in examining: the number of students who perceive globalism as an important and essential component in education for future job preparation, the “type” of student who perceives globalism important, and the “type” who doesn’t, whether or not there is a change or difference in students’ perceptions of globalization in beginning and later academic years, and whether or not there is a difference in the level of global-mindedness between “immigrant” and “digital natives”. See additions in Chapter 1 (p.13). The main objective of the study was to answer the six research questions that were introduced in Chapter 1.
Research Questions

Based on responses to the GMS Instrument (Hett, 1993) to measure Global-mindedness, the following research questions were examined:

1. To what degree do the students at this 4-year institution of higher education rank as globally-minded learners; i.e., identify with the relevance of social responsibility, cultural pluralism, personal efficacy on outside events, global-centrism, and interconnectedness based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

2. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between males and females based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

3. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students with and without study abroad experience based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

4. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are monolingual English speakers and students who know another language besides English based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

5. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between upper and lower academic rank students based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

6. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are digital natives (computer savvy) and digital immigrant (computer novices)? (Prensky, 2005).
A Scale to Measure Global-Mindedness

According to Hett (1993) a global-minded person is one whose beliefs, attitudes, and actions are connected to all of humanity; consequently, they have a responsibility to others worldwide. “People who are global-minded possess an ecological world view, believe in the unity of humankind and the interdependence of humanity, support universal human rights, have loyalties that extend beyond international borders, and are futurists” (Hett, 1993, p. 9). The GMS (Hett, 1993) was chosen for this study because of its five theoretical dimensions: Responsibility, Cultural Pluralism, Efficacy, Globalcentrism, and Interconnectedness. These dimensions correlate to the components of globally competent learners discussed in the literature review. Globally competent learners are those who have an international perspective instead of an insular one. They possess global-mindedness; meaning they are able to:

- think on a global level as opposed to provincial or western is better,
- recognize the interdependence of the different peoples of the world,
- cooperate and appreciate other cultures because of knowledge of global cultures and second language competence,
- have a personal responsibility for others,
- foster international understanding and peace


The GMS is composed of 30 items on a five-point Likert-type scale that ranges from strongly agree to disagree that were identified to measure one’s degree of “global-mindedness”; in other words, one’s openness or resistance to achieving global
competence. A composite score of the five sub-scales of the 30 items can range from a total possible score of 30 to 150 with the higher score indicative of a greater level of global-mindedness. The GMS instrument is located in Appendix B.

Furthermore, the GMS (1993) was chosen for this study as an instrument to measure students’ global-mindedness due to its strong validity and reliability. Hett developed the GMS using a process of retroductive triangulation by collecting data from literature reviews of related constructs along with analyses of related empirical instruments in an effort to substantiate evidence of validity. Hett then identified underlying constructs through a compilation of the information. The five theoretical dimensions identified for the GMS are Responsibility, Cultural Pluralism, Efficacy, Globalcentrism, and Interconnectedness. According to Waltz and Bausell, (1981) an exact number of items required for attitude measure has not been established, but they suggest “that attitude measures rarely consist of more than 40 items” (in Hett, 1993, p. 92). Principal components factor analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation was the method used for item selection in determining item reliability (Devellis, 1991; Nunnally, 1978, as reported in Hett, p. 104) and construct validation in the development of the instrument.

Hett surveyed 396 students at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) with the GMS, which resulted in a strong correlation of .65, significant at the .001 level. An internal reliability for Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient subscales for the five theoretical dimensions ranged from .70 to .70 with an overall coefficient alpha of .90. A Content Validity Index (CVI) of .88 for the overall instrument was reported in Hett’s research (Hett, 1993).
Furthermore, the GMS was chosen for this study due to its repeated use in globally-related studies. The GMS has been used in study abroad programs (Bates, 1997; Gillan, 1995; Golay, 2006; Kehl & Morris, 2007), internationalization of education courses (Ballou, 1996), teachers’ and professors’ perceptions of globalized initiatives in education (Carano, 2010; Francois, 2010), in developing global-mindedness through online delivery (Zong & Farouk, 1999), as well as in classroom communication (Walton, 2002). Table 1 lists the six research questions of this research and their correlation to the statements on the Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS). Additionally, Table 1 indicates the correlation between the research questions and the demographic profile questions. The final column of Table 1 lists the basis for the inclusion of the research questions in this proposed research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Heller Question</th>
<th>Demographic Question</th>
<th>Basis for Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GMS (5 Dimensions)</td>
<td>Questions 1-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male/Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kell &amp; Morris Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel/Study Abroad</td>
<td>Cultural Pluralism # 1,3,13, 14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gillen, Bates, Golay, Kell &amp; Morris Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Second Language</td>
<td>Cultural Pluralism # 14, 24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personal null hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Upper/Lower Division</td>
<td>Efficacy #15, 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferry’s Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Digital native or immigrant</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frensky’s Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reliability of Scores from the Instrument

Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is an estimate of reliability and an alpha of .05 is the most commonly set value for alpha (α) (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Hett (1993) reported a .88 content validity index for the overall instrument. In a 2010 study using the GMS (Francois) Cronbach’s alpha values were calculated to assess the reliability of the instrument, and the internal reliability for Cronbach’s alpha for the subscales ranged from .70 to .79. The overall alpha coefficient was .90.

In the dissertation, “Pedagogy of the Global: Knowledge, Empire and Internationalization in the University”, University of Toronto, 2007, Oka suggests an area to include for investigation in global pedagogy is the idea of surveying students who are enrolled in and faculty who teach courses with the word "global" or "international" in the title. Hett’s research “revealed a significant correlation at the .05 level between the number of global studies courses taken and global-mindedness” (Hett, 1993, p.128). Students who had taken one or fewer global studies courses scored a group mean of 114.79 or lower, while those taking three to four global studies courses scored 118.29, five to six courses scored 120.84 and students taking seven or more globally-oriented courses, scored a group mean of 123.38 on the GMS. Moreover, a significant difference was revealed between students who had taken less than three globally-oriented courses compared to those who had taken five or more through the use of the Tukey-B, post hoc comparison technique (Hett, 1993, p. 129). These results suggest including courses related to global issues would indicate a stronger global-mindedness perspective.
Previous Studies Using the GMS

This instrument, The Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) has been used in several research studies examining correlations between study abroad programs and global-mindedness and course content or teacher cultural competency and global-mindedness.

Table 2 lists previous studies in the past 15 years using the GMS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carano</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Florida High School Social Studies Teachers GMS rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>U.S. professors’ perceptions of global initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehl &amp; Morris</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golay</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welton</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Teachers’ Demographics and Classroom Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zong &amp; Farouk</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Developing Global-mindedness via the Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bafou</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>International/intercultural general education class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillan</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© V. Hall Stevens, 2011

Study Abroad

In 2007, Kehl and Morris used Hett’s Instrument to Measure Global-Mindedness differences in study abroad programs. There were 520 responses of which 52% were female and 29% male corroborating the national statistics of 35.8% male and 64.2% female according to the Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs at the U.S. Department of State’s Institute of International Education Open Doors (2010) that more females than males participate in study abroad. Their findings indicated statistically significant
differences between short-term eight weeks or less, and semester-long study abroad programs. Students in semester-long programs had a significantly greater global-mindedness score than those who were planning to study abroad. Students who participated in a semester-long study abroad program scored higher on the global-mindedness scale suggesting growth of international perspective and personal development (Kehl & Morris, 2007, p. 76). Unfortunately, nearly 90% of college students spend less than a semester abroad (Open Doors, 2005). Other interesting findings by Kehl and Morris were males scored higher on the GMS than females, as well as, of all 520 participants, students who indicated their parents had an annual income over $100,000.00 scored significantly lower than those whose parents earned less.

Golay (2006) used the GMS in a study of undergraduate students at Florida State University to measure the influence of participating in a semester study abroad program on global-mindedness. Findings were statistically significant for cultural pluralism, responsibility, globalcentrism and total global-mindedness for both groups after finishing the semester. Pre- to post-test scores revealed a statistical significance on the dimensions of cultural pluralism and total global-mindedness for the study abroad group. On the other hand, the non-study abroad group revealed no significant differences on any of the global-minded dimensions, indicating participation in a semester study abroad program may give one a more globally-minded perspective. Cronbach’s alpha for the five dimensions of global-mindedness were .80 for the theoretical dimension of cultural pluralism, .86 for responsibility, .79 for efficacy, .73 for globalcentrism, and .74 for the dimension of interconnectedness. The Cronbach’s alpha for the total post-test was .93.
Gillan used the GMS in a 1995 study at the University of Northern Colorado (UNC) involving study abroad students, non-study abroad students, faculty, and administrators to assess UNC’s openness to internationalization. Study abroad students tested higher on the Global-mindedness scale (GMS) than non-study abroad with the highest scores resulting for students who had studied or traveled abroad for a year or more. Moreover, independent variables of gender and age had significant predictive relationships for global-mindedness when tested with multiple regression analyses with the age range from 45-54 scoring the highest mean (120) and 62% of the 294 participants were female and 38% male (Gillan, 1995, p. 103) similar to the national average of 64.6% female and 35.4% male in 1999-2000 Open Doors (2010).

**Online Global-mindedness**

Another study using the GMS conducted in 1999 by Zong and Farouk examined “the effects of participation in an internet-based project, the International Communication and Negotiation Simulation (ICONS), on the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ global knowledge and global mindedness. “ICONS is a world-wide, multi-institution, computer-assisted, simulation network that uses an interdisciplinary approach to teach international negotiation and intercultural communication skills at both the university and secondary school level” (Golay, 2006, p. 28). For five weeks, pre-service teachers, registered for the course entitled “Developing a Global Perspective in Education: Contents and Methods” (Golay, 2006, p. 28), communicated through email messages with teams from different countries. The subject of the emails consisted of a variety of national perspectives on seven global issues. The participants were required to create strategies to negotiate, understand international
interdependence, and appreciate differences in culture and approaches to world problems. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the levels of global-mindedness between the experimental group and the control group, which took the course the previous semester in a traditional format.

**Professors’ and Teachers’ Perceptions**

In Francois (2010), the GMS results indicated there were significant differences in intrinsic motivation of assistant, associate, and full professors towards institutional support for internationalizing institutions to increase global-mindedness. However, no significant differences were perceived in extrinsic motivation among professors except in the area of internationalizing curriculum. According to Francois, U.S. College professors indicated there are five dominant intrinsic motivational factors that can affect the internationalization of a curriculum positively or negatively. The factors are intellectual challenge, personal interest (or lack thereof), and opportunities to improve one’s teaching, develop new ideas, and enhance personal self-satisfaction. (p. 177).

In comparison, the findings of the five dominant extrinsic motivational factors that negatively or positively affect curriculum internationalization were recognition, support and encouragement from one’s dean or chair, as well as inclusion of participation in internationalization efforts in evaluation processes such as salary increases, tenure, and promotion. There were three factors regarding funding: more funds to support student participation in internationalized programs, curriculum development and internationalization for off-campus courses (e.g., study abroad, exchange program) as well as on-campus courses (e.g., infusion, international subject matter courses (Francois).
In another study of teachers and global-mindedness, the Hett Global-Mindedness Survey (GMS) was used in the dissertation “Through the lens of a Global Educator: Examining Personal Perceptions Regarding the Construction of World-Mindedness” (Carano, 2010) to determine to what degree 13 Florida high school social studies teachers participating in a global education curriculum project attributed their development of global-mindedness. Ten of the thirteen teachers responded to the GMS. The highest possible score on the GMS is 150, which indicates an extraordinary level of global mindedness. The teachers’ responses to this survey resulted in scores beginning at the highest of 133, 132, 131, 131, 128, 122, 119, 118, and 111, to the lowest of 90 or 60% out of the possible 150. Interviews were then conducted with the teachers who scored in the top three and bottom three on the Hett GMS.

**Additional Variables**

This study, *Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four Year Community College*, represents a sampling of a diverse age group and life experiences at the community college, younger than 17 in dual enrollment programs and older than 65. Therefore, this study uses data gathered regarding demographic information to differentiate the participants’ comfort with technology use.

Using Prensky’s (2005) popular digital native paradigm, two questions were included in the Student Demographic Profile (see Appendix A) to differentiate among participants who are more comfortable with technology in many aspects of their lives (digital natives) and those who are not (digital immigrants). This premise is based on the fact that global competent opportunities for work, education, and social activities are widely and frequently available in our daily lives via technology. This study included the
testing of a hypothesis to determine whether more technically inclined participants score higher on the Global-mindedness scale than less technically competent participants in research question number 6:

Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are digital natives (computer savvy) and digital immigrant (computer novices)? (Prensky, 2005).

Therefore, in the demographic profile students responded to one question regarding the length of time using technology and a second question based on a 5 point Likert scale with 1 being very uncomfortable to 5 being extremely comfortable regarding their confidence or competence in using web search, databases, spreadsheets, email, blogs, and online courses.

Procedures

To administer the Global-Mindedness Scale (Hett, 1993) instrument of measurement, I requested a letter of permission from Hett’s widower, Dallas B. Boggs through her former dissertation director, Mary Woods Scherr, Ph.D. at UCSD (Appendices G & H). The survey was administered in a Web-based format that allowed for automatic recording of the raw data, using a commercial online survey tool, Survey Monkey (http://www.surveymonkey.com). Following approval by U.S.F.’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), I asked the college in the study’s research review committee for permission to conduct the research. Although this is a multi-campus college, it was not a college-wide survey. One campus was surveyed with the permission, assistance, and guidance of the campus provost and one of the college’s deans as the sponsor of the research study and another dean as the supervisor of the study. The random sample of
students received a link to the survey and demographic profile through their composition course in which they were enrolled with the instructor’s agreement to participate. The responses to the survey were anonymous. To further insure students’ anonymity, the Survey Monkey email scavenging device was disabled.

According to Gall, Gall, and Borg, (2007), a deadline for responses needs to be set that allows sufficient time to respond; however, the time allowance should not be excessive as respondents will set the survey aside to complete at a later date and possibly forget to complete it. Therefore, students selected to complete the questionnaire were given a period of 2 weeks to respond to the survey with a reminder from their composition or EAP professor in the online announcements of their course to participate at the end of the first week.

Edwards, et al., 2002 in Gall, Gall and Borg 2007 researched the effect of including monetary incentives to encourage participants to respond to questionnaires. The findings were the odds of response more than doubled. Therefore, as an incentive to participate in the survey, once students completed the survey, they were directed to a link to enter a chance to win a $50.00 Amazon.com certificate.

Once the collection phase was closed, the data file was downloaded from Survey Monkey in a format for analysis. Survey Monkey offers format options for Concurrent Versions Systems (CVS) or concurrent versioning systems, a version control system software in which data can be downloaded with commas, Portable Document Format (PDF), Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), or Excel. For the data analysis in this survey, that data were downloaded from Survey Monkey into an Excel spreadsheet. The electronic form of the raw data was imported into SPSS for analysis.
The data was kept secured and only available to the researcher and the Web-server program.

**Description of the Institution**

The students surveyed in this study attend a public community college in Florida. See Table 3 for county demographics, present and projected demographics.

Table 3: County Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Demographics</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; Over</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Projected Demographics</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-64</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; Over</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Web Factbook © V. Hall Stevens, 2012

Probably one of the biggest factors in the increasing enrollment at this college is the weak economy and rising unemployment rates. Presently, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rate in the state of Florida is the third
highest in the nation at 12.0% (BLS.gov, 2011). Thus, more students are returning to school for further education or reeducation for job security. The demographics for this institution reflect a growth due to enrollment in online courses and degree programs with a 22.95 percent increase in the 2008-2009 academic year (college website). The demographics also reflect the trend in enrollment of more females 61.1% than males 38.9%. For example, during the 1992 academic year, the enrollment of male students was 39.35% compared to 60.65% for females. This percentage dropped to 36.66% for males during the 2005 through 2007 academic years. In 2008, the college became proactive in male enrollment and retention, and the recent increase in the percentage of male enrollment suggests it has had an impact. Another factor contributing to increased enrollment is the addition of online learning and four-year degree programs.

Mission

According to Green (2002), characteristics of global institutions of higher education include study abroad programs, international student exchange, world language education, world perspectives in social sciences, foreign policy, economic issues and humanities, faculty with international backgrounds/experiences/bilingual abilities, and student activities that promote multi-cultural awareness. The genesis of these global characteristics is grounded in an institution’s mission statement (Green).

Currently, in the college's lengthy and thorough mission statement there is a generic mentioning of providing education “within our service area as well as globally”; it also states international study abroad opportunities are one of the ways it completes its goal. It includes a list of 25 objectives to prepare, provide, participate, recognize, etc. that follow the basic mission statement with the ninth objective stating:
• contribute to the international education of students through a variety of courses, foreign study tours, faculty and student exchanges, linkages with international institutions, distance learning and other special programs; (College Website).

One of the first steps in the evolutionary process of internationalization is its communication of priorities. This offers insight into what stage of the process the institution has evolved into. These priorities are typically expressed in the mission statement or vision statements of internationalization to distill and reframe the goals “include values and aspirations that inspire people to work toward the goals” (Olson, et al., 2006, p. 9). With this in mind, it appears for a glimpse of an institution’s attitude toward and commitment to internationalization, its mission statement is a good starting point. While this may not appear as an action to take because it seems to be more rhetoric without results, “…every university needs to be alert to updating its fundamental mission so that it reflects the realities of global interdependence” (Van de Water, 2000, p. 60).

That said, specifically in the area of focus, global-mindedness; the college’s mission statement appears to be the quintessential example of having something on paper without anything too specific that would require concrete expectations or results. Indeed, if the college is to be in the forefront of internationalization, the mission statement needs some updating. However, no matter how the wording of the mission statement may change and no matter how evolutionary it may sound, its words are but hollow echoes if they are not put into action. “Universities have lofty mission statements, but do not implement them; they have
cooperative partnerships with foreign universities, but do not function well” (Mestenhauser, 2006, p. 165).

**The Significance of Study Abroad**

*study abroad* will advance your education. It will expand your sense of possibilities and it will make you more competitive for the jobs of the future. But more importantly it will also show you just how much we all have in common -- no matter where we live in the world. . . - First Lady Michelle Obama (International Education Week November 2010).

As illustrated in the preceding quote, many world leaders promote the benefits and significance of study abroad.

Specifically, the website of the college in this study includes some encouraging reasons to persuade students to study abroad. These reasons include becoming more culturally aware and setting the stage for more job competitiveness and opportunities. The college’s website enumerates reasons for students to participate in study abroad programs. The list that the college gives to encourage students to study abroad has components of preparing globally competent learners to be global-minded with the dimensions of Cultural Pluralism and Interconnectedness. The other global-minded dimensions of Responsibility, Efficacy, and Global centrism will emanate from their global experience in study abroad. The added component of competence in a foreign language further promotes study abroad participants in achieving global competence, ultimately leading to graduation and increased professional opportunities. Participation in study abroad programs has been linked to higher levels of global-mindedness (Gillan, 1995; Golay, 2006; Hett, 1993; Kehl & Morris, 2007). Therefore, providing students with opportunities to participate in study abroad programs prepares more globally competent students for a globally competitive workforce.
Study Abroad Programs Offered

Presently, the college in this study offers a variety of study abroad programs in Latin America and Europe. Almost 150 students have participated in the college’s study abroad program with 38 in 2008 and 2009, and 71 in 2010. In 2008, 81.6% of students were female. In 2009, 68.4% of students were female and in 2010, 70.4% of students were female (personal communication, February 23, 2011).

The college’s data coincide with U.S. national statistics of more females than males participate in study abroad programs. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, between the academic years 1996-97 through 2007-08, study abroad participants were approximately 35% male and 65% female nationwide. Furthermore, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports freshman participation is the lowest of the 4 student ranks ranging from 2.4% to 3.7% with the 2005-06 academic year at 3.7% of freshmen participation decreasing to 3.3% in 2006-07 and increasing to 3.5% in the 2007-08 academic year.

Second year students show an increase in participation ranging from 12.8% to 14.0% with the highest level of participation in 2000-2001 dropping to its lowest in ten years with 11.8% participation in the 2002-03 academic year and increasing to 13.1 in 2007-08. Third year students are undoubtedly the largest percentage of participants in study abroad programs. Overall, juniors make up anywhere from 42.2% to 34.2% of study abroad participants. In the 1996-1998 academic year, over 40% of U.S. participants in study abroad programs were juniors; however, this number has experienced a steady decline to as low as 34.2% in the 2005-06 academic year. Although the percentage of senior students in study abroad programs is approximately
half of the average of juniors, fourth year students, on the average have a higher participation rate than freshmen and sophomores combined.

**International Education Week**

One way in which study abroad and global-mindedness is promoted at the various campuses of the college is through International Education Week a joint initiative of the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Department of Education to "celebrate the benefits of international education and exchange worldwide" (IEW, 2011). The college is active each day of International Education Week in the fall, with one or more activities hosted to increase awareness and interest in different cultures, customs, and programs; such as, identifying flags contest, international videos and movies, human rights discussions, foods and study abroad opportunities.

One of the college’s relatively new clubs has approximately 15 active members, including four officers who attend bi-monthly meetings, promotes cultural awareness and diversity and is an active participant in International Education Week (iew.state.gov). Meetings focus on a country selected by officers. Members present a Power Point presentation with the spotlighted country’s characteristics and images. Related activities with the country’s traditional food, music, and games follow. Members have monthly outings to ethnic restaurants or other organized social events. This club works closely with the Student Government Association and has collaborated with it in “globally-minded” events such as beach cleanup day, multicultural folk fair fieldtrips, and Salvation Army bell ringing that support the global-minded dimensions of Cultural Pluralism, Responsibility, and Efficacy.
According to the club advisor, there are estimated 50 membership applications on file, yet only 15 active members. During Club Rush Week in the fall, many students express an interest in joining, but the demands of school, work, and/or family prevent them from being actively involved (personal interview January 28, 2011). Student involvement in activities is one of the challenges for a "commuter college" where there are no student dormitories. It is difficult to establish a cohesive connection to the college community when there is a broad disconnect between academic life and family and/or work responsibilities.

**Methods Selection**

Is this Florida community college a competitive “globalized” institution of higher education? Are students global-minded? Do they feel they receive global-minded instruction in their programs? For my research on globalized perspectives at this particular Florida Community College, I collected a random sample of students’ responses to the GMS and demographic profile. It was quantitative study and descriptive in nature. The instrument developed by Hett titled “Global-Mindedness Scale” (GMS, 1993) was used to collect data. According to Johnson and Turner (2002, p. 297) the design of an instrument such as the GMS leads to “confirmatory, deductive, structured, closed-ended, controlled, and linear research”. The random sample included students ranging from first to fourth year academic rank, who anonymously responded to the GMS and demographic profile questions in a web-based format posted through a link in one of the courses in which they were enrolled.
Sample Selection

According to researchers Dixon, 1986 and Nunnally, 1978 in Hett 1993, the appropriate sample size should be between five and ten participants per item. In this study, *Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four Year Community College in Florida*, there were 176 students who began the survey and 175 or 99.4% completed it which fits the criteria of an appropriate sample size.

Variables

According to Gall, Gall, and Borg, (2007, p. 637), a dependent variable is “a variable that the researcher thinks occurred after, and as a result of, another variable (called the independent variable)“. The dependent variable (DV) for this study is global-mindedness. The constitutive definition of this variable is the five theoretical dimensions; Responsibility, Cultural Pluralism, Efficacy, Global centrism, and Interconnectedness, of global-mindedness. The operational definition of this variable is the degree of scoring on the five theoretical dimensions compiled for the total score on the GMS.

There were six non-manipulative independent variables (IV) in this study, which are gender, academic rank, native English speaker or other language, study abroad experience and technology expertise and comfort (digital natives or digital immigrants). For the demographic profile constructed to gather background information, see Student Demographic Profile in Appendix A. To demonstrate external validity, the results of this study may be generalized to describe students at some of the other campuses of this institution The Student Demographic Profile will include the following variables classified using a nominal scale:

1. Gender: 1- male 2-female
2. Study abroad experience 1-yes 2-no
3. Native language: 1- English 2- Other
4. Academic Rank
   1- First year student
   2- Second year student
   3- Third year student
   4- Fourth year student
5. Years of using technology
   1- 1 year or less
   2- 1-2 years
   3- 2-4 years
   4- 5-10 years
   5- 10 or more years
6. Comfort/confidence is using technology on a Likert Scale of 1 to 5
   1- very uncomfortable
   2- somewhat comfortable
   3- comfortable
   4- very comfortable
   5- extremely comfortable

The list of extraneous variables is inclusive, but not exhaustive. In two previous studies measuring global-mindedness, (Deng & Boatler, 1993) and (Gillan, 1995) females were determined to be more global-minded than males. However, in a 2007 study of 520 participants (Kehl & Morris) males scored higher on the GMS than females. Therefore, it was compelling to include the variable of gender in the demographic profile. As the population of the community college has changed from its original mission of providing associate degrees for students planning to transfer to a university or catering to community interests, the traditional community college student has
changed along with the times. Presently, the average community college learner is over 30 years old with 60% of the population in this age bracket and 40% in the “traditional” 18-24 year old category.

**Instrument**

Hett’s (1993) Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) designed with communality contains 30 items from an initial pool of 98 statements that represent these five theoretical dimensions of global-mindedness: responsibility, cultural pluralism, efficacy, globalcentrism, and interconnectedness (See Figure 4 – next page). The 30 items of the GMS that were identified to measure one’s degree of “global-mindedness”; in other words, one’s openness or resistance to achieving global competence are on a five-point Likert-type scale that ranges from strongly agree to disagree. According to Corcoran and Fischer (1987), “the Likert Scale is particularly useful when assessing attitudes” (Hett, 1993, p.93). Responses to the items can range from 30 for a minimum possible score of the 5 subscales to a maximum of 150 total possible score of the 5 subscales. The higher score indicates a greater level of global-mindedness.

In designing the GMS, Hett’s choices for each survey question were scaled to carry roughly the same weight or value ranging from Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4), to Strongly Agree (5) with a higher score indicating a stronger global perspective. Hett then correlated and examined these items in an Exploratory Factor Analysis using an oblique rotation. Figure 4 provides a visual of the 5 theoretical dimensions and their related questions which comprise the GMS.

Appendix B contains the thirty questions from Hett’s 30-item GMS questionnaire. Figure 5 is a graphic representation of the Five Theoretical Dimensions of Global-
mindedness: Responsibility, Cultural Pluralism, Efficacy, Globalcentrism, and Interconnectedness. This model highlights the collective, but multifaceted aspects for the concept.

✓ **Responsibility:** A deep personal concern for people in all parts of the world which surfaces as a sense of moral responsibility to try and improve conditions in some way.

✓ **Cultural Pluralism:** An appreciation of the diversity of cultures in the world. A belief that all have something of value to offer. This is accompanied by taking pleasure in exploring and trying to understand other cultural frameworks.

✓ **Efficacy:** A belief that an individual’s actions can make a difference and that involvement in national and international issues is important.

✓ **Globalcentrism:** Thinking in terms of what is good for the global community, not just what will benefit one’s own country. A willingness to make judgments based on global, not ethnocentric, standards.

✓ **Interconnectedness:** An awareness and appreciation of the interrelatedness of all peoples and nations which results in a sense of global belonging or kinship with the “human family.”
Global-Mindedness

Interconnectedness

Efficacy

Cultural Pluralism

Responsibility

Interconnectedness

Figure 4: Global-mindedness
The item numbers reflect the five theoretical dimensions that collectively define global-mindedness. The scores for the responses to each of the 30 items range from 1 - 5 on a Likert Scale; therefore, a sum of all responses may range from the lowest of 30 indicating the least level of global-mindedness to the highest sum of 150 indicative of the level of most global-minded. Thus, the responses are measured as ordinal variables.

The scoring key is:

- 35 possible points for the dimension of Responsibility: questions 2, 7, 12, 18, 23, 26, 30
- 40 possible points for the dimension of Cultural Pluralism: questions 1, 3, 8, 13, 14, 19, 24, 27
- 25 possible points for the dimension of Efficacy: questions 4, 9, 15, 20, 28
• 25 possible points for the dimension of Globalcentrism: questions 5, 10, 16, 21, 29
• 25 possible points for the dimension of Interconnectedness: questions 6, 11, 17, 22, 25

There are nine reverse score items which are 4, 5, 9, 10, 16, 21, 25, 27, and 29. As a result, the responses are reversed for questions 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30 changing 5 to 1, 4 to 2, 2 to 4, and 1 to 5 while a score of 3 “Unsure” remained the same.

Based on prior studies and additions for this research the survey should have taken approximately 20 minutes to complete.

To measure internal consistency or reliability of the GMS results in this study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used. An alpha level of .80 is suggested for an established scale (Corcoran, Fischer, & Nunnally, 1978 in Hett 199) even though; an exact alpha level has not been established by the literature. With the sample size between 150 to 300, it was possible for Hett to use an Exploratory Factor Analysis for validity evidence and report descriptive results of the median, mean, minimum, and maximum. The mean scores of Hett’s study (1993) were (113-120).

Limitations

As noted, Hett’s Global-Mindedness Scale (1993), has been used in several other studies, with the assumption that students’ responses to the survey questions will indicate their level of global-mindedness. Nevertheless, there were some limitations in the findings of previous studies in that the students surveyed were a convenience sampling of participants with variables such as, age, gender, previous study abroad
experience, and second language ability creating some extraneous variables (Gillan, 1995; Golay, 2006; Kehl & Morris, 2007).

Efforts were made to minimize the limitations, but due to the approaches to research and geographic and demographic differences there are some limitations that may affect the ability to generalize this study to students at other community colleges. One such limitation being students' awareness of the principles of the study may influence them to choose answers that could distort the findings of the study. Another limitation is, due to focusing on students at one specific institution, the findings will be limited to a single community college in Florida, and therefore, may not be generalizable to students' perceptions of global-mindedness at other U.S. community colleges. For example, community college students in Southern California or in Portland, Oregon may respond quite differently.

However, the results of this study are generalizable to similar college populations. Gall, Gall, & Borg, (2007 p. 641) define generalizability as “the extent to which the findings of a quantitative research study can be assumed to apply not only to the sample studied, but also to the population that the sample represents.” Because of the limitations and the unique demographics of the sample population, generalization of the results is limited. However, using replication logic, transferability of results to similar settings is widely supported in the literature. Particularly, the academic discipline of physical sciences has achieved success in discovering highly generalizable laws.

Therefore, similar community colleges nationwide can evaluate the appropriate fit of demographic parameters and institutional descriptions to determine likely approximation of their results taking into consideration the percent of margin of error.
What’s more, this study provides a baseline for future comparisons that may possibly contribute to improvements in the area of research in global-mindedness. “The need for replication is even more critical in education and other social science disciplines because studies often have weaknesses in methodology or very limited generalizability” Gall, Gall, and Borg, (2007 p. 46).

**Delimitations**

As this is one of the few studies to survey the general population of a four-year college’s students’ degree of global-mindedness, the study is limited. The topic of students’ levels of global competence and their perceptions of the importance of global competence merits an in-depth worldwide view. According to Bakke and Tharp (1996, p.1) in establishing a framework to prepare globally-minded learners “perhaps the most difficult parameter to determine is the depth of global competence that is being defined, whether to prescribe a base level of global literacy or to aim toward a higher level of proficiency.” Therefore, this dissertation was limited to a scratching of the surface or testing of the waters of students’ perceived levels of global-mindedness based on responses to the GMS. Demographics of gender, previous study abroad experience, knowledge of another language, academic year, and technology expertise were also examined to determine differences and/or similarities in students’ interests in and attitudes towards components of globalization at a Florida four-year college.

The results of identifying students’ level of global-mindedness may be useful to target areas of curricula and programs lacking a global-minded perspective that would lead to reforms in curricula and academic programs with the objective of graduating globally competitive students; thus, producing a globally competitive workforce.
Data Analysis Plan

The target population of this study was community college students. The study took into consideration the main characteristics of these students; such as gender, study abroad experience, native and second language competence, academic rank, and expertise in using technology. The study consisted of a random sampling of approximately 600 students at a four-year community college in Florida. Permission was obtained to use the Global-Mindedness Scale. Participants received a link to the web-based survey through a course in which they were enrolled. This link was opened for a 14-day period. Responses to the demographic profile were collected during the web-based survey. It was an anonymous online survey accessed through courses in which students were enrolled. Neither did I know who responded, nor did I urge any students I knew to participate in the survey. The request for participation came from the students’ instructor with an announcement that indicates participation in the survey was anonymous, voluntary, and it would not have a negative or positive impact on course grades.

Analysis of data included examining if the random sample of 600 respondents was a fair representation of the student population. Responses were analyzed to identify similarities and/or differences based on demographic characteristics. Utilization of the statistical program SPSS facilitated the tabulation and analysis of the GMS questionnaire data. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to assess the reliability of all instruments in the study. Descriptive statistics to examine the five underlying dimensions of global-mindedness and analysis of the student demographic profile were used to conduct the
statistical analysis, which allowed for addressing the research questions and interpreting the findings.

**Chapter Summary**

Chapter 3 Methods has outlined the research for the dissertation *A Snapshot of Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four-Year Community College in Florida*. This chapter presented Hett’s (1993) Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) with its 5 theoretical dimensions of global-mindedness and its 30 question survey to measure one’s level of global-mindedness, and included previous studies using the GMS. Additionally, it presented the demographic profile that was used to identify students’ gender, previous study abroad experience, knowledge of a second language, academic rank, and level of comfort using technology.

Also included, was a brief description of some programs, policies and demographics of the four-year institution involved in the study. The chapter also included the research design, research questions, variables, population sample, instrumentation, procedures of data collection, limitations, delimitations, and data analysis.
Chapter 4: **RESULTS**

**Overview**

This chapter summarizes the research findings including descriptive statistics and results from analysis of the study *Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four Year Community College in Florida*. Furthermore, it includes a rationale of the methods used and demographics of the participants in the study in an effort to quantify student global-mindedness at a four-year community college in Florida. The purpose of the study was to identify four-year community college students’ level of global-mindedness and variables that may contribute to their level of global-mindedness. This chapter begins with the demographic characteristics of the participants followed by the results from the six questions of gender, study abroad experience, monolingual English speaker, academic rank, and comfort in using technology.

**Demographic Characteristics of the Participants**

After I had obtained IRB approval at both my doctoral and participants’ institutions, a random sample of approximately 600 students received the Global-mindedness Scale (GMS) demographic profile, and consent form through their composition course or Advanced English for Academic Purposes (EAP) writing course. The composition courses and three EAP courses were chosen in order to contact a wide range of students as they are required courses and would prevent students from responding to the survey more than once. The number of EAP student responses totaled
45 or 25.7% of the total number of student respondents to the GMS while the number of composition student respondents was 130 or 74.3% of the total responses. There were 176 students who began the survey and 175 or 99.4% completed it. The incomplete survey was response participant # 148. It was removed from the body of data to be analyzed because there were no answers on all questions. Table 4, Participants’ Profile, includes the demographic description of the participants in this study.

**Instrument**

The instrument used for the study *Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four Year Community College in Florida* was Hett’s (1993) Global-
Mindedness Scale (GMS), designed with communality that contains 30 items from an initial pool of 98 statements which represent five theoretical dimensions of global-mindedness: responsibility, cultural pluralism, efficacy, global centrism, and interconnectedness. The 30 items of the GMS that were identified to measure one’s degree of “global-mindedness”; in other words, one’s openness or resistance to achieving global competence, are on a five-point Likert-type scale that ranges from strongly agree to disagree.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, Hett (1993) surveyed 396 students at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and scaled the choices for each survey question to carry roughly the same weight or value ranging from Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Unsure (3), Agree (4), to Strongly Agree (5) with a higher score indicating a stronger global perspective. These items were correlated and examined in an Exploratory Factor Analysis using an oblique rotation for validity evidence and to report descriptive results of the median, mean, minimum, and maximum. To measure internal consistency or reliability of the GMS, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used. An internal reliability for Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient subscales for the five theoretical dimensions ranged from .70 to .70 with an overall coefficient alpha of .90. A Content Validity Index (CVI) of .88 for the overall instrument was reported in Hett’s research (Hett, 1993). The mean scores of Hett’s study (1993) were (113-120).

Based on this survey’s development research, the GMS item numbers reflect the five theoretical dimensions that collectively define global-mindedness. The scores for the responses to each of the 30 items ranged from 1 - 5 on a Likert Scale; therefore, a sum of all responses ranged from the lowest of 30 indicating the least level of global-
mindfulness to the highest sum of 150 indicative of the level of most global-minded. Thus, the responses were measured as ordinal variables. Hett’s (1993) GMS statements (Appendix B) related to each of the five theoretical dimensions are as follows:

- Responsibility is composed of statements 2, 7, 12, 18, 23, 26, and 30.
- Cultural Pluralism is composed of statements 1, 3, 8, 13, 14, 19, 24, and 27.
- Efficacy is composed of statements 4, 9, 15, 20, and 28.
- Globalcentrism is composed of statements 5, 10, 16, 21, and 29.
- Interconnectedness is composed of statements 6, 11, 17, 22, 25.

**Notes on Important Preliminary Data Treatment**

For the data analysis of this study, several procedures were followed to ensure the validity of the results. The first step to prepare the data for analysis was to remove the one incomplete response from the survey. Because Hett (1993) designed the GMS to have 9 reverse score items, the second step to prepare the data for analysis was to change the numbered responses to the reverse order questions; in order for data analysis to be consistent. Therefore, questions 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 30 responses were reversed from 1 to 5, 2 to 4, 4 to 2 and 5 to 1. A response of “unsure” or number 3 remained the same. The final step of preparing the data for analysis was to create a composite of the 5 theoretical dimensions in order to analyze the means for each dimension. Per the description in the prior section, each dimension consisted of specific questions. These composite dimensions were then analyzed as an aggregate.

**Research Questions**
The main objective of the study was to answer the six research questions that were introduced in Chapter 1. Based on responses to the GMS Instrument (Hett, 1993) to measure Global-mindedness, the following research questions were examined:

1. To what degree do the students at this 4-year institution of higher education rank as globally-minded learners; i.e., identify with the relevance of social responsibility, cultural pluralism, personal efficacy on outside events, global-centrism, and interconnectedness based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

2. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between males and females based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

3. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students with and without study abroad experience based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

4. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are monolingual English speakers and students who know another language besides English based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

5. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between upper and lower academic rank students based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

6. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are digital natives (computer savvy) and digital immigrant (computer novices)? (Prensky, 2005).

Research Questions and Statistical Results
Global-mindedness Survey Responses

Response to Question #1. To what degree do the students at this 4-year institution of higher education rank as globally-minded learners; i.e., identify with the relevance of social responsibility, cultural pluralism, personal efficacy on outside events, global-centrism, and interconnectedness based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

The data demonstrated the following findings regarding research question #1 for this study. Out of a total of approximately 600 students who received the survey, 176 students started the Global-mindedness Scale (GMS) survey and 175 or 99.4% of students completed the GMS survey. See Appendix M for the distribution of responses. The maximum sum of the means of the students at this 4-year institution of higher education rank as globally-minded was 139.0. Conversely, the minimum sum of the means of the student participants was 61.0; as a result, the overall mean of the responses based on the Global-mindedness Scale (GMS) for the students who participated was 109.2. or 72.8% of the possible total of 150 on the GMS. Tables 5 & 6 include the 30 questions of the GMS and the means of the students’ responses for each.

Table 5: Means of Sums on Global-mindedness Scale (GMS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindedness</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>161.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>139.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 6: Global-mindedness Scale (GMS) 30 Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1  I feel an obligation to speak out when I see our government doing something I believe is wrong.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.346</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2  When I hear that thousands of people are starving in a foreign country, I feel frustrated.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>-0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3  When I see the conditions some people in the world live under, I feel a responsibility to do something about it.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.459</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4  The fact that a flood with 100,000 people in Bangladesh is very distressing to me.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-1.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5  I feel very concerned about the lives of people who live in politically repressive regimes.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>-0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6  I sometimes try to imagine how a person who is always hungry must feel.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>-1.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7  Americans have a moral obligation to share their wealth with the less fortunate people of the world.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.498</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8  I generally find it stimulating to spend an evening talking with people from another culture.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>-0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9  The United States is entitled to the fact that it is complex of many people from different cultures and countries.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.179</td>
<td>-1.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Americans can learn something of value from all different cultures.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>-1.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 I enjoy trying to understand people's behavior in the context of their culture.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 It is very important to me to choose a career in which I can have a positive effect on the quality of life for future generations.</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>-0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 It is important that American universities and colleges provide programs designed to promote understanding among students of different cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.110</td>
<td>-1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 It is important that educators prepare students to understand the impact that current policies might have on future generations.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 I have very little in common with people from Unterschieden nationalitiens.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 I think Asian American college students think about the problems of the world.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-0.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 Generally, an individual's actions are too small to have a significant effect on the ecosystem.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 My opinions about national politics are based on how those policies might affect the rest of the world as well as the United States.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-1.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 I think my behavior can impact people in other cultures.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 I am able to affect what happens on a global level by what I do in my own community.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 The needs of the United States must continue to be our highest priority in negotiating with other countries.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Americans should be permitted to pursue the standard of living they can afford if they have a minimal negative impact on the environment.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 I think Asian American college students think about the problems of the world.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 The present distribution of the world's wealth and resources should be maintained because it promotes societal stability.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25 I sometimes have feelings of anxiety because other countries.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 I often think about the kind of world we are creating for future generations.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 I think of myself not only as a citizen of my country, but also as a citizen of the world.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28 In the long run, America will probably benefit from the fact that the world is becoming more interconnected.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 In the long run, America will probably benefit from the fact that the world is becoming more interconnected.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 I feel a strong connection to the world in which I live.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Descriptive Statistics Responses in the Five Theoretical Dimensions of the Global-mindedness Scale

Responses of 3 or “Unsure”

The data analysis revealed four statements of the 30 items on the GMS received the highest percentage of responses for “Unsure” or a score of 3. These 4 statements were in the theoretical dimension of Globalcentrism. They were number 22, “Americans should be permitted to pursue the standard of living they can afford if it only has a slight negative impact on the environment” with 71 or 41.5% of student responses, number 23, “American values are probably the best”, with 69 students or 39.4%, and number 24, “The present distribution of the world’s wealth and resources should be maintained because it promotes survival of the fittest” with 63 or 36.4% of students responding “Unsure”. In the theoretical dimension of Responsibility statement number 7, “Americans have a moral obligation to share their wealth with the less fortunate peoples of the world” 59 students or 33.7% responded with a score of 3 or “Unsure”.

Responses of 5 or “Strongly Agree”

Analysis of the data included an observation of which of the 30 GMS items received the highest percentage of answers of a score of 5 or “Strongly Agree”. The results revealed there were 2 statements in this category. Both were in the theoretical dimension of Cultural Pluralism. Statement number 10, “Americans can learn something of value from all different cultures” received 83 responses or 47.4% for the highest percentage of scores of 5 and statement number 12, “It is very important to me to choose a career in which I can have a positive effect on the quality of life for future generations”, received 76 responses or 43.9% of a score of 5 or “Strongly Agree”.

121
Responses of “Disagree”

In the analysis of data for the percentage of scores of 2 or “disagree”, there were 5 responses, statements 15, 16, 17, 25, and 30 which received the largest percentage. These responses of “disagree” were 5 of the 9 reverse score items. None of the 30 statements received the highest percentage for a score of 1 or “Strongly disagree”. There were 19 responses to the 30 statements of the GMS that received the largest percentage of a score of 4 or “Agree”.

Skipped Responses

Although the data analysis was intended to target responses from 1 to 5, there were statements that respondents omitted. The statements with the most skipped responses were statements 15 and 22. Five of the 175 students did not respond to either of the statements. Statement 15 is a component in the theoretical dimension of Cultural Pluralism “I have very little in common with people in underdeveloped nations”, while statement 22 “Americans should be permitted to pursue the standard of living they can afford if it only has a slight negative impact on the environment” is in the theoretical dimension of Globalcentrism. Moreover, in the theoretical dimension of Efficacy, six students did not respond to question number 20, “I am able to affect what happens on a global level by what I do in my own community”.

Table 7 contains the results of students’ responses for each of the 5 theoretical dimensions of 30 statements that comprise the GMS.
Table 7: Responses for each of the 5 Theoretical Dimensions of the GMS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel an obligation to speak out when I see our government doing something I consider wrong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I hear that thousands of people are starving in an African country, I feel frustrated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I see the conditions some people in the world live under, I feel a responsibility to do something about it</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The fact that a flood can kill 50,000 people in Bangladesh is very depressing to me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel very concerned about the lives of people who live in politically repressive regimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I sometimes try to imagine how a person who is always hungry must feel.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Americans have a moral obligation to share their wealth with the less fortunate peoples of the world</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Pluralism</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. I generally find it stimulating to spend an evening talking with people from another culture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The United States is enriched by the fact that it is comprised of many people from different cultures and countries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Americans can learn something of value from all different cultures.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I enjoy trying to understand people's behavior in the context of their culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is very important to me to choose a career in which I can have a positive effect on the quality of life for future generations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It is important that American universities and colleges provide programs designed to promote understanding among students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is important that we educate people to understand the impact that current policies might have on future generations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have very little in common with people in underdeveloped nations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Really, there is nothing I can do about the problems of the world.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>33 19.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Generally, an individual's actions are too small to have a significant effect on the ecosystem.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>25 14.4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My opinions about national policies are based on how those policies might affect the rest of the world as well as the United States.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>44 25.3</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I think my behavior can impact people in other cultures.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>35 20.0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am able to affect what happens on a global level by what I do in my own community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>40 23.5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Globalcentrism</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The needs of the United States must continue to be our highest priority in negotiating with other countries.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>60 34.3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Americans should be permitted to pursue the standard of living they can afford if it only has a slight negative impact on the environment.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>71 41.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. American values are probably the best.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>69 39.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The present distribution of the world's wealth and resources should be maintained because it promotes survival of the fittest.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>21 17.7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I sometimes feel irritated with people from other countries because they don't understand how we do things here.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>21 17.7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interconnectedness</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I often think about the kind of world we are creating for future generations.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12 6.5</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think of myself, not only as a citizen of my country, but also as a citizen of the world.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>17 9.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In the long run, America will probably benefit from the fact that the world is becoming more interconnected.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>41 23.7</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel a strong kinship with the worldwide human family.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>45 26.0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is not really important to me to consider myself as a member of the global community.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>34 19.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The percentages for all participants’ means were equal for the theoretical dimensions of Global-mindedness of Responsibility and Efficacy at 3.6% each. The percentage of the mean for the theoretical dimension of Interconnectedness was 3.8. The theoretical dimension of Globalcentrism received the lowest score of the 5 theoretical dimensions at 3.1%, while Cultural Pluralism received the highest percentage of the 5 dimensions with 4.1%. Table 8 describes the statistical analysis of the 5 theoretical dimensions of the Global-mindedness Scale. Table 9 describes the means of the 5 theoretical dimensions.

Table 8: Mean of Global-mindedness Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Means of scores of the 5 Theoretical Dimensions of the Global-mindedness Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindedness</td>
<td>199.2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>161.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>139.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Research Question #2. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between males and females based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?
Research question 2 asked participants their gender. There were 174 student responses to this question; 60.9% or 106 of the students were female, while 39.1% or 68 of the students who participated in the survey were male. Two students did not answer this question. As previously reported in Chapter 3, these percentages coincide with the college and national demographics of more females 61.1% than males 38.9% of the percentages of student gender in higher education.

**Group Statistics**

As illustrated in Table 10, analysis of the data revealed significant differences between females and males for the overall mean of the Global-mindedness Scale and in the theoretical dimension of Cultural Pluralism, defined as an appreciation of the diversity of cultures in the world and the belief that all have something of value to offer. As seen in Table 10 the mean of the score for females in Global-mindedness was 110.792 while the mean for males on the GMS was 106.426 out of the possible total on the GMS of 150. The mean of females in the dimension of Cultural Pluralism was .411 while the mean for males was .586.


Findings by Kehl and Morris (2007), in a study of 520 participants were males scored higher on the GMS than females, as well as, of all 520 participants. However, in this study, females scored higher than males. To answer research question 2 regarding difference of global-mindedness, an Independent T-Test compared the means of responses between the female and male groups of students as seen in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindedness</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>110.7925</td>
<td>11.50453</td>
<td>1.11743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>106.4205</td>
<td>14.68113</td>
<td>1.70795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.5761</td>
<td>.54366</td>
<td>.05830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.4933</td>
<td>.75100</td>
<td>.09012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4.1103</td>
<td>.44288</td>
<td>.04090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.9438</td>
<td>.59643</td>
<td>.07111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.6688</td>
<td>.55997</td>
<td>.05799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.5441</td>
<td>.69555</td>
<td>.06403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.1226</td>
<td>.57921</td>
<td>.07943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.9734</td>
<td>.53552</td>
<td>.07951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.8125</td>
<td>.59275</td>
<td>.07992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.6934</td>
<td>.50404</td>
<td>.06234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11: Independent t-tests for Females and Males on GMS & the 5 Theoretical Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>t-test conclusion **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindedness</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>4.35598</td>
<td>1.95319</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>167.463</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.17882</td>
<td>.10950</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.16604</td>
<td>.07816</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.13969</td>
<td>.09900</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.14323</td>
<td>.09155</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.12807</td>
<td>.09304</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) unequal variance  ** at alpha .05
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Research Question #3. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students with and without study abroad experience based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

The analysis results for research question number 3 reported no significant difference on the GMS or its 5 theoretical dimensions between students who have as opposed to those who haven’t participated in Study Abroad programs. As indicated in Chapter 3, a possible explanation for the lack of student participation in study abroad is the majority of the student participants in this study were identified as lower academic rank. According to the research on study abroad, third year U.S. students are the largest percentage, approximately 40%, of participants in study abroad programs. Although the percentage of senior students in study abroad programs is approximately half of the average of juniors, fourth year students, on the average have a higher participation rate than freshmen and sophomores combined.

The descriptive statistics for participants’ study abroad experience are shown in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Mean</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindedness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>111.400</td>
<td>11.93913</td>
<td>3.08267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not study abroad</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>108.467</td>
<td>12.80037</td>
<td>1.01514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7899</td>
<td>.53398</td>
<td>.13767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not study abroad</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.5912</td>
<td>.66443</td>
<td>.05269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0833</td>
<td>.55273</td>
<td>.14271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not study abroad</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.0440</td>
<td>.50562</td>
<td>.04010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0133</td>
<td>.46270</td>
<td>.11947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not study abroad</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.5307</td>
<td>.65429</td>
<td>.05109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not study abroad</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.9457</td>
<td>5.5759</td>
<td>.14405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0133</td>
<td>.54231</td>
<td>.14002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not study abroad</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.7440</td>
<td>.60183</td>
<td>.04773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, to answer research question 3 regarding difference in level of global-mindedness, an Independent T-Test compared the means of responses between study abroad and non-study abroad students as seen in Table 13.

Table 13: Independent t-tests for Study Abroad and Non-Study Abroad Participation on GMS & the 5 Theoretical Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>t-test conclusion*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindedness</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.25208</td>
<td>.34808</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.19769</td>
<td>.17686</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.01451</td>
<td>.13785</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>-.01738</td>
<td>.17309</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>-.821</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>-.13132</td>
<td>.15997</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.26081</td>
<td>.16131</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Research Question #4.** Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are monolingual English speakers and students who know another language besides English based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

In response to the demographic question number 3 regarding knowledge of another language besides English, the responses to this question were almost equal with 84 or 48.8% of students responding yes and 51.2% or 88 students responding no. Four students did not answer this question. The number of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) student responses totaled 45 or 25.7% of the total number of student respondents to the GMS. EAP students are studying English as a second language. The number of composition student respondents was 130 or 74.3% of the total responses. It is very likely there were students in the composition courses whose first language is not
English; however, according to the college's institutional data the percentage of non-native English speakers is approximately 20%. Further investigation of this demographic questions revealed there was most likely confusion about this question as the question read, “Do you speak another language other than English?” Unfortunately, the descriptive area below the question indicated "English Only". Consequently, the response to this question cannot be accurately included in this study and was deleted from this dissertation. Table 14 indicates the variances between monolingual speakers and those who speak another language are equal and Table 15 is the independent t-test.

Data Used: Language, 1: Speak English only, 2: Speak other Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>English only</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>110.3452</td>
<td>12.27545</td>
<td>1.33936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak other</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>107.6705</td>
<td>13.11551</td>
<td>1.39812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.6590</td>
<td>.62314</td>
<td>.06799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak other</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.5525</td>
<td>.69937</td>
<td>.07349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.1259</td>
<td>.42906</td>
<td>.04028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak other</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.9534</td>
<td>.55549</td>
<td>.06028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.7093</td>
<td>.52445</td>
<td>.06486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak other</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.5443</td>
<td>.67621</td>
<td>.07208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.0202</td>
<td>.54281</td>
<td>.05923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak other</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.1102</td>
<td>.64095</td>
<td>.06633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.8131</td>
<td>.63956</td>
<td>.06978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak other</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.7182</td>
<td>.55539</td>
<td>.06027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Research Question #5. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between upper and lower academic rank students based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

The basis for research question number 5 was Perry’s (1970) theory in *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme*. According to Perry, there is a dramatic change between adolescence and adulthood in how people think and what they believe, value and take responsibility for. This study looked for differences in scores on the GMS between students in the lower academic rank with limited exposure to higher education curricula and students in upper academic ranks who have had more exposure to education and are possibly more mature students. Therefore, in question number 5, the analysis of student responses to the GMS defined lower academic rank students as a student in their first two years of college earning 1-60 credits or possibly pursuing an Associate’s Degree. The analysis defined upper academic rank students in their last two years of college or 61-120 or more credits possibly in pursuit of a Bachelor’s Degree. For the question of Academic Rank on the Demographic Profile, students responding with 1-30 credits totaled 125 or 72.3%.
Student respondents with 31-60 credits totaled 34 or 19.7%. Students with 61-90 credits totaled 11 or 6.4%. There were 3 student participants with 91-120 or more credits. Three students did not answer this question.

Data treatment

The responses for students indicating their Academic Rank were divided into two groups. Those students in the categories of 1 to 30 credits and 31-60 credits were combined to describe lower academic rank. The 11 students in the category of 61 to 90 credits were combined with the 3 students who have earned 91-120 or more credits to describe upper academic rank. The recoding used for analysis of responses was: 1 → 1, 2 → 1, 3 → 2, 4 → 2.

Lower Academic Rank

The sums of the scores of students with 0-30 credits and 31-60 credits were combined to produce the following means: overall Global-mindedness 108.289, Responsibility 3.563, Cultural Pluralism 4.011, Efficacy 0.058, Globalcentrism 3.059, and Interconnectedness 3.746.

Upper Academic Rank

The sums of the scores of students with 61-90 credits and 91-120 or more credits were combined to produce the following means: overall Global-mindedness score 116.357, Responsibility 4.023, Cultural Pluralism 4.364, Efficacy 3.857, Globalcentrism 3.114, and Interconnectedness 3.928. Table 16 reports the analysis for academic rank.

Group Statistics
Table 17 illustrates the independent t-tests on the GMS and its 5 Theoretical Dimensions for lower and upper Academic Ranks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Academic Rank</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindedness</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>108.2893</td>
<td>11.51852</td>
<td>.99278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116.3571</td>
<td>11.59978</td>
<td>3.10017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.5638</td>
<td>.64695</td>
<td>.05131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0238</td>
<td>.54478</td>
<td>.14560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.0111</td>
<td>.50759</td>
<td>.04025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3648</td>
<td>.33266</td>
<td>.06891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.6030</td>
<td>.62459</td>
<td>.05033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.8571</td>
<td>.63454</td>
<td>.16559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.0591</td>
<td>.59632</td>
<td>.04729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1143</td>
<td>.55865</td>
<td>.14931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.7465</td>
<td>.56969</td>
<td>.04734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0286</td>
<td>.50021</td>
<td>.15774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Independent t-tests on the GMS and its Five Theoretical Dimensions for lower and upper Academic Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>t-test conclusion* at alpha .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindedness</td>
<td>-2.324</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>8.06783</td>
<td>3.47110</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>-2.579</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-4.6002</td>
<td>.17835</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>-2.555</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-3.5368</td>
<td>.13940</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>-1.436</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-2.5410</td>
<td>.17691</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>-0.5517</td>
<td>.16547</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>-1.095</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>-1.8203</td>
<td>.16629</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theoretical dimensions of Efficacy, Globalcentrism and Interconnectedness reported no significant difference between the lower and upper academic groups. However, there were significant differences in two of the theoretical dimensions. In the dimension of Responsibility, defined as a deep personal concern for people in all parts of the world which surfaces as a sense of moral responsibility to try and improve conditions...
in some way, the upper academic rank students scored 4.023 as opposed to 3.563 for lower academic rank students.

In the dimension of Cultural Pluralism, which describes one who appreciates cultural differences and believes that all have something of value to offer, the upper academic rank students scored 4.364 as opposed to 4.011 for lower academic rank students. Furthermore, there was a significant difference in the total score on the GMS with the upper academic rank students’ mean at 116.357 in contrast to the lower academic rank students’ mean of 108.289. The responses in the dimension of Cultural Pluralism suggest the upper academic rank students enjoy exploring and trying to understand other cultural frameworks.

These significant differences suggest a support for Perry’s Theory that the student participants identified in the upper academic rank group have matured in how they think and what they believe, value and take responsibility for or for the purposes of this study, are more globally-minded than students in the lower academic rank category.

**Research Question #6.** Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are digital natives (computer savvy) and digital immigrant (computer novices)? (Prensky, 2005).

**Years of Technology Use**

A total of 174 students responded to demographic question number 5 regarding the length of time using technology. Three students or 1.7% placed in the 1 year or less category. Four students or 2.3% placed in the 1-2 year category. Ten students or 5.7% placed in the 2-4 year category. Sixty-five students or 37.4% of students placed in the 5-10 year category and 52.9% or 92 students placed in the 10 or more years’ category.
ANOVA for Years Using Technology. The length of time using technology is divided into five levels: a year or less, from 1 to 2 years, 2 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, and 10 or more years. As illustrated in Table 18 the analysis of variance for years of using technology and level of global-mindedness and its 5 theoretical dimensions resulted in no significant differences while Table 19 shows digital immigrants and digital natives' scores on independent samples test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global-mindedness</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>310,147</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77,537</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>276,615,560</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>163,678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279,717,707</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>73,050</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74,279</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>44,138</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44,673</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>68,464</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70,458</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalcentrism</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58,868</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60,576</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>61,327</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62,339</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Descriptive Statistics of Comfort Using Technology and the GMS

To respond to the question of whether or not digital natives or digital immigrants score differently on the GMS, students’ responses were combined into 2 categories. Digital Immigrants or technology novices were defined as students who responded with scores of 1 as extremely uncomfortable and those who responded with scores of 2 as very uncomfortable. Digital Natives or technology savvy students were defined as students who responded with scores of 3 as comfortable, those who responded with scores of 4 as very comfortable, and those who responded with scores of 5 as extremely comfortable.

The range of the 6 questions for digital savviness is from 1 to 5 with a minimum score of 6 for those who are not comfortable with technology, digital immigrants, as opposed to a maximum score of 30 for those who are highly comfortable, or digital natives. Digital immigrants, those with scores from 6 to 18 were labeled Group 1 while...
Group 2 or the Digital Natives were students with scores from 19 to 30. Responses resulted in a total of 46 Digital Immigrants and 128 Digital Natives.

One-hundred and seventy-three of the 176 student participants responded to demographic question number 6 regarding comfort of using email. Two students or 1.2% feel very uncomfortable, 7 students or 4.0% feel somewhat comfortable, 26 or 15.0% feel comfortable, 45 or 26% feel very comfortable, and 93 or 53.8% feel extremely comfortable. Therefore, almost 8 out of 10 student respondents or 79.8% rated using email as very or extremely confident. However, this was not a significant difference.

One-hundred and seventy-four of student participants responded to demographic question number 7 regarding comfort of using the Worldwide Web. Only one student or 0.6% feel very uncomfortable, 5 students or 2.9% feel somewhat comfortable, 19 or 10.9% feel comfortable, 43 or 24.7% feel very comfortable, and 106 or 60.9% feel extremely comfortable. Therefore, 85.6% of student respondents feel very or extremely confident using the Worldwide Web, indicating the highest level of confidence in the technology category.

One-hundred and seventy-three of the student participants responded to demographic question number 8 regarding comfort of using databases. Eleven students or 6.4% feel very uncomfortable, 27 students or 15.6% feel somewhat comfortable, 40 or 23.1% feel comfortable, 50 or 28.9% feel very comfortable, and 45 or 26.0% feel extremely comfortable.

One-hundred and seventy-four student participants responded to demographic question number 9 regarding comfort of using spreadsheets. Twenty-two students or
12.6% feel very uncomfortable, 44 students or 25.3% feel somewhat comfortable, 40 or 23.0% feel comfortable, 38 or 21.8% feel very comfortable, and 30 or 17.2% feel extremely comfortable.

One-hundred and seventy-three of student participants responded to demographic question number 10 regarding comfort of using blogs. Two-five students or 14.5% feel very uncomfortable, 41 students or 23.7% feel somewhat comfortable, 44 or 25.4% feel comfortable, 32 or 18.5% feel very comfortable, and 31 or 17.9% feel extremely comfortable.

One-hundred and seventy-four of the 176 student participants responded to demographic question number 11 regarding comfort of using taking blended or online courses. Thirty-one students or 17.8% feel very uncomfortable, 32 students or 18.4% feel somewhat comfortable, 45 or 25.9% feel comfortable, 32 or 18.4% feel very comfortable, and 34 or 19.5% feel extremely comfortable. Less than half or 37.9% of student respondents feel very or extremely comfortable taking a blended or online course while less than half or 36.2% of students feel very to somewhat uncomfortable taking blended or online courses. Approximately a quarter or 25.9% of students feel comfortable.

Table 20: Digital Savviness Profile Results on the Demographic Profile for Students’ Level of Comfort with Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
<th>Extremely comfortable</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level with email</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level searching the web</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level using databases</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level using spreadsheets</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level using blogs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level taking blended or online courses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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These responses suggest students are more comfortable using the Internet than taking a blended or online course as the difference in students’ level of very to extremely comfortable in taking a blended or online course is less than half (37.9%) of students’ level of comfort in using the Worldwide Web 85.6%. Table 20 describes the students’ level of comfort using technology.

**ANOVA for Blogs**

An ANOVA to compare if at least one of the means of responses to the Global-mindedness Scale among those who answered 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 to blogs was significantly different resulted in no significant difference. Table 21 shows the results of the means of global-mindedness and comfort using blogs and Table 22 illustrates the ANOVA for the digital immigrant and digital native groups’ global-mindedness and the 5 theoretical dimensions with blogs.

**Table 21: Means on Global-mindedness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global-mindedness</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1521.324</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>380.331</td>
<td>2.416</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26466.699</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>157.421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27988.023</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, as seen in Tables 23 and 24, Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference Test was used for further analysis of 2 of the 5 theoretical dimensions of global-mindedness because the results were borderline significant at the 0.05 level. Had there been a significant difference, the results would indicate Technology Natives or digital savvy students with a higher level of comfort using blogs have a higher level of global-mindedness than those who don’t.
Chapter Summary

Chapter 4 summarized the research findings including descriptive statistics and results from analysis of the study Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related
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to Globalization at a Four Year Community College in Florida. It included a rationale of the methods used and demographics of the participants in the study. The chapter began with a demographic profile of the participants and a review of the Global-mindedness Survey Instrument. The analysis and results from the six demographic profile questions of gender, study abroad experience, English only or knowledge of another language, lower or upper academic rank, and comfort in using technology followed.
Chapter 5: **Relevant Theories**

**Conclusions, Implications, Recommendations**

"*Passage to India 183*"

"Lo, soul, seest thou not God's purpose from the first?  
The earth to be spanne'd, connected by network,  
The races, neighbors, to marry and be given in marriage,  
The oceans to be cross'd, the distant brought near,  
The lands to be welded together"  
*Walt Whitman (Leaves of Grass, 1855)*

**Introduction**

This chapter begins with a review of the research problem and methods used for the study *Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four-Year Community College in Florida*. It presents a brief summary of the findings, interpretation of the results, a discussion of the limitations and implications of the study. The last section of this chapter discusses the study’s significance and recommendations for possible further research. A needs assessment can be initiated from the information in this study to promote faculty involvement and support curricula reforms that would provide "globally-minded" perspectives in courses. The rationale behind the curricula reform would be to promote global competence in order to empower students for competing in the global job market as well as become better-informed and productive members of society.
Summary of Study and Findings

One-hundred and seventy-five students at one campus of a four-year college in Florida participated in the study by responding to Hett’s Global-mindedness Scale (GMS) and 11 demographic profile questions. The students’ responses determined their level of global-mindedness, based on the means of the sums on the GMS. An analysis of the GMS scores with the demographic profile questions examined whether or not certain variables may have an influence on students’ level of global-mindedness. The interpretation of the results of this study are based on the five dimensions of the global-mindedness scale which are Responsibility, Cultural Pluralism, Efficacy, Globalcentrism, and Interconnectedness along with the demographic profile questions of gender, study abroad experience, knowledge of more than one language, academic rank and technology use.

Summary of Research Design

A random sampling of students in composition courses and 3 EAP courses responded to a link in the online announcement area of their course to access the GMS and demographic questionnaire. The online survey tool, Survey Monkey, collected their anonymous responses. These analyzed data provided an overall score of the student participants’ level of global-mindedness. Furthermore, strengths and weakness were identified by observation of where students scored high or low in one or more of the five dimensions. A data analysis of students’ responses examined student demographic differences such as gender, study abroad experience, knowledge of a second language, academic rank and technology use. The following 6 research questions generated the data analysis:
1. To what degree do the students at this 4-year institution of higher education rank as globally-minded learners; i.e., identify with the relevance of social responsibility, cultural pluralism, personal efficacy on outside events, global-centricism, and interconnectedness based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

2. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between males and females based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

3. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students with and without study abroad experience based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

4. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are monolingual English speakers and students who know another language besides English based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

5. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between upper and lower academic rank students based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?

6. Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between students who are digital natives (computer savvy) and digital immigrants (computer novices)? (Prensky, 2005).

The research objective was to identify four-year college students’ levels, strengths, and weaknesses in global-mindedness, defined as a worldview in which one’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviors reflect a sense of connection to the global community,
as well as a sense of responsibility to and respect for its members, their environment, rights, and freedoms (Hett, 1993; Oka, 2007; Selby & Pike, 2000). Furthermore, the study explored whether specific variables may influence one’s level of global-mindedness. The assumptions of this study were that community college students have deficiencies in their perceptions toward other cultures. As a result of these deficiencies, community college students are at a disadvantage to compete with their contemporaries in other countries.

Therefore, the purpose of the study was to identify four-year community college students’ mean on the GMS and variables that may potentially influence their level on the GMS with the objective of potentially using the information to target areas for curricula reforms that would provide more globally-minded programs that better prepare graduates for competing in a global society.

**Summary of Findings**

The sum of scores of Global-mindedness ranged from a minimum of 61 to the maximum of 139 with the overall mean of the student participants in this survey 109.2. Although there are numerous variables to consider, it is interesting to note how the students from the four-year Florida College in this survey scored in comparison to the University of California San Diego students. In Hett’s (1993) research, student participants scored 114.79 or lower, 118.29, 120.84 and 123.38 depending on the number of globally-oriented courses they had taken; 0-1, 3-4, 5-6, and 7 or more respectively.

**Gender.** Of the 174 student responses to this question; 60.9% or 106 of the students were female, while 39.1% or 68 of the participants were male. Significant
differences were found between females, 110.792 and males, 106.426 out of the possible total of 150 on the GMS for the overall mean of the Global-mindedness Scale. Additionally, in the theoretical dimension of Cultural Pluralism, defined as an appreciation of the diversity of cultures in the world and the belief that all have something of value to offer, there were significant differences 4.11 for females and 3.94 for males. Although the results in this study contrast with the findings by Kehl and Morris’ (2007) study of 520 participants in which males scored higher on the GMS than females, overall, the significant research findings revealed that the female student participants in this study have a higher level of global-mindedness than their male counterparts.

This difference between males’ and females’ levels of global-mindedness may be related to national demographic trends according to the Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs at the U.S. Department of State’s Institute of International Education Open Doors (2010) as discussed in Chapter 3. Presently, there is a decline in male student enrollment in and completion of higher education courses. The demographics of this study reflect the trend in current college enrollment of more females, approximately 60%, than males approximately 40%. Additionally, recent county statistics report the percentage of male high school graduates has decreased especially black male graduates to an alarming 21%. Consequently, it is not unreasonable to anticipate the number of male college students would decrease. This issue of males falling behind their female counterparts in higher education rates is one that needs to be addressed. Therefore, it is imperative for colleges to be proactive in male enrollment and retention if male students are to be equally prepared as females to compete in a global society.
**Study Abroad.** In the demographic response to study abroad participants versus non-study abroad participants, the t-test conclusions were not significant for levels of global-mindedness. One explanation for this result is the students who have participated in study abroad programs did so for only a short period of time. As previously mentioned in Chapter 3, findings by Kehl and Morris (2007) indicated statistically significant differences between short-term eight weeks or less, and semester-long study abroad programs. Students who participated in a semester-long study abroad program scored higher on the global-mindedness scale which suggests growth of one’s’ international perspective. Additionally, according to Golay (2006), “Contact of short duration does not allow enough time for attitudes to change. It takes at least two years in the new cultural environment for students to acquire a new worldview”. (p. 56)

Another factor in the influence of study abroad programs is the study abroad program itself in which students participate. Whether the study abroad program focuses on a superficial view of a western viewer observing from the outside as a tourist or emphasizes students immersing themselves in the culture can have an impact on increasing their worldview. As stated earlier in Chapter 2 both the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) or National Association of International Educators and The Lincoln Commission’s Report (2005) are strong proponents of increased participation in quality (emphasis mine) study abroad programs to create a more globally informed American citizenry.

Moreover, the type of study abroad program may influence participants’ global-mindedness. As defined in Chapter 3, the theoretical dimension of Responsibility on the
GMS is “A deep personal concern for people in all parts of the world which surfaces as a sense of moral responsibility to try and improve conditions in some way” and the dimension of Efficacy is, “A belief that an individual’s actions can make a difference and that involvement in national and international issues is important”. Based on these definitions, study abroad programs which include a goal of service-learning with cultural acclimation and language acquisition may increase the theoretical dimensions of Responsibility and Efficacy. In addition, the results of the analysis of lower and upper academic rank students’ levels of global-mindedness indicated upper academic rank students scored higher on the GMS than lower academic rank students. Hence, targeting upper academic rank students for study abroad programs may be more effective than encouraging lower academic rank students to participate.

Nevertheless, the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program cites one of the top reasons a student should study abroad is economic competitiveness (2005 p. vi). Therefore, ongoing evaluation of the study abroad programs offered by the college in this study for effectiveness in successfully providing students with the necessary components of educating students to acquire “global citizenship” (Lefrere, 2007) could be a key in increasing students’ level of global-mindedness.

*English Only or More than One Language.* As defined in Chapter 3, Cultural Pluralism is, an appreciation of the diversity of cultures in the world; a belief that all have something of value to offer. This is accompanied by taking pleasure in exploring and trying to understand other cultural frameworks. A T-test conclusion was significant for English Only or bilingual students in the theoretical dimension of Cultural Pluralism.
with a mean of 4.125 for English only speakers and a mean of 3.959 for speakers of another language.

It seems probable that a student living in two cultures would demonstrate strength in this dimension. The responses to this question were almost equal with 84 or 48.8% of students responding yes to speaking another language besides English and 51.2% or 88 students responding no. Therefore, this question had to be eliminated from the research. A clear explanation for the lack of validity in these responses is, according to the federal census in 2007 only 19.7% of Floridians speak a language other than English at home.

**Academic Rank.** In response to Research Question 5, “Is there a difference in the degree of global-mindedness between upper and lower academic rank students based on responses to the Global-mindedness instrument?” There were significant differences in the theoretical dimensions of Responsibility in which the upper academic rank students scored 4.023 as opposed to 3.563 for lower academic rank students, and Cultural Pluralism in which the upper academic rank students scored 4.364 as opposed to 4.011 for lower academic rank students. The responses in the dimension of Cultural Pluralism suggest the upper academic rank students enjoy exploring and trying to understand other cultural frameworks. Moreover, upper academic rank students scored at a higher level of global-mindedness than students of a lower academic rank. There was a significant difference in the total score on the GMS with the upper academic rank students’ mean at 116.357 in contrast to the lower academic rank students’ mean of 108.289.
These significant differences suggest support for William Perry’s Theory referred to in Table 1, p. 86. According to Perry, as one progresses through their education, they mature in how they think and what they believe, value and take responsibility for. Their intellectual development progresses from dualism or black and white thinking, to multiplicity, beginning to understand different positions exist, to relativism forming one’s own decisions (Perry, 1970). As the student participants identified in the upper academic rank group scored higher on the GMS than the lower academic rank, it appears they have acquired a more mature level of global-mindedness.

**Technology.**

**Years of Technology Use.** The length of time using technology was divided into five levels: a year or less, from 1 to 2 years, 2 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, and 10 or more years. Students’ years of using technology were not indicative of a higher or lower score on the Global-mindedness Scale. As illustrated in Chapter 4 Table 19 the analysis of variance (ANOVA) for years of using technology and level of global-mindedness resulted in no significant differences.

**Email and the Worldwide Web.** Students’ use of email and the Worldwide Web were not indicative of a higher or lower score on the Global-mindedness Scale. Student response rates were similar for their level of comfort in using Email & the Worldwide Web. Almost 95% of student respondents rated their level of using email as comfortable, very or extremely comfortable. Student response to comfort level indicated 96.5 % of student respondents feel comfortable, very or extremely comfortable using the Worldwide Web, resulting in the highest level of confidence in the technology category.
**Databases.** Students’ use of databases did not show a significant difference in their level of Global-mindedness. In response to demographic question number 8 regarding comfort of using databases, 22% of the 173 student respondents feel very uncomfortable or somewhat comfortable using databases as opposed to 78% of students who feel comfortable, very or extremely comfortable using databases. These responses may be indicative of instructors including library orientation in their courses as well as the college’s library staff providing effective instruction for students to familiarize themselves with navigating the library’s database selection.

**Spreadsheets and Blogs.** Additionally, there were no significant differences in the levels of global-mindedness of students using spreadsheets and blogs. Approximately 38% of students are not comfortable using spreadsheets while 62% feel comfortable, very comfortable, or extremely comfortable. Similar to spreadsheets, students’ level of comfort in using blogs was approximately 38% of students are not comfortable using spreadsheets while 62% feel comfortable, very comfortable, or extremely comfortable.

**Blended or Online Courses.** Responses to taking blended or online courses indicated a little over one-third or 36.2% of students feel extremely to somewhat uncomfortable studying their courses using the Internet or a blended/hybrid combination of face-to-face and Internet delivery model. In comparison, almost 64% of students feel comfortable, very to extremely comfortable taking blended or online courses. Despite differences in level of comfort taking blended or online courses, students’ responses were not indicative of a higher or lower score on the Global-mindedness Scale.
Limitations

**Current Events Influence.** One of the limitations of this study was that the GMS instrument was designed more than 15 years ago. Some of the statements; such as, number 4, “The fact that a flood can kill 50,000 people in Bangladesh is very depressing to me” do not relate to current events and may have lessened their impact. Changing some statements to more specific present-day relevant topics; such as Syria, Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Global Warming, and the Millennium Development Goals of 2015 might result in different levels of global-mindedness.

Another one of the factors influencing the outcomes of this study is the increasing enrollment at this college due to the weak economy and rising unemployment rates. At the present time, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rate in the state of Florida is the third highest in the nation at 12.0% (BLS.gov, 2011). Thus, more students are returning to school for further education or reeducation for job security. Moreover, institutions of higher education are suffering from budget cuts which exacerbate the difficulty in supporting globally-minded initiatives.

**Students’ Responses.** The descriptive statistics of the data results were determined by student responses. Some student participants may have only responded with the goal of reaching the link to enter into the drawing for the $50.00 gift card. There may have been students who were completely insincere in their responses because of their disinterest in globalization or lack of class participation and for example, chose response “3” or “Agree” for all answers or those who “Christmas-treed” the survey choosing the “Strongly Agree” (5) or “Strongly Disagree” (1) responses.
The survey was distributed after the 60% point of the semester indicating originally enrolled students who had not actively participated in their course or who withdrew from the course because they were dissatisfied by their performance were eliminated from participation in the survey.

Furthermore, findings by Kehl and Morris, (2007), of 520 student participants, who indicated their parents had an annual income over $100,000.00 scored significantly lower than those whose parents earned less. As community colleges have historically been a “stepping stone” to four-year universities to help students make the transition from high school to higher education, as well as a means of investing less costs in a degree, based on Kehl and Morris’ findings, students at this college may have scored higher on the GMS than students at a more prestigious university.

Finally, the type of students themselves influence the data as higher achieving students and those with fewer responsibilities; such as not juggling studies with jobs and family may have been a higher percentage of the respondents compared to those who weren’t motivated to take the time or didn’t have the time to take the GMS.

**Faculty.** In keeping with research protocol of anonymity and the support for anonymity by the research committee of the four-year college in this study, students were not directly contacted to participate in the survey. Students were not contacted by email. The campus provost and the communication department’s dean were instrumental in the distribution of the survey to the composition and EAP faculty. Faculty received the Recruitment Script (Appendix I) via email from the Dean of Communications. The Recruitment Script included the link to the GMS survey and Demographic Profile (Appendix A) to be placed in the online announcement section of
their course. All composition faculty, full-time tenure and adjunct, at the campus were included in the email. As it was not mandatory for faculty to comply and no incentive was offered for them to include the survey link in their course, there is a possibility that not all contacted instructors followed through. As a result, the number of students who had access to participate in the survey is an approximation of 600, based on the probability that 100 percent of the faculty contacted did not provide access to the survey link.

Furthermore, there may have been an influence on students’ participation from their professor. If the professor, did not present the survey or participation in the survey as significant, students may have decided it was not worth investing their time; consequently, those students’ responses would not be included.

However, taking into consideration all of these variables, most of these are common descriptives of community colleges suggesting generalization of the results to other higher education institutions could be implied.

**Implications**

With 21st Century Higher Education, facing limitations of access, diminished choices and jeopardized excellence, Arthur Levine, (2009) president of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, called for another Truman Commission to address the challenges higher education faces. Indeed the call for reforms in higher education must be met. America’s tradition of being a leading competitor in our global economy is being challenged. The demand for globally competent graduates is increasing all the while the supply is decreasing. This news directly affects community
colleges, the traditional gateway to higher education, as one of their roles has been to prepare students for continuing their education to complete more advanced degrees.

Moreover, four-year community colleges, particularly in Florida, have become increasingly more common among institutions of higher education. Along with this growth in numbers comes the demand for growth in programs. Community colleges have the responsibility to provide students with more than the basic general education required courses. Community colleges’ programs have to prepare a supply of globally competent graduates who meet the demand for a globally competitive workforce. There is a need to implement an interdisciplinary approach in research. “...most, if not all problems in the global arena today, require an interdisciplinary approach to both problem definition and problem” (Hudzik, 2004, p. 18). Based on the research in this study, there are two significant areas that community colleges can address to better prepare their graduates for competing and succeeding in our global society.

**Curricula Reforms**

According to Sabine Schuerholz-Lehr, (2007) assistant director of the Office of International Affairs at the University of Victoria (UVic) in Canada, in her article *Teaching for Global Literacy in Higher Education: How Prepared Are the Educators?*, reforms in course design are key to preparing graduates with a level of global competence that prepares them to compete and succeed in a global society. Higher education can accomplish this by providing courses and programs that include an international dimension into their course design and adopt an international perspective throughout: content, instructional strategies, learning outcomes, and assessment.
As previously mentioned in Chapter 3, Oka (2007) suggested an area to include for investigation in global pedagogy is the idea of surveying students who are enrolled in and faculty who teach courses with the word "global" or "international" in the title. Hett’s research “revealed a significant correlation at the .05 level between the number of global studies courses taken and global-mindedness” (Hett, 1993, p.128). Students who had taken 7 or more globally-oriented courses scored the highest on the GMS while students who had taken only one or no global studies courses scored the lowest on the GMS. Moreover, a significant difference was revealed through the use of the Tukey-B, post hoc comparison technique between students who had taken less than three globally-oriented courses compared to those who had taken five or more (Hett, 1993, p.129). These results suggest including courses related to global issues would indicate a stronger global-mindedness perspective, and faculty are critical in providing a more global dimension in courses.

**Faculty**

For an institution involved in becoming a more globally-minded campus, a diverse group representing various departments, programs, and administration is ideal; however, faculty are identified as the key to achieving internationalization in higher education institutions (Stohl, 2007). Internationalization of an institution begins with a strong foundation in the faculty. Internationalizing the institution would be to target the faculty for their input into course objectives and program redesign to incorporate global awareness. Stohl agrees that the engagement of the faculty is the foremost obstacle to overcome for internationalizing an institution of higher education. (Stohl, 2007) “If we want to internationalize the university, we have to internationalize the faculty.” (p. 367)
To achieve the necessary curricula reforms, faculty would need to be recognized and rewarded for their experiences and achievements in global networking, research, and studies. "Faculty-led teams need support in the form of release, or a stipend for the chair, or administrative support to organize meetings, prepare and distribute summaries, and post material on a web site." (Olson, 2006, p. 9) As a result, faculty would be motivated to design courses and programs that include more than an international flavor, but a global perspective. Faculty’s high level of Cultural Pluralism or in the case of service work programs, their high level in the dimension of Responsibility, could generate a contagious enthusiasm, and more students may begin to actualize their dreams of studying abroad. There would no longer be the discrepancy between planning to go and actually going.

Faculty at the heart of curricula reforms to provide global-minded education can offer a wide variety of world languages for students to choose from along with study abroad programs that provide internships for students to continue their coursework in a country using the target language. Living in the culture opens the door for students to increase their worldview. These reformed programs would replace the traditional short-term programs designed to meet minimum language requirements and never use the language again. In addition, faculty-led programs need not be limited to study abroad language and culture courses, but may include interdisciplinary courses, international relations, politics, business, health care, athletics, education, finance, and faculty exchange programs. Furthermore, Green (2002), reminds us there is a need for an institution to have internationalization at home as well as abroad.
The goal of internationalizing an institution in order to prepare graduates for a globally competitive society is an ambitious task and will no doubt be a road filled with many potholes and detours; nonetheless, with persistence one will come closer to may eventually reach the desired destination. As attributed to Confucius, “Our greatest glory is not in never falling, but in rising every time we fall.” Faculty involvement in spearheading reforms is a process that requires assessment, review, redesign, action, and urgency. The global world will not patiently wait for institutions of higher education to come on board; institutions need to take the initiative.

Institutions cannot become stagnant in their efforts or they risk not only losing their dream of recognition as a globally-competent institution of higher education, but also risk the dreams deferred of their graduates. As indicated in the results of the GMS, 82% of students at this four-year community college agreed or strongly agreed their dream upon graduating is “…to choose a career in which I can have a positive effect on the quality of life for future generations.” Institutions of higher education have an obligation to meet this need for and dream of global competence.

A definition of *global competence* is knowledge related to the interconnectedness of world events, history, and culture as well as attitudes and skills that enable one to be successful in cross-cultural settings (Bakke & Tharp, 1996). The president of the community college in this study expressed his support for graduating students from the college who are prepared for the globally competitive world. In a fall keynote address, the president announced,

“Two things are really important to me in this part (student success, learning, and support) global perspective. We have to find new ways for global
integration. Let me be as clear as I know how. There are a lot of things you can do in international education, and I’m happy to do them all. The thing that matters most to me is that our students have experiences that raise their global awareness, their global commitment. I’m delighted when we attract students to come to us. There’s no part of that I don’t like, but that’s not a substitute for our students finding opportunities to experience something that changes their life that gets them started. **We can’t turn out a graduate who’s not aware of the global world that we live in.**” (Emphasis mine)

**Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Research**

“Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world.”

Nelson Mandela (n. d.)

Based on the results obtained from this study, the following recommendations are suggested for further research.

**Global-minded Courses**

Use the same GMS instrument to survey students who are taking or who have taken globally-oriented courses in contrast to those who haven’t to look for significant differences in levels of global-mindedness. Similar to Hett’s (1993) research, the number of courses with a global perspective that students have taken can be analyzed to examine whether higher levels of global-mindedness correspond with taking a greater number of globally-minded courses.

**Longitudinal Study**

Use the same instrument and student population in a longitudinal study. Students in four-year degree programs would be given the GMS their first and last
academic years of study to compare their scores of global-mindedness. With these data, using Perry’s Theory (1970) *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme*. Students’ scores on the GMS may be analyzed to identify whether or not students’ global perspective may have increased in an effort to examine if programs are providing curricula that is increasing students’ level of global-mindedness.

**Technology**

Use the GMS to survey students’ level of global-mindedness who are only enrolled in online and/or courses. This study would look further into Prensky’s Model of digital natives and digital immigrants’ and global-mindedness for analysis of the level of global-mindedness of students who are comfortable in enrolling in online and/or blended courses in comparison to students’ level of global-mindedness who are not comfortable studying via the Internet.

**State, National, and International**

Furthermore, the same instrument could be used in English or translated to other languages to compare levels of global-mindedness in similar colleges in other states and/or countries to those of students in Florida. In this way, a framework as suggested in Chapter 3 (Baake & Thorpe, 1996) may be established to determine what programs, curricula, and global competency components are more effective than others to prepare more proficient globally-minded learners.

**Relevant Topics**

Conduct a new study using a modified GMS with current relevant topics. In addition to updating the GMS, asking some open-ended questions regarding interest in
location, language, or cultural preference for study abroad programs which may include service learning by using a combination of multiple methods or triangulation may result in significant differences on GMS scores.

**Chapter Summary**

This final chapter of the study *Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four-Year Community College in Florida* presented a summary of the research problem, methods and main findings. It also discussed the implications of the findings and their consistency with previous research. The chapter concludes with some recommendations for further research as this study represents an exploration of community college students’ present level of global-mindedness and introduction to specific areas colleges can target to better meet the needs of students facing a future with the need for global competence to compete with contemporaries in other countries.

As discussed in the Chapter 2 Literature Review, more than 6 decades ago, President Truman “called to arms” a commission for reforms in higher education that would achieve a proliferation of democracy because education was seen as a key component to establishing an exemplary model of democracy. As reported by Zook, (1947, p. 8) this inextricable connection between democracy and education was a principal goal of Truman’s Commission to not only “bring to all the people of the Nation education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living, but also, education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation.” In this arena, education’s goal underscores Truman’s proclamation as it did in the 1940s only now more so than ever.
With our interconnectedness and interdependence, education needs to continue its mission to further students’ personal responsibility for fostering international understanding and peace. In the new millennium, education has the additional responsibility to prepare graduates who meet needs of the future workforce. In order to take action and participate in the global phenomenon, U.S. education needs to evaluate how it is preparing its graduates to actively engage in the global community and evolve into globally and multi-culturally competent citizens if our U.S. graduates intend to compete in the global workforce.

As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (1963) so eloquently stated in his call to action forty-five years ago, “This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy.” Alternatively, using Madeleine Green’s phrasing, now is the time to make real “the continued democratization of higher education” (2003, p. 3).
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Appendix A

Student Demographic Profile

1. Gender
   - female
   - male

2. Study Abroad Experience?
   - Yes
   - No

3. First Language?
   - English
   - Other

4. Academic Rank/Credits
   - 1-30
   - 31-60
   - 61-90
   - 91-120 or more

5. How long have you been using technology; such as, the internet, email, Google, etc?
   - 1 year or less
   - 1-2 years
   - 2-4 years
   - 5-10 years
   - 10 or more years

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being least comfortable/confident and 5 being extremely comfortable/confident, how comfortable do you feel using technology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat Comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
<th>Extremely Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blogs</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online or blended course</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Hett Global-Mindedness Scale, (GMS) Form B

Student Attitude Survey

On the following pages you will find a series of statements. Please read each statement and decide whether or not you agree with it. Then choose the response that most accurately reflects your opinion. There are no correct answers.

Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Unsure=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree= 5

1. I generally find it stimulating to spend an evening talking with people from another culture.

2. I feel an obligation to speak out when I see our government doing something I consider wrong.

3. The United States is enriched by the fact that it is comprised of many people from different cultures and countries.

4. Really, there is nothing I can do about the problems of the world.

5. The needs of the United States must continue to be our highest priority in negotiating with other countries.

6. I often think about the kind of world we are creating for future generations.

7. When I hear that thousands of people are starving in an African country, I feel frustrated.

8. Americans can learn something of value from all different cultures.

9. Generally, an individual’s actions are too small to have a significant effect on the ecosystem.

10. Americans should be permitted to pursue the standard of living they can afford if it only has a slight negative impact on the environment.
11. I think of myself, not only as a citizen of my country, but also as a citizen of the world.

12. When I see the conditions some people in the world live under, I feel a responsibility to do something about it.

13. I enjoy trying to understand people’s behavior in the context of their culture.

14. My opinions about national policies are based on how those policies might affect the rest of the world as well as the United States.

15. It is very important to me to choose a career in which I can have a positive effect on the quality of life for future generations.

16. American values are probably the best.

17. In the long run, America will probably benefit from the fact that the world is becoming more interconnected.

18. The fact that a flood can kill 50,000 people in Bangladesh is very depressing to me.

19. It is important that American universities and colleges provide programs designed to promote understanding among students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

20. I think my behavior can impact people in other cultures.

21. The present distribution of the world’s wealth and resources should be maintained because it promotes survival of the fittest.

22. I feel a strong kinship with the worldwide human family.

23. I feel very concerned about the lives of people who live in politically repressive regimes.

24. It is important that we educate people to understand the impact that current policies might have on future generations.

25. It is not really important to me to consider myself as a member of the global community.

26. I sometimes try to imagine how a person who is always hungry must feel.

27. I have very little in common with people in underdeveloped nations.

28. I am able to affect what happens on a global level by what I do in my own community.
29. I sometimes feel irritated with people from other countries because they don't understand how we do things here.

30. Americans have a moral obligation to share their wealth with the less fortunate peoples of the world.
Appendix C
The United Nations 8 Millennium Development Goals for 2015

1. Cut in half the number of people who live on less than $1 per day
   - Cut in half the number of hungry people

2. Approximately 77 million children do not attend primary school.
   - Ensure that girls and boys everywhere are able to complete primary school

3. 96 million young women aged 15-24 in developing countries cannot read or write
   - Eliminate discrimination against women in education

4. 26,000 children under 5 die every day, many from preventable illnesses
   - Reduce by two-thirds the number of children who die before age 5
• Approximately 500,000 women die every year from complications due to pregnancy and childbirth
• Reduce by 75% the number of women who die as a result of pregnancy and childbirth

• One million people die each year from malaria — an easily preventable disease
• Stop the spread of these diseases and see a decline in death rates
• 4,000 new HIV/AIDS infections are diagnosed every day

• 1 billion people — one-fifth of the world’s population—do not have access to clean water within a 15-minute walk from their home
• Forests worldwide are shrinking at an unprecedented rate
• Cut in half the number of people without access to safe drinking water
• Reverse the loss of natural resources by practicing sustainable development

• Unfair trade systems, crippling debt and limited access to markets prevent growth and opportunity for all people
• Improve levels of development assistance, promote good governance, provide access to markets, offer solutions for indebted countries
Appendix D

U.S. International Education Week Fact Sheet

- A joint initiative of the U.S. Departments of State and Education, International Education Week (IEW) was first held in 2000 and today, is celebrated in more than 100 countries worldwide.
- IEW is an opportunity to celebrate the benefits of international education and exchange worldwide. This annual initiative aims to promote international understanding and build support for international educational exchange by encouraging the development of programs that prepare Americans to live and work in a global environment and attract future leaders from abroad to study in the United States.
- Exchanges are critical to developing mutual understanding and respect, building leadership abroad, fostering an appreciation for the U.S., and investing in the future relationship between Americans and people around the world.
- According to Open Doors, 262,416 U.S. students studied abroad in 2007/08.
- International education prepares U.S. citizens to live, work, and compete in the global economy.
- International education is also a vital service industry, bringing more than $17.7 billion into the U.S. economy in 2008/09.
• According to Open Doors, 671,616 international students from over 200 countries studied in the U.S. in 2008/09.

• The more than 40,000 students, scholars and other exchange participants that the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs supports are in the vanguard of the hundreds of thousands of students and scholars who come to the United States and study abroad each year.

• International cooperation on education contributes to education reform and education solutions for the U.S. and for our partner nations.
Appendix E

International Students in the United States

Estudiantes internacionales en Estados Unidos
Panorama global de los países de origen de los estudiantes 2008/2009

Global Panorama of International Students’ Countries of Origen
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Certification of Completion

Certificate of Completion

Vickie Hall Stevens

Has Successfully Completed the Course in

Foundations in Human Research Protections at USF

On

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

USF
UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTH FLORIDA
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Institutional Permission to Conduct Research

January 26, 2012

Ms. Vickie Stevens
St. Petersburg College
Clearwater Campus
2465 Drew Street
Clearwater, FL 33765

RE: USF IRB Human Research Application Letter of Support

Dear Ms. Stevens:

Consistent with the policy of St. Petersburg College, your application to perform research to address your dissertation requirements at the University of South Florida, was reviewed and approved by the SPC Research Review Committee.

This letter authorizes you to conduct research at the Clearwater Campus of St. Petersburg College provided such research conforms to College policy; limitations defined by the Research Review Committee; methodology defined in your research proposal/SPC research application; and pursuant to the approval of your research by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of South Florida.

This letter is intended for your use in completing an application to perform human research as required by the USF IRB, specifically, items 1.8a.1 and 1.8a.2.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Gardner, Ed.D.
Research Review Committee
St. Petersburg College

cc: SPC Research Committee co-chairs
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USF IRB Permission to Conduct Research

March 12, 2012

Vickie Stevens
Adult, Career and Higher Education

RE: Exempt Certification for IRB#: Pro00005095
Title: Students' Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four-Year Community College in Florida

Dear Vickie Stevens:

On 3/10/2012, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) determined that your research meets USF requirements and Federal Exemption criteria as outlined in the federal regulations at 45CFR46.101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
(ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

As the principal investigator for this study, it is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted as outlined in your application and consistent with the ethical principles outlined in the Belmont Report and with USF IRB policies and procedures. Please note that changes to this protocol may disqualify it from exempt status. Please note that you are responsible for notifying the IRB prior to implementing any changes to the currently approved protocol.

The Institutional Review Board will maintain your exemption application for a period of five years from the date of this letter or for three years after a Final Progress Report is received, whichever is longer. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond five years, you will need to submit a 1) Final Report and 2) submit a new application. Should you complete this study prior to the end of the five-year period, you must submit a request to close the study.
We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-5638.

Sincerely,

John Schinka, PhD, Chairman
USF Institutional Review Board

Cc: Various Menzel, CCRP, USF IRB Professional Staff
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Consent form Hett’s Widower

University of San Diego
School of Leadership and Education Sciences

28 September 1993

MEMORANDUM

For: Dr. Mary Scherr

From: Dallas Boggs

Subject: Doctoral Dissertation of Dr. E. Jane Hett

It is my pleasure to authorize you to share any or all portions of subject dissertation for educational and/or research purposes, as you deem appropriate.

Dallas B. Boggs

September 30, 1993

The above authorization is signed by Dallas Boggs, the husband of E. Jane Hett, who is now deceased.

Mary Woods Scherr, Ph.D.
Dissertation Director
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Consent Form Hett’s Dissertation Supervisor

March 22, 2012

Vickie H. Stevens
Assistant Professor EAP & español
St. Petersburg College
Clearwater Campus
P.O. Box 13489
St. Petersburg, FL 33733-3489

Dear Ms. Stevens:
I want to extend my best wishes to you for much success with your dissertation. We are pleased you plan
to use Jane Hett’s Global Mindedness Scale. She was an excellent student fully committed to global
peace.

Enclosed you will find a letter of authorization from Dallas B. Boggs, the husband of E. Jane Hett, who is
now deceased.

Sincerely,

Beth Yemana
Assistant Director of Leadership Programming

Department of Leadership Studies
School of Leadership and Education Sciences
5998 Alcardi Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492
Phone (619) 260-4637 • Fax (619) 849-8179 • www.sandiego.edu/sles/leadstudies
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Recruitment Script

Recruitment Script for Students’ Participation

The Dean of the Communications Department will contact the campus’ composition instructors to participate in the survey via the Recruitment Script. The Informed Consent to Participate Form with the link to access the survey will be attached for instructors to copy and paste into their course(s).

Dear Composition Faculty,

Your students are being asked to take part in a research study that is called Students’ Perceptions on Issues Related to Globalization at a Four-Year Community College in Florida USF eIRB#5095. The person who is in charge of this research study and the principal investigator is Vickie Hall Stevens. The research will be done by collecting students’ responses online through an electronic survey that they complete. Students who consent to participate will click on a response to provide their answer for each statement. Their personal information and email address will not be collected. Their participation in this survey will in no way affect their grade for the course. There is a 2-week period to respond to the anonymous survey, which offers a chance to win a
$50.00 Amazon Gift Card. The Informed Consent to Participate Form with the link to access the survey is attached for you to copy and paste into your course(s).

Thank you for participating!
Appendix L
Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Research Study
IRB Study # PRO00005095

Researchers at the University of South Florida (USF) study many topics. To do this, we need the help of people who agree to take part in a research study. This form tells you about this online research study. We are asking you to take part in a research study that is called: Florida Students’ Perceptions on Globalization. The person who is in charge of this research study is Vickie Hall Stevens. This person is called the Principal Investigator. The research will be done by collecting your responses online through an electronic survey that you complete at this link provided in your selected course: Click here to take survey:

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY The purpose of this study is to find out what your level of global-mindedness and if certain variables may have influenced it. You are being asked because the principal investigator is interested in collecting data on community college students’ global-mindedness.

STUDY PROCEDURES If you take part in this study, you will be asked to respond to 30 questions about global-mindedness as well as answer demographic questions.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION/WITHDRAWAL You should only take part in this study if you want to volunteer. You should not feel that there is any pressure to take part in the
study. You are free to participate in this research or withdraw at any time. If you choose not to participate or decide to stop taking part in this study, your decision to participate or not to participate will not affect your course grade. RISKS OR DISCOMFORT This research is considered to be minimal risk. That means that the risks associated with this study are the same as what you face every day. There are no known additional risks to those who take part in this study.

COMPENSATION We will not pay you for the time you volunteer to participate in the study; however, you will be able to enter a chance to win a $50.00 Amazon gift card.

CONFIDENTIALITY We must keep your study records as confidential as possible. It is possible, although unlikely, that unauthorized individuals could gain access to your responses because you are responding online. Your results will be password protected and may be stored for up to 5 years after the Final Report is filed with the IRB. However, certain people may need to see your study records. By law, anyone who looks at your records must keep them completely confidential. The only people who will be allowed to see these records are:

• The research team, including the Principal Investigator, the Advising Professor, and all other research staff.

• Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study. For example, individuals who provide oversight on this study may need to look at your records. This is done to make sure that we are doing the study in the right way. They also need to make sure that we are protecting your rights and your safety. These include:
• The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the staff that work for the IRB. Other individuals who work for USF that provide other kinds of oversight may also need to look at your records.

• The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not let anyone know your name. We will not publish anything else that would let people know who you are. You can print a copy of this consent form for your records. If you agree, please proceed with the survey.
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Distribution of Students’ Response to GMS

Global Mindedness Responses

$n = 175; \ \mu = 109.2; \ \sigma = 12.7$
About the Author

Vickie Hall Stevens is an assistant professor in the Communications Department at a 4-year college in Florida. A first generation college student, she attended Southern Illinois University where she received a Bachelor's degree in Spanish and a Master's Degree in English as a Second Language. During her 30 year teaching career, Mrs. Stevens has taught English and Spanish in Medellin, Colombia and in Southern California at the middle school, high school, community college, adult education, and university levels.


A world traveler, Mrs. Stevens has travelled extensively in countries of 6 continents. Most recently, she has begun devoting summers to working with her husband, Dr. Robert Stevens, executive director of the Dominican Development Group for Episcopal Outreach in la República Dominicana, whom she met on her first visit to the Dominican Republic.