

**International Business Standards Integration for Promoting Global Competence in the
Business Education Classroom**

by

Tsepo David Moleleki

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 5, 2023

Key words: Global Competence, International Business,

Copyright 2023 by Tsepo David Moleleki

Approved by

Leane Skinner, Chair, Professor Curriculum and Teaching
Elisha Wohleb, Clinical Professor Curriculum and Teaching
Chih-hsuan Wang, Professor Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
Chadwick Springer, Assistant Clinical Professor Curriculum and Teaching

ABSTRACT

This research study investigated business educators' perceptions of their competence to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business, the extent of integration of these standards, and the challenges faced by educators in incorporating them into their subject areas. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The findings revealed that the majority of respondents were female, primarily within the age range of 48 to 57 years and with less than 10 years of teaching experience. Most educators held a master's degree, taught in rural schools, and primarily at the high school level.

Business educators rated their perceived competence to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business as basic to moderately competent. Notably, educators felt most competent in explaining differences between import, export, and international trade, while they felt least competent in evaluating impacts of foreign direct investments. Furthermore, the overall extent of integration of the standards was reported to be low, with business educators rarely integrating the standards into their teaching practices. Respect for other languages and cultures was the most integrated standard, while evaluating foreign direct investment was the least integrated.

Significant positive correlations were found between business educators' perceived competence and the extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business. This suggests that educators who felt more competent in integrating the standards demonstrated higher levels of integration. However, no significant differences were found in the extent of integration based on subject areas taught or educators' international experience.

Challenges faced by business educators in integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business included perceiving the standards as unrelated to their subjects, lack of

student interest, educators' perceived lack of content knowledge, and states prioritizing other competencies. However, educators generally recognized the importance of the standards for student learning.

The findings of this study highlight the need for increased support and professional development for business educators to enhance their competence and integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business. Additionally, addressing challenges such as difficulty of integration and time constraints will contribute to the effective implementation of these standards in business education curricula.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to give honor and glory to God without whom this would be possible. I am deeply indebted to my supervisor, Dr. Leane Skinner, whose expertise, patience, and unwavering support have been instrumental in shaping the direction of this research. Your guidance, insightful feedback, and encouragement have truly enriched my academic experience.

I would also like to extend my heartfelt appreciation to the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Elisha Wohleb, Dr. Chih-hsuan Wang, and Dr. Chadwick Springer. Your constructive criticism, valuable suggestions, and scholarly insights have contributed significantly to the refinement and rigor of this work.

My sincere thanks go to the participants of my study and the National Business Education Association, whose willingness to contribute their time, knowledge, and perspectives has been crucial in shaping the empirical findings of this dissertation. Their invaluable insights and candid responses have enriched the quality of this research.

I would also like to thank my family, friends, and colleagues in the Auburn University Business/Marketing Education Program. Your support, encouragement, and belief in me, even at times when I struggled to myself, have made all of this possible. Special thanks to my wife, Nthati, and my precious son Tlhalefo for their love, understanding and encouragement. To Nthati, I will forever be indebted to you for all the sacrifices you have made and continue to make for our family. You truly are a blessing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
I. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM	1
Theoretical Framework.....	3
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study	8
Research Questions.....	9
Definition of Terms.....	10
Limitations	11
Delimitations.....	11
Summary	12
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	13
Overview of Global Competence and Career and Technical Education	13
Global Competence and its relevance to Career and Technical Education	20
Global Competence and its relevance to Business Education	21
Relating International Business Education and Global Competence	23
International Business Standards	24

Global Competence Definitions and Frameworks	26
Integrating Global Competence in Business Education.....	32
International Experience and Globally Competent Teaching.....	36
Challenges to Integrating Global Competence	39
Summary	41
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	43
Research Design.....	43
Population	44
Instrumentation	45
Validity and Reliability.....	46
Data Collection	48
Data Analysis	48
Research Question Matrix.....	50
IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	51
Introduction and Restatement of the Problem	51
Descriptive Data Analysis and Results	51
Demographic Characteristics	51
Research Questions	53
Research Question 1	53
Research Question 2	59

Research Question 3	65
Research question 4	70
Extent of Integration Overall – Subject Area Taught.	71
Extent of Integration Overall – International Experience.	72
Research Question 5	73
Summary	77
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	78
Introduction.....	78
Summary of Findings.....	79
Conclusions.....	82
Limitations	83
Recommendations.....	84
REFERENCES	87
Appendix A.....	94
IRB Exempt Protocol Approval.....	95
Appendix B	96
Information Letter	97
Appendix C	99
Global Competence Integration Survey (GCIS).....	100

LIST OF TABLES

1. Comparing the NBEA Standards for International Business to Global Competence Frameworks.....	31
2. Reliability of Scales	47
3. Research Question Matrix on Survey Questions and Statistical Analyses used.....	50
4. Demographic Data of Participants	52
5. Business Ownership and Opportunity Competence Subscale.	54
6. Communication Strategies Competence Subscale.....	55
7. International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade Competence Subscale	56
8. Global Business Environment Competence Subscale	57
9. International Economic Policy Competence Subscale	58
10. Business Ownership and Opportunity Integration Subscale.....	60
11. Communication Strategies Integration Subscale	61
12. International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade Integration Subscale	62
13. Global Business Environment Integration Subscale.....	63
14. International Economic Policy Integration Subscale.....	64
15. Correlations: Business Ownership Subscale.....	66
16. Correlations: Communication Strategies Subscale.....	67
17. Correlations: International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade Subscale.....	68
18. Correlations: Global Business Environment Subscale	69
19. Correlations: International Economic Policy Subscale.....	70
20. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Extent of Integration based on Business Education Subject Areas taught.	72

21. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Extent of Integration based on International Travel.	73
22. Other Challenges to the Integration of NBEA Standards for International Business.....	75

I. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

When your suppliers are in Asia, your competitors are in Europe and your target markets range from South America to Africa, readiness for the job may require more than knowledge of your industry. It may entail being equipped to understand the dynamics of consumers in different markets, respecting local sensitivities and priorities, as well as collaborating with colleagues in different time zones and contexts with unfamiliar perspectives and workplace practices. (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2016)

The life of a student in the 21st Century has, more than ever before, been impacted by the world's interconnectedness in technology, trade, and migration patterns. Today the effects of globalization have become more apparent, and indeed as Friedman (2007) asserted, our world in this century has become flat. How this global interconnectedness affects students in the United States can be interpreted either negatively or positively, but what remains true is that “put simply, if individuals and their communities are to thrive in the future, schools must prepare today's students to be globally competent” (Asia Society & The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2018, p. 5).

The urgency to integrate global competence in education cannot be overemphasized. In their report on preparing a globally competent workforce through Career and Technical Education (CTE), Asia Society and the Longview Foundation (2013) asserted that teachers in the United States are increasingly faced with a crucial role to get students ready for jobs in environments that will require them to compete, connect and cooperate on a global level. A report by Business Roundtable (2022) revealed that in 2019, over 41 million jobs constituting 20.3% of total employment were connected to trade, with trade dependent jobs having increased

over thrice the rate of non-trade related jobs in the 10-year period of 2004 to 2014. This put into perspective the scale at which global business has become essential in the United States.

Moreover, it was estimated that 95% of the global consumer market that constituted 70% of the world's buying power was in other countries outside the United States, further proving that the direction of economic growth will be fueled beyond the borders (Business Roundtable, 2010).

The OECD defined global competence as “a multidimensional construct that requires a combination of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values successfully applied to global issues or intercultural situations” (OECD, 2018, p. 1). The emergent importance of the skill was recognized such that global competence was added as a new dimension to be assessed in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). Among many intended goals, preparing students for global competence would enable them to be ready for the world of work in which they would collaborate and communicate effectively with other culturally diverse individuals, in a world that has increasingly been connected through technology (OECD, 2018).

CTE has been at the forefront of workforce readiness since its genesis. The reauthorization of Carl D. Perkins' Act V - Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century in 2019 by the Trump Administration further indicated the centrality of CTE to respond in relevant ways to the challenges of College and Career Readiness. In its articulation of the Common Career Technical Core's Ready Practices, Advance CTE (2012) spelled out that career ready individuals must “work productively in teams while using cultural /global competence” (p. 2). Indeed, preparing students for the increasingly globalized world of work we live in falls squarely on CTE educators to implement globally relevant curriculum in the classroom.

As part of CTE, Business Education through its career clusters and pathways delivers content that seeks to prepare students for future workforce and post-secondary education. In particular, the National Business Education Association (NBEA) standards (2020) which prescribe skills students should possess to be successful in business, recognized the need for preparation of a globally literate knowledge worker who will operate in workspaces rich in global cultural diversity, and thrive in these environments by effectively working with others. Among the numerous standards developed are those of International Business “so that students understand the interrelatedness of one country’s political policies and economic practices on one another and learn to function in a global business environment” (p. IV). The standards are designed flexibly, specifically to allow for integration in different content areas, not necessarily restricted to a singular course. Within the current standards, NBEA (2020) highlighted the centrality of global competence integration, calling for “... the use of International Business standards in all business education disciplines, which enables the internationalization of the curriculum to reflect the impact of the global economy on the workplace” (p. 2).

Theoretical Framework

The focus of this study was on teachers’ implementation of global competence in business education through the integration of the NBEA Standards on International Business. As a result, the study was based on the Ecological Model of Teacher Agency (Priestly et al., 2012) in which teachers’ capacity for action was posited to be informed by their past professional and personal histories, oriented towards their future aspirations, and enacted in the present given different competing demands and contexts. Priestly et al. (2012) designed a model depicting teacher agency as explained through three dimensions being: the Iterational Dimension, the Projective Dimension and Practical-Evaluative Dimension; each of which contains specific

factors that could either promote or inhibit teacher agency. According to this model for instance, how a teacher may respond to a new educational technology will be predicated by their background with technology stemming from their training or personal interests. Further, the teacher's objectives and long-term goals would have to be in alignment with adopting such technology; and finally, the determination of the aspects of that technology and how to use it in the present will be made.

Within the iterational dimension, Priestly et al. (2015) highlighted the importance of a broad range of skills and knowledge teachers may draw from to respond to situations. These would range in depth and breadth between veteran and new teachers, as well as according to structural and cultural differences. For example, Priestly et al. (2015) posited that new teachers' iterative repertoires could be confined only to their training and some personal history, which limits the range of their responses to situations. Veteran teachers, on the other hand, may have a broad range of experiences from which to refer that also allow them alternatives for action. As Leijen et al. (2020) explained, the iterational dimension "refers to the activation of accumulated patterns of thoughts and actions from the past. These patterns are incorporated into practical activities, allowing for stability and sustainment of identities and institutions" (p. 279). The current study assessed business educators' iterational dimension as it relates to global competence with a research question asking how business educators perceive their competence to integrate the NBEA Standards on International Business in their different business education subject areas.

"The projective dimension of teacher agency concerns [teachers'] aspirations in respect of their work – both long term and short term" (Priestly et al., 2012, p. 6). Moreover, these aspirations can be expressed on a broad-spectrum between those that are positive and protective

of student interests or policy determinations, to those that may have narrower and less desirable motives like having a quiet classroom to signify good classroom management. Priestly et al. (2015) additionally noted that teachers' projective dimension was mostly guided by short term goals like effective classroom management rather than long term goals like the meaning of education in a broader sense. Teachers' experience was also seen to affect these goals as expert teachers were posited to use more intuitive decision-making than novice teachers, further showing the interplay between the iterative and projective dimensions.

The practical-evaluative dimension is the one “where a particular temporary situation is perceived and interpreted based on the professional competence described in the iterative dimension and professional purpose described in the projective dimension of agency” (Leijen et al., 2019, p. 301). Within this dimension, Priestly et al. (2015) identified factors influencing teacher agency nested with groupings of discourse, materials, and relational categories. In effect, the action that teachers took on their day-to-day practical-evaluative activities would be enhanced or hindered by the inner dialogue or professional discussions with colleagues, the physical resources available to them, and the hierarchical and lateral relationships within the school environment. The practical-evaluative dimension involves judgement that teachers make concerning their professional practice as influenced by their patterns of knowledge and thought, as well as their professional aspirations in the long and short term. As a result, the second research question concerned the curricular decision making by business educators towards integration of global competence. The third research question investigated whether there is a statistically significant association between business educators' perceptions of competence to integrate the NBEA Standards on International Business—within the iterative dimension and the extent of integration of the NBEA Standards on International Business—in the practical-

evaluative dimension, in an attempt to capture the influences that Priestly et al. posited exists from the iterational dimension to the practical-evaluative dimension.

The teacher agency model situates the teacher as an important player who participates in, and shapes reality within their classroom through dealing with competing demands of their professional lives for the benefit of their students, among other duties. To understand how decisions about adopting new ways to teach for an emergent competence are reached, it is important to consider embedded factors that affect their curricular decision-making processes. This study recognized the role of business education teachers as important agents whose perceptions and decisions about the integration of International Business can give insights into the ways in which students are being prepared for the globally interconnected future.

Statement of the Problem

In their International Strategy 2012-16, the United States Department of Education (2012) declared that

Students today will be competing for jobs with peers around the world and those jobs will require advanced knowledge and non-routine skills. Transglobal communication and commerce are increasingly part of the daily work of large and small businesses which face difficulties in hiring employees with the requisite global skills, including cultural awareness and linguistic proficiency. (p. 2)

Central to the role of CTE, more so than other disciplines, is the requirement to prepare students for the future workforce – a role that is rife with competing demands for knowledge and skills that can be presently imparted to students. This workforce-preparation focus of CTE places global competency within the scope of multidisciplinary skills that teachers need to ensure

students have when they graduate from their programs. As Asia Society and the Longview Foundation (2013) put it, globally focused CTE programs “help strengthen students’ readiness for the global economy, allowing them to understand and navigate global markets and cultures” (p.2).

While the importance of global competence for the future and its relation to CTE have been acknowledged, Asia Society and the Longview Foundation (2013) noted that numerous schools across the United States have not placed the necessary emphasis on instruction that promotes global competence. In addition, schools missed the opportunity to relate CTE classes to others of crucial global competence relevance such as foreign language instruction that usually get scheduled at the same time as CTE classes. Further, Apple Inc. (2007) shared that while it is undeniable that the world has become increasingly interconnected, “Americans are becoming less—not more—globally engaged” (p.3). This was said to be evident in that less than 10% of US college students were studying foreign languages, down from 15% in the 1960s; that 85% of US students could not locate Afghanistan and Iraq on the map, especially during the period of conflict with both countries, and that there was a very low coverage of international content in the American mainstream media.

The California Department of Education (2016) further demonstrated the complexities of integrating global competence instruction, outlining that while this competence is not only critical for employment but for civic engagement and socio-emotional intelligence, lack of uniformity across the state stemming from school system autonomy meant global competence integration differed vastly from one system to another, with most sidelining its integration. In addition, Woo (2019) revealed that some of the challenges facing global competence integration in Business/Marketing Education were factors such as states’ prioritization of other

competencies over it, lack of student interest, teachers' own negative perspectives to the concept, and their inadequate content knowledge on global competence.

Through their standards, the NBEA (2020) provided nationally relevant guidance to teachers on what students should know and be able to do to increase their chances of success in the future. The articulation of standards for International Business, and the NBEA's call for their integration across other business education disciplines indicated appreciation of the importance of global competence as a crucial component of business education. However, very little is known about business educators' perceptions about global competence and the integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business in their subject areas which is necessary to ensure that students thrive in the globally interrelated workplace of the future. Therefore, the problem of this study was the lack of information regarding teachers' integration of the NBEA standards on International Business.

Purpose of the Study

With the world becoming increasingly globalized through technology, mobility and trade, business educators are faced with a challenge of preparing students for the 21st century workplace in which they will increasingly have to communicate, compete, and cooperate with globally diverse colleagues. One of the direct ways in which these skills can be imparted is through the integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business in different business education disciplines. The purpose of this study was to investigate business educators' perceptions of their competency to integrate the NBEA standards on International Business, the extent to which they do (if at all) integrate the standards in their subject areas, and possible predictors and challenges to the integration of these standards.

Research Questions

1. What is the perceived competence of business educators to integrate the NBEA standards for International Business?
2. To what extent do business educators integrate the NBEA standards for International Business?
3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between business educators' perceptions of competence to integrate the NBEA standards for International Business and the extent of integration of these standards?
4. Are there differences in the extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business based on the business education area taught and business educators' international experience?
5. What are some of the challenges that business educators encounter to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business?

Definition of Terms

Global Competence – Global competence refers to knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to understand and engage effectively in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world. It involves having deep understanding of global issues, cultures, and systems, as well as the ability to communicate, collaborate, think critically, and solve complex problems in diverse cultural and global contexts.

International business education – refers to academic programs or courses that provide students with knowledge, skills, and insights into the complexities of conducting business in a global context. It encompasses the study of international trade, cross-border investments, global marketing, cultural differences, global supply chains, and the legal and economic aspects of conducting business across national boundaries. The goal of international business education is to prepare students for careers in the global marketplace by equipping them with a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities that rise in an interconnected and diverse business environment.

National Business Education Association (NBEA) – A professional organization in the United States that focuses on advancing business education at all levels, including K-12, postsecondary, and career and technical education. NBEA provides resources, professional development opportunities, networking, and advocacy for business educators and professionals in the field of business education. The association promotes best practices, curriculum development and research in business education to enhance the quality of business instruction and prepare students for success in the business world.

NBEA Standards for International Business – Content standards that the NBEA developed to guide development of business education programs at various levels including K-

12, post-secondary and career and technical education, specifically in the area of international business. These standards are developed to help students understand the interrelatedness of political policies and economic activities, and to learn about important aspects of doing business in a global environment. Standards are divided into content area levels to allow adoption at appropriate school levels.

Content Area Levels – Levels used in the 2020 NBEA Standards: (a) Level 1 – Elementary School (Grades K-6); (b) Level 2 Middle/Junior High School (Grades 6-9); (c) Level 3 - Secondary School (Grades 9-12); (d) Level 4 – Two-Year Post-secondary/ Community College or Technical College.

Limitations

Limitations are the conditions beyond the control of the researcher that may place restrictions on the conclusions of the study and their application to other situations. Limitations of this study include: (a) the number of business educators responding to the survey; (b) self-reporting survey instrument; and (c) respondents' interpretation of the NBEA Standards for International Business.

Delimitations

Delimitations are boundaries beyond which the study is concerned. This study involved only business educators who were members of the National Business Education Association, teaching high school and post-secondary institutions. Additionally, only the integration and perceived competence to integrate the NBEA Standards on International Business as spelled out in the NBEA (2020) standards were analyzed in this study.

Summary

The first chapter introduced global competence as a vital skill that needed to be integrated across all subjects in order to ensure that today's students are prepared to collaborate, compete, and communicate with their peers in the 21st century workplace that is highly globally diverse. CTE in general and business education in particular, were presented as areas that needed an urgent effort to integrate global competence across the numerous subject areas of instruction. Further, the NBEA Standards on International Business were introduced as a relevant and readily available tool through which business educators can integrate global competence in their teaching, across different business education subject areas.

This chapter also discussed the ecological model of teacher agency as a theoretical framework for this study, where the three dimensions of teacher agency being the iterative, projective and practical-evaluative dimensions and their implications for globally competent teaching were presented. Additionally, the key research questions, purpose of the study and its limitations and delimitations were discussed. The following chapter will delve into the literature on global competence, international business education and other topics of relevance to this study.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review included the following topics:

Overview of Global Competence

Global Competence and Career and Technical Education

Global Competence and Business Education

Relating International Business Education and Global Competence

International Business Standards

Global Competence Definitions and Frameworks

Integrating Global Competence in Business Education

International Experience

Challenges to Integration

Overview of Global Competence and Career and Technical Education

The challenge of preparing our youth for the future includes, but is greater than, preparing them for work and ensuring their college readiness. Pressing issues such as protecting the environment, managing unprecedented human migration, and addressing the challenges of poverty, global health and human rights will demand a generation of individuals with a strong capacity to cooperate across national borders—individuals able to solve problems in the workplace, among many nations, through the internet and in private decisions. (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011, p. 9)

For many years there has been growing evidence that the world has become increasingly interconnected due to unprecedented technological advances, migration, and international trade. Friedman (2007) posited this phenomenon to be the ‘flattening’ of the world, with imposing and

far reaching economic, social, and political implications requiring solutions that go against the business-as-usual approach. In education, researchers like Harvard Project Zero's Veronica Boix-Mansilla (2011) have talked about the need for global competence preparation in students, which would enable them to communicate, compete and cooperate with others from different parts of the world. Similarly, Tichnor-Wagner et al. (2019) highlighted the interconnected nature of the world, and the need for teachers to use instructional practices that are globally relevant and responsive. Indeed, even at the highest level of government in the United States, the urgency of globally relevant education has been acknowledged, with former President Barack Obama (2009) remarking that:

The source of America's prosperity has never been merely about how ably we accumulate wealth, but how well we educate our people. This has never been more true than it is today. In a 21st-century world where jobs can be shipped wherever there's an internet connection, where a child born in Dallas is now competing with a child in New Delhi, where your best qualification is not what you do, but what you know—education is no longer just a pathway to opportunity and success, it is a prerequisite for success. (Para. 7)

In 2006, the Committee on Economic Development (CED) released a report which revealed some of the major challenges that were facing the United States at the turn of the 21st century relating to globalization. Mainly, the CED pointed out that the highly interconnected world tested the country on three avenues of the economy, national security, and America's multicultural society. These challenges, the CED proposed, could be confronted through robust investments in globally focused education across all levels.

Within the economic realm, the CED (2006) demonstrated that cross cultural and foreign language knowledge had become fundamental for countries to thrive in the global marketplace characterized by increased competition for customers. The challenge, however, was that employees in the United States lacked, in comparison to their global counterparts, when it came to world languages and cross-cultural skills. This in turn disadvantaged the United States economy, with American companies losing close to \$2 billion a year due to employee deficits in global competence in multicultural situations.

The lack of preparation in foreign language skills and global competence also presented a national security challenge to the United States (CED, 2006). According to the CED, since the September 11th attacks, it became evident that the diplomatic efforts of the country required a broad pool of people capable in critical languages as well as enhanced cultural awareness that is integral to the United States protecting itself and presenting its position more clearly globally. The CED (2006) revealed that insufficient language skills delayed the time within which intelligence critical to the national security was translated and acted on, while lack of cultural awareness during the conflict in Iraq, for instance, placed soldiers and civilians at greater risk of harm.

The multicultural society that characterizes the United States was projected to continue an upward trajectory for the near future (CED 2006, Mansilla & Jackson 2011, Tichnor-Wagner et al. 2019). For instance, in their policy brief, the National Education Association (NEA, 2010) indicated that the American society was increasingly shifting linguistically, racially, and culturally. This was evidenced by the minority public school student-population percentage increase from 35% to 43% in the decade ending in 2006. The increase has persisted such that in recent years, a Pew Research Center (2021) report revealed that White students accounted for

47% of the public-school student body, down from 65% in 1995, making the public-school student population ‘majority minority’ for the first time in US history. For these reasons, schools, employees as well as the consumer base will continue to see increased linguistic and cultural diversity which will require commensurate cross-cultural preparation, or risk to “suffer diminished communication among our citizens and a weaker civic culture” (CED, 2006 p. 1).

Recommendations made by the CED (2006) placed education as the core solution to the above challenges, calling for global knowledge integration across different subjects and throughout all levels of education, as well as targeted improvements in critical foreign language skill acquisition to the American students. It was further suggested that states mandate global competence as a graduation requirement, that teachers receive professional development emphasizing global competence, and for teacher education programs to include strong international grounding, among others.

The NEA (2010) also joined the clarion call to declare global competence as imperative for all students in the 21st Century where public education should intervene to capacitate all for future success. This, the NEA posited, was necessitated by growing global economic interdependence evidenced by the surge in international trade, the expanding cultural diversity within the American population, increasingly intricate global challenges such as pandemics that require global solutions, and lastly, that global competence can strengthen holistic academic achievement in students. Strategies to advance towards global competence were said to include integrating it in teacher preparation and creating globally focused professional development opportunities for educators. Further, the NEA (2010) recommended leveraging the internet to design low-cost virtual international experiences for students, expanded foreign language

instruction, and to model the U.S. education system and supports against those of high performing countries globally.

Much of the literature, however, shows that these aspirations have not yet been adequately translated into action in education. As the California Department of Education (2016) mentioned, there were fragmented efforts to infuse global competence across different school systems, such that most schools disregarded it for skills they felt needed better emphasis. The Partnership for 21st Century Skills et al. (P21, 2010) better expressed this predicament writing that “Most schools have neither the expectations nor the measures, neither the instructional programs nor the learning environments, to equip students with the knowledge and skills they need to compete and succeed in a global economy” (p. 6).

Worldwide, shifts are occurring that also warrant better preparation of students for a future rife with competition from peers abroad and automation resulting from rapid technological advances. The World Economic Forum’s (WEF) Global Competitiveness Report (2020) revealed worrying human capital trends, such as the declining adequacy of employability skills and increasing digital skills gaps among secondary school and college graduates of advanced economies like the United States. The result of these, beyond worsening unemployment for workers in the United States, was said to be increased global competition for jobs that are already becoming scarce due to automation. To curb this, the WEF (2020) recommended that:

Policymakers must also innovate and refresh how school curricula teach the core skills that must be seeded for innovation capability later in life through creativity and critical thinking skills. In addition, to drive better economies and societies, education and training systems will need to be updated not only to prepare children and adults for future employment but will also need to prepare them to be socially just citizens. (p. 26)

Additionally, the Institute for the Future for the University of Phoenix Research Institute (IFTF, 2011), in their report on “Future Work Skills 2020” highlighted global connectedness as one of the six drivers of change or “big disruptive shifts that are likely to reshape the future landscape” (p. 3). They explained that the traditional nature of doing global business—where research, innovation and development were centered in the global north while production was outsourced to the developing nations for cost-effectiveness—was being disrupted at a greater pace as the rapidly increasing global demand and technological advances boosted innovation and productivity in the emerging economies like India and China. This also meant increased competition for United States’ multinational companies, whose solution would include effective integration of business processes and people in the locales of the subsidiaries, other than the business-as-usual approach, to retain the competitive advantage. Among the ten skills for the future workforce that the IFTF (2011) identified was cross-cultural competency, which they said would enable people to function in diverse cultural situations regardless of geographical location as diversity was becoming predominant universally.

While the need for globally responsive education has been established, and policies developed at various levels, the task of implementation—given the competing demands of education—rests on teachers. In their book titled “Becoming a Globally Competent Teacher,” Tichnor-Wagner et al. (2019) brought attention to the teachers’ predicament, noting that while the duty of classroom teaching may seem like an isolated and local pursuit, it is instead a global endeavor. They pointed out that teachers these days are faced with the task of preparing students for an increasingly globalized knowledge economy, where they would be expected to thrive based on the education they received. Further, the demographic characteristics of students in the classrooms have seen increased cultural diversity coupled with growing connectedness to global

events that, through technology and other factors, have affected students' mental and physical wellbeing. All the while, minimal guidance existed on what teachers need to do to ensure that their practice is responsive to some of these expectations. As Tichnor-Wagner (2019) expressed it: "the pushes and pulls teachers face as they seek to provide an equitable education to every student are multifaceted, and the responsibility to prepare students for global world is rarely defined" (p. 1). They further heralded globally focused education as a necessity for all students, rather than an option for a few, due to the nature of our interconnected world, and the many benefits students stand to gain from it. As Tichnor-Wagner et al. expressed it, global education can no longer be perceived as 'nice-to-have' subject for select students in some programs, but a primary lens through which all subjects can be viewed and taught, for the benefit of all who live in this interconnected world.

Along the same lines, the Longview Foundation (2008) reported on the need for education to be responsive to the global competence needs of the 21st century student, going further to claim that teachers themselves were seldom well prepared to carry out this function. In their report "Teacher Preparation for the Global Age," the Longview Foundation expressed that several stakeholders—from national education leaders to supranational organizations with educational interest—have sounded the alarm on the need for the American student to be prepared for the globalized world. They noted, however, that teacher preparation had not adequately responded to this challenge by ensuring that its graduates were prepared in ways that would enable them to infuse global content in their subject areas, as student teaching and teacher education coursework were localized and seldom left any space for study abroad or foreign language learning. They explained that a limited number of programs were finding ways to integrate global competence in their teacher preparation, further claiming that "...the earlier

teachers learn to infuse global knowledge and perspectives into their teaching, the comfortable and skilled they will become at making this a natural and essential part of their teaching practice” (p. 6).

Global Competence and its relevance to Career and Technical Education

CTE is no exception among disciplines that have been impacted by globalization. To underscore the impact specifically to CTE, and the urgent need to respond, Gordon (2014) wrote:

Career and technical educators throughout the nation are affected by what goes on internationally. Each day, new developments—improved communication, faster travel, and increased commerce—make the world we live in smaller. In the national interest, we must prepare our CTE students to compete in the 21st-century workplace. (p. 331)

Indeed, due to its comprehensive approach of educating for college, career, and lifelong learning, CTE has a direct interest and stands to benefit from an infusion of global perspectives in its different clusters and pathways. To display how this integration could be seamless and beneficial to CTE students, the Asia Society and Longview Foundation (2013) remarked that:

Teaching global competency in a career-focused context gives students the opportunity to acquire important skills needed for success in many careers that are part of the current economy. The more effective, sustainable approach is to integrate global themes and content into existing coursework, not a separate global CTE class. (p. 12)

Further, Gordon (2014) indicated that “career and technical education has focused on helping people understand the relationship between education and work and acquire employability skills. However, people need assistance in realizing the opportunities and meeting the challenges of the international workplace” (p. 356). In effect, if CTE does not concern itself with global competence and internationalization, it becomes limited in its mission to provide

relevant skills and knowledge necessary for people to thrive in society and the workplace.

Among those pertinent skills, Gordon (2014) highlighted that CTE aimed at promoting holistic education that blended academic aspects with practical applications for specific occupations of the modern workforce; to lessen the scourge of unemployment and economic disparities that are associated with it; train young people for career prospects and/or entrepreneurship, and curb rural to urban migration for the unskilled seeking employment. These goals, altruistic as they may sound, need to be adjusted so that they are cognizant of the interconnected nature of our world, and for CTE to be truly responsive to the needs of the 21st century student.

Global Competence and its relevance to Business Education

Business Education has historically been tied to business activity in the United States and the world at large. Starting from the days when apprentices would learn the practice of book-keeping and its associated rules to the current era where business education comprises advanced concepts from Accounting to Information Technology, Gordon (2014) traced the inextricable ties which have necessitated that young people be educated about the business world. Gordon went further to note that the high pace of business has meant that business education had to evolve to keep up with changing market demands, modern technologies, practices, as well as policies that the emerging worker needs to know to be successful in the workplace. Among instructional practices and principle shifts Gordon highlighted were evolutions from shorthand to computerized word processing and information management systems; the move from secretarial processes to management and entrepreneurship; and lastly, the shift from focusing only on the local to global dimensions of business (Gordon, 2014).

Global business education has featured prominently among issues of vital importance to business education. As early 1992, the Policies Commission for Business and Economic

Education (PCBEE) released Statement No. 52 entitled ‘This We Believe About the Role of Business Education in the Global Marketplace’. In it, the PCBEE expressed the need for business education to incorporate international content to ensure that American students and workers are “skilled, adaptable, and innovative... and respond with an expanding vision in a shrinking world” (p. 1). The PCBEE moved that: attention and sensitivity to the diversity of cultural and linguistic dimensions of our world; the awareness of the interrelatedness of political, economic, socio-cultural and other systems; development of global business skills and understanding of nuances in local and international markets; as well as the need for American businesspeople to possess advanced cross-cultural communication, technological and analytical capabilities, were indispensable to the United States keeping its global leadership and influence. These, the PBCCE suggested would be accomplished through, among others, targeted instruction that prioritized the infusion of global content in education from elementary grades to the highest levels of education, promotion of technology-based skills and systems that facilitate global business and stimulating the development of ethical consideration in dealing with issues of global importance. Distinctly and of relevance to this study, the PCBEE expressively declared “We believe that business education must promote international business courses and infuse international business content into existing business courses at all educational levels” (p. 3).

In a further attestation of the necessity of global competence in business education, the PCBEE released another policy statement with emphasis on global business education in 2004. In this statement entitled “This We Believe About Business Education in a Global Environment,” the PCBEE (2004) recognized, as major challenges of globalization, the prevalence of interconnected economic systems, global business practices, varied legal and political structures across countries, and the miscellaneous tapestry of cultures that characterized the world.

Business educators were said to be faced with developing curricula and implementing instructional strategies that would enable students to develop global perspectives and navigate the highly interconnected world with ease. More specifically, the committee identified the predecessor of the current NBEA Standards for International Business (2020)—the National Standards for Business Education (NBEA, 2001) section on global business—as a tool that can be used to give business education students the much-needed preparation on global business matters. The PBCEE expressed that the objectives of the National Standards for Business Education on global business could provide a framework on which to design and implement business instruction for preparing students for the global business world.

Relating International Business Education and Global Competence

There are multiple lenses through which International Business can be conceptualized, such as those outlined in Klarin et al., (2021), where it was posited that International Business Education could be explained through four interrelated lenses. These were, firstly, the pedagogy of global business —where the study of International Business Education referred to the collection of methods and practices for teaching global business issues. Secondly, International Business Education encompassed the study of the interdisciplinary field which situated International Business as a discipline on its own, or a sub discipline within other functional elements of business education such as marketing and management. The third conceptualization, from which this study derived, referred to a view where International Business Education formed a component of efforts towards internationalization of the curriculum aimed at promoting intercultural and global competence within students of business education. Lastly, International Business Education referred to the study of communication in global business, and the study of English as a medium for doing business internationally. While these four conceptualizations are

interrelated, this study relied on the third conceptualization of International Business Education by investigating the integration of international business in other business education areas to promote global competence in the business education classroom. As such, the NBEA Standards for International Business (2020) were used as a tool through which the integration of global competence could be observed.

International Business Standards

Since its rapid development in the post-second world war era, International Business has wavered between being a standalone discipline, or an amorphous blend of the global components of business education that keep changing with the advancing world (Laughton, 2005). The latter pattern has seen more prominence lately, as the nature of business has become globalized. This has been evident in the intensifying calls for International Business content to be integrated across all different business education disciplines to reflect the interrelatedness of countries in the international economy, and to reflect the global nature of business NBEA (2020). The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB, 2011) echoed this view, saying:

The global nature of today's business environment demands that international content be consciously included within the core curriculum of all business programs—and that it not be solely an optional elective or supplemental course, or a component of only those programs with a specifically “global” focus. (p. 106)

The NBEA designs standards for use in different areas of business education ranging from Accounting, Marketing and Management to Information Technology, Personal Finance, and International Business, to name a few. The standards are constantly updated to reflect content that business students need to know and be able to do for success in college and career in

the 21st century (NBEA, 2020). According to Stitt-Gohdes (2002), the increased need for accountability in business education ushered in an era of educational standards development in the 1980s, starting with the Standards for Excellence in Business Education that were accepted by the US Department of Education. These were followed by the NBEA's 1987 publishing of the Database of Competencies for Business Curriculum Development, K-14, and the Business Teacher Education Curriculum Guide, all of which encompassed guidance on curriculum and standards for business education from the lowest grades up to graduate school (Stitt-Gohdes, 2002).

The current NBEA Standards (2020) evolved from the first publication, which, according to Skinner (2002), was in 1995, with the second edition released in 2001. Skinner explained that the curriculum model upon which the standards were developed integrated the 11-content areas instead of delineating them into separate courses in order to reflect the interdisciplinary nature of business education and to promote instruction that integrated these areas. Further, the standards were said to be “divided into four developmental levels: Level 1—Elementary School (Grades K-6); Level 2—Middle/Junior high school (Grades 6–9); Level 3—Secondary school (Grades 9–12); Level 4—Two-year Postsecondary/Community College or Technical College” (Skinner, 2002, p. 25).

According to the NBEA (2020) the National Standards for Business Education were developed to provide guidance on skills and knowledge that students need to possess to be able to thrive in an increasingly globalized world. Emphasizing the need for a globally literate knowledge worker, the NBEA explained why it was paramount to ensure that all standards prepared students for a future characterized by work that transcends geographical boundaries. To this end, the NBEA wrote:

Because all students will encounter a business environment that is characterized by cultural diversity—on both the domestic and international levels—all students need to practice interpersonal, teamwork, and leadership skills that will help them function successfully in that environment. (p. iii)

The NBEA standards for International Business were developed against this background, with a specific objective of demonstrating to students that political and business activities in one geographical region have implications that may manifest in other connected nations as well, and to prepare students for the global nature of business. Aside from the demarcation of standards by their four developmental levels, the NBEA standards for International Business were conceptually developed to encompass:

- Raising awareness of the interrelatedness of one country’s political policies and economic practices on another.
- Learning to improve international relations through appropriate communication strategies.
- Understanding the global business environment—that is, the interconnectedness of cultural, political, legal, economic, and ethical systems.
- Exploring basic concepts underlying international finance, law, management, trade relations and
- Identifying forms of business ownership and international business opportunities.

(NBEA, 2020, p. 86)

Global Competence Definitions and Frameworks

In 2015, Bill Hunter wrote a brief for the United Nations Youth Envoy in support of the position that global competence is a necessary skill for young people and the pursuit of

sustainable development goals. First, Hunter (2015) expressed how it had become essential that, over and above occupation specific competences, students needed to develop other general skills that are crucial for success in the workplace such as time management, communication and others commonly known as soft skills. Hunter further demonstrated that global competence was becoming increasingly necessary in the interconnected world where people will collaborate in teams with others from diverse cultural and geographical backgrounds different from their own. For this reason, global competence has an overarching importance in the flattened economy of the future as it will bring together the technical and soft skills that the youth should possess into a global workplace.

Hunter (2015) further discussed the Global Competency Model created to encompass the knowledge, skills and attitudes people needed to become globally competent. The model comprised four nested circles depicting internal and external readiness dimensions of global competence. In the innermost circle, Hunter placed self-awareness, which he posited was the core competence, followed on the second level by attitudes of open mindedness, risk taking and attentiveness to diversity. Together these comprised the internal readiness aspect of global competence. The third layer contained global awareness and historical perspectives followed on the outermost layer, by intercultural capability and collaboration across cultures, which together were classified as the external readiness dimension of global competence. According to Hunter, one had to possess a combination of these dimensions to be truly globally competent, going further to explain that: “a person who is globally competent would have sound capability in all areas. Having only strong knowledge is not enough and cannot compensate for an individual with inferior people skills or poor attitudes” (2015, para. 4).

Boix Mansilla and Jackson (2011), under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the Asia Society defined global competence as “the capacity and disposition to understand and act on issues of global significance” (p. xiii). They explained that due to emergent and critical issues such as the flattened global economy, the increasing rate of global migration, and global warming and climate change, it had become incumbent upon education leaders to ensure that schools prepare students in ways that are mindful of the growing interdependence and interconnections that characterizes our world today. Additionally, Boix Mansilla and Jackson clarified that while efforts to focus on foundational skills like literacy, numeracy and problem solving, were imperative, it was also important to advance students’ knowledge and propensity for action in a progressively challenging, diverse, and interdependent world. They then put forth the global competence framework for what students needed to be able to do, which was comprised of the domains:

1. Investigate the world beyond their immediate environment, framing significant problems and conducting well-crafted and age-appropriate research.
2. Recognize perspectives, others and their own, articulating and explaining such perspectives thoughtfully and respectfully.
3. Communicate ideas effectively with diverse audiences, bridging geographic, linguistic, ideological, and cultural barriers.
4. Take action to improve conditions, viewing themselves as players in the world and participating reflectively. (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011, p. 11)

The OECD (2018) released the PISA global competence framework in which they explained that increasing multicultural environments have made it imperative to educate students to be able to exist harmoniously with others from diverse cultural backgrounds. The OECD

expounded that since the most pervasive source of violence since the end of the Cold War has been ethno-cultural conflict, the interconnectedness of society today and increasing global migration made it critically important to provide an education that prepares students to coexist harmoniously with others from different cultural, linguistic, and geographical backgrounds. Further, due to the global nature of trade, it has become crucial for companies to recruit workers who thrive in diversity and can be productive given multiple contexts, hence the need for global competence for workforce readiness. Moreover, the ubiquitous use of online networks among people universally meant that responsible use and engagement with others has become ever important, thus students need better preparation for the global online communities. Finally, global competence education was important for advancing toward the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The OECD then set forth a global competence framework against these challenges which advanced that students with global competence would:

- Examine local, global, and intercultural issues,
- Understand and appreciate the perspectives and worldviews of others
- Engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions across cultures
- Take action for collective well-being and sustainable development.

The OECD (2018) further illustrated that these four dimensions would be supported by knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values. This included knowledge about the world and other cultures, which would enable students to discern differences and similarities regarding cultures and people, hence enabling them to overcome stereotypical views. The skills highlighted were those to understand the world and act, which included ability to demonstrate complex cognitive and behavioral patterns of thought and action including conflict resolution, effective communication, and adaptability. The attitudes and values that the OECD highlighted included

respect for others from diverse backgrounds, global mindedness and valuing human dignity and diversity.

P21 (2015) developed a framework for integrating skills and knowledge that students should demonstrate to be successful in today's world. They grouped these into a structure of outcomes and supports that together were posited to enable education to be responsive to the 21st century learning needs. Among outcomes, P21 identified key subjects including Mathematics, History, Economics, and others, and 21st Century themes. The 21st century themes were global awareness, financial, economic, business, and entrepreneurial literacy, civic literacy, health literacy, and environmental literacy. The other outcomes included learning and innovation skills, as well as life and career skills. Global awareness, which was highlighted as one of the 21st Century interdisciplinary themes that needed to be integrated into key subjects included:

- Using 21st Century skills to understand and address global issues
- Learning from and working collaboratively with individuals representing diverse cultures, religions, and lifestyles in a spirit of mutual respect and open dialogue in personal, work and community contexts
- Understanding other nations cultures, including the use of non-English languages.

(P21, 2015, p. 2)

In 2014, in response to perceived fragmented and sparse state leadership efforts regarding global education and preparing students for the future, P21 adopted the VIF International Education global competence indicators for teachers and students which provided the Framework for State Action on Global Education (2014). In it, P21 acknowledged the importance of global competence in education, but decried the lack of unified action that would give teachers and school systems direction on what to do to prepare students for the globally

interconnected world. P21 moved that states needed to have “actionable framework for making global education a clear, but seamless part of state education systems” (p. 1). In this framework, P21 posited that globally competent students would:

- Explore their own cultures, make comparisons with other cultures, and investigate global issues and challenges.
- Improve their critical thinking, problem solving, perspective-taking, and research skills.
- Develop awareness of cultural diversity and global issues. (pp. 1-2)

A summary of the global competence frameworks together with the NBEA Standards for International Business that highlights their key characteristics providing a clear and concise overview of their focus and emphasis is provided below.

Table 1

Comparing the NBEA Standards for International Business to Global Competence Frameworks

Framework	Key Characteristics
NBEA Standards for International Business (2020)	• Awareness of interrelatedness of political policies and economic practices • Communication strategies for international relations • Understanding the global business environment • Exploring international finance, law, management, trade relations • Identifying business ownership and international opportunities
Hunter's Model of Global Competence (2015)	• Self-awareness • Open-mindedness, risk-taking, and attentiveness to diversity • Global awareness and historical perspectives • Intercultural capability and collaboration across cultures

Table 1 (Continued).

Boix Mansilla and Jackson Model of Global Competence (2011)	• Investigating the world beyond immediate environment • Recognizing and articulating different perspectives • Effective communication across geographic and cultural barriers • Taking action to improve conditions
OECD Model for Global Competence (2018)	• Examination of local, global, and intercultural issues • Understanding and appreciating others' perspectives and worldviews • Engaging in effective interactions across cultures • Taking action for collective well-being and sustainable development
P21 Global Awareness Model (2009)	• Using 21st-century skills to understand and address global issues • Collaborating with individuals from diverse cultures and backgrounds • Understanding other nations' cultures, including non-English languages
Framework for State Action on Global Education (2014)	• Exploring own culture and comparing with others • Developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills • Awareness of cultural diversity and global issues

Integrating Global Competence in Business Education

Davis et al. (2010) wrote an article in which they demonstrated the nuanced nature of cross-cultural verbal communication in the world, its challenges and opportunities, and what business educators needed to do in their classrooms to prepare students to effectively communicate with others from diverse cultures. First, Davis et al. discussed the embedded

differences in cultures across the world, centering their comparison on the concept of high context cultures, such as those East Asian countries like Japan, versus low context cultures such as those of Western societies like the United States. One of the key differences that Davis et al. referenced for example, was that people in high context cultures communicate based on non-verbal cues, placed value on the social and physical environment, and tend not to trust written or spoken word, while people in low context cultures on the other hand tend to place high value on verbal and written communication, directness, and brevity in formal business communication.

Davis et al. (2010) proceeded to recommend various ways to improve global communication, including being empathetic, knowing oneself, communication styles and values, exploring biases, and encouraging feedback. Among instructional methods and strategies that Davis et al. recommended, were the concepts of exploring multiple perspectives, careful consideration when making cultural generalizations and using inductive approaches instead of relying on definitions. Resources such as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) World Factbook website, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace website and the NBEA standards on communication were suggested as aids business educators can rely on as they endeavor to impart rich verbal cross-cultural communication skills.

In the same vein, Moore and Szul (2010) discussed the importance, challenges, and strategies for teaching non-verbal cross-cultural communication and etiquette in business education. To shed light on the vital nature of non-verbal communication in global settings, Moore and Szul expressed that majority of the social content in communication is contained in non-verbal communication, however, educators predominantly focus on teaching verbal communication, leaving students prone to making mistakes that can have high business and relational costs if they are not trained to discern the differences. Further, differences such as

high-context and low-context cultural characteristics were discussed as some of the factors needing attention in non-verbal cross-cultural communication.

Among components of non-verbal cross-cultural communication, Moore and Szul (2010) highlighted eye contact, personal space, paralanguage, body language and facial expressions as factors that vary in use and importance across cultures, which business educators needed to ensure their students had awareness of. Regarding instructional methods and strategies for equipping business education students with these skills, Moore and Szul recommended interactive strategies such as cooperative problem solving on cultural business cases; experiential learning strategies like pairing students with others from different cultures, having them interview each other and provide feedback on cultural differences that impacted them the most and finally; individual activities like encouraging students to learn of generalizations about other cultures and refraining from using them, recognizing power imbalances and respectfully listening to others' perceptions of those and how they affect them, and rejecting assumptions such as their way of communication is the only correct way, for example.

Awang and Carnes (2010) wrote on the importance of teaching cross-cultural and international business law and ethics to business education students. They started with the discussion on ethical differences across cultures, demonstrating the interlinks that make culture influence ethical decision-making in business. Due to these differences, illegal activities such as corruption and bribery could be viewed with different ethical lenses depending on culture, according to Awang and Carnes (2010). For this reason, it was vital to discuss different safeguards in the form of anti-corruption bodies and legal frameworks put in place to govern multinational business activity internationally. Laws such as the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 in the United States, and other legislation put forth by the OECD, the European Union (EU)

and work by Partners Against Corruption Initiatives were discussed. Finally, teaching strategies such as discussions, debates, case analysis and research projects were recommended for business educators to teach about international law and ethics in global business.

The prevalent use of the internet and information technology (IT) tools has transformed the world into a global village. To demonstrate how business educators could respond to this phenomenon, Zhao (2010) wrote a study profiling computer, internet, and mobile device usage around the world. He shared that many technological advances are making it easier for people to connect, create and share content, and conduct business, which made the internet a digital equalizer as growing trends of participation were seen in developed, emerging, and developing countries. Zhao also went further to demonstrate that due to the efficiency and low-cost solutions granted by technology, users all over the world were being empowered to learn and develop skills online and that occupations tied to rapid technology changes carried better compensation across the board. For these reasons, business educators had to teach their students effective use of computers, IT, and the internet, recommending strategies like international education cooperation, student exchanges and online learning through Massive Online Open Classrooms (MOOCs), to mention a few.

In accordance with the call by the NBEA that business education subjects needed to incorporate international business topics, Gruber (2010) wrote a chapter in the NBEA Yearbook advocating for the inclusion of international content in financial literacy and accounting. In it, he demonstrated how financial literacy efforts by different US states predominantly focused on the personal finance dimensions, neglecting other topics of importance that a financially literate student of the 21st century needed to know. Among these topics, Gruber (2010) included: foreign currency conversion and effects of their fluctuations, as well as currency demand and supply

issues. Regarding international accounting, Gruber saw it important that for students who will operate in the increasingly interconnected world to be conversant with issues such the convergence of US Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAPs) and the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), the differences between financial statements as determined by these two and terminology differences between them. Gruber further shared resources in the form of websites and materials that business educators could refer to while incorporating international dimensions of financial literacy and accounting.

International Experience and Globally Competent Teaching

Studies have shown connections between international exposure and experience to cross-cultural experience and global competence. The Longview Foundation (2008) advocated for various forms of access to enriching international experiences for preparation of globally competent teachers. These included offering international experiences at home, abroad and online. At home, they recommended encouraging prospective teachers to engage with people from different countries, either as members of faculty, international students and other members of university communities from diverse cultures. Regarding study abroad, the Longview Foundation recommended international educational visits to different places where students can have meaningful cultural immersion. They demonstrated that while short-term study abroad may not be enough for meaningful cultural exchange, it laid a foundation for commitment to cross-cultural exploration and continued immersion upon return to the home country. Using the internet to create rich cross-cultural experiences was also discussed which included forming virtual partnerships with international peers where student teachers can learn cooperatively with others in different countries using various technology resources.

In their research to explore ways that engineering students could effectively acquire international experience while still in college and the efficiency of different ways that global competence could be developed, Streiner and Besterfield-Sacre (2019) surveyed 301 engineering students from 14 US institutions regarding their international experiences and global perspectives development. They grouped different ways that students could develop international experience into personal tourism, including trips abroad visiting friends or vacationing; second language courses; coursework that had a global focus; study abroad, including student exchange programs; work or project with international collaboration and finally; student organizations with international engagement.

Using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) techniques and Data Envelopment Analysis they found that the most effective ways of developing global competence from international experience were international internships, co-ops, and technical research. However, they also found that these were the least explored or available means for students while still in college. Moreover, significant increases in global competence were seen after participation in international experiences or by stacking various forms of cross-cultural experiences available to students.

Kerkhoff et al. (2019) undertook a quantitative case study of K-12 Indiana public school teachers to explore the ways in which they regarded their instructional practices to promote students' global readiness, using the Teaching for Global Readiness Scale. The influence of travel abroad and teaching experience on the likelihood of teaching in ways that promoted global readiness was also investigated. The researchers analyzed data from 136 survey responses that included teacher characteristics such as race, grade level and subjects taught, as well as responses on the Likert-type sub-scales of situated practice, integrated global learning, critical literacy

instruction, transactional experiences, and global competence. Overall, teachers scored highly on the sub-scale of situated practice, which had to do with valuing diversity, negating stereotypes, and providing an environment where students felt welcomed. Lower results were reported on the sub-scales of critical literacy instruction and transactional experiences, while global learning integration had the lowest score. Interestingly, “neither years of teaching nor travel abroad appeared to be related to teaching for global readiness” (Kerkhoff et al., 2019, p. 21).

While studies have shown varied results regarding whether travel abroad influences global competence integration among teachers, there has been consistent evidence that ties international experience, in its numerous forms, with cross-cultural skills and openness to global competence integration. In their study to investigate non-international travel ways in which teachers accumulate experiences that fuel global competence, Parkhouse et al. (2016) shared that traditionally, overseas teaching experience and teacher education coursework have been credited with helping teachers develop global awareness, which they could in turn use in their instruction. They demonstrated that teachers to whom travel abroad or internationally focused coursework were not available, it was important to conduct research to learn other ways in which they are exposed to cross-cultural encounters which contribute to their international experience.

Through a qualitative case study relying on the mediated action theory and transformative learning theory, Parkhouse et al. identified 10 teachers who were committed to and demonstrated global competence and interviewed them regarding the experiences that led them to develop globally focused teaching practice. The results of observing and recording the reflections of these teachers revealed interesting patterns of international exposure that did not involve international travel, but propelled teachers to espouse globally competent teaching for the benefit of their students. Among the ways Parkhouse et al. (2016) found that stimulated globally focused

teaching among teachers were: working in environments that promoted international education, such as schools offering the International Baccalaureate (IB), which compelled teachers to expand their teaching to include global perspectives; serving students from diverse cultural backgrounds and having a need to teach in ways that piqued their interests and affirmed their backgrounds and experiences; as well as, working with colleagues from different cultural contexts and a willingness to learn from them.

Challenges to Integrating Global Competence

As crucial as global competence integration is, there are myriad challenges that teachers face in order to integrate it. Woo (2019) carried out a qualitative research study to investigate how Virginia Business and Information Technology (BIT) and Marketing Education (MKED) teachers integrated global competencies in their curriculum, and more specifically to this study, the challenges they identified to the integration of global competence in these courses. Woo followed a sample of 11 BIT and MKED teachers, conducting interviews and learning how they infused global content in the business education related courses. Regarding challenges, Woo (2019) found that teachers faced barriers to integration on two levels, which they grouped as internal barriers, emanating from teachers' characteristics, and external barriers—those extrinsic to the teacher. Among internal barriers, Woo found that teachers held negative views towards global competence integration and had inadequate content knowledge. Some of the statements that were shared regarding sentiments of teachers included coded phrases like “too diverse topics; do not know how to deal with the differences, and personality” (p. 87). Additionally, within the external barriers, Woo found that teachers felt their students had no interest in the content, and that there were other competencies needing urgent attention. As Woo reported it,

teachers felt that challenges outside their control were “mismatch between the context and students’ interests, and priority of state required competencies” (p. 109).

Similarly, Kerkhoff and Cloud (2020) carried out a mixed-methods study in which they examined teachers’ perceptions and self-reported practices regarding globally competent teaching. Participants were comprised of teachers in a graduate level course that was focused on global learning and developing globally focused instruction among the in-service teachers. Findings of this study indicated that teachers saw value in globally focused education, however, they had challenges in implementing it. Some of the challenges that Kerkhoff and Cloud shared that teachers expressed regarding integrating global learning were that teachers had to navigate the conflicting educational ideologies since they felt that concepts like culturally relevant pedagogy implied focusing on students’ local environments, leaving no space for teaching about other countries or cultures. Further, teachers felt that they did not have the time, given myriad demands and end of course exams they had to prepare their students for. Finally, Kerkhoff and Cloud shared that teachers expressed a need for guidance regarding how to integrate global learning since majority of them were already convinced of its importance. These findings were consistent with those of Kerkhoff et al. (2019) study referenced earlier that showed low scores on self-reported integration of global learning, where the reasons suggested were that lack of resources on global competence and that due to inadequate experience on internationalizing curricula, teachers may view global competence integration as an addition to an already heavy load in this age of standards-based instruction.

Summary

The review of literature situated global competence as a crucial 21st century skill that all, especially in education, need to care about. A case was made for global competence as an interdisciplinary theme that needed to be integrated across all subject areas to ensure that students are prepared to compete, collaborate, and communicate with others from different cultures and countries. CTE was identified as one of the key disciplines that needs to urgently integrate global competence in the curriculum due to its nature and workforce preparation focus. Business education was also discussed as an area where global competence was relevant, with the NBEA Standards for International Business having been identified as a paramount tool that can be used to ensure the integration of global competence in business education.

The literature further drew comparisons between the NBEA Standards for International Business and the most prominent definitions and frameworks for global competence, making a case for the NBEA Standards for International Business integration in other business education subject areas. Additionally, ways of integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business were discussed from the literature, followed by consideration of international experience and its influence, or lack thereof, for global competence. Finally, the challenges emanating from multiple sources for integrating global competence were discussed.

Having studied and explored numerous sources in the literature regarding integration of global competence in multiple subjects, no studies were found that focused on the NBEA Standards for International Business as a tool for measuring global competence integration, and surveyed business educators on their current use and perceptions of competence. For this reason, this study will address this gap in literature, and present the findings towards building a corpus of

knowledge for an advancement of globally competent teaching for our increasingly diverse and interconnected world.

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to investigate business educators' integration of global competence in business education as determined by their perceptions of competence to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business, and the extent to which they integrated these standards in their subject areas. Teacher characteristics, like subject area taught and international experience were also considered to explore factors that may influence global competence integration. Finally, the study explored some of the challenges to the integration of global competence by business educators.

Permission to conduct this study was granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Auburn University (Appendix A). Researchers at Auburn University, where this study was conducted, must obtain permission from the IRB to use responses from human subjects. Protocol, a request for exempt status, an information letter (Appendix B), and a copy of the survey document (Appendix C) were sent to the IRB for approval prior to the survey being sent to participants. The Auburn University IRB approved the study in March 2023. Permission was also granted by the participants in the form of a completed survey.

Research Design

The study employed a cross-sectional survey research design, collecting data with the use of a survey instrument that was sent to business educators who are members of the NBEA. For analysis, the study followed the quantitative descriptive and inferential research approaches. Creswell (2015) described quantitative research approaches to be those characterized by “collecting numeric data from a large number of people using instruments with preset questions and responses, analyzing trends, comparing groups, or relating variables using statistical analysis

and interpreting results by comparing them with prior predictions and past research...” (p. 13). In analyzing data, descriptive statistics are concerned with explaining specific attributes of the data in consideration, while inferential statistics would go further by trying to make predictions and generalizations about population parameters based on sample statistics (Johnson, 2014).

A survey is “a systematic method of gathering information from a sample of entities for the purposes of constructing quantitative descriptors of the attributes of the larger population of which the entities are members” (Groves, 2009, p. 2). Survey research was selected for the current study due to the numerous benefits and options available from survey data. According to Cohen et al. (2018) surveys can allow researchers meaningful ways to observe patterns in data from a given sample in exploratory research, test hypotheses about relations between variables of interest in confirmatory research, and further offer researchers descriptive and analytical data. Survey data can be collected in multiple ways including telephone and mail; however, web-based survey administration has risen in popularity in recent years due to the ubiquity of technology via computers and handheld devices (Groves et al., 2009). The survey was designed and administered using Qualtrics software through which a link was sent by email to business educators who are members of the NBEA.

Population

The population for the study was all business educators who are members of the NBEA, a national organization with membership across the United States. According to its website, as of May 2023, the NBEA had 1863 active members spread across the 50 states and US territories. Recruitment emails were sent to all members and at the end of data collection a total of 169 surveys were returned ($N = 169$), resulting in a 9% response rate. This study sought to

collect data from all members of the organization and as a result, no sampling techniques were used as the entire membership was under consideration.

Instrumentation

Data were collected through a researcher-designed survey entitled Global Competence Integration Survey (GCIS). The survey was comprised of three sections: Section 1: teacher demographic characteristics such as gender, age, years of teaching experience, type of school and business education subjects taught. Section 2 was comprised of Likert type scales two columns: A and B. On the Likert-type scales, participants were asked to decide on the rating of the standards based on the perceptions of their competency and how often they integrate the standards. The standards in section 2 were grouped according to the five classifications being: (a) Business Ownership and Opportunity, (b) Communication Strategies, (c) International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management, and Trade, (d) Global Business Environment, (e) International Economic Policy. Column A was anchored on the question: “How competent are you to integrate the standards?” The responses within the column range from (1) No Competence, (2) Basic Competence, (3) Moderate Competence, (4) Expert Competence. Column B was based on the question: “How frequently do you integrate these standards?” Here the responses can be rated from (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Very Often, (5) Always.

Section 3 was comprised of questions on international experience and challenges educators identified to integration of the standards. The first question in this section was a multiple-choice question asking “which of these internationally focused experiences have you had? Select all that apply”. Response options were personal international travel, study abroad, second language course(s), globally focused coursework, work involving international collaboration, living abroad (e.g., Military expatriate, foreign born), and none of the above.

Respondents were also given a chance to share any other instances of international experience in the space below the options. The last question gave respondents an opportunity to share challenges they encountered for implementing NBEA standards for International Business. The question was phrased as: “my main challenge for integrating the NBEA Standards for international business in my classes are... select all that apply”. The responses from which participants chose were: my state prioritizes other competencies; my students lack interest in these topics; I do not find these necessary for my students to learn; I do not have adequate content knowledge to integrate these; International Business standards are not related to the courses I teach; none of the above. Participants were also encouraged to elaborate on any other challenges relating to NBEA Standards for International Business integration in the field below the options.

Validity and Reliability

The basis for the items in the survey was the International Business Standards in the NBEA Standards for Business Education (2020). The items were derived directly from the NBEA Standards for Business Education to ensure content validity. A panel of university experts was also used to evaluate face validity of the items in the survey. Since the standards were derived directly from the NBEA publication, validation of the competency list will not be necessary.

A panel of experts comprised of Auburn University faculty and past graduate students in the Business/Marketing Education program were consulted to determine reliability and usability of the survey. The panel of experts was asked to review the survey instrument for clarity of directions, concepts, and definitions. The suggestions and input of the panel of experts were considered for inclusion in the final instrument. Cronbach’s Alpha was used in this study to

determine the internal consistency of the survey items. Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine reliability coefficients for the following scales in the survey: business educators' perceived competence to integrate business ownership and opportunity, communication strategies, international law, marketing management and trade, global business environment and international economic policy. The internal consistency coefficients for the extent of integration on the same scales were also calculated. According to Johnson (2014) as a general practice, an acceptable alpha coefficient should be .70 or above to signify the internal consistency of each dimension in a multidimensional test, with 1 indicating perfect reliability. The reliability coefficients showed that there was high internal consistency within the scales, as shown below.

Table 2

Reliability of Scales

Item	<i>N</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>
Perceived Competence		
Business Ownership and Opportunity	6	.916
Communication Strategies	6	.842
International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade	6	.895
Global Business Environment	6	.870
International Economic Policy	6	.942
Extent of Integration		
Business Ownership and Opportunity	6	.903
Communication Strategies	6	.863
International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade	6	.908
Global Business Environment	6	.887
International Economic Policy	6	.950

Data Collection

Permission was requested from the NBEA executive director for the survey to be distributed to all members of the association. Members received an email containing a request to complete the survey, an information letter describing the purpose of the survey and procedures to be followed, and a Qualtrics link to complete the survey. In addition, a QR code with a link to the survey was distributed at the 2023 NBEA Convention in Kansas City, MO, in an effort to increase participation rate. Follow-up emails were sent to remind potential participants who had not done so to fill out the survey. A total of 1863 recruitment emails were sent to members of the NBEA and at the conclusion of the data collection process, 169 surveys were returned, resulting in a 9% response rate.

Data Analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 28.0. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used to analyze, organize, and describe the data. Descriptive statistical analysis was performed through calculations for the mean, standard deviation, and frequency (Cohen et al., 2007). Specifically, research questions one, two and five were analyzed using descriptive statistics to explore the data and how it is distributed.

Research question three investigated the relationship between business educators' perceived competence and the extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business, in which both the independent and dependent variables were continuous. As a result, the Pearson product-moment correlation was used to analyze this question. Cohen et al. (2007)

explained that correlational studies normally deal with investigating relations between continuous variables by ascertaining the direction, and magnitude of the association between those variables under consideration. “Pearson’s product moment coefficient of correlation, one of the best-known measures of association, is a statistical value ranging from -1.0 to +1.0 and expresses this relationship in a quantitative form” (Cohen et al. 2007, p. 530).

Research question four was analyzed using One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Research question four investigated whether there are differences in business educators’ extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business based on (a) the business education area taught and (b) international experience. Two one-way ANOVA tests were conducted to determine if there was a difference in means of the extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business for educators of (a) different business education subject areas; and (b) with or without international experience. According to Cohen et al. (2007), ANOVA tests are suitable for analysis in situations where means of a categorical independent variable with multiple levels can be compared to those of a continuous outcome variable. The alpha level was set at $\alpha = .05$, as is usually the practice in social sciences research.

Research Question Matrix

Table 3

Research Question Matrix on Survey Questions and Statistical Analyses used

Research Question	Survey Question & Associated Variable	Statistical Test(s)
1. What is the perceived competence of business educators to integrate the NBEA standards on International Business?	<i>Survey Question 8a – 12a</i> <u>Variable:</u> Perception of Competence to integrate NBEA Standards for International Business	Descriptive Statistics: Mean, Standard Deviation, Frequency.
2. To what extent do business educators integrate the NBEA standards on International Business?	<i>Survey Question 8b – 12b</i> <u>Variable:</u> Extent of Integration of NBEA standards for International Business	Descriptive Statistics: Mean, Standard Deviation, Frequency
3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between business educators' perceptions of competence to integrate the NBEA standards on International Business and the extent of integration of these standards?	<i>Survey Questions (8a -12a) *(8b – 12b)</i> <u>Variables:</u> Perception of competence (IV) Extent of Integration (DV)	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation
4. Are there differences in the extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business based on (A) Business Area Taught and (B) Business Educators' International Experience?	<i>Survey Questions (6 & 13) * (8 – 12)</i> <u>Variables:</u> Extent of Integration (DV) International Experience (IV) Business Education Area(s) taught (IV)	One -Way ANOVA - Extent of Integration*International Experience - Extent of Integration*Area(s) taught
5. What are the challenges that business educators encounter to integrate the NBEA standards for International Business?	<i>Survey Question 14</i> <u>Variables:</u> Challenges to integration	Descriptive Statistics: Means, Standard Deviation, Frequency

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction and Restatement of the Problem

This study was designed to investigate business educators' perceptions of their competency to integrate the NBEA standards on International Business, the extent to which they do integrate the standards in their subject areas, and possible predictors and challenges to the integration of these standards. The review of literature situated global competence as a necessity for all students, especially those in CTE and business education, and provided evidence linking global competence to the NBEA Standards for International Business. In this chapter, data analysis and results will be presented on data collected from the business educators who were members of the NBEA using the researcher-designed survey entitled Global Competence Integration Survey (GCIS).

Descriptive Data Analysis and Results

Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were conducted in SPSS to summarize, organize, and describe the data. Descriptive statistics were used to answer research questions one, two and five, as well as to explore the demographic characteristics of the business educators who responded to the survey. Out of almost 1863 emails sent to members on the NBEA database, 169 ($N = 169$) responded to the survey, resulting in a 9% response rate. Among the returned surveys, 63 had completed less than 50% of the survey, which were deleted as they could not be used for analysis due to the number of missing values. Of the remaining 106, a few still had some missing values and as a result, the value of N will vary for different questions.

Demographic Characteristics

Among the participants were 82 females (78.8%) and 20 males (19.2%). The highest reported age range was between the ages of 48-57 (30.2%), with a master's degree being the

most frequently reported highest qualification (54.8%). Additionally, the highest number of the respondents had between 1-10 years of experience (37.3%), with the largest number reporting they worked in a rural school (40.4%), and in the high school setting (63.5%). The table below summarizes the key demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 4

Demographic Data of Participants

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Age		
28-37	18	18.75
38-47	23	23.96
48-57	29	30.21
58-67	22	22.92
68-77	4	4.17
Gender		
Male	20	19.2
Female	82	78.8
Teaching experience		
1-10	38	37.25
11-20	32	31.37
21-30	21	20.59
31-40	4	3.92
41-50	6	5.88
51-60	1	0.98

Table 4 (Continued).

Item	<i>n</i>	%
Level of education		
Associates	1	1
Bachelors	14	13.5
Masters	57	54.8
Specialist	14	13.5
Doctorate	16	15.4
Location of school		
Urban	22	21.2
Suburban	38	36.5
Rural	42	40.4
School level		
Middle	10	9.6
High school	66	63.5
Post-secondary	36	34.6

Research Questions

Research Question 1

What is the perceived competence of business educators to integrate the NBEA standards for International Business? Survey questions 8a to 12a addressed this question with 30 items distributed across five sub-scales with six items each, where business educators had to rate how competent they felt to integrate NBEA Standards on International Business. The options on

the Likert-type sub-scales were (1) No Competence, (2) Basic Competence, (3) Moderate Competence (4) Expert Competence. Overall, business educators rated themselves as basic to moderately competent as shown by the mean competence level which fell between the basic and moderate competence ratings ($M = 2.46$, $SD = .574$). The tables below show the Means (M) and Standards Deviations (SD) of items measuring business educators' perceptions of competence on the five sub-scales of (a) Business Ownership and Opportunity, (b) Communication Strategies, (c) International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade, (d) Global Business Environment, and (e) International Economic Policy.

Table 5

Business Ownership and Opportunity Competence Subscale.

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
International Business Ownership	102	2.60	.812
International Business Opportunity	101	2.39	.800
International Business Planning	101	2.31	.880
International Business Potential Analysis	101	2.23	.847
Evaluation of Foreign Direct Investment	101	1.97	.888
International Career Planning	100	2.27	.827

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = No Competence, 2 = Basic Competence, 3 = Moderate Competence, 4 = Expert Competence. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .916$)

Table 6*Communication Strategies Competence Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Respect for Cultures and Languages	100	2.95	.672
Conversation Modification for ESL speakers	101	2.59	.666
Correct Ineffective Global Communication	101	2.34	.816
Cultural Impact on Negotiation	100	2.73	.802
Global Business Technology Tools	100	2.60	.725
Write Effective Global Communication	101	2.60	.776

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = No Competence, 2 = Basic Competence, 3 = Moderate Competence, 4 = Expert Competence. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .842$)

Table 7*International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade Competence Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Define import, export, and trade	100	3.06	.862
International Trade Agreements	100	2.21	.868
Global Labor Pool Analysis	99	2.51	.774
International Marketing Mix	100	2.62	.826
Currency Exchange calculation	100	2.73	.973
Minimizing International Financial Risk	101	2.17	.837

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = No Competence, 2 = Basic Competence, 3 = Moderate Competence, 4 = Expert Competence. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .895$)

Table 8*Global Business Environment Competence Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Importance of Intercultural Competence	101	2.42	.725
Political Impacts on Global Business	101	2.50	.770
Legal Factors influence on global Business	101	2.34	.803
Distinguish Free Market vs Government Controlled economies	101	2.76	.850
Define Multiculturalism and stereotypes	101	2.80	.813
Global Ethics and Social Responsibility	101	2.45	.818

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = No Competence, 2 = Basic Competence, 3 = Moderate Competence, 4 = Expert Competence. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .870$)

Table 9*International Economic Policy Competence Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Impact of International Business on local, state, and other economies	101	2.47	.715
Trade Barriers and incentives impact	101	2.50	.730
Interpret Impact of Emerging Markets	101	2.26	.844
Analyze political and economic system relationship	100	2.43	.807
Trade Limits and local market protection	101	2.21	.887
Global politics impact on international business	100	2.23	.763

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = No Competence, 2 = Basic Competence, 3 = Moderate Competence, 4 = Expert Competence. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .942$)

Research Question 2

To what extent do business educators integrate the NBEA standards for International Business? This question was addressed by survey questions 8b to 12b with 30 items distributed across five sub-scales with six items each, where business educators had to rate how frequently they implemented the item list derived from the NBEA Standards on International Business. The options on the Likert-type sub-scales were (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Very Often, 5 Always. Overall, results showed that business educators integrated the standards rarely, on average ($M = 2.38$, $SD = .769$). The tables below show the Means (M) and Standards Deviations (SD) of business educators' extent of integration on the five sub-scales of (a) Business Ownership and Opportunity, (b) Communication Strategies, (c) International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade, (d) Global Business Environment, and (e) International Economic Policy.

Table 10*Business Ownership and Opportunity Integration Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
International Business Ownership	95	2.51	1.166
International Business Opportunity	94	2.30	.993
International Business Planning	91	2.10	1.076
International Business Potential Analysis	93	2.14	1.059
Foreign Direct Investment Evaluation	93	1.83	.940
International Career Planning	91	2.10	1.065

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Very Often, 5 = Always. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .903$)

Table 11*Communication Strategies Integration Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Respect for Culture and Languages	94	3.29	1.094
Conversation Modification for ESL	95	2.73	1.026
Correct Ineffective Global Communication	95	2.19	1.094
Cultural Impact on Negotiation	94	2.68	1.128
Global Business Technology Tools	94	2.53	1.114
Produce effective Global Communication	95	2.53	1.156

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Very Often, 5 = Always. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .863$)

Table 12*International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade Integration Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Define import, export, and trade	92	2.97	1.227
International trade agreements	93	2.10	.968
Global labor pool Analysis	94	2.27	.930
International Marketing Mix	93	2.46	1.089
Currency Exchange Calculation	95	2.41	1.162
Global Financial Risk	95	1.94	.909

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Very Often, 5 = Always. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .908$)

Table 13*Global Business Environment Integration Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Intercultural Competence	95	2.33	1.015
Political Impacts on global business	95	2.44	1.089
Legal factors influence on global business	95	2.17	.907
Distinguish free market vs government-controlled economies	95	2.64	1.220
Define Multiculturalism and stereotypes	94	2.76	1.152
Global Ethics and Social Responsibility	93	2.38	1.042

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Very Often, 5 = Always. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .887$)

Table 14*International Economic Policy Integration Subscale*

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Global Business impact on local, state economies	95	2.42	1.017
Impact of Trade Barriers and incentives	95	2.43	1.108
Interpret Impacts of Emerging Markets	95	2.19	1.094
Political and Economic system relationship	95	2.35	1.156
Trade Limits and local market protections	94	2.10	1.006
Global Politics impact on international business	95	2.22	1.074

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Very Often, 5 = Always. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = .950$)

Research Question 3

Is there a statistically significant relationship between business educators' perceptions of competence to integrate the NBEA standards for International Business and the extent of integration of these standards? This question was addressed by survey questions 8 to 12. There was a total of 60 items distributed across 10 sub-scales with six items each, where business educators had to rate how competent they felt to integrate (Column A) and how frequently they implemented the item list derived from the NBEA Standards on International Business in Column B. The options in Column A on the Likert-type sub-scales were: (1) No Competence, (2) Basic Competence, (3) Moderate Competence (4) Expert Competence. In Column B, the options participants chose from were: (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Very Often, (5) Always. The five sub-scales were (a) Business Ownership and Opportunity, (b) Communication Strategies, (c) International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade, (d) Global Business Environment, and (e) International Economic Policy.

Overall, the Pearson Product-Moment correlation showed a high positive correlation between perceived competence to integrate the NBEA Standards on International Business and the extent integration of the standards [$r(96) = .730, p > .01$]. Pearson Product-Moment correlations were also computed on each subscale, starting with the Business Ownership Subscale which revealed statistically significant positive correlations between the perception of competence to integrate the standards and the extent of integration. Perceived competence on the standard on international business potential analysis showed the highest influence on the extent of integration, $r(91) = .695, p > .01$. The effect size ($r^2 = .48$) indicated that the perception of competence accounted for 48% of the variability in the extent of integration of this standard. The

table below shows the correlation coefficients, with perception of competence in the row and extent of integration numerically in columns.

Table 15

Correlations: Business Ownership Subscale

Variable	<i>n</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. International Business Ownership	95	.588**					
2. International Business Opportunity	94		.598**				
3. International Business Planning	91			.651**			
4. International Business Potential Analysis	93				.695**		
5. Foreign Direct Investment Evaluation	93					.684**	
6. International Career Planning	91						.639**

Note: Row numbers denote competence while column numbers denote the extent of integration.

** . Correlation is significant at .01 level

On the Communication Strategies subscale, Pearson Product-Moment correlations were computed which also revealed statistically significant positive correlations between the perception of competence to integrate the standards and the extent of integration. Perceived competence on the standard on formulating corrective action for ineffective international business communication showed the highest influence on the extent of integration, $r(93) = .727$, $p > .01$. The fairly large effect size ($r^2 = .53$) indicated that the perception of competence accounted for 53% of the variability in the extent of integration of this standard. The table below shows the correlation coefficients, with perception of competence in the row and extent of integration numerically in columns on the Communication Strategies subscale.

Table 16*Correlations: Communication Strategies Subscale*

Variable	<i>n</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Respect for Culture and Languages	94	.517**					
2. Conversation Modification for ESL Speakers	95		.549**				
3. Correct Ineffective Global Communication	95			.727**			
4. Cultural Impact on Negotiation	94				.597**		
5. Global Business Technology Tools	94					.612**	
6. Produce effective Global Communication	95						.658**

Note: Row numbers denote competence while column numbers denote the extent of integration.

** . Correlation is significant at .01 level

Pearson Product-Moment correlations were further calculated for the International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade subscale, which also revealed statistically significant positive correlations between the perception of competence to integrate the standards and the extent of integration. Perceived competence on the standard on comparing between unilateral, bilateral and multilateral trade agreements showed the highest influence on the extent of integration, $r(91) = .754, p > .01$. The large effect size ($r^2 = .57$) indicated that the perception of competence accounted for 57% of the variability in the extent of integration of this standard. The table below shows the correlation coefficients, with perception of competence in the row and extent of integration numerically in columns on the International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade subscale.

Table 17*Correlations: International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade Subscale*

Variable	<i>n</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Define import, export, and trade	92	.715**					
2. Compare International trade agreements	93		.754**				
3. Global labor pool Analysis	93			.636**			
4. International Marketing Mix	93				.685**		
5. Currency Exchange Calculation	94					.728**	
6. Minimizing Global Financial Risk	95						.753**

Note: Row numbers denote competence while column numbers denote the extent of integration.

** . Correlation is significant at .01 level

Additionally, Pearson Product-Moment correlations were computed for the Global Business Environment subscale, which also revealed statistically significant positive correlations between the perception of competence to integrate the standards and the extent of integration. Perceived competence on the standard on distinguishing between the free-market and the government-controlled economies showed the highest influence on the extent of integration, $r(93) = .737, p > .01$. The large effect size ($r^2 = .54$) indicated that the perception of competence accounted for 54% of the variability in the extent of integration of this standard. The table below shows the correlation coefficients, with perception of competence in the row and extent of integration numerically in columns on the Global Business Environment subscale.

Table 18*Correlations: Global Business Environment Subscale*

Variable	<i>n</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Define Intercultural Competence	95	.626**					
2. Evaluation of Political Impacts on global business	95		.603**				
3. Evaluation of how legal factors influence global business	95			.567**			
4. Distinguish between free market vs government-controlled economies	95				.737**		
5. Define Multiculturalism and stereotypes	94					.651**	
6. Global Ethics and Social Responsibility	93						.721**

Note: Row numbers denote competence while column numbers denote the extent of integration.

** . Correlation is significant at .01 level

The final Pearson Product-Moment correlations were computed for the International Economic Policy subscale, which also revealed statistically significant positive correlations between the perception of competence to integrate the standards and the extent of integration. Perceived competence on the standard on describing formal practices governments can use to limit international companies from conducting business showed the highest influence on the extent of integration, $r(92) = .790, p > .01$. The large effect size ($r^2 = .62$) indicated that the perception of competence accounted for 62% of the variability in the extent of integration of this standard. The table below shows the correlation coefficients, with perception of competence in the row and extent of integration numerically in columns on the Global Business Environment subscale.

Table 19*Correlations: International Economic Policy Subscale*

Variable	<i>n</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Global Business impact on local, state economies	95	.714**					
2. Impact of Trade Barriers and incentives	95		.600**				
3. Interpret Impacts of Emerging Markets	95			.722**			
4. Political and Economic system relationship	95				.688**		
5. Trade Limits and local market protections	94					.790**	
6. Global Politics impact on international business	95						.721**

Note: Row numbers denote competence while column numbers denote the extent of integration.

** . Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Research question 4

Are there differences in the extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business based on the business education area taught and business educators' international experience? The fourth research question was analyzed using a One-Way ANOVA, with an alpha level $\alpha = .05$ to determine if there were differences between the reported levels of integration of the standards depending on participants' business education subject area and their international experience. The subject areas were selected in survey question 6, where participants had to choose between (1) Accounting, (2) Business Law, (3) Career Development, (4) Communication, (5) Economics/Personal Finance, (6) Entrepreneurship, (7) Management, (8) Marketing, (9) Information Technology. The International Experience variable was derived from

survey question 13, where participants had to select from different internationally focused experiences. The response options were: (a) Personal international travel, (b) study abroad, (c) Second language course, (d) Globally focused coursework, (e) Work involving international collaboration, (f) Living abroad (e.g., military, expatriate, foreign born), and (g) None of the above. The extent of integration was addressed by survey questions 8b to 12b with 30 items distributed across five sub-scales with six items each, where business educators had to rate how frequently they implemented the item list derived from the NBEA Standards on International Business. The options on the Likert-type sub-scales were (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Very Often, 5 Always. Participants rating of their extent of integration was divided into the five sub-scales of (a) Business Ownership and Opportunity, (b) Communication Strategies, (c) International Law, Finance, Marketing, Management and Trade, (d) Global Business Environment, and (e) International Economic Policy.

Extent of Integration Overall – Subject Area Taught.

A One-Way ANOVA was computed for the overall extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business as the dependent variable and the business education subject area taught as the independent variable. No statistically significant differences were found in the overall extent of integration based on participants' subject area $F(8, 85) = 1.583, p = .142$. Below are Means (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) of the extent of integration based on different subject areas.

Table 20

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Extent of Integration based on Business Education Subject Areas taught.

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Accounting	11	2.42	.692
Business Law	6	2.74	.408
Career Development	37	2.54	.732
Communication	3	2.43	.934
Economics/Personal	2	2.59	.889
Finance			
Entrepreneurship	2	2.64	1.19
Management	5	2.41	.573
Marketing	6	2.50	.985
Information	22	1.89	.832
Technology			

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Very Often, 5 = Always

Extent of Integration Overall – International Experience.

A One-Way ANOVA was computed for the overall extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business as the dependent variable, based on participants' international experience as the independent variable. No statistically significant differences were found in the overall extent of integration based on participants' international experience $F(6, 89) = 1.317, p = .258$. Below are Means (*M*) and Standard Deviations (*SD*) of the extent of integration based on international experience.

Table 21

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Extent of Integration based on International Travel.

Item	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Personal International Travel	13	2.29	.750
Second Language Course	21	2.34	.796
Globally Focused Coursework	18	2.49	.679
Study Abroad	3	2.48	.193
Work with global collaboration	13	2.85	.976
Living Abroad	5	2.45	.966
None of the Above	23	2.15	.601

Note: Likert-type scale used: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Very Often, 5 = Always

Research Question 5

What are some of the challenges that business educators encounter to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business? This research question was addressed by survey question 14, where participants were asked to choose the options that best described the challenges to integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business. The response choices were: (a) My state prioritizes other competencies, (b) My students lack interest in these topics, (c) I do not find these necessary for my students to learn, (d) I do not have adequate content knowledge to

integrate these, (e) International Business Standards are not related to what I teach, (f) None of the above. The other part of the question gave participants a chance to elaborate, in an open-ended manner, on their perceived challenges to integrate the standards with a prompt asking to “Please share any other challenges you have for integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business”.

The vast majority of teachers felt that the NBEA Standards for International Business were not related to the courses they taught 42% ($n = 44$). Further, lack of student interest was also seen as a prominent challenge 17.3% ($n = 18$), followed by participants’ perceived lack of content knowledge 13.5% ($n = 14$) and state’s prioritization of other skills and competencies 8.7% ($n = 9$). Very few participants perceived the standards as unnecessary for their students to learn 4.8% ($n = 5$). Among participants, 10% felt that they did not have any of the challenges from the provided options.

Other challenges were shared in the open-ended and last question of the survey. Only a few participants responded to the open-ended question ($n = 21$). Multiple challenges were shared that ranged from difficulty coordinating with faculty in other schools and countries, time constraints, as well as challenges relating to lack of textbooks and other necessary resources for students. The table below summarizes major themes emanating from the responses and the frequency with which they emerged in the responses.

Table 22*Other Challenges to the Integration of NBEA Standards for International Business (n =21)*

Challenge to integration	Example quote	Frequency, <i>n</i> (%)
Time Constraints	“Covering some of the topics in depth is hard to do because of the courses I teach. It is not expected to cover some of the topics. It is also a short window to teach many of the items mentioned but with limited number of days.”	3 (14.2)
Limited Depth of Coverage	“We are a very small school and are limited in the classes we can teach. I rotate classes and incorporate International Business into Personal Finance but have yet to be able to teach an Economics class. (Btw...War Eagle!!!)”	2 (9.5)
Expectations of Standards	“My State expects me to include local, state, and national standards in all my courses”	1 (4.7)
Limited Focus on International Business	“We don't have international business, but I cover small components of it in some classes”	2 (9.5)
Limited Resources	“Lack of supplies/textbook's that is supports my student reading level and demographics”	1 (4.7)
Awareness vs. Practice	“I'm at the two-year postsecondary level, basic exploration and career-focused school-to-work focus. International is discussed to an awareness level, but not practice.”	1 (4.7)
Engaging Activities	“Preparing engaging activities that will help students comprehend the elements of the standards.”	1 (4.7)

Table 22 (Continued)

Challenge to integration	Example quote	Frequency n (%)
Overlap with Other Subjects	“The standards are too many and there’s plenty of overlap with other subjects.”	1 (4.7)
Advanced Content	“Some of the content is very advanced for my students and there is only so much you can integrate”	2 (9.5)
Difficulty of Integration	“I already teach a lot of standards. integrating these would have to be additional work.”	5 (23.8)
Unsuitable for Student Level	“International content can be too abstract and its challenging to get my students' attention”	1 (4.7)
Difficulty of Teaching Grade Levels	“The standards are too advanced for the grade levels I teach”	1 (4.7)

Summary

The fourth chapter provided statistical analyses of the data concerning business educators' perceived competence to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business, the extent of integration of the standards and its association with perceived competence, as well as analysis on whether subject area taught, and international experience had any effects on the level of integration of the standards. Business educator challenges were also considered and analyzed. Overall, data from the current study revealed that participants felt minimum to moderate competence to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business and reported average levels of integration of the standards. Data also showed that perceived competence was highly associated with the likelihood of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business, that business education subject area and international experience had no statistically significant effects on the extent of integration of the standards, and finally showed that most participants felt that the standards were not related to the courses they taught.

While the analysis provided valuable insights into the key research questions, further interpretation and synthesis is required, which will be covered by the next section being the summary, conclusions, and recommendations chapter. In chapter five, the overall findings of this study will be discussed and interpreted. Further conclusions will be drawn, and final reflections and recommendations made for future studies.

V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The globally interrelated world we live in today requires that business education students are prepared to enter post-secondary education and the workforce ready to collaborate, compete and communicate with peers from all over the world. Global competence is one of the interdisciplinary skills or 21st Century themes (P-21, 2009) that students need in order to be able to thrive in the globally interconnected future. The NBEA Standards on International Business provide discipline relevant guidance on international content and skills business educators can integrate in the different subject areas to ensure that students gain global competence. This research study was conducted against this premise, and used a researcher developed instrument to study business educators' perceptions of competence to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business in their subject areas; the extent of integration of these standards; whether associations existed between perceived competence to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business and the extent of integration of the standards; if there were statistically significant differences in the extent of integration based on business education subject area and business educators international experience; and finally, which challenges business educators faced to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business in their subject areas.

In the previous chapter, data collected from business educators who were members of the NBEA using the Global Competence Integration Survey (GCIS) instrument were presented and analyzed. This chapter includes a discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Summary of Findings

The majority of business educators who responded to the survey were female (78.8%). The highest reported age was 48 to 57 years of age (30.21%), with the highest number of the business educators being in their first 10 years of teaching (37.25%). The most frequently reported highest qualification was a master's degree (54.8%), with the frequently reported school location category being rural (40.4%). Most of the business educators taught in high school (63.5%).

Business educators were asked to rate their perceived competence to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business in their business education subject areas on a four-point Likert-type scale. Overall, business educators rated themselves as basic to moderately competent as evidenced by the mean competence level ($M = 2.46$, $SD = .574$). Further, the standards which they felt mostly competent concerned explaining differences between import, export, and international trade ($M = 3.06$, $SD = .862$), while they felt the least competent on the standard concerning evaluating impacts of foreign direct investments ($M = 1.97$, $SD = .888$).

Business educators were also asked to rate the extent of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business on a five-point Likert-type scale. Results showed that overall, business educators integrated the standards rarely on average ($M = 2.38$, $SD = .769$). A granular look into the standards and reported extent of integration showed that on average, business educators integrated the standard on respect for other languages and cultures higher than all other standards ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.094$), while the standard on evaluating foreign direct investment was once again the least integrated, on average ($M = 1.83$, $SD = .940$).

A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was conducted to check if associations existed between business educators' perceived competence to integrate the NBEA Standards on

International Business and the extent of integration. Results revealed a high correlation between competence and integration overall [$r(96) = .730, p > .01$]. The high linear association between the perception of competence and the extent of integration suggested that business educators who felt more competent to integrate the standards would have higher levels of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business.

A one-way ANOVA was used to investigate if differences existed in business educators reported extent of integration based on the subject areas they taught. Results of the ANOVA showed no statistically significant differences between the extent to which business educators integrated the standards based on the subject they taught [$F(8, 85) = 1.583, p = .142$]. Another ANOVA was performed to see if significant differences existed in the extent to which business educators integrated the standards based on their international experience. Results showed that no statistically significant differences existed within the extent of integration based on teachers' international experience [$F(6, 89) = 1.317, p = .258$].

Business educators were asked to select challenges they faced to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business among five options. The highest number of business educators (42%) selected the option that the NBEA Standards for International Business were unrelated to the subjects they taught. Lack of student interest (17.3%) was also identified as a challenge, followed by educators perceived lack of content knowledge to integrate the standards (13.5%) and states' prioritization of other competencies (8.7%). Interestingly, the least amount of business educators felt that the standards were unimportant for their students to learn (4.8%).

Business educators were given a chance to share what challenges they faced to integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business in an elaborate manner. Multiple themes emerged from educators' responses, even though the response rate had been much lower

on that particular question (21 out of 169). Among the themes identified, the highest number of business educators pointed to difficulty of integration (23.8%) and time constraints (14.2%).

Conclusions

Based on the findings mentioned, several research conclusions can be drawn:

1. **Demographics:** The majority of business educators who participated in the survey were female, the highest number were in their first 10 years of teaching, with the highest reported age group being 48 to 57 years. Most held a master's degree, and the main school location category was rural. Additionally, a significant number of educators taught in high schools.
2. **Perceived Competence:** Business educators rated themselves as basic to moderately competent in integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business. They felt most competent in explaining differences between import, export, and international trade, while their least competence was in evaluating impacts of foreign direct investments.
3. **Integration of Standards:** Overall, business educators reported rarely integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business into their teaching. The standard of respect for other languages and cultures was integrated to a higher extent compared to other standards, while evaluating foreign direct investment had the lowest integration.
4. **Correlation:** There was a strong positive correlation between business educators' perceived competence to integrate the standards and the extent of integration. Those who felt more competent tended to have higher levels of integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business.
5. **Subject Areas and International Experience:** There were no statistically significant differences in the extent of integration based on the subject areas taught by business educators or their international experience.

6. Challenges: The challenges faced by business educators in integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business included perceiving the standards as unrelated to their subjects, lack of student interest, educators' perceived lack of content knowledge, states' prioritization of other competencies, difficulty of integration, and time constraints. These findings were consistent with those found in the literature, such as those identified by Woo (2019), as well as Kerkoff and Cloud (2020) who found that teachers often saw no relation between global competence and the subjects they taught and felt that it was extra work that they were not prepared to do, mostly due to lack of experience and guidance in globally focused teaching.

Limitations

Due to the chosen research design, the study had some limitations. One of the primary limitations was the response rate that the survey garnered. Only 169 members of the NBEA responded to survey resulting in a low (9%) response rate. Additionally, among the respondents 63 completed only the first section, which was the demographics section of the survey. This led to those surveys being discarded as they could not be used for statistical analysis, further reducing the total number of usable responses to 103.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn from the findings, the following recommendations can be made:

1. **Professional Development:** Provide professional development opportunities for business educators to enhance their competence in integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business. Focus on areas where educators reported lower competence, such as evaluating the impacts of foreign direct investments. This can help improve their confidence and ability to effectively integrate the standards. Through groups such as the NBEA Council on International Business, these opportunities can be availed to teachers through webinars, online courses, and workshops.
2. **Curriculum Alignment:** Work towards aligning the NBEA Standards for International Business with the subjects taught by business educators. Address the perception that the standards are unrelated to their subjects by demonstrating practical connections and real-world examples. This alignment can enhance educators' understanding of how the standards apply within their curriculum. As evident in the literature, teachers were inclined to believe that their courses were not related to global competence due to lack of awareness, but enhanced efforts towards alignment revealed that in some cases they would already be implementing some of the concepts
3. **Resource Support:** Offer resources and materials that facilitate the integration of the standards. These resources should be designed to address the challenges identified, such as lack of content knowledge and time constraints. Providing ready-to-use lesson plans, case studies, and multimedia materials can assist educators in incorporating the standards into their teaching without extensive preparation.

4. **Student Engagement:** Develop strategies to increase student interest in international business topics. This can be achieved through interactive and engaging instructional methods, incorporating real-world examples and case studies, and highlighting the relevance and potential career opportunities associated with international business. Engaged students are more likely to value and appreciate the integration of the standards.
5. **Advocacy and Policy Support:** Collaborate with policymakers and educational leaders to emphasize the importance of the NBEA Standards for International Business and advocate for their inclusion in educational priorities. Address the challenge of states prioritizing other competencies by raising awareness about the value and relevance of international business education for students' future success.
6. **Time Management and Integration Strategies:** Provide educators with time management strategies and integration techniques that can help them overcome time constraints and the perceived difficulty of integration. Training on efficient planning, lesson design, and identifying opportunities for cross-curricular integration can support educators in effectively integrating the standards within their existing instructional time.
7. **Research and Collaboration:** A qualitative follow-up study should be conducted to learn more about business educators' perceptions about global competence and ways they are preparing their students for the globally interconnected future. Ultimately, studies that document the integration practices that business educators are implementing should be conducted. Work also needs to be done to encourage business educators to share their experiences, success stories, and challenges faced in integrating the standards.

8. Additionally, similar studies should be conducted with a different survey design that puts the demographics section towards the end of the survey in order to increase the chances that respondents who begin the survey may actually complete it.

By implementing these recommendations, educational institutions and policymakers can support business educators in improving their competence, increasing the integration of the NBEA Standards for International Business, and ultimately enhancing students' knowledge and skills towards global competence.

REFERENCES

AACSB International- The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. (2011).

Globalization of management education: Changing international structures, adaptive strategies, and the impact on institutions. AACSB International.

Advance CTE. (2012). *Career ready practices.*

<https://cte.careertech.org/sites/default/files/CareerReadyPractices-FINAL.pdf>

Apple Inc. (2007). *Global awareness and education: America's test for the 21st Century.*

http://webspace.ship.edu/hliu/etextbook/21skills/global_awareness.pdf

Asia Society, & Longview Foundation. (2013). *Preparing a globally competent workforce through high-quality career and technical education.* <https://asiasociety.org/files/preparing-a-globally-competent-workforce-june-2016.pdf>

Asia Society, & OECD. (2018). *Teaching for global competence in a rapidly changing world.*

OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264289024-en>

Awang, F., & Carnes, L. (2010). Cross-cultural and international law and ethics. In *Cross-Cultural and International Business Education* (pp. 34–46). National Business Education Association.

Boix Mansilla, V., & Jackson, A. (2011). *Educating for global competence: Preparing our youth to engage the world.* Asia Society. <https://asiasociety.org/files/book-globalcompetence.pdf>

Business Roundtable. (2010). *We can't sit on the sidelines: The race for exports and jobs.*

https://s3.amazonaws.com/brt.org/archive/We_Cant_Sit_on_the_Sidelines_FINAL_11_17_10_3.pdf

Business Roundtable. (2022). *Trade and American jobs: The impact of trade on U.S. and state-level employment: 2022 update.* [https://s3.amazonaws.com/brt.org/Business-](https://s3.amazonaws.com/brt.org/Business-Roundtable_TradeandAmericanJobs2022.pdf)

[Roundtable_TradeandAmericanJobs2022.pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/brt.org/Business-Roundtable_TradeandAmericanJobs2022.pdf)

California Department of Education. (2016). *Educating for global competency: Findings and recommendations from the 2016 California global education Summit*.

https://cdn.caeducatorstogether.org/files/uploaded/resource/y2TXtp44kc7twZhVRxXnji8yOBdaObkqsFB7yFwUHzFp4BOT/CA%20GEN%20Report_AR_Nov%2029_Educating%20for%20Global%20Competency.pdf

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (Eighth edition). Routledge.

Committee for Economic Development. (2006). *Education for global leadership: The importance of international studies and foreign language education for U.S. economic and national Security*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED502294.pdf>

Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (Fifth edition). Pearson.

Davis, T. S., Ward, D. A., & Woodland, D. (2010). Cross-cultural and international business communication-verbal. In *Cross-Cultural and International Business Education* (pp. 1–21). National Business Education Association.

Economist Intelligence Unit. (2016). *Going global: Are graduates prepared for a global workforce?* Kaplan. <https://impact.economist.com/perspectives/talent-education/going-global-are-graduates-prepared-global-workforce/white-paper/going-global-are-graduates-prepared-global-workforce>

Frey, W. H. (2020, July 1). The nation is diversifying even faster than predicted, according to new census data. *Brookings*. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/new-census-data-shows-the-nation-is-diversifying-even-faster-than-predicted/>

- Friedman, T. L. (2007). *The world is flat: a brief history of the twenty-first century* (First Douglas McIntyre edition). Douglas & McIntyre.
- Gordon, H. R. D. (2014). *The history and growth of career and technical education in America* (4th ed.). Waveland Press, Inc.
- Groves, R. M. (Ed.). (2009). *Survey methodology* (2nd ed). Wiley.
- Gruber, R. (2010). Cross-cultural and international financial literacy and accounting. In *Cross-Cultural and International Business Education* (pp. 63–79). National Business Education Association.
- Hunter, B. (2015, July 14). Global competence amongst youth is critical to achieve sustainable development goals. *Office of the Secretary-General's Envoy on Youth*.
<https://www.un.org/youthenvoy/2015/07/global-competence-amongst-youth-critical-achieve-sustainable-development-goals/>
- Institute for the Future for the University of Phoenix Research Institute. (2011). *Future work skills 2020* (SR-1382A). https://legacy.iftf.org/uploads/media/SR-1382A_UPRI_future_work_skills_sm.pdf
- Johnson, B. (2014). *Educational research: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (Fifth edition). Sage Publications.
- Kerkhoff, S., & Cloud, M. (2020). Equipping teachers with globally competent practices: A mixed methods study on integrating global competence and teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 103.
- Kerkhoff, S., Dimitrieska, V., Woerner, J., & Alsup, J. (2019). Global teaching in Indiana: A quantitative case study of k-12 public school teachers. *Journal of Comparative Studies and International Education*, 1(1), 5–31.

- Klarin, A., Inkizhinov, B., Narazov, D., & Gorenskaia, E. (2021). International business education: What we know and what we are yet to develop. *International Business Review*, 30(5).
- Laughton, D. (2005). The development of international business as an academic discipline: Some implications for teachers and students. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 16(3), 47–70. https://doi.org/10.1300/66v16n03_04
- Leijen, Ä., Pedaste, M., & Lepp, L. (2020). Teacher agency following the ecological model: How it is achieved and how it could be strengthened by different types of reflection. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 68(3), 295–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2019.1672855>
- Longview Foundation. (2008). *Teacher preparation for the global age: The imperative for change*. https://longviewfdn.org/index.php/download_file/force/10/
- Moore, W., & Szul, L. (2010). Cross-cultural and international business communication-nonverbal and etiquette. In *Cross-Cultural and International Business Education* (pp. 22–33). National Business Education Association.
- National Business Education Association. (2020). *National standards for business education: what students should know and be able to do in business* (2020 edition). National Business Education Association.
- National Education Association. (2010). *Global competence is a 21st century imperative*. NEA Education Policy and Practice Department. <https://www.staffordschools.net/site/handlers/filedownload.ashx?moduleinstanceid=35909&dataid=37863&FileName=NEA%20Global%20Competence.pdf%20Competence.pdf>

- Obama, B. (2009, March). *Remarks of the President to the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce*. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-united-states-hispanic-chamber-commerce>
- OECD. (2018). *Global competence - PISA*. <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/innovation/global-competence/>
- Parkhouse, H., Tichnor-Wagner, A., Cain, J. M., & Glazier, J. (2016). “You don’t have to travel the world”: accumulating experiences on the path toward globally competent teaching. *Teaching Education*, 27(3), 267–285.
- Partnership for 21st Century Learning. (2015). *P 21 framework definitions*. Battelle for Kids. <https://www.battelleforkids.org/networks/p21/frameworks-resources>
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2014). *Framework for state action on global education*. Partnership for 21st Century Skills.
- Partnership for 21st century skills, Association for Career and Technical Education, & National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium. (2010). *Up to the challenge: The role of career and technical education and 21st century skills in college and career readiness*. Association for Career and Technical Education, National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium and Partnership for 21st Century Skills. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED519335.pdf>
- Policies Commission for Business & Economic Education. (2017). *PCBEE policy statements 1959-present*. B.E. Publishing.
- Priestly, M., Biesta, G. J., & Robinson, S. (2012). *Teachers as agents of change: An exploration of the concept of teacher agency*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277798152_Teachers_as_agents_of_change_An_explo

ration_of_the_concept_of_teacher_agency?enrichId=rgreq-

8133ba5267ad278dae9030abd0c46093-

XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzI3Nzc5ODE1MjtBUzoyNDM4MjA5NzM1MjI5NDZ

AMTQzNTE0Mjg1OTA4NA%3D%3D&el=1_x_2&_esc=publicationCoverPdf

Priestly, M., Biesta, G., & Robinson, S. (2015). *Teacher agency: An ecological approach*.

Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474219426>

Schaeffer, K. (2021). *U.S. public school students often go to schools where at least half of their*

peers are the same race or ethnicity. [https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2021/12/15/u-s-](https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2021/12/15/u-s-public-school-students-often-go-to-schools-where-at-least-half-of-their-peers-are-the-same-race-or-ethnicity/)

[public-school-students-often-go-to-schools-where-at-least-half-of-their-peers-are-the-same-race-or-ethnicity/](https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2021/12/15/u-s-public-school-students-often-go-to-schools-where-at-least-half-of-their-peers-are-the-same-race-or-ethnicity/)

Schwab, K., Zahidi, S., & World Economic Forum. (n.d.). *The global competitiveness report*

special edition 2020: How countries are performing on the road to recovery (Special Edition

2020). World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2020>

Skinner, L. (2002). *The implementation of information technology in Alabama business education*

courses as compared to national recommendations [Doctoral Dissertation]. Auburn University.

Stitt-Gohdes, W. (2002). *The business education profession: Principles and practices*.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED478127>

Streiner, S., & Besterfield-Sacre, M. (2019). Measuring the relative impact of international

experiences on engineering students: A benchmarking analysis. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 35(5), 1503–1517.

Tichnor-Wagner, A., Parkhouse, H., Glazier, J., & Cain, J. M. (2019). *Becoming a Globally*

Competent Teacher. ASCD.

U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *Succeeding globally through international education and engagement. U.S. department of education international strategy 2012-2016.*

<https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/international/international-strategy-2012-16.pdf>

Woo, J. (2019). *Integrating global competencies into business and information technology and marketing education curriculum* [Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University].

https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/90411/Woo_J_D_2019.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Zhao, J. (2010). Cross-cultural and international information technology and computers. In *Cross-Cultural and International Business Education* (pp. 46–62). National Business Education Association.

Appendix A

IRB Exempt Protocol Approval

Moleleki Approval, Exempt Protocol #23-132 EX 2303, "International Business Standards for Promoting Global Competence in the Business Education Classroom"

2

Dear Mr. Moleleki,

Your protocol titled "International Business Standards for Promoting Global Competence in the Business Education Classroom" has been approved by the IRB as "Exempt" under federal regulation 45 CFR 46.104(b)(2). Attached is a copy of your approved request.

Official notice:

This e-mail serves as official notice that your protocol has been approved. By accepting this approval, you also accept your responsibilities associated with this approval. Details of your responsibilities are attached. Please print and retain.

Expiration:

Continuing review of this Exempt protocol is not required; however, all modification/revisions to the approved protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB.

When you have completed all research activities, have no plans to collect additional data and have destroyed all identifiable information as approved by the IRB, please notify this office via e-mail. A final report is no longer required for Exempt protocols.

PLEASE NOTE: If any unfunded, IRB-approved study should later receive funding, you must submit a MODIFICATION REQUEST for IRB review. In the request, identify the funding source/sponsor and AU OSP number. Also, revise IRB-stamped consent documents to include the Sponsor at the top of page 1 and the "Who will see study data?" section of consent documents." (see online template consent documents).

Best wishes for success with your research!

IRB Admin
Office of Research Compliance
Auburn University
540 Devall Drive
Auburn, AL

Appendix B

Information Letter



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION CURRICULUM & TEACHING

(NOTE: DO NOT AGREE TO PARTICIPATE UNLESS IRB APPROVAL
INFORMATION WITH CURRENT DATES HAS BEEN ADDED TO THIS
DOCUMENT.)

INFORMATION LETTER
for a Research Study entitled
*"International Business Standards Integration for Promoting Global Competence in
the Business Education Classroom"*

You are invited to participate in a research study that aims to investigate business educators' perceptions of competency to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business, the extent of integration of the standards in different business education subject areas and perceived challenges to the integration of these standards. The study is being conducted by Tsepo Moleleki, a doctoral candidate, under the direction of Dr. Leane Skinner, Professor in the Auburn University Department of Curriculum & Teaching. You are invited to participate because you are a business educator and member of the National Business Education Association and are age 18 or older.

What will be involved if you participate? Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete an anonymous survey where you will be asked to share your experiences regarding integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business in the different subject areas you teach. The survey can be completed online, and there will also be a pencil-paper option for those attending the upcoming NBEA Convention. Your total time commitment will be approximately 15 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? There are no risks associated with participating in this study above and beyond what a person would experience in daily life. To mitigate the risk of COVID-19 exposure for paper surveys at the NBEA convention, the researcher will adhere to all COVID-19 policies and procedures set by the NBEA at the convention.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you will be contributing to efforts to learn more about the current use of the NBEA Standards for International Business, and challenges business educators face regarding their integration towards global competence.

Will you receive compensation for participating? There will be no compensation for participating in the study.

Are there any costs? If you decide to participate, there will be no cost to you.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time by exiting the survey. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Once you've submitted anonymous data, it cannot be withdrawn since it will be unidentifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Curriculum & Teaching or the Business/Marketing Education Program.

5040 HALEY
CENTER

AUBURN, AL
36849-5212

TELEPHONE:
334-844-4434

FAX:
334-844-6789

WWW.AUBURN.EDU

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from 03/08/2023 to 03/08/2025 Protocol # 20-034-RS-2300	8
--	---



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
CURRICULUM & TEACHING

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. We will protect your privacy and the data you provide by not collecting any identifiable data about you. Information collected through your participation may be used to fulfill an educational requirement, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Tsepo Moleleki at tlm0034@auburn.edu or Dr. Leane Skinner at skinnal@auburn.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334) 844-5966 or e-mail at IRBAdmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION ABOVE, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, PLEASE CLICK ON THE LINK BELOW. YOU MAY PRINT A COPY OF THIS LETTER TO KEEP.

Tsepo D. Moleleki 3/12/2023

Investigator Date

Dr. Leane B. Skinner Digitally signed by Dr. Leane B. Skinner
DN: cn=Leane B. Skinner, o=Auburn University, ou=College of Education, email=skinnal@auburn.edu

Faculty Advisor Date

5040 HALEY
CENTER
AUBURN, AL
36849-5212

TELEPHONE:
334-844-4434

FAX:
334-844-6789

WWW.AUBURN.EDU

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from _____ to _____, Protocol # _____

[LINK TO SURVEY](#)

The Auburn University Institutional
Review Board has approved this
Document for use from
03/08/2023 to _____
Protocol # 23-132 EX 2303

Appendix C

Global Competence Integration Survey (GCIS)

3/12/23, 1:29 PM

Qualtrics Survey Software



AUBURN UNIVERSITY

Information Letter

The Auburn University Institutional
Review Board has approved this
Document for use from
03/08/2023 to _____
Protocol # 23-132 EX 2303

Dear Prospective Participant,

You are invited to participate in a research study titled *International Business Standards Integration for Promoting Global Competence in the Business Education Classroom*. The purpose of the study is to investigate business educators' perceptions of competency to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business, the extent of integration of the standards in different business education subject areas and perceived challenges to the integration of these standards. The study is being conducted by Tsepo Moleleki, a PhD student under the supervision of Dr. Leane Skinner, Professor and Program Coordinator of Career & Technical Education in the College of Education at Auburn University.

You are invited to participate because you are a member of the National Business Education Association, teaching at least one class in Business Education or related fields, and are age 18 or older. This is an anonymous survey and your participation is completely voluntary. There are no risks associated with participating in this study other than what a person may experience in daily life. Participating in this study will be at no cost to you, and there will be no compensation for taking part in this study. Responding to the study will contribute towards learning more about the current use of the NBEA Standards for International Business and the challenges to integration.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time by exiting the survey. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Once you've submitted anonymous data, it cannot be withdrawn since it will be unidentifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Curriculum & Teaching, or the Business/

https://auburn.edu/qualtrics.com/Q/EdSectionBlocks/Jsx/GetSurveyPrintPreview?ContextSurveyID=SV_7U78UGoF24x9sUC&ContextLibraryID=U... 1/11

Marketing Education Program.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. We will protect your privacy and the data you provide by not collecting any identifiable data about you. Information collected through your participation may be used to fulfill an educational requirement, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to a variety of questions on global competence integration, and submit this survey. Your total time commitment will be approximately 15 minutes.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Tsepo Moleleki at tam0034@auburn.edu or Dr. Leane Skinner at skinna1@auburn.edu.

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

By clicking the "Next" button, you are giving consent to participate in this study.

Please tell us about yourself in this section

What is your age?

What is your gender?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Non-binary/third gender
- ☐ Prefer not to say

The Auburn University Institutional
Review Board has approved this
Document for use from
03/08/2023 to _____
Protocol # 23-132 EX 2303

How many years have you been teaching?

What is your highest level of education?

- ☐ Associate's Degree
☐ Bachelor's Degree
☐ Master's Degree
☐ Education Specialist
☐ Doctorate
☐ Other. Please enter

Which best describes the location of your school?

- ☐ Urban
☐ Suburban
☐ Rural

Please select the Business Education Area(s) you currently teach. Check all that apply.

- ☐ Accounting
☐ Business Law
☐ Career Development
☐ Communication
☐ Economics/Personal Finance
☐ Entrepreneurship
☐ Management
☐ Marketing
☐ Information Technology



<https://auburn.vu1.com/Ed@SessionBlocks/AlsoGetSurveyPrintPreview?ContextSurveyID=6V-7U78UGaF24s9aUC&ContextElibrandID=U...> 3/11

☐ Other, please write in the space below

At what level do you teach the area(s) selected above? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Middle School
☐ High School
☐ Post-Secondary

Competence & Frequency of Integration

The next section covers skills and knowledge excerpted from the NBEA Standards for International Business which have been divided into five (5) sections, with three columns.

The first column lists the **standards**.

In the second column, indicate how **competent** you feel to integrate the standards in the first column. The response categories are:

1 = No Competence: You do not possess skills/knowledge to teach performance expectations to achieve the standards.

2 = Basic Competence: You have limited skills and knowledge to teach performance expectations for achievement of standards and require more training to teach without reliance on textbooks and other materials.

3 = Moderate Competence: You have functional knowledge and skills to teach MOST performance expectations towards achievement of the standard effectively.

4 = Expert Competence: You have broad and in-depth skills and knowledge to teach ALL performance expectations towards achievement of the standard effectively.

In the third column, indicate how **often** you implement performance expectations towards achieving the standards in the first column. The response categories are:
 1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Very Often; 5 = Always

The last two questions ask about your international experience and some

challenges you may have to integrate the NBEA Standards for International Business.

Please click **"Next"** to continue!

Please rate **how competent you feel to integrate (Column A)** and **how often you integrate (Column B)** the following NBEA standards for international business relating to identifying forms of ownership and business opportunity in international business.

	How competent do you feel to integrate the standards?				How often do you implement these standards?				
	1. No Competence	2. Basic Competence	3. Moderate Competence	4. Expert Competence	1. Never	2. Rarely	3. Sometimes	4. Very often	5. Always
Identify types of ownership of selected businesses involved in international trade	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Identify potential international business opportunities for locally based companies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Develop a business plan for a new company in a foreign market	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Analyze a company's resources to determine its potential for becoming a global company	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	How competent do you feel to integrate the standards?				How often do you implement these standards?				
	1. No Competence	2. Basic Competence	3. Moderate Competence	4. Expert Competence	1. Never	2. Rarely	3. Sometimes	4. Very often	5. Always
Evaluate the use of foreign direct investment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Create a plan to obtain skills and qualifications to enter a selected international business career	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please rate **how competent you feel to integrate (Column A)**, **how often you integrate (Column B)** the following NBEA standards for international business relating to appropriate communication strategies in international relations.

	How competent do you feel to integrate the standards?				How often do you implement these standards?				
	1. No Competence	2. Basic Competence	3. Moderate Competence	4. Expert Competence	1. Never	2. Rarely	3. Sometimes	4. Very Often	5. Always
Demonstrate awareness, appreciation and respect for different languages and culture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Explain conversation modifications for communicating with a person who speaks English as a second language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	How competent do you feel to integrate the standards?				How often do you implement these standards?				
	1. No Competence	2. Basic Competence	3. Moderate Competence	4. Expert Competence	1. Never	2. Rarely	3. Sometimes	4. Very Often	5. Always
Formulate appropriate corrective action for ineffective international business communication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Describe how the process of negotiating may be affected by cultural differences	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Identify technology tools and applications to facilitate global business activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Compose effective business communications for the global business environment that demonstrates an understanding difference in tone, style, format, media and context	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please rate **how competent you feel to integrate (Column A)**, **how often you integrate (Column B)** the following NBEA standards for international business relating to basic concepts in international finance, law, management, marketing and trade.

	How competent do you feel to integrate the standards?				How often do you implement these standards?				
	1. No Competence	2. Basic Competence	3. Moderate Competence	4. Expert Competence	1. Never	2. Rarely	3. Sometimes	4. Very often	5. Always
Define Import, export and trade	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Compare unilateral, bilateral and multilateral trade agreements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Explain the advantages and disadvantages to a company of having a global labor pool	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Describe how consumer behavior and foreign markets can affect the elements of the marketing mix	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Calculate simple currency exchange transactions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Discuss strategies to minimize risk in international finance transactions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please rate how competent you feel to integrate (Column A), how often you integrate (Column B) the following NBEA standards for international business relating to the interrelatedness of systems in the global business environment

	How competent do you feel to integrate the standards?				How often do you implement these standards?				
	1. No Competence	2. Basic Competence	3. Moderate Competence	4. Expert Competence	1. Never	2. Rarely	3. Sometimes	4. Very Often	5. Always
Define intercultural competence and discuss its importance when working in global context	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluate how the political environment of a given country impacts international business	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluate cases where legal factors influenced business outcomes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Explain the difference between free market economy and the government controlled economy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Define terms such as culture, multiculturalism, stereotyping and their effects on conducting business internationally	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Analyze a variety of international companies to identify their commitment to ethical behavior and social responsibility	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please rate **how competent you feel to integrate (Column A)**, **how often you integrate (Column B)** the following NBEA standards for international business relating to the interrelatedness of one country's policy and economic practice on another country.

	How competent do you feel to integrate the standards?				How often do you implement these standards?				
	1. No Competence	2. Basic Competence	3. Moderate Competence	4. Expert Competence	1. Never	2. Rarely	3. Sometimes	4. Very Often	5. Always
Describe the impact of international business activities on the local, state, national and international economies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Describe how trade barriers and incentives affect choices of location for companies operating internationally	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Interpret the impact of emerging economies and political changes on international operations, markets, commodity supplies and unemployment rates	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Analyze the relationship between the political system of a country and its economic system	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Describe formal practices a given country uses to limit international companies from establishing or conducting business	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluate how the political environment of a given country impacts international business	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Which of these internationally focused experiences have you had?

- ☐ Personal International Travel
- ☐ Second Language Course

- ☐ Globally focused coursework
- ☐ Study abroad
- ☐ Work involving international collaboration
- ☐ Living abroad (e.g., military service, expatriate living, foreign born)
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ Please discuss any other international experience you have

The challenges for integrating the NBEA standards for international business in my classes are... select all that apply

- ☐ My state prioritizes other competencies
- ☐ My students lack interest in these topics
- ☐ I do not find these necessary for my students to learn
- ☐ I do not have adequate content knowledge to integrate these
- ☐ International Business Standards are not related to the courses I teach.
- ☐ None of the above

Please share any other challenges you have for integrating the NBEA Standards for International Business (other than those listed above)