

# **Leadership Competencies for Global Education Leaders: A Delphi Study of UNESCO Delegates and Administrators**

**George Saltsman**  
*Lamar University*

**Kaye Shelton**  
*Lamar University*

*The rise of globalization has increased the need for globally prepared leaders in all sectors, including education. Despite clear calls within the literature for empirical research to support the development of globally prepared education leaders, little research has occurred and no prior peer-reviewed study regarding essential global leadership competencies in education was located. Due to this absence, a Delphi study, conducted in English, French, and Spanish, was conducted with an expert panel of official UNESCO delegates, national delegates of the UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network, and senior-level UNESCO Education Sector executives to identify essential leadership competencies for global education leaders. After completing three successive survey rounds, the panel reached consensus on 70 essential competencies required for future global education leaders including an ordinal ranking of essentiality of global education leadership competencies. The findings of the expert panel conclude that when preparing leaders in global education, general leadership competencies still apply and that global leadership competencies overall were valued more highly than domestic leadership competencies or even managerial-focused education competencies. Additional analysis revealed alignment with broad twenty-first century skills and a balance between personality-based and situational leadership competencies.*

*Keywords:* global education leadership, education leadership, leadership competencies, education leadership competencies

Globalization is profoundly changing our world. Over the last century, advances in transportation, telecommunications, and trade have resulted in an unprecedented interconnecting of global economies and cultures. These forces have also been a major disruptor to many industries (Dean, 2005; Litz, 2011), including education (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2019; Christensen, Horn, Caldera, & Soares, 2011; Christensen, Johnson, Horn, 2008; Friedman, 2005; Litz, 2011). In fact, globalization is one of the most frequently documented challenges facing education leaders (Khan, 2018; Ong, 2012; Patrizio, & Stone-Johnson, 2016; Pierce & Pedersen, 1997; UNESCO, 1995).

Globalization also occurs in all aspects of education, including higher education. Over twenty years ago, Pierce and Pedersen (1997) identified globalization as one of the most significant disruptors college presidents face and expect it to continue to rise significantly in the future. Similarly, the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO, 1995) *Policy Paper for Change and Development in Higher Education* placed globalization as one of five major trends facing higher education. More recently, scholars are still recommending globalization should be considered as an impact on leadership development as well as competition within higher education (Altbach, 2015; Altbach et al., 2019; Cumberland, Ann Herd, Meera Alagaraja, & Kerrick, 2016; Ghemawat & Bastian, 2017). The literature further documents numerous international efforts to respond to globalization in primary and secondary education with the nations of Pakistan (Saeed, Zulfiqar, Ata, & Rathore, 2015), Turkey (Ilgar, 2011), and Malaysia (Chang-Da & Sirat, 2018) as just three examples of many.

The need to identify global leadership competencies for education leaders is clearly documented (ACE, 1998; Litz, 2011; Mendenhall, Weber, Arna Arnardottir, & Oddou, 2017; Reimers, 2009; Sullivan, 2011; Tichnor-Wagner & Manise, 2019). Consequently, many authors speculated while current training programs for education leadership may be acceptable for domestic leadership, they are not or may not be adequate for preparing global education leaders (Mendenhall et al., 2017; Tichnor-Wagner & Manise, 2019; Walker, 2018; Zhang, Bohley, & Wheeler, 2017). This lack of formal preparation has resulted in what has been described as a chronic deficiency of globally focused leaders in all levels of education (Goodman, 2012; Marquardt & Berger, 2000; Mendenhall et al., 2008; Smith, Caver, Saslow, & Thomas, 2009; Tichnor-Wagner & Manise, 2019; Winter, 2003).

### **Literature Review Summary**

The global leadership literature suggests past research on leadership development is not sufficient when placed in a global environment (Black & Gregersen, 2000; Hollenbeck, 2001; Jenkins, 2012; Lewis, Boston, & Peterson, 2017; Morrison, 2000). Even when examining the efficacy of domestic leadership in global contexts, scholars urged the leadership practices and paradigms of the last century must be updated (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 2008; Dugan, 2012). The literature also revealed competencies that are transferable between organizational cultures and international cultures should be prioritized in importance when creating global leadership competency models (Jokinen, 2005; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner 1998; Walker, 2018).

Many authors cite a lack of global leadership preparation programs (Goodman, 2012; Kim & McLean, 2015; Marquardt & Berger, 2000; Mendenhall et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2009; Terrell, 2011; Walker, 2018; Winter, 2003). In fact, Gillis (2011) asserted a need “to address the gap between global leadership needs and the capacity shortage” (p. 117). Yet, due to the lack of empirical research, there is no common agreement on how to address the shortage of global leaders, the format development programs should take (Cseh et al., 2013), or what content these programs should include (Konyu-Fogel, 2011). In addition, the literature is clear on the need to develop leaders who possess strong competencies in global leadership (Davis, 2015; Jeong, Lim, & Park, 2017; Kim & McLean, 2015; Morrison, 2000; Park, Jeong, Jang, Yoon, & Lim, 2018; Patrizio, & Stone-Johnson, 2016; Suutari, 2002). Unfortunately, formal training programs are not keeping pace with that demand (Walker, 2018). Because of the time it takes to obtain the competencies required to become a proficient as a global leader (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2000), researchers have turned to identifying the essential competencies in the hopes that they can be delivered quickly and effectively (Terrell, 2011). Global leadership competencies for industries outside of education are numerous and domestic educational leadership competencies are well established (Cumberland et al., 2016). However, specific global leadership competencies for educational leadership have yet to be identified through empirical analysis.

## **Methodology**

The purpose of this Delphi study was to gain consensus from a panel of experts in the global education community regarding the most essential competencies required for future global education leaders. This study sought to further evaluate the essentiality of those global education leadership competencies by providing an ordinal ranking. Specifically, the study explored the following research questions:

1. What are the essential competencies for global education leaders?
2. What is the ordinal ranking of essentiality of competencies for global education leaders?

The Delphi Method, developed by the RAND Corporation in the early 1950s (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963), employs a diverse panel of experts to gather and refine knowledge through a series of structured group interactions (Linstone & Turoff, 2002). In addition, Powell (2003) recommended the use of Delphi Method when judgments of individuals are needed to “address a lack of agreement or incomplete state of knowledge . . . [thus] the Delphi is particularly valued for its ability to structure and organize group communication” (p. 377). For this study, the literature review identified an incomplete state of knowledge regarding global education leadership competencies and establishing those competencies requires the input of a group of experts; therefore, the Delphi Method was determined to be an appropriate methodology.

This Delphi study, conducted with simultaneous translations available in English, French, and Spanish, surveyed three communities of experts in global education that consisted of: national delegates of UNESCO permanent and associate member states (typically holding the title of ambassador), national delegates from The UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network (appointed individuals working for a national commission to UNESCO), and senior-level UNESCO Education Sector executives.

The Delphi Method develops consensus through iterative rounds that is considered to be a relevant and valid measure of accumulated opinions of experts (Baker, Lovell, & Harris, 2006;

Hasson, Keeney, & McKenna, 2000; Winzenried, 1997). The expert panelists in this study participated in three consensus-seeking rounds, an established norm for Delphi studies (Sizer et al., 2007; Skulmoski, Hartman, & Krahn, 2007; Turoff, 2002). The strength of the Delphi Method comes from the collective experience and expertise of panel (Adler & Ziglio, 1996; Linstone & Turoff, 2002; Rossman & Eldredge, 1982). For this study, each panelist had at least 10 years professional experience in education with the highest being 37 years; for the total panel, there was an average (arithmetic mean) of 16.7 years of professional experience in education. Furthermore, the participating panelists in this study were highly diverse and evenly distributed throughout the five United Nations Geopolitical Regional Groups (Table 1).

Table 1

*List of United Nations Geopolitical Regional Groups with Participating Panelists*

| United Nations Geopolitical Regional Groups   | Country Name        |
|---|---------------------|
| African Group<br>(9 of 54 possible= 17% participation)                                | Burundi             |
|   | Ghana               |
|   | Lesotho             |
|   | Liberia             |
|   | Mali                |
|   | Nigeria             |
|   | Tunisia             |
|   | Zambia<br>Zimbabwe  |
| Asia-Pacific Group<br>(12 of 53 possible= 23% participation)                          | Bangladesh          |
|   | India               |
|   | Indonesia           |
|   | Iraq                |
|   | Kuwait              |
|   | Mongolia            |
|   | Palau               |
|   | Papua New Guinea    |
|   | Philippines         |
|   | Thailand            |
|   | Uzbekistan<br>Yemen |
| Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)<br>(4 of 33 possible = 12% participation) | Dominican Republic  |
|   | Paraguay            |
|   | Suriname            |
|   | Trinidad and Tobago |
| Eastern European Group (EEG)<br>(3 of 23 possible = 13% participation)                | Bulgaria            |
|   | Lithuania           |
|   | Montenegro          |
| Western European and Others Group (WEOG)<br>(9 of 29 possible = 31% participation)    | France              |
|   | Germany             |
|   | Greece              |
|   | Malta               |

Netherlands  
 New Zealand  
 Sweden  
 United Kingdom  
 United States of America

---

To prepare for the study, a meta-analysis examining 70 individual studies on global leadership was completed and revealed a total of 522 previously validated competences. Additionally, 239 validated competences were identified from an extensive meta-analysis on education leadership competences. Combining the meta-analyses of global leadership competencies and education leadership competencies resulted in 761 total competencies. Using a rigorous coding process, a fourth meta-analysis was conducted to remove duplicates and sort the 761 combined competencies into in 61 unique competency clusters.

Following their response to the literature-derived competencies, panelists were encouraged to suggest potential global leadership competencies not previously identified within the literature meta-analysis. The open-ended questions resulted in 51 additional competencies, of which 35 were determined to be unique after the coding process was employed. Between literature-derived and panelist–provided competencies, the expert panel examined a combined total of 96 potential global education competencies during this study. Using an online survey tool, these 61 literature-identified competency clusters and 35 panelist–provided competencies were presented to the panel using a bi-polar Likert scale instrument to gauge essentiality.

### Summary of Findings

Through three rounds of consensus finding, the expert panelists reached consensus on 70 essential competencies for global educational leadership out of the combined pool of 96 presented competencies. Table 2 presents the competencies that reached consensus. Competencies that failed to reach consensus are presented in Table 3. Following the three consensus finding rounds, panel members then provided an ordinal ranking of the 10 most important validated competencies. Individual panelists responses were combined and tabulated with 10 points assigned for a first place ranking, 9 points assigned for a second place ranking and continuing to 1 point being assigned for a tenth place ranking. The ordinal ranking by frequency of selection is presented in Table 2 and includes the origin (literature-provided or panelist-provided) for each competency.

Table 2  
*Ordinal Ranking Ordinal Ranking of Consensus Competencies by Points Awarded*

| Competencies |   |        |        |
|--------------|---|--------|--------|
| Ranking      | Competency  | Source | Points |
| 1 (Tie)      | Vision  | Lit    | 35     |
| 1 (Tie)      | Leadership (capacity to lead others, empowering others) | Lit    | 35     |

|          |   |       |    |
|----------|---|-------|----|
| 3        | Integrity (honest, trustworthy, responsible, ethical)   | Lit   | 29 |
| 4        | Global mindset (understanding of other cultures, world perspective, the capacity to think globally) | Lit   | 24 |
| 5        | Ability to cope with stress (balance tensions, life balance)  | Lit   | 21 |
| 6 (Tie)  | Creative thinking   | Lit   | 20 |
| 6 (Tie)  | Leadership by example   | Panel | 20 |
| 8        | Open-mindedness   | Lit   | 19 |
| 9        | Motivation  | Lit   | 18 |
| 10 (Tie) | Problem solving (assessment, analysis, analytical thinking)   | Lit   | 17 |
| 10 (Tie) | Sincere/Honest/Truthful   | Panel | 17 |
| 10 (Tie) | Maturity  | Lit   | 17 |
| 10 (Tie) | Social Adaptability (Able to feel the situation and people)   | Panel | 17 |
| 14 (Tie) | Personal style (the way one presents oneself)   | Lit   | 16 |
| 14 (Tie) | Proactive   | Panel | 16 |
| 16       | Decision making (judgment, decisiveness)  | Lit   | 15 |
| 17 (Tie) | Patience  | Lit   | 13 |
| 17 (Tie) | Confidence  | Lit   | 13 |
| 19       | Listening skills  | Lit   | 12 |
| 20 (Tie) | Ethos   | Panel | 11 |
| 20 (Tie) | High standards (quality)  | Lit   | 11 |
| 20 (Tie) | Empathy (concern for others, sensitivity)   | Lit   | 11 |
| 20 (Tie) | Relationship building (building partnerships and alliances - external focus)                        | Lit   | 11 |

|          |   |       |    |
|----------|---|-------|----|
| 20 (Tie) | Advocacy for education (commitment to values of education)  | Lit   | 11 |
| 25       | Team building (building work teams and empowering teams - internal focus)                           | Lit   | 10 |
| 26 (Tie) | Curiosity   | Lit   | 10 |
| 26 (Tie) | Content knowledge   | Panel | 10 |
| 28 (Tie) | Conflict management (diplomacy, negotiation)  | Lit   | 9  |
| 28 (Tie) | Optimism  | Lit   | 9  |
| 28 (Tie) | Tolerance for ambiguity (ability to manage uncertainty)   | Lit   | 9  |
| 28 (Tie) | Flexibility   | Lit   | 9  |
| 32       | Collaboration (team member, sharing leadership)   | Lit   | 8  |
| 33 (Tie) | Cross-cultural management (working across cultures, balancing of tension, intercultural competence) | Lit   | 8  |
| 33 (Tie) | Social awareness (emotional intelligence, sensitivity to others' needs)                             | Lit   | 8  |
| 33 (Tie) | General communication skills (written, oral, non-verbal)  | Lit   | 8  |
| 36       | Strategic thinking  | Lit   | 8  |
| 37 (Tie) | Knowledge (intelligence)  | Lit   | 7  |
| 37 (Tie) | Change agent (leads and facilitates the change process)   | Lit   | 7  |
| 37 (Tie) | Appreciates proactive subordinates  | Panel | 7  |
| 40       | Meaningfully derolling and engaging in professional discussions with subordinates                   | Panel | 6  |
| 41       | Personal energy (dynamic, energizing)   | Lit   | 5  |
| 42 (Tie) | Self-control (to think before acting, control personal conduct)                                     | Lit   | 5  |

|          |   |       |   |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| 42 (Tie) | Advocacy for students (commitment to student-centered learning and student satisfaction)            | Lit   | 5 |
| 42 (Tie) | Work Ethic  | Panel | 5 |
| 42 (Tie) | Ability to understand research and data from a multi-disciplinary approach                          | Panel | 5 |
| 46 (Tie) | Courage   | Lit   | 4 |
| 46 (Tie) | Persuasion (influencing, inspiring, motivational)   | Lit   | 4 |
| 46 (Tie) | Cross-cultural communication skills   | Lit   | 4 |
| 46 (Tie) | Gumption (shrewd or spirited initiative and resourcefulness)  | Panel | 4 |
| 50 (Tie) | Result-oriented   | Panel | 3 |
| 50 (Tie) | Manage time effectively   | Panel | 3 |
| 50 (Tie) | Respect   | Lit   | 3 |
| 53 (Tie) | Operational management (coordination, organization, administration, delegating)                     | Lit   | 2 |
| 53 (Tie) | Commitment/Perseverance   | Panel | 2 |
| 53 (Tie) | Professionalism   | Panel | 2 |
| 53 (Tie) | Holistic view of well-being   | Panel | 2 |
| 57       | Cultural awareness (cultural intelligence, appreciation for diversity)                              | Lit   | 1 |
| 58 (Tie) | Hardiness (overcomes adversity, persistence, tenacity)  | Lit   | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Self awareness (understanding one's self and role)  | Lit   | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Commitment to personal professional development and learning  | Lit   | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Personnel building (hiring, developing and empowering individuals - internal focus)                 | Lit   | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Commitment to safe work environments (balancing organizational tensions, global vs. local tensions) | Lit   | 0 |



|          |  |       |   |
|----------|--|-------|---|
| 58 (Tie) | Understanding of educational systems (college structure, student affairs, trends in education) | Lit   | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Understanding of organizational systems (global work structures)                               | Lit   | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Language Skills  | Lit   | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Timely (punctual)  | Lit   | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Fairness   | Panel | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Conceptual Thinking  | Panel | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Wisdom   | Panel | 0 |
| 58 (Tie) | Knowledge of the local context   | Panel | 0 |

Table 3

*Competencies Not Achieving Consensus*

| Competency   |   |
|--|---|
| Academic administration (instructional leadership, academic success) | ICT (computer and technology) skills                                    |
| Accomplished (cultivated, adept)                                     | Legal awareness   |
| Belief in God (religious)  | Life skills   |
| Budgeting and fiscal management                                      | Long-term orientation (as opposed to temporary position abroad)         |
| Business savvy (understanding of business systems)                   | Low neuroticism (not sensitive, obsessive, tense or anxious)            |
| Capacity in evidence-based management                                | <i>Political philosophy</i>   |
| Comprehensive  | Protective  |
| Deep knowledge of global educational agenda                          | Rigorous  |
| Entrepreneurial (risk-taking)  | Straightforward   |
| Extroversion (outgoing personality)                                  | Studious  |
| Global capitalism (economic integration and profitability)           | Ubuntu (A Nguni Bantu term for human kindness, humanity towards others) |
| Good Humor   | Understanding of comparative education                                  |
| Humility   | Understanding and experience in ethics                                  |

**Discussion**

Overall, competencies from the literature connected to general leadership (e.g. *vision, leadership, and integrity*) were validated and ranked highest in the ordinal ranking procedure. As might be expected, competencies that were more specific to specialized areas of for-profit business leadership (e.g. *global capitalism, business savvy, and entrepreneurial*) did not reach consensus. Interestingly, the panel also showed less interest in managerial-focused competencies, even if they

were education specific (e.g. *deep knowledge of global educational agenda, academic administration, and understanding of comparative education*).

When examining the 62 competency clusters distilled from the meta-analysis of global leadership and education leadership literature, significant overlap is observed with the findings from this study. With domain specific competencies (*global capitalism, business savvy, and ICT skills*) and managerial-focused (*budgeting and fiscal management, and legal awareness*) excluded, only three global leadership competency clusters (*humility, entrepreneurial, and low neuroticism*) did not reach consensus by the panel. Furthermore, overlap with education leadership competencies was also observed with *humility* being the only literature-derived education leadership competency not validated once domain specific competencies (*academic administration, and budgeting and fiscal management*) were excluded. There were, however, 20 panelist-provided competencies not previously identified in the global leadership or educational leadership literature that were validated by this study. However, even though validated by panel consensus, only five competencies made it into the top 20 ranked competencies: *Leadership by example, Sincere/Honest/Truthful, Social Adaptability, Proactive, and Ethos*.

The global education leadership competencies that reached consensus were, however, significantly different from commonly listed domestic leadership competencies cited in the literature. Within this study, leadership skills related to the intercultural experience are far more apparent (e.g. *global mindset, social adaptability, tolerance for ambiguity, and social awareness*) and stand out as unique when compared to domestic leadership competencies. There is also an observed alignment of skills often referred to as twenty-first century skills (e.g. *creative thinking, problem solving, and adaptability*) that ranked higher than content-centric competencies (e.g. *content knowledge, knowledge, and commitment to personal professional development and learning*).

Lokkesmoe (2009) previously suggested the application of Fielder's contingency theory of 1967 would demonstrate a balance between a leader's personality traits and idiosyncratic competencies when performing a leadership competency analysis. Examining the competencies validated by the panel in this study, Lokkesmoe's assumption regarding Fielder's contingency theory appears to be supported. Analysis of the competencies that reached consensus demonstrates those that are personality-based (e.g. *optimism, maturity, patience, confidence, and courage*) in contrast to those that are more situational (*decision making, understanding of organizational systems, operational management, advocacy for students, and advocacy for education*).

In comparing literature-suggested and panelist-suggested competencies, competencies located from the literature had a higher percentage make it into the consensus stage. The panel approved 50 of the 61 (82%) of the literature-suggested competencies while only approving 20 of the 35 (57%) of the panelist-suggested competencies. Furthermore, of the panelists-suggested competencies, only *leadership by example* and *social adaptability* were in the top 20 ordinal ranked competencies. This study appears to provide an additional level of credence to the effectiveness of previous global leadership and educational leadership studies in identifying applicable competencies.

Of all the competencies presented, both from the literature and from panelists themselves, only the panelist-provided competency of *Belief in God* was negatively scored. All other competencies were positively scored, even if there was not enough agreement to pass the threshold level set for consensus in this study. Moreover, *Belief in God* was also the only competency that failed to receive a majority of panelists rank it with some level of essentiality.

This work provides a foundation for which the emerging field of global education leadership research can advance. For researchers and scholars, this work provides a foundational set of empirical findings that can be tested and further empirically validated (or invalidated). In addition to the competencies located from the global leadership literature and education leadership literature, the panel added specific global education leadership competencies not found previously in either body of work.

Within the literature, it has been suggested there is little difference between leadership skills for domestic leadership versus global leadership (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992). Vloeberghs and Macfarlane (2007) proposed that perhaps previous research has failed to adequately define global leadership competencies due to confusion between global and domestic leadership needs. Examining previous competencies derived from the literature on domestic leadership and the competencies generated in this study on global leadership competencies, distinct differences emerged. For example, social skills related to the intercultural experience are far more apparent (e.g. *global mindset*, *social adaptability*, *tolerance for ambiguity*, and *social awareness*) and stand out as unique.

Mintzberg (2004) observed the number of competencies in the literature and warned including too many competencies into a leadership development program could lead to a disorganized and incomplete preparation. Other scholars (Conger & Ready, 2004; Intagliata, Ulrich, & Smallwood, 2000; Munoz, 2007) agreed with Mintzberg, stressing the importance of selecting a small list of competencies that best fit the position, organization, or industry. This study successfully reduced the number of possible global leadership competencies by over 90% by starting with 761 competencies located in the existing literature and reducing to 70 competencies upon which the panel reached consensus.

Within the competency-based leadership literature, the complexity of the competencies is also a considering factor for the efficiency of implementation. Conger and Ready (2004) and Intagliata et al. (2000) urged the creation of competencies that are simple enough to be comprehensible and actionable. Munoz (2007) agreed, asserting leadership competencies must be kept simple for implementation. There is, however, also a risk that competencies become too minimalistic. Kuchinke and Han (2005) established the need to appreciate the depth and complexity of the leadership context within competency selection. They warned that many competency frameworks are not fully able to account for the variability and situational circumstances the real world will present. Conger and Benjamin (1999) also noted this by commenting on the rigidity of competencies and the inability to shape into the leadership context of the individuality of a leader's personality.

### **Implications for Practice**

Because globalization has led to profound changes throughout the world, these initial findings of global education leadership competencies offer implications for both practitioners and scholars. The identification of specific global leadership competencies for education is a foundational component for formal training and development programs to prepare global education leaders. Universities and leadership development programs for education may utilize the findings to expand existing education leadership degrees to become more globally focused or to create new offerings focused exclusively on global education. Additionally, organizations focused on the advancement of education across the globe (e.g. World Bank, UNESCO, and numerous public and private foundations) now have metrics to develop and assess the effectiveness of their investments

in global education leadership, as well as their assessment of selecting their own internal global education staff. Beyond training programs, these competencies also provide insight into recruiting, succession planning, career development, talent management, coaching, assessment, and personal reflection of global education leaders.

Moreover, this study validates the appropriateness of the existing literature in the global leadership and education leadership domains as a basis for the study of global education leadership. These existing bodies of work could provide a foundation for building a global education leadership development program until a more robust collection of literature in global education leadership is established. However, the existing global education leadership literature does not overlap with domestic education leadership literature within this context.

As an apparent initial study in global education leadership competencies, this work provides a foundation for which the emerging field of global education leadership research can advance. For researchers and scholars, this work provides an initial set of empirical findings that can be tested and further empirically validated (or invalidated) through more direct research. Such foundational works are required for future research, and the field of global education leadership now has at least one study from which to build upon.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

As an initial study on global education leadership competencies, this work did not consider possible sub-categorizations of primary, secondary, and tertiary education. The literature clearly differentiates between leadership competencies for pre-tertiary and post-secondary, yet the methodology of this study made no attempt to subcategorize competencies by school classification. Furthermore, this study also used only the three most common of the six official UN languages. Future studies should replicate this study with homogeneous panels of experts in each of the UN Geopolitical and linguistic clusters. Expanding the study outside the UNESCO umbrella would add additional insight and perspective as well. Finally, these findings represent the opinions of experts in global education leadership and have not been validated in actual practice. Further research should be conducted to validate the competencies in actual application.

## References

- Adler, N. J., & Bartholomew, S. (1992). Managing globally competent people. *Academy of Management Executive*, 6(3), 52-65. doi:10.5465/AME.1992.4274189
- Adler, M., & Ziglio, E. (1996). *Gazing into the oracle: The Delphi Method and its application to social policy and public health*. London, England: Kingsley Publishers.
- Altbach, P. G. (2015). Higher education and the WTO: Globalization run amok. *International Higher Education*, 23, 2-4.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2019). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Paris and Rotterdam: UNESCO and Sense Publishers. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000183168>
- American Council on Education, Commission on International Education [ACE]. (1998). *Education for global competence: America's passport to the future*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Baker, J., Lovell, K., & Harris, N. (2006). How expert are the experts? An exploration of the concept of 'expert' within Delphi panel techniques. *Nurse Researcher*, 14(1), 59-70. doi:10.7748/nr2006.10.14.1.59.c6010
- Bartlett, C., & Ghoshal, S. (2008). The myth of the generic manager: New personal competencies for the new management roles. In C. Bartlett, S. Ghoshal & P. Beamish (Eds.), *Transnational Management* (5th ed., pp. 775-793). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Black, J. S., & Gregersen, H. B. (2000). High impact training: Forging leaders for the global frontier. *Human Resource Management*, 39(2/3), 173-184.
- Chang-Da, W., & Sirat, M. (2018). The development of Malaysian higher education. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 7(2), 144-156. doi:10.1108/AEDS-07-2017-0068
- Christensen, C., Horn, M., Caldera, L., & Soares, L. (2011). *Disrupting college: How disruptive innovation can deliver quality and affordability to postsecondary education*. Washington, D.C: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/reports/2011/02/08/9034/disrupting-college/>
- Christensen, C., Johnson, C., & Horn, M. (2008). *Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Professional.
- Conger, J. A., & Benjamin, B. (1999). *Building leaders: How successful companies develop the next generation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A., & Ready, D. A. (2004). Rethinking leadership competencies. *Leader to Leader*, 32, 47.
- Cseh, M., Davis, E. B., & Khilji, S. (2013). Developing a global mindset: Learning of global leaders. *European Journal of Training and Development* 37(5), 489-499. doi:10.1108/03090591311327303
- Cumberland, D. M., Herd, A., Alagaraja, M., & Kerrick, S. A. (2016). Assessment and development of global leadership competencies in the workplace: A review of literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 18(3), 301-317. doi:10.1177/1523422316645883
- Dalkey, N. C., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi Method to the use of experts. *Management Science*, 9(3), 458-467. Retrieved from <https://pubsonline.informs.org/journal/mnsc>

- Davis, S. (2015). The state of global leadership development. *Training*, 52(4), 52-55.
- Dean, B. P. (2005). Emerging leadership ethics in an interdependent world: Human capabilities development as a global imperative for moral leadership. In N. S. Huber & M. C. Walker (Eds.), *Emergent models of global leadership* (pp. 17-33). Silver Spring, MD: International Leadership Association.
- Dugan, J. P. (2012). Exploring local to global leadership education assessment. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2012(140), 89–101. doi:10.1002/ss.20034
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Ghemawa, P., & Bastian, P. (2017, July). Anti-globalization and higher education. *BizEd*, July/August 2017. Retrieved from <https://bized.aacsb.edu/articles/2017/07/anti-globalization-and-higher-education>
- Gillis, J. (2011). *Global leadership development: An analysis of talent management, company types and job functions, personality traits and competencies, and learning and development methods* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3455394)
- Goodman, N. (2012). The crisis in the global leadership pipeline. *Training*, (May/June 2012), 66-67. Retrieved from <https://trainingmag.com/content/best-practices-crisis-global-leadership-pipeline/>
- Hasson, F., Keeney, S., & McKenna, H. (2000). Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32(4), 1008-1015. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01567.x
- Hollenbeck, G. P. (2001). A serendipitous sojourn through the global leadership literature. In W. H. Mobley & M. W. J. McCall (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership Vol. 2*. (pp. 15-47). New York, NY: JAI.
- Ilgar, R. (2011). Geography education for sustainable education system under the influence of globalization: The case of Turkey. *Australian Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences*, 5(4), 192-200. Retrieved from <http://www.ajbasweb.com/>
- Intagliata, J., Ulrich, D., & Smallwood, N. (2000). Leveraging leadership competencies to produce leadership brand: Creating distinctiveness by focusing on strategy and results. *Human Resource Planning*, 23(3), 12-23.
- Jenkins, D. M. (2012). Global critical leadership: Educating global leaders with critical leadership competencies. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(2), 95-101.
- Jeong, S., Lim, D. H., & Park, S. (2017). Leadership convergence and divergence in the era of globalization. In P. Ordoñez de Pablos & R. Tennyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research on human resources strategies for the new millennial workforce* (pp. 286-309). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-0948-6.ch014
- Jokinen, T. (2005). Global leadership competencies: A review and discussion. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29, 199–216. <https://doi.org/fgvwbc>
- Kim, J., & McLean, G. N. (2015). An integrative framework for global leadership competency: Levels and dimensions. *Human Resource Development International*, 18(3), 235–258. doi:10.1080/13678868.2014.1003721
- Konyu-Fogel, G. (2011). *Exploring the effect of global mindset on leadership behavior: An empirical study of business leaders in global organizations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3444218)

- Kuchinke, K. P., & Han, H-Y (2005). Should caring be viewed as a competence? (Re-) opening the dialogue over the limitations of competency frameworks in HRD. *Human Resource Development International*, 8(3), 385-389. doi:10.1080/13678860500163788
- Lewis, E., Boston, D., & Peterson, S. (2017). A global perspective of transformational leadership and organizational development. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, 2(3), Article 5. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1103&context=jri>
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (2002). *The Delphi Method: Techniques and applications* (pp. 3-12). Newark, NJ: New Jersey Institute of Technology. A reproduction of the 1975 original text.
- Litz, D. (2011). Globalization and the changing face of educational leadership: Current trends and emerging dilemmas. *International Education Studies*, 4(3), 47-61. doi:10.5539/ies.v4n3p47
- Lokkesmoe, K. J. (2009). *A grounded theory study of effective global leadership development strategies: Perspectives from Brazil, India, and Nigeria* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3360374)
- Marquardt, M. J., & Berger, N. O. (2000). *Global leaders for the 21st century*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., & Maznevski, M. L. (2008). *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mendenhall, M., Weber, T., Arna Arnardottir, A., & Oddou, G. (2017). Developing global leadership competencies: A process model. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 10, 117-146. doi:10.1108/S1535-120320170000010004
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBAs*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Morrison, A. J. (2000). Developing a global leadership model. *Human Resource Management*, 39(2), 117.
- Munoz, R. (2007). *The AACCC Six Competencies for Community College Leaders: Perceptions of Workforce/Continuing Education Administrators in Texas* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3296137)
- Ong, V. Y. S. (2012). Complexities of multiple paradigms in higher education leadership today. *Journal of Global Management*, 4(1), 91-100.
- Park, S., Jeong, S., Jang, S., Yoon, S. W., & Lim, D. H. (2018). Critical review of global leadership literature: Toward an integrative global leadership framework. *Human Resource Development Review*, 17(1), 95-120. doi:10.1177/1534484317749030
- Patrizio, K. M., & Stone-Johnson, C. (2016). Curriculum leadership in global context: A self-study of educational leadership teaching practices. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 19(4), 402-416. doi:10.1080/13603124.2015.1015615
- Pierce, D. R., & Pedersen, R. P. (1997). The community college presidency: Qualities for success. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 98, 13-20. doi:10.1002/cc.9802
- Powell, C. (2003). The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 41(4), 376-382. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02537.x
- Reimers, F. M. (2009). Leading for global competency. *Educational Leadership*, 67(1). Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept09/vol67/num01/Leading-for-Global-Competency.aspx>

- Rossmann, M. H., & Eldredge, S. (1982). *Needed functions, knowledge, and skills for hospital education directors in the 1980's: A Delphi study*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221752)
- Saeed, A., Zulfikar, S., Ata, G., & Rathore, K. (2015, Jul-Dec). *South Asian Studies*, 30(2), 297-316.
- Sizer, P. S., Felstehausen, V., Sawyer, S., Dornier, L., Matthews, P., & Cook, C. (2007). Eight critical skill sets required for manual therapy competency: A Delphi study and factor analysis of physical therapy educators of manual therapy. *Journal of Allied Health*, 36(1), 30–40. Retrieved from <http://www.asahp.org/journal-of-allied-health>
- Skulmoski, G. J., Hartman, F. T., & Krahn, J. (2007). The Delphi Method for graduate research. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 6, 1–21. doi:10.28945/199
- Smith, A., Caver, K., Saslow, S., & Thomas, N. (2009). *Developing the global executive: Challenges and opportunities in a changing world*. Pittsburgh, PA: Development Dimensions International.
- Sullivan, J. (2011). *Global leadership in higher education administration: perspectives on internationalization by university presidents, vice-presidents and deans* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3445264)
- Suutari, V. (2002). Global leader development: An emerging research agenda. *Career Development International*, 7(4), 218-233.
- Terrell, S. (2011). *How global leaders develop: A Phenomenological study of global leadership development* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3432281)
- Tichnor-Wagner, A., & Manise, J. (2019). *Globally competent educational leadership: A framework for leading schools in a diverse, interconnected world*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Retrieved from <http://files.ascd.org/pdfs/publications/general/ascd-globally-competent-educational-leadership-report-2019.pdf>
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Turoff, M. (2002). General applications: Policy Delphi. In H. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds), *The Delphi Method: Techniques and applications* (pp. 80-96). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO]. (1995). *Policy paper for change and development in higher education*, Paris, France: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0009/000989/098992e.pdf>
- Vloeberghs, D., & Macfarlane, A. (2007). A working paper on global leadership development. *The Eighth International Conference on HRD Research & Practice Across Europe*, (pp. 1-12).
- Walker, J. L. (2018). Do methods matter in global leadership development? Testing the global leadership development ecosystem conceptual model. *Journal of Management Education*, 42(2), 239–264. doi:10.1177/1052562917734891
- Winter, S. G. (2003). Understanding dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10), 991. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10970266>
- Winzenried, A. (1997). *Delphi studies: The value of expert opinion bridging the gap-data to knowledge*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Association of School Librarianship, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.



Zhang, G., Bohley, K. A., & Wheeler, L. (2017). Global perspective and the implications for school leadership. *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, 13(2), 9-14. Retrieved from <https://publons.com/journal/213312/the-journal-of-academic-administration-in-higher-e>