

The International Leadership Competencies of Jordanian Universities Leaders

Aieman Ahmad Al-Omari, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Higher Education Administration

Faculty of Educational Sciences

The Hashemite University, Kingdom of Jordan

Abstract: *The purpose of this study is to assess the competencies required by presidents of universities to lead a Jordanian institution of higher education in an international society as perceived by academic administrators and faculty members chosen randomly from three universities representative of the northern, middle, and southern regions of Jordan. Two hundred fifty-eight survey packages were mailed and 225 responses were received (86 academic administrators and 139 faculty members), for a response rate of 87%. The results of the study reveal that four of five dimensions of international leadership competencies were rated by academic administrators and faculty members as moderately important: International Culture, Vision, and Mind set; International Strategic Planning; International Human Resources; and International Operations and Structure. The dimension learning was rated as very important by administrators and faculty. Training higher education leaders for the future and urging them to consider the forces of internationalization and its impact on the development of their institutions were recommendations resulting from this study.*

Introduction

Events that occur miles away may seriously affect institutions of higher education, often without the knowledge of those at the local level (Witte, 2000). In the 21st century, a new social force, internationalization, and globalization,

plays a substantial role in shaping and influencing higher education. Factors in internationalization and globalization include rapid development in all areas, expanding use of technology, growing interdependence of world economics, increasing inter-connectivity of the global environment, staggering increases in the availability of information, heightening in mobility of the world's population, and blurring of national boundaries (Black, Morrison, & Gregersen, 1999; Bondreau, Lock, Robey, & Straud, 1998; Connor, 1998; Dauphinais & Price, 1998).

Bohn, Davis, Meares, and Pearce (2002) illustrated in a study the importance of the internationalization and globalization in that it sets out the size of the global challenges for institutions over the next quarter century. The authors estimated that in 2000, there were 1.8 million international students enrolled in institutions of higher education around the world, and projected that this global demand for international higher education will exceed 7 million by 2025.

As societal influences transform the structure and purpose of the institution, they also serve to modify the leadership role of presidents and to determine the competencies required for success. Hahn (1995) and Shaw (1999) noted that a president should understand the nature of the institution he or she leads; an understanding of shared values and a capacity to build trust to enhance a leader's effectiveness. Whereas a leader's effectiveness within an institution is significantly improved through an

understanding of shared values and trust, leadership is also about change - change in personal competencies as well as change within organizations (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). The presidential leadership is essential to facilitate such a change to a more global focus (Fischer & Koch, 1996).

Today, in the internationalized and globalized society of the 21st century, the nature of presidential leadership continues to evolve. This study's focus on presidents of Jordanian institutions of higher education provides insights on how leadership competencies are being redefined in an era of internationalization and globalization.

To internationalize an institution, a leader focuses on the vision, structure, and strategies of that institution. The president's role in the internationalization of an institution includes development of international human resources, allocation of financial resources to support international activities, and communication of an international mission and vision (Arum, 1987; Henson, Noel, Gilliard-Byers, & Ingle, 1990; Robertson & Michael, 1999; Scott, 1992). Robertson and Michael's (1999) study concluded that, in the view of Ohio presidents, presidential leadership was an essential element in an institution's internationalization. AL-Omari and Obeidat's (2006) study about University Missions/Goals in the Context of Globalization: Public and Private Institutions in the Middle East concluded that the investigated universities in the Middle East pay more attention to the role of the university in preserving Arab and Islamic culture.

In an international society, a leader must focus not only on what is happening within the institution, but also on international influences (Marquardt, 1999). Although leadership competencies needed to internationalize an institution may overlap with those required to lead

an institution in an international society, the complexity of internationalization and globalization raises the following questions: Is a wider array of leadership competencies needed for presidents of institutions operating within international society?

The men and women in leadership positions must be ready to meet the multifaceted, multi-disciplinary challenges introduced by the increase in internationalization throughout the world. The speed of change, the ever expanding uses of technology, the interdependence of world economies, the interconnectivity of the international environment, the explosion of information, the mobility of the world population, and the blurring of national boundaries all are forces that create a new environment for leadership.

Throughout history, leadership theories have changed. The first studies of leadership were defined by the emerging industrial age and focused on Taylor's scientific management theories. With the increased understanding of the psychology of man through the work of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, McGregor's Leadership Theory X and Theory Y, the role of leaders was redefined. In developing a more comprehensive understanding of leadership and followership, Transformational Leadership appeared. Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership model (Kouzes & Posner, 1987) defined the leader's relationship to followers and found that leadership was situational-changing as the tasks changed and as the need to maintain relationships changed. As organizations began to adapt to a more diverse work force, Transactional Leadership emerged. Kouzes and Posner's Transactional Leadership was to become the most heavily researched theory in the 1980s and early 1990s. In the late 1990s, studies began to indicate that within the increasingly international society, current

leaders needed new and different skills. Studies conducted by Black et al. (1999), Dauphinais and Price (1998), Marquardt and Berger (2000), Rhinesmith (1996), and Rosen et al. (2000) indicated that specific leadership characteristics were necessary to meet the diverse challenges of international organizations. Specifically, Black et al. (1999) found that 67% of the current leaders with international and global responsibilities needed additional skills to meet expected standards.

The Purpose of this study

Given the impact of internationalization and globalization, institutions are compelled to respond, reactively or proactively, to its multi-faceted forces (Currie & Newson, 1998; Davis, 1981; Ellenboe, 1999; McHugh, 1991; Scott, 1991). Presidents of institutions of higher education, who are ultimately responsible for the well-being of their institutions, must take into consideration factors such as internationalization, globalization and the expanded, interdependent society the institutions now serve.

The present investigation proposes that the challenge of internationalization and globalization facing institutional leaders requires a new set of leadership strategies and competencies. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to assess the competencies required by presidents of universities to lead a Jordanian institution of higher education in an international society as perceived by academic administrators and faculty members.

Statement of Research Problem

The general research problem for this study was to identify the overall international leadership competencies that academic administrators and faculty members deemed necessary to lead Jordanian institutions of higher education in an internationalized society. To identify

these competencies, academic administrators and faculty members were asked to respond to survey questions on the importance of general international leadership competencies.

The research questions

Question One: To what extent do academic administrators and faculty members perceive that presidents should demonstrate competencies in the following specific areas of international leadership? (a) International culture, vision and mind set; (b) International human resources; (c) International strategic planning; (d) International operations and structure; and (g) International learning.

Question Two: To what extent do academic administrators and faculty members differ in their perceptions on the international leadership competencies of university presidents?

Significance of the study

Prior to this study, no studies could be found in higher education institutions in Jordan that investigated the international leadership competencies of university presidents. In this era of rapid change, technological influences, and worldwide interdependency, a whole new set of leadership skills will be required. Leaders possessing these skills will be challenged to deal with an unprecedented demographic diversity characterized by issues such as age, race, nationality, and gender. They will be compelled to stay abreast of changes in technology, to embrace boundary less collaborations, to maintain a national mind-set, to be risk takers, and to recognize that long-standing leadership styles were designed to meet the needs of yesterday's institutions.

For current presidents, aspiring presidents, policy makers at the local and national level, and scholars of higher education and educational leadership, this study may prove to be a significant

resource. This research will identify leadership skills, and institutional management capabilities that current academic administrators and faculty members regard as essential to lead an institution amid rapid internationalization. It is the researcher's hope that this study will also help to guide the development of strategies to assist presidents in their efforts to address internationalization and globalization issues in 21st century. By identifying the international leadership competencies expected of presidents in Jordanian higher education, this research may play a role in helping to ensure the continued influence of Jordanian higher education.

Methodology

Research Design

This study combined quantitative and descriptive research design. The study describes the perceptions of randomly selected administrators and faculty members, and in doing so, supposes that these administrators and faculty members understand the competencies of the presidency and the demands that an international society might place on presidents.

The Population and Sample of the Study

The population of concern was all ten public universities in Jordan. The sampling frame of institutions was represented by the listing of public universities in each region of Jordan (North, Middle, and South). Stage one of the sampling process was institution selection. A random selection of institution was chosen from each of three regions in Jordan. From the three selected institutions, administrators and faculty members were chosen.

The population in all three universities was (97) administrators and (161) faculty members. The sample from

the population was taken as a purposive trial. Two hundred fifty eight survey packages were mailed and 225 responses were received (86 administrators and 139 faculty members), for an 87% response rate.

Data Collections Procedures

The instrument of this study was administered by the researcher and hand scored following the administration and scoring guidelines set forth by instrument. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program was used to analyze the collected data. Analyses consisted of the computation of means, standard deviations, and t-Tests. In all tests of the hypotheses, the 0.05 confidence level was used for determining statistical significance.

Instrument Development of the Study

The researcher of this study reviewed the instruments in the literature related to leadership from an international and global perspective as in Marquardt (1999), Marquardt and Berger (2000), and Robertson (2005). Specific aspects that related and were suitable to the Jordanian higher education population were combined and modified. Five categories in "The Higher Education International Leadership Competencies" instrument were included: international culture, vision and mind set; international human resources; international strategies planning; international operations and structure; and international learning. To determine the extent that administrators and faculty members valued international leadership competencies, a Likert scale was used to differentiate responses. The Likert scale was listed as: not important (1.0 – 1.50), slightly important (1.51 – 2.50), moderately important (2.51 – 3.50), very important (3.51 – 4.50), and critical (4.51 – 5.00).

The Higher Education International Leadership Competencies Instrument was

then pilot tested with a group of 20 faculty members and administrators to collect feedback about instrument content and usage. The feedback from faculty members and administrators emphasized that the instrument has content validity.

Reliability and Validity

The Higher Education International Leadership Competencies Instrument was tested with a sample of 20 faculty members and administrators different from those participating in the study but drawn from the same population. Reliability coefficients for the 20 faculty members and administrators established for the five categories as follows: an international culture, vision and mind set (.91), international human resources (.83), international strategic planning (.87), international operations and structure (.91), and international learning (.83). Based on the reliability estimates, the Higher Education International Leadership Competencies Instrument seemed to be a valid and reliable measure for use with a Jordanian population.

Data Analysis

For research question 1: the perception of the administrators and

faculty members on the importance for presidents of the five categories of international competencies, t-test statistics, descriptive statistics of mean, and standard deviation were computed. For question 2: the differences between faculty members and administrators in their perception of the importance of the five categories of international competencies, t-test statistics, descriptive statistics of mean, and standard deviation were also used.

Findings of the study

Question One: To what extent do academic administrators and faculty members perceive that presidents should demonstrate competencies in the following specific areas of international leadership? (a) International culture, vision and mind set; (b) International human resources; (c) International strategic planning; (d) International operations and structure; and (g) International learning.

Table (1) provides a summary of t-test, means and standard deviations of the perceptions of the academic administrators and faculty members on the five categories of international competencies.

Table (1): Summary t-test for Differences in Categories of International Leadership Competencies Rating by Faculty Members and Academic Administrators.

International Competencies	Position	M	SD	t	Df	Sig.
International Culture, Vision, and Mind set	Faculty member Administrator	3.14 3.08	.59 .63	-.713	223	.477
International Strategic Planning	Faculty member Administrator	2.95 2.77	.93 .83	-1.471	223	.143
International Human Resources	Faculty member Administrator	2.80 2.73	.70 .86	-.670	223	.503
International Operations and Structure	Faculty member Administrator	3.10 3.11	.72 .79	.032	223	.974
International Learning	Faculty member Administrator	4.15 4.04	.58 .65	-1.363	223	.174

Table (1) identifies four of five categories of international leadership competencies rated by academic administrators as moderately important: International Culture, Vision, and Mind set ($M = 3.08$, $SD = .63$); International Strategic Planning ($M = 2.77$, $SD = .83$); International Human Resources ($M = 2.73$, $SD = .86$); and International Operations and Structure ($M = 3.11$, $SD = .79$). International learning was rated as very important by academic Administrators ($M = 4.04$, $SD = .65$).

Faculty members rated four of five categories of international leadership competencies as moderately important: International Culture, Vision, and Mind set ($M = 3.14$, $SD = .59$); International Strategic Planning ($M = 2.95$, $SD = .93$);

International Human Resources ($M = 2.80$, $SD = .70$); and International Operations and Structure ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .72$). International learning was also rated as very important ($M = 4.15$, $SD = .58$). The categories of international leadership competencies did not differ significantly in their ratings by academic administrators and faculty members.

Question Two: To what extent do academic administrators and faculty members differ in their perceptions on the international leadership competencies of university presidents?

The perceived differences between the academic administrators and faculty members on the international leadership competencies were statistically computed as clarified through the following.

International Culture, Vision, and Mind Set

Table (2): Summary t-test for Differences in Competencies Rating of Faculty Members and Administrators for International Culture, Vision, and Mind Set

Culture, Vision and Mind set Competency	Position	M	SD	t	Df	Sig.
Communicating an international vision	Faculty member Administrator	4.06 4.67	.84 .52	6.076	223	.00*
Viewing the world without boundaries	Faculty member Administrator	4.40 4.30	.75 1.06	-.772	223	.441
Participating in conferences overseas	Faculty member Administrator	3.29 2.88	1.49 1.56	-1.945	223	.053
Reading publications on worldwide higher educational issues	Faculty member Administrator	2.19 2.43	1.22 1.27	1.427	223	.155
Initiating policies and procedures that enhance international thinking and action	Faculty member Administrator	3.94 3.90	1.27 1.23	-.272	223	.786
Knowing how to access resources to meet challenges of internationalization	Faculty member Administrator	2.14 2.35	1.26 1.48	1.106	223	.270
Seeing the institution as serving the world through knowledge development and service to the international community	Faculty member Administrator	3.43 3.06	1.51 1.49	-1.810	223	.072
Having the ability to promote an international mind set for faculty and staff	Faculty member Administrator	1.86 1.97	1.20 1.26	.649	223	.517
Possessing the ability to make decisions in face of international complexities	Faculty member Administrator	3.57 3.24	1.47 1.60	-1.550	223	.122
Possessing the ability to frame day-to-day management issues, problems and goals in international context	Faculty member Administrator	2.06 2.16	1.37 1.41	.513	223	.608
Understanding that the forces of technological and science innovation, and the speed of change are part of internationalization	Faculty member Administrator	3.60 2.92	1.61 1.62	-3.062	223	.002*
Average of Means	Faculty member Administrator	3.14 3.08	.59 .63	-.713	223	.477

* $p = .05$

Table (2) provides a summary of International Culture, Vision and Mind set. The competency of communicating an international vision was rated by administrators as critical (M = 4.67, SD = .52). Two competencies were rated as very important: Viewing the world without boundaries (M = 4.30, SD = 1.06), and initiating policies and procedures that enhance international thinking and action (M = 3.90, SD = 1.23). Four competencies were rated as moderately important: Participating in

conferences overseas (M = 2.88, SD = 1.56), seeing the institution as serving the world through knowledge development and service to the international community (M = 3.06, SD = 1.24), possessing the ability to make decisions in face of international complexities (M = 3.24, SD = 1.60), and understanding that the forces of technological and science innovation, and the speed of change are part of internationalization (M = 2.92, SD = 1.62). Four competencies were rated with a slightly important rating: Reading

publications on worldwide higher educational issues ($M = 2.43$, $SD = 1.27$), knowing how to access resources to meet challenges of internationalization ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 1.48$), having the ability to promote an international mind set for faculty and staff ($M = 1.97$, $SD = 1.26$), Possessing the ability to frame day-to-day management issues, problems and goals in international context ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.41$).

Faculty members in Table (2), reported five of the eleven world-focused leadership strategies as very important for the effective performance of Jordanian university presidents: Communicating an international vision ($M = 4.06$, $SD = .82$), viewing the world without boundaries ($M = 4.40$, $SD = .75$), initiating policies and procedures that enhance international thinking and action ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.27$), possessing the ability to make decisions in face of international complexities ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.27$), and understanding that the forces of technological and science innovation, and the speed of change are part of internationalization ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.61$). Two competencies were rated with a moderately important rating: Participating in conferences overseas ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.49$), seeing the institution as serving the world through knowledge

development and service to the international community ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.51$). Four competencies were rated with a slightly important rating: Reading publications on worldwide higher educational issues ($M = 2.19$, $SD = 1.22$), knowing how to access resources to meet challenges of internationalization ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 1.26$), having the ability to promote an international mind set for faculty and staff ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 1.20$), and possessing the ability to frame day-to-day management issues, problems and goals in international context ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 1.37$).

Table (2) shows only two areas with significant differences in the ratings of faculty members and administrators: Communicating an international vision ($p = .000$), and understanding that the forces of technological and science innovation and the speed of change are part of internationalization ($p = .002$). The administrators rated the former higher than the faculty members, means of former ($M = 4.67$, $M = 4.06$), and the faculty members rated the second one higher than the administrators, means of second ($M = 3.60$, $M = 2.92$). The other competency areas were not significantly different in their ratings by administrators and faculty members.

International Strategic Planning

Table (3): Summary t-test for Differences in Competencies Rating of Faculty Members and Administrators for International Strategic Planning

Strategic Planning Competency	Position	M	SD	t	df	Sig.
Ensuring that the institution has a clear international mission built on international values and norms	Faculty member	2.01	1.35	.608	223	.544
	Administrator	2.13	1.37			
Establishing the systematic analysis of international opportunities and concerns	Faculty member	3.46	1.40	-.989	223	.324
	Administrator	3.27	1.45			
Aligning resources and organizational units for implementation of international strategies	Faculty member	2.65	1.49	-1.025	223	.306
	Administrator	2.44	1.54			
Using systemic thinking in evaluating and modifying an international strategy	Faculty member	3.68	1.50	-2.066	223	.040*
	Administrator	3.24	1.56			
Average of Means	Faculty member	2.95	.93	-1.471	223	.143
	Administrator	2.77	.83			

* $p = .05$

In this category as showed in Table (3), two strategic planning processes were rated by administrators as moderately important: Establishing the systematic analysis of international opportunities and concerns (M = 3.27 SD = 1.45), and using systemic thinking in evaluating and modifying an international strategy (M = 3.24, SD = 1.56). The other two strategic planning competencies were rated as slightly important: Ensuring that the institution has a clear international mission built on international values and norms (M = 2.13, SD = 1.37), and aligning resources and organizational units for implementation of international strategies (M = 2.44, SD = 1.54).

Similarly, faculty members rated one of the four worldwide focused strategic planning processes as very important to the effective performance of Jordanian university presidents today: Using systemic thinking in evaluating and modifying an international strategy (M = 3.68, SD = 1.50). Two competencies were rated with a moderately important rating:

Establishing the systematic analysis of international opportunities and concerns (M = 3.46, SD = 1.40), and aligning resources and organizational units for implementation of international strategies (M = 2.65, SD = 1.46). The last competency was rated as slightly important: Ensuring that the institution has a clear international mission built on international values and norms (M = 2.01, SD = 1.35).

Table (3) reported the summary of the t-test statistics of the independent samples for International Strategic Planning as rated by the faculty members and administrators. Only one of the international competencies was rated statistically significant in this population of faculty members and administrators: Using systemic thinking in evaluating and modifying an international strategy (p = .040). Faculty members rated this higher than the administrators (M = 3.68, M = 3.52). The other three competencies were not statistically different in their ratings by administrators and faculty members.

International Human Resources

Table (4): Summary t-test for Differences in Competencies Rating of Faculty Members and Administrators for International Human Resources

Human Resources Competency	Position	M	SD	t	df	Sig.
Establishing international competencies for administrative team.	Faculty member Administrator	2.04 2.30	1.35 1.46	1.393	223	.165
Establishing international competencies for all faculty.	Faculty member Administrator	3.58 3.62	1.38 1.43	.212	223	.832
Fostering recruitment worldwide for the best faculty and staff.	Faculty member Administrator	2.36 2.44	1.45 1.55	.403	223	.688
Valuing the need for cross-cultural communication skills for all involved internationally.	Faculty member Administrator	3.63 3.26	1.34 1.41	-2.017	223	.045*
Appreciating the training for faculty and staff on international issues affecting research and scholarship.	Faculty member Administrator	2.19 2.21	1.45 1.59	.073	223	.942
Knowing the importance of multiple languages for students, faculty, and staff.	Faculty member Administrator	3.47 2.93	1.38 1.47	-2.763	223	.006
Highlighting international collaboration in institutional meetings.	Faculty member Administrator	1.66 1.97	1.16 1.45	1.730	223	.085
Featuring international activities in institutional publications.	Faculty member Administrator	4.06 3.49	1.25 1.46	-3.109	223	.002*
Providing support for overseas initiatives for faculty/ staff such as predeparture programs.	Faculty member Administrator	1.88 2.06	1.30 1.46	.926	223	.356
Developing institutional leaders through international collaborations.	Faculty member Administrator	3.99 3.52	1.29 1.52	-2.440	223	.015*
Designing performance and reward systems that include an international perspective.	Faculty member Administrator	1.97 2.26	1.39 1.54	1.428	223	.155
Average of Means	Faculty member Administrator	2.80 2.73	.70 .86	-.670	223	.503

* $p = .05$

Administrators rated 4 of 11 competencies of International Human Resources as very important: Establishing international competencies for all faculty (M = 3.62, SD = 1.43), and developing institutional leaders through international collaborations (M = 3.52, SD = 1.52). Three of the international human resources leadership strategies were rated as moderately important: Valuing the need for cross-cultural communication skills for all involved internationally (M = 3.26, SD = 1.41); knowing the importance of multiple languages for students, faculty, staff (M = 2.93, SD = 1.47); and featuring international activities in

institutional publications (M = 3.49, SD = 1.46). Four of the international human resources leadership strategies were rated as a slightly important by the administrators: Establishing international competencies for administrative team (M = 2.30, SD = 1.46), fostering recruitment worldwide for the best faculty and staff (M = 2.44, SD = 1.55), appreciating the training for faculty and staff on international issues affecting research and scholarship (M = 2.21, SD = 1.59), and highlighting international collaboration in institutional meetings (M = 1.97, SD = 1.45).

The responding faculty members, as showed in Table 4, rated four of the competencies in International Human Resources as very important: Establishing international competencies for all faculty (M = 3.58, SD = 1.38); valuing the need for cross-cultural communication skills for all involved internationally (M = 3.63, SD = 1.34); featuring international activities in institutional publications (M = 4.06, SD = 1.25); and developing institutional leaders through international collaborations (M = 3.99, SD = 1.29). One of the strategies was given the moderately important rating: Knowing the importance of multiple languages for students, faculty, and staff (M = 3.47, SD = 1.38). Faculty members rated six competencies as slightly important: Establishing international competencies for administrative team (M = 2.04, SD = 1.35); fostering recruitment worldwide for the best faculty and staff (M = 2.36, SD = 1.45); appreciating the training for faculty and staff on international issues affecting research and scholarship (M = 2.19, SD = 1.45); highlighting international collaboration in institutional meetings (M = 1.66, SD = 1.16); providing support for overseas initiatives

for faculty/ staff such as predeparture programs (M = 1.88, SD = 1.30); and designing performance and reward systems that include an international perspective (M = 1.97, SD = 1.39).

In this category *International Human Resources*, as showed in Table (4), three international competencies were rated significantly different by the sample's faculty members and administrators: Valuing the need for cross-cultural communication skills for all involved internationally (p = .045); featuring international activities in institutional publications (p = .002); and developing institutional leaders through international collaborations (p = .015).

For those found to be statistically different, the faculty members in the study rated the international human resources competencies higher than the administrators: valuing the need for training in cross-cultural communication skills for all involved internationally (M = 3.63, M = 3.26), featuring international activities in institutional publications (M = 4.06, M = 3.49), and developing institutional leaders through international collaborations (M = 3.99, M = 3.52).

International Operations and Structure

Tale (5): Summary t-test for Differences in Competencies Rating of Faculty Members and Administrators for International Operations and Structure

Operations and Structure Competency	Position	M	SD	t	df	Sig.
Creating flexible delivery systems for instructional programs for international dissemination	Faculty member Administrator	3.93 3.66	1.24 1.38	-1.488	223	.138
Developing academic program quality benchmarks against international standards	Faculty member Administrator	2.28 2.48	1.40 1.61	1.189	223	.236
Providing financial resources for responding to unexpected international events or to take advantage of unexpected international opportunities	Faculty member Administrator	3.88 3.65	1.23 1.49	-1.232	223	.219
Advertising and marketing program and services that are customized to meet the local as well as the variety of international cultural expectations	Faculty member Administrator	2.51 2.69	1.39 1.53	.881	223	.379
Creating a balanced mix between international and local outreach	Faculty member Administrator	4.17 3.88	1.19 1.26	-1.678	223	.095
Ensuring that a standardize international communication system for gathering processing and distributing information is institutionalized	Faculty member Administrator	2.15 2.47	1.31 1.56	2.161	223	.032*
Developing international student recruitment that includes training programs for recruiters in international diversity issues	Faculty member Administrator	3.54 3.90	1.45 1.39	-.203	223	.840
Determining that the institution's structure is boundaryless	Faculty member Administrator	2.04 2.10	1.40 1.49	.725	223	.470
Determining that the institution's structure is streamlined and seamless	Faculty member Administrator	3.41 3.3	1.45 1.52	-.667	223	.499
Average of Means	Faculty member Administrator	3.10 3.11	.72 .79	.032	223	.974

* $p = .05$

Table 5 summarizes the administrators' rating four of the competencies in operations and structure as very important: Creating flexible delivery systems for instructional programs for international dissemination ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.38$), providing financial resources for responding to unexpected international events or to take advantage of unexpected international opportunities ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.49$), creating a balanced mix between international and local outreach ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.26$), and developing international student recruitment that

includes training programs for recruiters in international diversity issues ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.39$). Determining that the institution's structure is streamlined and seamless ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.52$), advertising and marketing program and services that are customized to meet the local as well as the variety of international cultural expectations ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.53$) were rated as moderately important. Three of the competencies in operations and structure were rated as slightly important: Developing academic program quality benchmarks against international standards ($M = 2.48$, $SD = 1.61$), ensuring

that a standardized international communication system for gathering processing and distributing information is institutionalized ($M = 2.47$, $SD = 1.56$), and determining that the institution's structure is boundary less ($M = 2.19$, $SD = 1.49$).

The responding faculty members, as showed in Table 5, rated four of the competencies in operations and structure as very important: Creating flexible delivery systems for instructional programs for international dissemination ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.24$), providing financial resources for responding to unexpected international events or to take advantage of unexpected international opportunities ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.23$), creating a balanced mix between international and local outreach ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.19$), and developing international student recruitment that includes training programs for recruiters in international diversity issues ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.45$). Determining that the institution's structure is streamlined and seamless ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.45$), advertising and marketing program and services that are customized to meet the local as well as the variety of international

cultural expectations ($M = 2.51$, $SD = 1.39$) were rated as moderately important. Three of the competencies in operations and structure were rated as slightly important: Developing academic program quality benchmarks against international standards ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 1.40$), ensuring that a standardized international communication system for gathering processing and distributing information is institutionalized ($M = 2.15$, $SD = 1.31$), and determining that the institution's structure is boundary less ($M = 2.04$, $SD = 1.40$). The average of the means for International Operations and Structure given by responding administrators was 3.15 or moderately important.

In Table (5), one of the international operations and structure competencies was found to be statistically different between the faculty members and administrators in the rating: ensuring that a standardized international communication system for gathering, processing and distributing information is institutionalized ($p = .032$, $M = 2.47$, $M = 2.15$). In this case, administrators rated the international operations and structure competencies higher than faculty members.

International Learning

Table (6): Summary t-test for Differences in Competencies Rating of Faculty Members and Administrators for International Structure

Culture and Vision Competency	Position	M	SD	t	df	Sig.
Encouraging and rewarding learning to all faculty and staff as well as students	Faculty member	4.21	.99	2.151	223	.03*
	Administrator	4.49	.88			
Utilizing technology to enhance learning and knowledge management on a worldwide basis	Faculty member	3.80	1.29	-1.244	223	.215
	Administrator	3.58	1.25			
Internationalizing the design delivery, and evaluation of all training programs for staff and faculty	Faculty member	4.17	1.01	-1.196	223	.233
	Administrator	4.01	.94			
Developing the use of multicultural learning materials including videos and software	Faculty member	4.44	.86	-2.468	223	.009*
	Administrator	4.08	1.16			
Average of Means	Faculty member	4.15	.58	-1.363	223	.174
	Administrator	4.04	.65			

* $p = .05$

In the category of International Learning as reported in Table 6, the responding administrators rated all of the world focused learning strategies as very important to the effective performance of Jordanian university presidents: utilizing technology to enhance learning and knowledge management on a worldwide basis ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.25$); internationalizing the design, delivery, and evaluation of all training programs for staff and faculty ($M = 4.01$, $SD = .94$); developing the use of multicultural learning materials including videos and software ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 1.16$); and encouraging and rewarding learning to all faculty and staff as well as students ($M = 4.49$, $SD = .88$).

Faculty members rated all of the four international institutional learning strategies as very important to effective performance of Jordanian university presidents: utilizing technology to enhance learning and knowledge management on a worldwide basis ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.29$); internationalizing the design, delivery, and evaluation of all training programs for staff and faculty ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.01$); developing the use of multicultural learning materials including

videos and software ($M = 4.44$, $SD = .86$); and encouraging and rewarding learning to all faculty and staff as well as students ($M = 4.21$, $SD = .99$).

Table (6) reported that encouraging and rewarding learning in all faculty and staff as well as students was significantly rated higher by administrators than by faculty members ($p = .03$, $M = 4.49$, $M = 4.21$). In contrast, developing the use of multicultural learning materials including videos and software significantly rated by faculty members than by administrators ($p = .009$, $M=4.44$, $M=4.08$).

Discussion and Recommendations

In this study, the five categories of international leadership competencies provided an integrated set of actions describing competencies that presidents need for effectiveness during a period of dramatic change. Academic administrators perceived that four of the five international categories: culture, vision, and mind set; strategic planning; human resources, and operations and structure were moderately important. International learning was shown to be only very important.

The academic administrators who participated in this study rated none of the competencies as critical. However, 13 of the 39 international competencies were rated by academic administrators as very important to international leadership in a rapidly changing world. The fact that 13 competencies received a very important rating supports the findings of literature on international leadership (Black et al., 1999; Marquardt, 1999; Marquardt & Berger, 2000; Rosen et al., 2000).

Faculty members in the study rated four of the five categories: culture, vision, and mind set; strategic planning; human resources, and operations and structure as moderately important and the other one category, Learning, as very important to the success of a president of an institution of higher education in Jordan today. Only 18 of the 39 competencies were rated as very important to faculty members for effective leadership of presidents. Once again, the data from this study supports international leadership studies (Marquardt, 1999; Marquardt & Berger, 2000) and the discussion of the future of leadership provided by top leadership thinkers (Bennis, Spreitzer, & Cummings, 2001).

Overall, academic administrators tended to rate the competencies lower than did faculty members. In addition, in the comparison of international leadership competencies, significant differences were found among the perceptions of academic administrators and faculty members regarding the importance of nine of the thirty-nine competencies in the context of presidential leadership. Also, both did not consider as many international leadership competencies to be critical to the success of presidents.

This result may be explained as universities increasingly become involved with international and global corporations, send students abroad, conduct research in foreign countries; academic administrators view themselves more

challenged than faculty members to protect the institution against the threat of contract disputes, liability concerns. With the increased population mobility and interconnectivity of technology redefining basic values, the academic administrators again will be challenged more than faculty members to safeguard against the erosion of the basic values of Jordanian institutions of higher education, and institutional autonomy.

The shift from a nationally focused institution to one that reflects an international focus is a developmental process enhanced through leadership (Marquardt, 1999). This study suggests that there are specific international competencies that can assist a president in guiding the development process of an institution from a nationally focused institution to a more internationally positioned institution for today's highly internationalized society.

Lawler (as cited in Bennis et al., 2001) revealed in his discussion of the future of leadership in a globalized world that global organizational capabilities and core competencies are vital assets among top leaders of an institution. The findings of the great global leadership thinkers of today (Bennis et al., 2001) are consistent with this study's conclusions on the perceptions of faculty members.

The objective of this study has been to validate international leadership competencies essential for the effectiveness of those leading Jordanian universities. In a highly internationalized society, leaders of Jordanian universities must adopt new competencies if they want to serve and survive in the larger international community. New circumstances are forcing a redefinition of the leadership competencies required to be effective. Additionally, one can examine the similarities and differences between corporations and universities. In an era of internationalization and globalization, technological connectivity,

knowledge generation, information explosion, and elimination of trade barriers, this study suggests that nationally focused presidents and institutional structures may have to have new competencies to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

A truly international and global organization is a learning community; therefore, another research project is suggested to examine the international leadership found throughout one institution. Does international culture, vision, and mind set permeate the institution or are they found in only in the international offices and internationally involved faculty? Higher education faculty, training higher education leaders for the future and increasingly training the presidents of the future, will need to consider the forces of internationalization and globalization and their impact in designing higher education institutions. This study indicates that particular consideration should be given to the study of international and global leadership culture, vision, and mind set; strategic planning; human resources; operations and structure; and learning in the higher education institution, those competencies deemed important by this study.

References

- Al-Omari, A., & Obeidat, O. (2006). University Missions/Goals in the Context of Globalization: Public and Private Institutions in the Middle East. *International Journal of Private Higher Education*, 1, 20-36.
- Arum, S. (1987). Promoting international education: The president sets the pace. *Educational Record*, 68(2), 18-22.
- Bennis, W., Spreitzer, G.M., & Cummings, T.G. (Eds.). (2001). *The future of leadership: Today's top leadership thinkers speak to tomorrow's leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Black, J.S., Morrison, A.J., & Gregersen, H.B. (1999). *Global leaders: The next generation of leaders*. New York: Routledge.
- Bohn, A., Davis, D., Meares, D., & Pearce, D. (2002). *Global student mobility 2025: Forecasts of the global demand for international higher education*. Sydney: IDP Education Australia.
- Bondreau, M.C., Lock, K.D., Robey, D., & Straud, D. (1998). Going global using information technology to advance the competitiveness of the virtual transnational organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(4), 120-127.
- Conner, D.R. (1998). *Leading on the edge of chaos: How to create a nimble organization*. New York: John Wiley.
- Currie, J., & Newson, J. (1998). *Universities and globalization*. London: Sage.
- Dauphinais, G.W., & Price, C. (1998). *Straight from the CEO*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Davis, J.D. (1981). *Development of international programs at the University of Alabama in Birmingham: An analysis of perceptions of key administrators, faculty, and staff*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alabama.
- Drucker, P.F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Ellenboe, B.J. (1999, January). *Internationalizing the private liberal arts college: A comparative, five-college case study of components, strategies, and recommendations*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Fisher, J.L., & Koch, J.V. (1996). *Presidential leadership: Making a difference*. Phoenix, AZ: American

- Council on Education and the Oryx Press.
- Hahn, R. (1995). Getting serious about presidential leadership: Our collective responsibility. *Change*, 27, 12-20.
- Henson, J.B., Noel, J.C., Gilliard-Byers, T.E., & Ingle, M.D. (1990). *Internationalizing US universities: Preliminary summary of a national study*. Presented at the Conference on internationalizing US Universities: A time for Leadership-Conference Proceedings. Pullman, WA: Washington State University International Program Development Office.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Pozner, B.Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Marquardt, M.J. (1999). *The global advantage: How world class organizations improve performance through globalization*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Marquardt, M.J., & Berger, N.O. (2000). *Global leaders for the 21st century*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- McHugh, C.J. (1991). *Presidential leadership: Criteria for excellence in the leadership of American colleges and universities*. Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University.
- Rhinesmith, S.H. (1996). *A manager's guide to globalization: Six skills for success in a changing world* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Irwin.
- Robertson, L.B. (2005). *American higher education in a global society: A study of presidential leadership*. Doctoral Dissertation, Kent State University, U.S.A.
- Robertson, L., & Michael, S.O. (1999). *The role of presidents in the internationalization of Ohio institutions of higher education*. Paper presented at Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater, FL, February 1999.
- Rosen, R., Digh, P., Singer, M., & Phillips, C. (2000). *Global literacies: Lessons on business leadership and national cultures*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Scott, R.A. (1992, September). *Campus development in response to the challenges of internationalization: The case of Ramapo College of New Jersey*. Paper presented at General Conference Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development. Paris, France. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 345 678).
- Scott, R.A. (1991). *The trustees' role in the globalization of university programs*. A paper presented at the Retreat of University Trustees, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University, Greensboro, NC. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 343 479.
- Shaw, K.A. (1999). *The successful president: "Buzz words" on leadership*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council of Education and Ornyx Press.
- Witte, J. (2000). Education in Thailand after the crisis: A balancing act between globalization and national self-contemplation. *International Journal of Education Development*, 20, 232-245.