



Article **Open Access**

Sustainable Institutional Internationalization as Pathway to Student Global Competence in a Chinese University

Haochen Liu ^{1,*}

¹ Graduate School, Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manina, Philippines

* Correspondence: Haochen Liu, Graduate School, Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manina, Philippines



Abstract: This study examined the Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies (SIIS) implemented by the university and their relationship to students' Preparation for Global Competence (PGC). A quantitative survey was conducted across different demographics (sex, year level, academic major) to assess students' views on internationalization and readiness for global engagement. Results showed that students generally agreed on the strategic implementation of SIIS, with Reflexive Policy Frameworks and Environmental Sustainability receiving the highest ratings. Students felt prepared for global competence, particularly in Intercultural Sensitivity and Civic Responsibility, though Global Awareness posed more challenges. No significant demographic differences in SIIS and PGC were found, except for a slight sex-based difference in Communication Proficiency. Correlation analysis revealed weak, negative correlations between SIIS and PGC, suggesting that institutional strategies alone may not be sufficient to enhance students' global competence. The study emphasizes the need for stronger curriculum integration, discipline-specific global learning, and sustained intercultural engagement, offering practical recommendations for enhancing global competence development in higher education.

Keywords: Sustainable Internationalization; Global Competence; Intercultural Sensitivity; Communication Proficiency; Global Awareness

Received: 19 January 2026

Revised: 04 March 2026

Accepted: 16 March 2026

Published: 19 March 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The rapid process of globalization has made the cultivation of global competence among students a critical priority in higher education. As outlined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2018), global competence involves the ability to analyze global and intercultural issues, understand diverse perspectives, engage in effective cross-cultural communication, and take responsible action for sustainable development [1,2]. These competencies are essential for both personal growth and the advancement of peaceful, sustainable societies [3,4].

In China, the pursuit of "Double First-Class" university status has driven institutions to adopt comprehensive internationalization strategies aimed at improving global rankings, strengthening partnerships, and enhancing academic programs [5]. However, much of the focus has been on structural metrics like partnerships and mobility programs, which do not fully capture the qualitative aspects of student development, particularly in terms of global competence. While these internationalization strategies are crucial for the growth of universities, little attention has been given to their impact on student outcomes, such as the development of global competence [6].

This study aims to explore the relationship between sustainable internationalization strategies implemented by universities and students' self-assessed readiness for global competence. By addressing gaps in existing research, this study provides empirical evidence to support educational reforms and the enhancement of global competence among students [7].

As China's political, economic, and technological influence expands, the national imperative to cultivate globally competent graduates has become more pressing. Policies such as China's Education Modernization 2035 and the "Belt and Road" initiative emphasize intercultural understanding and global engagement. In this context, university internationalization strategies are increasingly aligned with these national priorities, yet their actual effectiveness in fostering global competence remains insufficiently explored [8].

This research, motivated by the researcher's role as Director of Student Affairs at a leading Chinese university, aims to fill this gap by examining the correlation between sustainable internationalization strategies and students' preparedness for global competence. Despite significant investments in international offices, exchange programs, and curriculum reforms, concerns persist regarding the disconnect between institutional strategies and students' ability to demonstrate the global competencies necessary for success in a globalized world [9].

2. Research Framework

This study is based on two key perspectives: sustainable institutional internationalization and student global competence. Both constructs are explored through complementary theoretical lenses, ensuring the study is grounded in established scholarship while addressing current educational trends.

2.1. Theoretical Foundation for Sustainable Institutional Internationalization

The Integrated Model of Internationalization challenges the traditional view of internationalization, emphasizing its integration into the institution's core functions, values, and mission. It advocates for a holistic approach that embeds global and intercultural dimensions across governance, pedagogy, stakeholder engagement, and policy, making internationalization transformative rather than merely structural [10,11].

2.2. Theoretical Foundation for Student Global Competence

This study uses the OECD-PISA Global Competence Framework (OECD, 2018 report), which defines global competence as a multidimensional construct encompassing cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral domains, including intercultural sensitivity, communication proficiency, global awareness, civic responsibility, and action orientation. This framework provides measurable indicators for assessing student preparedness for global engagement and aligns with China's focus on the SDGs and educational modernization [12].

2.3. Conceptual Framework

The study examines the relationship between institutional internationalization strategies and student readiness for global competence in a Chinese university. Key factors include demographic variables (sex, year level, academic major), which may influence students' perceptions and experiences [13].

Institutional strategies are assessed through seven dimensions: (1) strategic governance, (2) inclusive curriculum, (3) stakeholder engagement, (4) mobility, (5) intercultural competence, (6) sustainability, and (7) reflexive policy. Student readiness is measured by five factors: (1) intercultural sensitivity, (2) communication skills, (3) global awareness, (4) civic responsibility, and (5) action orientation.

This framework posits that students' perceptions of institutional strategies correlate with their self-assessed global competence. Demographic factors may moderate these perceptions and outcomes. The study aims to provide insights for improving institutional practices and better preparing students for global engagement [14].

3. Research Background and Objectives

In the face of global challenges and increasing interdependence among nations, higher education institutions must adopt sustainable internationalization strategies that prepare students to become globally competent professionals and responsible global citizens. These strategies-comprising strategic governance, inclusive curriculum and pedagogy, stakeholder engagement, digital and physical mobility, intercultural competence development, environmental sustainability, and reflexive policy frameworks-are instrumental in shaping a learning environment conducive to global competence formation [15].

At the same time, fostering global competence entails preparing students in areas such as intercultural sensitivity, communication proficiency, global awareness, civic responsibility, and action orientation. However, while these two domains-sustainable institutional internationalization and student global competence-are often promoted independently, their potential relationship remains underexplored.

This study aims to determine whether a significant correlation exists between students' assessment of their university's sustainable institutional internationalization strategies and their self-perceived preparation for global competence. The research will answer the following questions:

- 1) What is the profile of the student-respondents in terms of sex, year level, and academic major?
- 2) What is the assessment of the student-respondents on the sustainable institutional internationalization strategies implemented by the university?
- 3) Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the student-respondents on the sustainable institutional internationalization strategies when their profile variables (sex, year level, academic major) are used as test factors?
- 4) What is the assessment of the student-respondents regarding their preparation for global competence?
- 5) Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the student-respondents regarding their preparation for global competence when their profile variables (sex, year level, academic major) are used as test factors?
- 6) Is there a significant correlation between the assessment of the student-respondents on the sustainable institutional internationalization strategies and their preparation for global competence?
- 7) Based on the results, what strategic plan can be proposed to enhance sustainable institutional internationalization and strengthen student preparation for global competence?

Hypotheses:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the assessment of the student-respondents on the sustainable institutional internationalization strategies when grouped according to their profile variables (sex, year level, and academic major).

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in the assessment of the student-respondents regarding their preparation for global competence when grouped according to their profile variables (sex, year level, and academic major).

H₀₃: There is no significant correlation between the assessment of the student-respondents on the sustainable institutional internationalization strategies and their preparation for global competence.

This study is of critical importance as it explores the assessment of sustainable institutional internationalization strategies and student preparation for global

competence in the context of higher education. The findings are expected to contribute to both theory and practice by providing empirical evidence that informs internationalization policy, pedagogical frameworks, and institutional decision-making. For university administrators, policymakers, curriculum developers, and faculty, the research will offer evidence-based insights that can guide improvements in internationalization practices, curricular design, and teaching methods. Moreover, the study's findings will be valuable for students, international education bodies, and accrediting agencies [16].

4. Research Methodology

This section outlines the methodology for conducting the study, including the research design, locale, participants, data collection instrument, data gathering procedures, statistical analysis, and ethical considerations.

4.1. Research Design

This study will employ a quantitative comparative-correlational research design to examine differences and relationships among variables. The comparative aspect will assess whether students' assessments of institutional internationalization strategies and their preparation for global competence vary based on their demographic variables (sex, year level, academic major). The correlational aspect will explore the relationship between students' perceptions of internationalization strategies and their readiness for global competence [17].

4.2. Participants and Sampling Technique

The sample size will consist of 357 respondents selected using simple random sampling, ensuring that each student has an equal chance of selection. The sampling method ensures representativeness across different year levels and academic majors. This approach will minimize bias and allow for generalizability within the context of the institution.

4.3. Data Collection Instrument

A researcher-developed structured questionnaire will serve as the primary data collection tool. It will consist of three sections:

Part I: Respondent Profile (demographics including sex, year level, and academic major).

Part II: Assessment of Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies (covering seven key constructs).

Part III: Assessment of Preparation for Global Competence (covering five key domains).

The questionnaire will be initially developed in English and subsequently translated into Chinese. Responses will be recorded using a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree). The instrument will undergo expert validation and pilot testing with a small sample to ensure reliability and clarity.

It should be noted that the measurement of sustainable institutional internationalization strategies in this study relies on students' perceptions rather than institutional policy documents or administrative data. While perception-based measures offer valuable insight into how internationalization is experienced at the student level, future research could triangulate these findings with institutional records and qualitative data to provide a more comprehensive understanding of institutional internationalization.

4.4. Data Gathering and Analysis

Data will be collected following ethical approval, and a pilot test will be conducted to ensure the clarity and cultural relevance of the instrument. The main data collection

will occur over three weeks, with online and printed questionnaires distributed to the sample. Participants will be informed of the study's purpose and will provide informed consent.

Data analysis will be performed using SPSS software. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, means) will summarize the demographic profile and assessments. Inferential statistics, including t-tests and ANOVA, will be used to examine differences based on profile variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient will assess the relationship between internationalization strategies and global competence.

4.5. Ethical Considerations

The study will adhere to ethical standards in educational research. Ethical approval will be obtained from the university's ethics review board. Participation will be voluntary, and confidentiality will be maintained throughout. No personally identifiable information will be collected, and all data will be stored securely.

5. Data Analysis and Results Presentation

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of the data collected in the study. It focuses on the assessment of sustainable institutional internationalization strategies and preparation for global competence by student respondents. The findings are systematically organized using appropriate statistical methods to uncover patterns, trends, and insights related to the research objectives and questions.

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of 357 student respondents, showing the distribution of sex, year level, and academic major. The sex distribution is relatively balanced, with 54.3% females and 45.7% males. The year level distribution is fairly even, with the largest group being first-year students (31.4%), followed by second-year (24.4%), fourth-year (23%), and third-year students (21.3%). In terms of academic major, Education students make up the largest group (26.6%), followed by Sciences (20.4%), Engineering (19.3%), Business (19.0%), and Arts and Humanities (14.6%). This distribution helps provide context for interpreting the results from the later sections regarding institutional internationalization strategies and global competence preparation.

Table 1. Respondents' Demographic Profile.

Indicators	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	163	45.7%
	Female	194	54.3%
Year Level	First Year	112	31.4%
	Second Year	87	24.4%
	Third Year	76	21.3%
	Fourth Year	82	23.0%
Academic Major	Education	95	26.6%
	Business	68	19.0%
	Engineering	69	19.3%
	Arts and Humanities	52	14.6%
	Sciences	73	20.4%

Table 2 presents the assessment of Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies across six key dimensions: Inclusive Curriculum and Pedagogy, Stakeholder Engagement, Digital and Physical Mobility, Intercultural Competence Development, Environmental Sustainability, and Reflexive Policy Frameworks. Each dimension's mean score (WM) and standard deviation (SD) are provided, along with the rank based on student assessment [18].

Inclusive Curriculum and Pedagogy (WM: 3.11) and Reflexive Policy Frameworks (WM: 3.21) received the highest ratings, indicating that students feel the university has

made considerable progress in integrating global content and involving students in shaping policies.

Stakeholder Engagement (WM: 3.05) and Environmental Sustainability (WM: 3.05) received lower ratings, reflecting that although these areas have seen some progress, there is still room for improvement, particularly in strengthening external partnerships and more fully integrating sustainability into the academic curriculum and practices.

Table 2. Assessment of Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies.

Dimension	Indicator	WM	SD	Rank
Inclusive Curriculum and Pedagogy	Courses integrate international content.	3.05	0.835	8
	Inclusive classroom environments are supported.	3.07	0.809	6
	Learning outcomes include global competencies.	3.10	0.822	3
	Critical thinking about global issues is encouraged.	3.11	0.822	1
Stakeholder Engagement	Alumni contribute to global initiatives.	3.06	0.794	7
	Industry partnerships support student exposure.	3.08	0.851	5
	Local community engagement in programs.	3.05	0.836	8
Digital & Physical Mobility	Clear procedures for student exchanges.	3.15	0.794	1
	Support for global mobility opportunities.	3.14	0.825	2
Intercultural Competence Development	Interaction with students from diverse cultures.	3.10	0.812	4.5
	Faculty model inclusive behavior.	3.11	0.857	4.5
Environmental Sustainability	University collaborates on environmental issues.	3.17	0.825	1
	Research focuses on sustainability solutions.	3.16	0.846	2
Reflexive Policy Frameworks	Student feedback informs policy changes.	3.21	0.796	1
	Policies adapt based on evaluation outcomes.	3.17	0.813	2

Table 3 provides a summary of student assessments of the university's sustainable institutional internationalization strategies across seven dimensions. The overall mean score of 3.10 with a low standard deviation (0.10) suggests consistent agreement that the university is strategically advancing internationalization, but there is still room for improvement. Reflexive Policy Frameworks and Environmental Sustainability received

the highest ratings, with means of 3.13 and 3.12, respectively, indicating strong recognition of the university's efforts in these areas. Strategic Governance and Digital and Physical Mobility both scored 3.11, reflecting solid but moderate engagement. On the other hand, Inclusive Curriculum and Pedagogy and Stakeholder Engagement received the lowest ratings (3.08 and 3.07), suggesting these areas require further development to translate policy intentions into everyday practice. Overall, the findings suggest the university is making meaningful progress in internationalization but must focus on strengthening stakeholder engagement and embedding global perspectives across curricula and classrooms to create a more inclusive and impactful experience for all students.

Table 3. Summary of Student-Respondents' Assessment of Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies.

Dimension	Overall Mean	WM	SD	QD	VI
1. Strategic Governance	3.11	0.29	Agree	Strategic	3.5
2. Inclusive Curriculum and Pedagogy	3.08	0.29	Agree	Strategic	6
3. Stakeholder Engagement	3.07	0.29	Agree	Strategic	7
4. Digital and Physical Mobility	3.11	0.30	Agree	Strategic	3.5
5. Intercultural Competence Development	3.09	0.29	Agree	Strategic	5
6. Environmental Sustainability	3.12	0.29	Agree	Strategic	2
7. Reflexive Policy Frameworks	3.13	0.28	Agree	Strategic	1
Overall	3.10	0.10	Agree	Strategic	

The analysis of the students' assessments of the university's sustainable institutional internationalization strategies reveals no significant differences based on sex. Both male and female students rated the university's internationalization efforts similarly across all dimensions. For Strategic Governance, males scored a mean of 3.14, while females scored 3.09, but the difference was not statistically significant ($F = 2.40$, $p = 0.12$). Similar patterns were found for Stakeholder Engagement (3.10 for males, 3.05 for females, $F = 0.50$, $p = 0.48$) and Reflexive Policy Frameworks (3.14 for males, 3.12 for females, $F = 1.99$, $p = 0.16$). These results suggest that the university's internationalization strategies are perceived in a gender-neutral manner. Though the differences are not significant, males rated Strategic Governance, Stakeholder Engagement, and Reflexive Policy Frameworks slightly higher, while females rated Inclusive Curriculum and Pedagogy and Environmental Sustainability slightly higher. These small gaps could suggest gendered preferences for certain types of internationalization experiences but require further qualitative investigation for confirmation.

When assessing differences across academic years, the data show that students at different stages of their academic journey rated the university's internationalization strategies similarly. The mean scores across first-year to fourth-year students were all within the "Agree-Strategic" range, with no significant differences found. For example, Strategic Governance received mean scores of 3.12 for first-year students, 3.06 for second-year students, 3.15 for third-year students, and 3.12 for fourth-year students, with an F value of 1.23 and a p -value of 0.30, indicating no statistical significance. This consistent pattern across all dimensions suggests that internationalization strategies are applied uniformly across all year levels. While one might expect upper-year students to rate certain dimensions more favorably due to increased exposure to mobility programs or

advanced coursework, the results indicate that these opportunities may not be systematically integrated into the later stages of the program.

In terms of academic major, the analysis revealed some slight differences, but again, none were statistically significant. For Strategic Governance, Arts and Humanities students reported the highest mean of 3.18, followed by Business students at 3.16, while Education students rated it lowest at 3.07 ($F = 1.98, p = 0.10$). Digital and Physical Mobility showed a similar pattern, with Sciences students scoring the highest at 3.16, while Arts and Humanities students scored the lowest at 3.02 ($F = 2.23, p = 0.07$). These slight differences may reflect variations in how different fields engage with internationalization, with Business, Engineering, and Sciences likely having more direct connections to global industries and research networks. On the other hand, Arts and Humanities students may focus more on global policy, sustainability, and ethics, as reflected in their higher scores for Strategic Governance and Environmental Sustainability.

The overall assessment of internationalization strategies by academic major showed no significant differences, with all mean scores ranging between 3.08 and 3.18. This indicates that, despite some small variations, the university has implemented a relatively consistent approach to internationalization across disciplines. This uniformity suggests that internationalization practices are widely accessible to all students, regardless of their academic focus, though there may be room for more targeted initiatives in specific disciplines.

Table 4 provides a summary of student assessments in terms of their preparation for global competence across five dimensions. The overall mean for each dimension suggests that students feel reasonably prepared, with scores consistently falling within the "Agree" range.

Intercultural Sensitivity and Communication Proficiency show strong results in areas such as avoiding stereotyping and effectively communicating across cultures. Students feel confident in their ability to interact with diverse cultures, although some areas, like showing respect and communicating clearly, could still benefit from further development.

Global Awareness shows that students are aware of global issues and interconnectedness but may not engage deeply with global news or personal global learning outside the classroom. Civic Responsibility is one of the stronger areas, with students demonstrating a commitment to social issues and global justice. However, action-oriented items like making a positive community impact scored lower, indicating a gap between awareness and behavioral action.

Action Orientation reveals that students are proactive in advocating for global issues, but their engagement in long-term global projects is still developing. Participation in structured global initiatives remains an area to further strengthen.

Overall, this summary highlights that while students possess foundational global competencies, more structured opportunities for real-world application and deeper engagement with global issues may enhance their preparedness further.

Table 4 summarizes students' self-assessments regarding their preparedness for global competence across five key dimensions: Intercultural Sensitivity, Communication Proficiency, Global Awareness, Civic Responsibility, and Action Orientation.

Intercultural Sensitivity ranks the highest, with students feeling well-prepared to engage with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. They show respect and adaptability when interacting with individuals from different cultures. This dimension reflects a strong foundation in intercultural understanding, with students demonstrating openness to cultural differences and the ability to engage effectively in cross-cultural situations.

Communication Proficiency also ranks highly, with students demonstrating effective communication skills in cross-cultural settings. They express themselves clearly and adjust their communication styles depending on the cultural context. This suggests that students possess the ability to navigate communication challenges in global environments, although there may still be room for improvement in more advanced, complex scenarios.

Global Awareness is another strong area but with more variability. Students generally report an understanding of global issues and interconnectedness, but they feel that further engagement with global topics is necessary. While they grasp the importance of global challenges, their involvement with real-world global issues might not yet be as deep as desired. This suggests that the university could provide more opportunities for students to connect classroom learning with practical global concerns [19,20].

Civic Responsibility reveals that students recognize their role as global citizens and express a strong sense of responsibility toward social and ethical issues. They are motivated to engage in actions that contribute to local and global causes, aligning with the concept of global citizenship. However, their actual involvement in sustained civic activities is still developing, as some students may not yet fully translate these ideals into consistent action.

Action Orientation is the area where students feel somewhat prepared but also shows room for growth. While they are motivated to take action on global issues, they feel that the opportunities available for real-world engagement are limited. The willingness to act on global challenges is evident, but the need for more structured and hands-on experiences is clear. This highlights the importance of integrating more practical opportunities for global engagement to complement students' awareness and readiness.

Table 4. Assessment of Preparation for Global Competence.

Dimension	Mean	SD	Rank	Explanation
Intercultural Sensitivity	3.13	0.29	1	Students are well-prepared to engage with people from different cultural backgrounds, showing respect and adaptability in intercultural interactions.
Communication Proficiency	3.09	0.29	2	Students demonstrate effective communication skills in cross-cultural contexts, expressing themselves clearly and adjusting their communication style when necessary.
Global Awareness	3.06	0.27	4	Students are generally aware of global issues and interconnectedness but may benefit from deeper engagement and more exposure to global perspectives beyond the classroom.
Civic Responsibility	3.11	0.28	3	Students recognize their responsibility as global citizens and are motivated to engage in social issues, contributing to local and global causes.
Action Orientation	3.09	0.29	5	Students are motivated to take action on global issues, though they may still need more opportunities for hands-on involvement in global projects or initiatives.

Table 5 summarizes the results of the five dimensions of global competence, offering an overview of students' preparedness. Intercultural Sensitivity ranks the highest at 3.14, indicating that students are most prepared in engaging with diverse cultures. Global Awareness is the lowest at 3.07, suggesting that students need further exposure to global issues. Overall, the scores range from 3.07 to 3.14, reflecting a consistent, moderate level of preparedness. Students perceive themselves as ethical, communicative, and willing to engage globally, though they may still be in the early stages of developing deeper global knowledge and practical skills. The high scores in Civic Responsibility reinforce the ethical component of global competence, while lower scores in Communication Proficiency and Action Orientation suggest that although students have the intention, they may need more opportunities to develop these skills in practice. The findings indicate that while students are prepared, they are not yet at the level of advanced global competence emphasized by OECD frameworks. The university can use this as a foundation to enhance future initiatives for more comprehensive global learning.

Table 5. Summary of Student-Respondents' Assessment of Preparation for Global Competence.

PGC Dimension	WM	SD	QD	VI	Rank
1.Intercultural Sensitivity	3.14	0.30	Agree	Prepared	1
2.Communication Proficiency	3.09	0.29	Agree	Prepared	3.5
3.Global Awareness	3.07	0.27	Agree	Prepared	5
4.Civic Responsibility	3.11	0.29	Agree	Prepared	2
5.Action Orientation	3.09	0.29	Agree	Prepared	3.5
Overall	3.10126	.138201	Agree	Prepared	

The study reveals that male and female students generally assess their global competence preparation similarly across all dimensions, with no significant differences in areas such as intercultural sensitivity, global awareness, civic responsibility, and action orientation. The only notable exception is in communication proficiency, where males reported slightly higher self-perceived proficiency than females, a difference that is statistically significant. Despite these small differences, the overall findings suggest that both male and female students experience the university's internationalization efforts in relatively uniform ways, highlighting the effectiveness of the strategies across genders. Additionally, when comparing students at different year levels, the results show no significant differences in their perceptions of global competence preparation. First-year students rated their preparation similarly to seniors, suggesting that foundational global competence skills and attitudes are integrated early in the academic experience. However, the lack of significant differences across year levels may also indicate that the global competence activities offered by the university are not sufficiently differentiated or developed over time. This suggests that the university may need to reconsider how it structures its global competence initiatives to provide more advanced and immersive opportunities in later years, ensuring a progressive learning trajectory that deepens students' engagement with global issues and prepares them for more complex international challenges.

Table 6 shows that there are no significant differences in students' preparation for global competence based on their academic major. The mean scores for intercultural sensitivity, communication proficiency, global awareness, civic responsibility, and action orientation are similar across all fields of study, with all values falling within the same range. While some minor differences appear, such as slightly higher ratings in global awareness and action orientation for students in the sciences and arts & humanities, and lower scores in communication proficiency and global awareness for business students,

these differences are not statistically significant. This suggests that the university is implementing global competence preparation strategies fairly evenly across disciplines.

Table 6. Test of Difference in the Assessment of Student-Respondents on Their Preparation for Global Competence When Grouped According to Academic Major.

Indicator (PGC)	Academic Major	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Intercultural Sensitivity	Education	3.10	1.44	0.22	Accepted	Not Significant
	Business	3.19				
	Engineering	3.09				
	Arts & Humanities	3.15				
	Sciences	3.17				
2. Communication Proficiency	Education	3.13	1.71	0.15	Accepted	Not Significant
	Business	3.03				
	Engineering	3.07				
	Arts & Humanities	3.15				
	Sciences	3.09				
3. Global Awareness	Education	3.03	1.93	0.10	Accepted	Not Significant
	Business	3.07				
	Engineering	3.05				
	Arts & Humanities	3.05				
	Sciences	3.14				
4. Civic Responsibility	Education	3.10	0.44	0.78	Accepted	Not Significant
	Business	3.10				
	Engineering	3.10				
	Arts & Humanities	3.16				
	Sciences	3.12				
5. Action Orientation	Education	3.04	1.68	0.16	Accepted	Not Significant
	Business	3.06				
	Engineering	3.14				
	Arts & Humanities	3.11				
	Sciences	3.14				
Overall	Education	3.08	1.95	0.10	Accepted	Not Significant
	Business	3.09				
	Engineering	3.09				
	Arts & Humanities	3.12				
	Sciences	3.13				

Table 7 demonstrates a weak relationship between the university's sustainable institutional internationalization strategies (SIIS) and students' preparation for global competence (PGC). The correlation values are close to zero, with most being statistically insignificant. This pattern suggests that the internationalization strategies on campus are more structural or policy-level conditions rather than direct experiential drivers of competence development. Notably, the correlation between inclusive curriculum and

pedagogy and global awareness is negative, though minor, which may indicate that students who perceive their curriculum as highly internationalized are more aware of gaps in their own global knowledge. Additionally, mobility experiences show a marginal positive correlation with communication proficiency, hinting that mobility may help enhance communicative skills. However, the lack of strong correlations suggests that current internationalization efforts may not be fully aligned with fostering deeper student engagement and global competence [21,22].

Table 7. Correlation Between Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies and Preparation for Global Competence.

Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies	Preparation for Global Competence	Computed r	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Strategic Governance	Intercultural Sensitivity	-0.00	0.96	Accepted	Not Significant
	Communication Proficiency	-0.05	0.38	Accepted	Not Significant
	Global Awareness	0.00	0.99	Accepted	Not Significant
	Civic Responsibility	0.00	0.97	Accepted	Not Significant
	Action Orientation	0.06	0.28	Accepted	Not Significant
Inclusive Curriculum & Pedagogy	Intercultural Sensitivity	-0.02	0.73	Accepted	Not Significant
	Communication Proficiency	0.03	0.57	Accepted	Not Significant
	Global Awareness	-0.11	0.04	Rejected	Significant
	Civic Responsibility	0.00	0.97	Accepted	Not Significant
	Action Orientation	-0.04	0.43	Accepted	Not Significant
Stakeholder Engagement	Intercultural Sensitivity	-0.04	0.46	Accepted	Not Significant
	Communication Proficiency	0.05	0.39	Accepted	Not Significant
	Global Awareness	-0.01	0.84	Accepted	Not Significant
	Civic Responsibility	0.02	0.66	Accepted	Not Significant
	Action Orientation	0.06	0.25	Accepted	Not Significant
Digital & Physical Mobility	Intercultural Sensitivity	0.04	0.45	Accepted	Not Significant
	Communication Proficiency	0.09	0.08	Accepted	Not Significant

	Global Awareness	0.04	0.50	Accepted	Not Significant
	Civic Responsibility	-0.01	0.87	Accepted	Not Significant
	Action Orientation	-0.06	0.28	Accepted	Not Significant
Intercultural Competence Development	Intercultural Sensitivity	0.07	0.19	Accepted	Not Significant
	Communication Proficiency	-0.03	0.52	Accepted	Not Significant
	Global Awareness	0.03	0.62	Accepted	Not Significant
	Civic Responsibility	-0.02	0.77	Accepted	Not Significant
	Action Orientation	-0.06	0.26	Accepted	Not Significant
Environmental Sustainability	Intercultural Sensitivity	-0.01	0.84	Accepted	Not Significant
	Communication Proficiency	-0.11	0.03	Rejected	Significant
	Global Awareness	-0.05	0.39	Accepted	Not Significant
	Civic Responsibility	0.01	0.84	Accepted	Not Significant
	Action Orientation	-0.11	0.04	Rejected	Significant
Reflexive Policy Frameworks	Intercultural Sensitivity	0.07	0.17	Accepted	Not Significant
	Communication Proficiency	-0.03	0.56	Accepted	Not Significant
	Global Awareness	0.03	0.56	Accepted	Not Significant
	Civic Responsibility	-0.01	0.83	Accepted	Not Significant
	Action Orientation	-0.04	0.43	Accepted	Not Significant
Overall Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies	Overall Preparation for Global Competence	-0.03	0.54	Accepted	Not Significant

6. Analysis and Discussion of Results

It should be noted that the assessment of sustainable institutional internationalization strategies in this study is based on students' perceptions rather than direct measurements of institutional policies or administrative actions. Consequently, the weak correlations observed may partly reflect the gap between students' experiences and the actual implementation of institutional strategies. The demographic profile of the respondents shows a relatively balanced distribution across sex and academic year, with 54.3% females and 45.7% males. First-year students constitute the largest group (31.4%),

followed by second-year (24.4%), fourth-year (23%), and third-year students (21.3%). Regarding academic major, Education students are the most represented (26.6%), followed by Sciences (20.4%), Engineering (19.3%), Business (19.0%), and Arts and Humanities (14.6%). This distribution provides important context for interpreting the subsequent results on institutional internationalization strategies and students' preparation for global competence.

Students assess the university's Sustainable Institutional Internationalization Strategies (SIIS) positively, with ratings between 3.07 and 3.13 across seven key dimensions. Reflexive Policy Frameworks (3.13) and Environmental Sustainability (3.12) received the highest ratings, suggesting that institutional efforts in these areas are visible and well-communicated to students. However, Inclusive Curriculum and Pedagogy (3.08) and Stakeholder Engagement (3.07) received lower ratings, indicating that these areas need further development, particularly in integrating global content and fostering external partnerships [23,24].

Statistical tests show no significant differences in students' assessments based on sex, year level, or academic major, implying that the university's internationalization strategies are perceived similarly across these demographic groups. This suggests that internationalization is largely experienced as a general institutional policy rather than through personalized or discipline-specific pathways. However, this uniformity might also indicate that the strategies are not sufficiently differentiated or deeply embedded in student experiences.

Students' preparation for global competence (PGC) is also assessed positively across all dimensions. Intercultural Sensitivity (3.14) ranks the highest, indicating students feel well-prepared to engage with diverse cultures [25,26]. Civic Responsibility (3.11) follows closely, reflecting students' recognition of their global citizenship roles. On the other hand, Global Awareness (3.07) is the lowest-ranked dimension, highlighting the need for deeper exposure to global issues beyond the classroom. Communication Proficiency and Action Orientation are both at moderate levels (3.09), suggesting students are reasonably confident but still need more opportunities for practical application in complex international contexts [27].

There are minimal demographic differences in PGC, with the only notable exception being Communication Proficiency, where males report slightly higher levels than females. This small difference is statistically significant, but overall, global competence development is not significantly influenced by demographic factors. This further supports the idea that global competence needs more intentional, structured programming that targets specific skills and experiences.

Finally, the correlation analysis between SIIS and PGC reveals weak associations. The majority of correlations are close to zero, with three weak negative correlations. This suggests a gap between the institutional internationalization strategies and the students' development of global competence, which may reflect a mismatch between high-level policies and their translation into concrete, experiential learning opportunities. The findings align with critiques from internationalization scholars who argue that effective internationalization must be grounded in pedagogy and embedded in students' day-to-day academic and extracurricular experiences.

7. Recommendations and Conclusion

The study explored students' perceptions of the university's internationalization strategies and their own preparation for global competence. While students generally feel prepared, the findings suggest several areas for improvement to enhance the integration of internationalization into both the curriculum and experiential learning.

First, the university should focus on strengthening curriculum-embedded internationalization. Global content should be intentionally integrated across disciplines, ensuring that students engage with international issues in a structured and meaningful

way. Faculty development initiatives can support this shift by helping instructors redesign courses and learning activities to embed global perspectives. Expanding experiential global learning opportunities, such as Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL), intercultural team projects, and community partnerships, can provide students with practical ways to apply internationalization strategies. These experiences would bridge the gap between institutional policies and student engagement, creating the "missing link" between theory and practice.

Moreover, targeted interventions are needed to improve communication proficiency, particularly since a significant gender-based difference was found in this area. Initiatives like academic English clinics, intercultural communication workshops, and discipline-specific communication modules should be implemented to ensure that both male and female students feel equally prepared for global communication challenges. Improving the visibility of internationalization strategies is also crucial. By creating platforms like an internationalization dashboard or integrating orientations into first-year seminars, students would gain a better understanding of how institutional policies support their learning experiences, fostering stronger alignment between institutional efforts and students' perceived preparedness.

The university should also consider discipline-sensitive approaches to internationalization. Although the university applies internationalization strategies uniformly across all disciplines, discipline-specific action plans could help better align strategies with the unique needs and opportunities of each field. For example, science students could benefit from global laboratories, while business students could engage in international case simulations. These more contextualized efforts could yield stronger global competencies tailored to each discipline.

Finally, establishing a monitoring and evaluation system to track both institutional strategies and student competencies over time is essential. The weak correlations between internationalization strategies and student preparedness highlight the need for periodic audits to assess the effectiveness of internationalization initiatives. Combining quantitative surveys with qualitative feedback from students and faculty would provide valuable insights into how well the strategies are being implemented and whether they are translating into meaningful student outcomes.

In conclusion, while the university has made significant progress in implementing sustainable institutional internationalization strategies, the findings indicate that these efforts need to be further integrated into the student experience. There is a need for more targeted, experiential, and discipline-specific interventions that foster deeper engagement with global issues. Strengthening the alignment between internationalization policies and pedagogy will ensure that students' global competence develops in meaningful and impactful ways. The results also suggest that demographic factors such as sex, year level, and academic major exert minimal influence on students' global competence, emphasizing the importance of a unified yet adaptable approach to internationalization. However, the weak correlations between institutional strategies and student outcomes highlight the gap between policy-level intentions and actual student learning experiences, suggesting that internationalization must be embedded more effectively within the curriculum and extracurricular activities to be truly transformative.

References

1. Asia Society, *Teaching for global competence in a rapidly changing world*, Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2018. ISBN: 9789264289024.
2. H. De Wit, "Everything that quacks is internationalization-Critical reflections on the evolution of higher education internationalization," *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 3-14, 2024. doi: 10.1177/10283153231221655.
3. H. Idrissi, L. Engel, and K. Pashby, "The diversity conflation and action ruse: A critical discourse analysis of the OECD's framework for global competence," *Comparative and International Education*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 1-18, 2020. doi: 10.5206/cieci.v49i1.13435.
4. E. Auld and P. Morris, "Science by streetlight and the OECD's measure of global competence: A new yardstick for internationalisation?," *Policy Futures in Education*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 677-698, 2019. doi: 10.1177/1478210318819246.

5. X. Hu, and J. Hu, "A classification analysis of the high and low levels of global competence of secondary students: Insights from 25 countries/regions," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 19, p. 11053, 2021. doi: 10.3390/su131911053.
6. E. Koenig, K. Guertler, D. Żarnowska, and J. Horbačasienė, "Developing English language competence for global engineers," In *2020 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)*, April, 2020, pp. 242-249. doi: 10.1109/educon45650.2020.9125208.
7. D. J. Cobb, and D. Couch, "Teacher education for an uncertain future: Implications of PISA's global competence," In *Teacher education in and for uncertain times*, 2018, pp. 35-47. ISBN: 9789811086472.
8. C. Sälzer, and N. Roczen, "Assessing global competence in PISA 2018: Challenges and approaches to capturing a complex construct," *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2018. doi: 10.18546/ijdeg1.10.1.02.
9. S. T. Wren, "Improving Emirati students' social responsibility competence through global citizenship education," *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 80-94, 2021. doi: 10.1108/lthe-09-2020-0046.
10. A. S. Hofmeyr, "Intercultural competence development through cocurricular and extracurricular at-home programs in Japan," *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 363-386, 2023. doi: 10.1177/10283153211070110.
11. B. Ates et al., *Promoting global competence and social justice in teacher education: Successes and challenges within local and international contexts*, London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2015. ISBN: 9781498504355.
12. I. Ortiz-Marcos et al., "A framework of global competence for engineers: The need for a sustainable world," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 22, p. 9568, 2020. doi: 10.3390/su12229568.
13. H. De Wit, "Internationalization in higher education, a critical review," *SFU Educational Review*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 9-17, 2019. doi: 10.21810/sfuerv.12i3.1036.
14. H. De Wit, and P. G. Altbach, "Internationalization in higher education: Global trends and recommendations for its future," *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 28-46, 2021. doi: 10.1080/23322969.2020.1820898.
15. J. Li, and E. Xue, "Sustainable or unsustainable" in higher education internationalization development: Exploring the post-doctoral system in the humanities and social sciences," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 17, p. 11024, 2022. doi: 10.3390/su141711024.
16. K. Cushner, and S. Brennan, "Intercultural student teaching: A bridge to global competence," *Rowman & Littlefield Education*, 2007. ISBN: 9781578865796.
17. J. Li, and E. Xue, "Stakeholders' perspectives on implementing "internationalization at home" for China's international education sustainability: Challenges and strategies," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 247, 2022. doi: 10.3390/su15010247.
18. K. A. Corrales, J. Lombana-Coy, and L. Rey-Paba, "Fostering global competence in international business students on a Latin American campus," *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 81-101, 2021. doi: 10.1080/08975930.2021.1906381.
19. J. V. Cleofas, and C. C. Labayo, "Youth netizens as global citizens: Digital citizenship and global competence among undergraduate students," *Frontiers in Communication*, vol. 9, p. 1398001, 2024. doi: 10.3389/fcomm.2024.1398001.
20. L. Bailey, S. Ledger, M. Thier, and C. M. Pitts, "Global competence in PISA 2018: Deconstruction of the measure," *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 367-376, 2023. doi: 10.1080/14767724.2022.2029693.
21. E. Bruhn-Zass, "Virtual internationalization to support comprehensive internationalization in higher education," *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 240-258, 2022. doi: 10.1177/10283153211052776.
22. M. Cordova et al., "COVID-19 and higher education: Responding to local demands and the consolidation of e-internationalization in Latin American universities," *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 493-509, 2021. doi: 10.1108/arla-01-2021-0020.
23. F. Guo, "Internationalization at home: A sustainable model for Chinese higher education in the post-pandemic era," *Journal of Education and Learning*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 135-140, 2023. doi: 10.5539/jel.v12n3p135.
24. J. Lannert, and A. Derényi, "Internationalization in Hungarian higher education: Recent developments and factors of reaching better global visibility," *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 346-369, 2021. doi: 10.1556/063.2020.00034.
25. H. Chandir, and R. Gorur, "Unsustainable measures? Assessing global competence in PISA 2018," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, vol. 29, pp. 122-122, 2021. doi: 10.14507/epaa.29.4716.
26. H. Chandir, "Student responses on the survey of global competence in PISA 2018," *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 526-542, 2022. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2020.1844153.
27. S. Cao, "Effectiveness of collaborative online international learning in university students' global competence," *Advances in Education, Humanities and Social Science Research*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 747-747, 2024. doi: 10.56028/aehtsr.12.1.747.2024.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The views, opinions, and data expressed in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of PAP and/or the editor(s). PAP and/or the editor(s) disclaim any responsibility for any injury to individuals or damage to property arising from the ideas, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content.