

Comparison on Global Mindset of International and National High School Students

Johannes N. Zakaria¹ & Hana Panggabean¹

¹ Faculty of Psychology, Atma Jaya Catholic University Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

Correspondence: Hana Panggabean, Faculty of Psychology, Atma Jaya Catholic University Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia. Tel: 62-81-770-4769. E-mail: hana.panggabean@atmajaya.ac.id

Received: November 10, 2018

Accepted: December 14, 2018

Online Published: January 30, 2019

doi:10.5539/ass.v15n2p70

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v15n2p70>

Abstract

The role of Global Mindset for individual's qualities which enable leaders to influence people and organizations from different cultures is evidently important for leadership effectiveness in diversity contexts. While leadership is considered as one of the key competences to predict organizational excellence, its developmental process can start from a young age. Therefore, it is important to develop Global Mindset for young people. However, studies on global mindset in educational context are rare to find in comparison to that in organizational context. Indonesian educational system has been enriched with schools which are characterized by globally oriented education system known as SPK (Collaborative Education Unit) since the last decade. The objective of this study is to compare global mindset level of high school students from international school (SPK) and national school (SPN-National Education Unit) in Greater Jakarta area. A global mindset scale was delivered to 132 students (N SPK = 59; SPN= 73). The independent sample t-test statistic was used and a significant difference of Global Mindset level between SPK and SPN students was found. The score of SPK Students is consistently higher than SPN students, both in general and dimensional levels. While presenting the Global Mindset profiles of both educational contexts, predetermining factors are discussed; in addition, recommendations about school curriculum and atmosphere to develop students' Global Mindset are provided.

Keywords: global mindset, intercultural contact, international school, Indonesian

1. Introduction

The global integration of world economy creates highly dynamic and complex environments driven by fierce competitions and rapid information exchanges. Organizations and global leaders reasonably put efforts to increase their capabilities in dealing with the heightened business context volatility which lead to 'a shift from structural and administrative competencies to mindset-based competencies' (Levy, Taylor, Boyacigiller, & Beechler, 2007, p. 4). Levy et al. (2007) evidently pointed out that global leaders are constantly deal with contradictory pressures of international integration (e.g. international market) and local responsiveness (e.g. diversity domestic workforce). Works on global leadership capabilities are resulted in extensive list of competencies (see Beechler & Javidan for more details). Among them, the concept of Global Mindset (GM) attracts academicians and practitioners' discourses due to its important impacts on key organizational success factors. The concept is defined as "an individual's stock of knowledge, cognitive, and psychological attributes that enable him/her to influence individuals, groups and organizations from diverse sociocultural system" (Beechler & Javidan, 2007, p. 152).

Referring to their approach, the latter study divided research on GM into two groups. The first group focuses on cultural and national diversity and environmental complexity of globalization (e.g. challenges of work in multinational teams, managing organizational diversity). The second group of research put heavy emphasis on environmental complexity and strategic variety of global operations and markets. In this sense, the second approach looks at the demands of multinational companies to integrate geographically distant and strategically diverse operations and markets. As a result, the first group develops an understanding of 'cosmopolitan' as individual's engagement and ability to find a way across cultural diversity with open mind; while the second one defines it as cognitive ability which is characterized by both high integration and differentiation thinking. Based on these approaches, Javidan and his colleagues proposed three dimensions of GM which encompass conceptualizations from both perspectives (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Javidan & Bowen, 2013), namely Global

Intellectual Capital (GIC), Global Psychological Capital (GPC), and Global Social Capital (GSC). GIC refers to individual knowledge of global business and ability to digest and interpret information in global context; GPC means willingness and energy to engage in globalized context; and GSC refers to individual's ability to create trusting relationships with people from various backgrounds (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Javidan & Bowen, 2013).

Global mindset becomes a necessity in globalized world because it increases leader capacity to plan and coordinate, as well as their ability to lead, communicate, motivate, and collaborate with people, groups and organizations from various cultures (Konyu-Fogel, 2011). A number of studies revealed the relationship between GM and critical global leadership qualities, such as: global thinking, higher risk tolerance, strategic market orientation, and higher information-processing abilities (Levy et al., 2007). They also revealed positive result when GM is combined with several psychological aspects. Leaders with global mindset and high cultural intelligence are more likely to accentuate their global identities in comparison to other identities, resulting in attitudes and behavior to promote synergy and integration over cultural differences (Early, Murnieks, & Mosakowski, 2007). The contribution of global mindset is valuable to develop authentic leadership since it would help leaders reconcile with conflicting norms in global environments, which leads them to better recognize opportunities embedded in cultures where they work (Clapp-Smith, Luthans, & Avolio, 2007).

Leadership is recognized as one of the most important success factors, both for global individuals and organizations (Yukl, 2013); therefore, developing global mindset becomes crucial to excel in global context. Factors contributing to the development of GM includes: age, international experiences both in personal and professional lives such as working in international management, overseas living, intercultural spouse (Levy et al., 2007); psychological capital (Clapp-Smith et al., 2007), economic and sociocultural system (Redding, 2007); industry-specific (e.g. globalization pace, life-cycle product speed), organization-specific (e.g. leadership quality, knowledge management system) and person-specific (e.g. social support system, cultural intelligence) (Bhagat Triandis, Baliga, Billing, and Davis (2007). This study will focus on the factor of international/intercultural experiences which is imposed in the differential school system studied (international versus local schools).

Indonesia is facing its global realm with the establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) in 2015 which brings global economic collaborations among the ASEAN countries with the goal to transform ASEAN into a competitive economic region and better connected to global market networks (Ridhwan et al., 2015). Being the largest economy in AEC, Indonesia has a large amount of potentials and has been receiving optimistic international evaluations for its prospective economy development. Indonesia has a relatively steady economy increase despite the volatile global economy in the last five years (Asian Development Bank, 2016; Barua, 2016). However, Indonesia has been struggling with its human resources quality which-becomes significant barriers to materialize its huge economic potentials. As a result, Indonesia has a low talent competitive advantage. According to INSEAD Talent Competitiveness Survey, Indonesia ranks 90 out of 109, lower than its neighbour AEC countries such as Singapore (rank 2), Malaysia (rank 30), The Philippines (56), Thailand (69), and Vietnam (82) (Institut Européen d'Administration des Affaires, 2015).

Indonesia's human resources quality issues can be traced from its problems in education. The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2015 ranked Indonesia in 62 out of 72 participating countries in science, reading, and mathematics skills (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2016). Similar situation happens in higher education. Indonesia's leading universities have not yet reached satisfying world ranking in comparison to those of other ASEAN countries (Quacquarelli Symonds Limited, 2017). Not surprisingly, the problem affects Indonesia's human resources quality in job market. Gropello, Kruse, & Tandon (2011) stated that young unemployment rate in Indonesia reached 25% which is considerably high in comparison to the general unemployment rate (5%). A factor contributing to this phenomenon is the lack of job knowledge and skills due to the low educational level of Indonesian workforce. The fact shows that the majority of Indonesian workers (59.61%) have elementary and junior high school educational level and only 9.27% of the workforces are university graduates ("Pemegang kunci perubahan", 2017).

Indonesia undoubtedly needs to improve its quality of education to be able to compete in global environments. It is in line with Meyer, Bushney & Ukpere (2011) who stated that education institution needs to respond to the increasing global challenges, at least regarding two things. First, education institutions need to analyse globalization trend and to integrate it with the academic activity. Second, they need to build a strong network with institutions from other countries. This notion is in line with encouragements for schools and universities to nurture global competence for young people by including relevant content in the curriculum as well as learning process. Spodek (1983), for example, accentuated that cultural diversity learning and experiences are very important for students in order to develop global competences. Not surprisingly, international study becomes

more and more appealing, as it is shown by American Council on Education (ACE). On 2004, about 77% American students have been exposed to international world. In addition, a number of international students in America were increasing since then. The highest rate was in 2011 when there were 723.000 international students coming from 180 countries (Yakunina, Weigold, Weigold, & Elsayed, 2012). Studies on Indonesians who engage in global career evidently support the benefits of international exposures during study to develop global competence (e.g. Panggabean, 2012).

Responding to the global challenges, Indonesian government released policies and regulations to upgrade local schools to attain international qualities by establishing RSBI (Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional), local schools with international standard education (e.g., international curriculum, applying English as instructional language as a replacement for Bahasa Indonesia). This project received high public interest; however, it was discontinued in 2013 after 10 years for two reasons. First, RSBI ended up implementing dual curriculum system, the national and international ones, leading to work overloaded for school teachers and students. Second, schools are perceived as creating social gap because it charged expensive school fee and therefore it was only accessible for the affluent family.

RSBI is discontinued, however, the demands for schools with international qualities keep existing. As a result, the increasing number of private international schools is inevitable, especially in big cities of Indonesia. In responding to this, Indonesian government issued policy and regulation on international school and national schools. Schools which are based on collaboration between international and national education institution are called Satuan Pendidikan Kerjasama (SPK); while, those which are organized by a full local education institution are called Satuan Pendidikan Nasional (SPN). In popular terms, SPK is also known as international school. Hereinafter, this study refers to international school as SPK and local school as SPN.

In general, Kim (2016) revealed five features that differentiate the quality of education provided by international schools and national ones. Those aspects include facilities, scale (e.g. global connectivity, online course), connections (e.g. other international schools, powerful people and organizations), curriculum design and teachers. In line with the result of the study, international schools in Indonesia are characterized at least by three features: (1) the implementation of international curriculum; (2) various teacher' backgrounds of life; and (3) internationally oriented learning atmosphere (including school facilities). These characters distinguish them from the national schools (application of national curriculum, Indonesian teachers, and locally oriented learning atmosphere). In this sense, both types of school engage in different level of international exposures. The students from international schools experience higher intercultural contacts due to their learning atmosphere and curriculum. The learning atmosphere consists of instructional language, social and physical environment, and school program.

The second factor is curriculum. International schools use international curriculum; for most cases in Indonesia, they are Cambridge and International Baccalaureate Curriculum. Cambridge curriculum was created by Cambridge University in the UK, while IB was created by International Bacclaureate Organization in Switzerland. Both curricula give advantages for international students, not only to obtain knowledge from multiple perspectives, but also to be able enrol in an international assessment. Students passing the assessment will be given qualifications recognized by international standards and thus prepare students to enter the global context (Cambridge International Examination, 2017).

Differences of international exposure level applied in SPK and SPN reflect differential levels of intercultural contact existed. Intercultural contact refers to any form of exposure for people or cultural product from different cultural background. The intercultural contact constructs are originated from contact hypothesis which was formed by Gordon Allport (1957). Originally, contact hypothesis was stated as a solution to reduce prejudice in context of intergroup contact. In a more modernized era, intercultural contact can be categorized as direct contact and indirect contact. Direct contact consists of oral and written communication with people from other culture. Meanwhile, indirect contact consists of contacts with indirect cultural product such as media, internet, and literature (Kormos & Csizer, 2007).

Intercultural contacts have significant influence in changing individual attributes. A study conducted by Cao & Lin (2017) showed that intercultural contact using computer-mediated communication improved interpersonal and intergroup attitudes. Intergroup computer-mediated communication improves relationship between conflicting groups. The study of Guan & Dodder (2001) with international Chinese students in America (N=107) and those in local university (N=185) revealed that international exposures experienced by Chinese students in the United States have changed their values whereby they took on more liberal stance. For instance, the US Chinese students believed that no culture was more superior to the others, in comparison with their local peers

who believed that culture conservation was more important.

From the global leader perspective, to provide intercultural exposures is evidently important. Intercultural exposures enable individuals to obtain global information and get use to process numerous information, interact with various cultures, and develop relationship with people from various backgrounds. These opportunities, derived from intercultural contact, are stated as a way to develop global mindset (Levy et al., 2007; Javidan & Bowen, 2013). In addition, global mindset should also be nurtured for young people to prepare them for global challenges, since building global competences is imperative for young people.

This study contributes to the understanding of global mindset in two ways. First, this study is expected to broaden the explorations and implications of the global mindset concept, not only to build global competence of leaders but also to that of young people. The role of global mindset is important for young people to prepare them for global engagements, however, most of its studies were conducted in business settings, almost none have been conducted in educational context. Second, by having broader and deeper understanding about how to develop global mindset, social institutions such as schools and governments would be able to plan strategies to develop students in global era.

Thus, this study aims to explore the role of international exposures in schools to develop global mindset by comparing levels of global mindset between international and national high school students in areas of Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi (Jabodetabek). Accordingly, this study formulates its research question and hypotheses as follows:

The research question: Are there differences in global mindset levels between students from international schools (SPK) and those from national schools (SPN)? We hypothesize that there are differences in global mindset levels between SPK and SPN students with SPK students will score higher than SPN ones.

2. Method

2.1 Participant (Subject) Characteristics

There are 132 participants involved in this study (47.7% male, 52.3% female; 47% international school, 53% national school). The international schools selected for this research are listed as SPK at the Indonesian Ministry of Education (Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2016). All national schools selected for this study are private-owned schools. Students participated in this study were in grade 9 until 12, at age of 14-18 years old.

2.2 Sampling Procedures

Sampling technique used in this study is non-probability sampling, i.e. snowball sampling. Authors gained access to the targeted participants through personal network with school principals and students. Two types of questionnaire (paper-pencil and online form) were distributed to the students to measure all three dimensions of Global Mindset. Prior to data collection from the students, authors observed the school environment. After data collection, authors conducted interviews with principals of both types of school. The purpose of this procedure is to obtain in-depth information regarding factors that might affect Global Mindset development of the students such as school program and facilities. The results of those qualitative procedure are reported along with statistical analysis.

2.2.1 Measures and Covariates

Global Mindset Inventory (GMI) is a 6-point Likert type scale (0=not at all, 6=to a great extent) which is developed based on global mindset model (Javidan & Bowen, 2013). GMI consists of three subscales which represent three GM dimensions, namely Global Intellectual Capital (GIC), Global Psychological Capital (GPC) and Global Social Capital (GSC). The item sample of this scale in GIC is "To what extent am I able to understand complex information quickly?", in GPC is "To what extent do I want to work in other country?", and in GSC is "Am I able to work with a group consisting of people from various background?". All items have gone through psychometric analyses. A total of 118 items was analysed using S-CVI method, involving experts in psychometric and global mindset. There were 16 items omitted from this process. A total of 102 items was analysed using corrected item total correlation. There were 72 items selected for the final form. This scale has validity of .592. Meanwhile, reliability analysis shows Cronbach's alpha of this scale was .975.

2.2.2 Research Design

The design used for this study is survey, i.e. cross-sectional design. Survey cross-sectional design was chosen to compare the Global Mindset of students from two different kinds of school. Statistical methods used for this research are mean comparison, t-test independent samples.

3. Results

3.1 Demographic Profile

Majority of students (N=119) were studied in Jakarta, followed by twelve students who studied in Tangerang and one student who studied in Bogor and. The students' age range is 14 – 18 years old. At this stage, students were attending 9 – 12 grades. Most of the participants were 16 years old (N=61). The number of participants categorized by gender was almost equal, i.e. boys (47.7%) and girls (52.3%).

3.2 Global Mindset Profiles

The Global Mindset data is analysed using descriptive and inferential statistic. Students of both schools got highest score in GPC, while both schools also got the lowest score in GIC. Global Mindset subscales data is analysed using ANOVA to obtain deeper understanding of both schools. ANOVA one-way analysis shows that all three dimensions are significantly different both for SPK ($F=12.996$, $\text{sig}=.000$) and for SPN ($F=19.572$, $\text{sig}=.000$). Post-hoc analysis of SPK students shows that GIC is significantly lower than GPC ($\text{sig}=.000$) and GSC ($\text{sig}=.001$). Also, there is no significant difference found on GPC and GSC ($\text{sig}=.656$). Post-hoc analysis of SPN students also shows there is no significant difference between GPC and GSC ($\text{sig}=.063$). There is significant difference between GIC and GPC ($\text{sig}=.000$), also GIC and GSC ($\text{sig}=.001$) among SPN students. Therefore, it can be concluded that for SPK, GPC and GSC are significantly higher than GIC. In addition, for SPN, GPC and GSC is significantly higher than GIC.

Table 1. Intercorrelations of Global Mindset Dimensions

Dimension	Mean	Sd	GIC	GPC	GSC
GIC	92.08	16.59	-		
GPC	107.18	15.20	.672**	-	
GSC	102.62	16.54	.724**	.697**	-

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 1 shows that all GMI dimensions are positively correlated with one another. This result confirms that those three dimensions are distinct concepts but interrelated.

Significant GMI score difference was apparent between students from international schools and students from national schools, MD (22.98), $t(3.12)$, $p<.05$, $r^2=.07$. Similar results were also apparent for all three aspects of Global Mindset. In the Intellectual aspect, significant difference was found, MD 7.66, $t(2.70)$; $p<.05$ $r^2=.05$. In the psychological aspect, significant difference was found, MD 5.98, $t(2.29)$; $p<.05$ $r^2=.03$. In the social aspect, significant difference was found, MD 9.32, $t(3.35)$; $p<.05$ $r^2=.08$. It can be concluded that the hypothesis is true. In other words, there is significant difference in terms of global mindset between students from international school and students from national school.

Table 2. Independent Sample T Test: Global Mindset Difference between students of SPK and SPN

Group	Mean Difference	df	Std. Error	Sig. (2-tailed)
GMI	22.98*	130	7.32	.002
GIC	7.66*	130	2.84	.008
GPC	5.98*	130	2.62	.024
GSC	9.32**	130	2.80	.001

Note:

* The mean is significant at the .05 level

** The mean is significant at the .01 level

(-) Score of international school students is higher

(+) Score of national school students is higher

4. Discussion

4.1 Global Mindset in Young People

The objective of this study is to examine the role of intercultural exposures in educational setting to develop global mindset of young people. By doing this, the study provides a broader perspective regarding global mindset concept. Previously, global mindset research was only conducted within organizational context. The main reason is because global mindset is hypothesized to have direct relationship with leadership effectiveness. Konyu-Fogel (2011) examined 158 business leaders around the world to define global mindset, identify factors affecting global mindset, and the effect of global mindset on leadership behaviour. This study found a relationship of global mindset with both personal factors and leadership behaviour. This study is one of many global mindset research examples that are conducted in the organizational setting. However, this study can be used as a hypothetical foundation that global mindset is developed since young age.

In order to examine the role of intercultural exposures in educational setting to develop global mindset, the authors compare the level of global mindset from international and national high school students. The result reveals that international school students got scores significantly higher in all dimensions of global mindset than their peers in national schools. Accordingly, the international students have more knowledge, skills, understanding and cognitive complexity of global world. In addition, they are also equipped with better psychological attributes (adaptability, self-confidence, resiliency and optimism), leading to willingness to engage in and motivation for success in international settings; and finally, they are more able to build trusting relationship with culturally different individuals (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Javidan & Bowen, 2013). Referring to Table 2, in each group, SPK students scored significantly higher in GSC and GPC than in GIC. Similarly, students of national school scored higher in GSC and GPC than in GIC. This result shows that GSC and GPC contribute significantly in developing students' global mindset. The result reveals that development of global mindset has already started from school age, supporting the idea of Spodek (1983) regarding the importance of developing competences to handle future diversity challenges for young people.

4.2 The Role of School as Agent for Intercultural Exposures

The study results suggest that school is one of the contributing factors to develop global mindset development. At least, there are three differences between international and national schools that can affect students' global mindset development: curriculum, learning atmosphere, and school environment. The international schools refer to international curriculum system which provides trainings for the students to meet international qualification needed. It is also mandatory in international school to actively use international language (mostly English) both in daily interaction and in classroom situation. Another feature of international school is that the students of international school meet various people. In this context, variety and multi-perspective are integral parts of social environment. Finally, the existence of global culture artefacts in school environment (e.g. classroom design, bulletins, school uniforms, decorations) contributes to build global atmosphere. On the other hand, the national schools apply national curriculum and are heavily characterized by insufficient international language skills for teachers and students which lead them to lack of international exposures. As shown by the statistical differences, international exposures may play a role in developing global mindset of Indonesian high school students. Students of international school have abundant access to international exposure, contrast to students of national school.

Even though international schools usually charge higher school fee, its programs have positive impacts for its students. In this sense, the schools build an antecedent factor for global mindset as mentioned by Bhagat et. al (2007), i.e. the Person-Specific factor. The Person-Specific factor may act as Opportunities (i.e. to provide opportunities) or as Constraints (i.e. to hinder) the development of global mindsets. The Opportunities of Person-Specific factors consist of several supporting personal qualities, namely cosmopolitan orientation, cognitive complexity, cultural intelligence, emphasis on non-judgmental and universalistic modes of thinking, and supportive network of family and friends. On the other hand, the Constraints of person-specific factors include local orientation, cognitive simple ways to interpret the world, lack of cultural intelligences and competencies, emphasis on judgmental and particularistic thinking, and lack of supportive network. The study results evidently accentuated the role of international exposure to develop the Opportunities of Person-Specific factor in young people. Specifically, school along with its resources can be used as an opportunity to enhance student's global mindset.

Works on intercultural relations have been supporting the role of international exposure in supporting global competence (e.g. Cushner & Karim, 2004; Yakunina et al., 2012). In terms of educational setting, international exposure can be obtained from the school's program, social environment, and physical environment. Those three

aspects help students develop global mindset, thus, help them be competent in global context. Improvement of school program and activities are necessary to prepare young generation to compete in a global context.

4.3 Strength and Limitation of the Study

There are two main strength of this study. First, this study extend the scope of global mindset studies. Previously, studies of global mindset are limited to adult workers and leaders. This study shows the development of global mindset of young people. Thus, it implies the importance of early global mindset development.

Second, the result of this study pinpoints the advantage of building international school atmosphere, with regard to physical and social environment. This information is useful, particularly to develop an education system that fits for global realm. The challenges and demand that are expected from young people today are different. Thus, how school develop students has to adapt to current demand. One of those demands is to prepare them to face global challenges.

The study has several limitations. First, it does not examine and measure the international exposure in systematic manner, rather it is imposed in the types of school. As a result, the study could not empirically justify international exposure as a sole influence on global mindset. Others factors may affect the research result.

Second, this study has limited variation of participants, especially for SPN since the group consists of only three schools in comparison to thirteen schools for SPK. This might contribute to the heavy influence of school culture in the result. For further studies, we suggest measuring the international variable systematically in order to gain insights on its contributions to the global mindsets. We also recommend a larger number of participants with random sampling technique for better representativeness. We would like to note that there is a 14-year-old participant in this study (tenth grade). It is very uncommon; however, the international curriculum system makes it possible.

Third, this study was conducted in two different procedures, online and offline. This might affect the result of this study as offline procedure allowed authors to give emphasis on instructions to fill out the questionnaire.

4.4 Further Studies

To extend current studies, global mindset antecedents in child development is one area that has not been covered. It is known from this study that young people has already develop global mindset in their adolescent age. Hence it would be useful to explore developmental factors for global mindset. Furthermore, it can be used to develop suitable measurement approach and instrument for young people.

Second, it is also important to conduct a systematic studies to measure program effectiveness to promote international exposure in schools. Eventhough programs to initiate global readiness in schools are available, evaluation for the existing program effectiveness is still scarce. Therefore, it is also important to use a suitable global mindset measurement for young people as a parameter of school program effectiveness in terms of developing global readiness.

5. Implications of the Findings

5.1 Suggestions

First, as it is shown by Table 3, global intellectual capital, global psychological capital, and global social capital are highly interrelated. It means that a holistic educational approach is needed in order to fully develop global mindset for young people at schools. Partial implementation of international curriculum will produce inconsistency which can hinder students' development (Natalia & Pandia, 2013).

This study promotes the benefit of international study program to build competences in a diverse world; one of them is being Global Mindset. The presence of international school can ignite a challenge and be a good example for national school to develop each aspect to nurture the students. Following this line of thought, Indonesia's local schools should also be encouraged to provide international exposures for their students. Partnership between local school and school from abroad could be beneficial for Indonesian students. These partnerships may initiate mobility programs which will expose Indonesian students to global environment, both overseas and locally such as student exchange, scholarships, homestay, and international competition. However, to ensure the success of these program, the students need to have the openness and the curiosity to understand cultures of the destined country. Without them, the chance of intercultural contact may not happen, and the program would fail to develop the students' global mindset. The role of teachers and school in facilitating these processes is fundamental to the success of the programmes.

In addition, local schools could develop global knowledge and perspectives of the teachers by providing proper trainings (language, international qualifications on teachings) and international experiences (overseas training,

international workgroups). Recent study shows that there are concerns regarding teaching workforce in Indonesia; one of them is being competent compared with other occupation or with teacher from other countries (Chang et al., 2014). Considering that teachers are a fundamental part of a school's environment, they can help form a social environment that would be healthy for the global mindset development. Well-prepared teachers would be able to introduce numerous perspectives from other cultures and induce the students' openness and curiosity of other cultures. These are the platform that would help students have global perspectives and motivate them to engage in a global world.

5.2 Important Contributed Factors of Intercultural Exposures

Tracing back to the contact hypothesis, Kormos and Csizér (2007) stated that contact can be classified into two categories, direct and indirect contacts. Students of international school might have benefitted from the direct contact they experienced within their environment; meanwhile, the same thing cannot be achieved by students of national school. However, school might not be the only important contributed factors to the development of global mindset. In fact, there should be many other important contributed factors that have not been discussed in this paper.

Peng & Wu (2016) explored intercultural contact and its effect to intercultural competence. The author found that both direct and indirect contacts were significant to improve intercultural competence; in which indirect contact has relatively stronger positive effect than direct contact. Therefore, the pathway to develop intercultural competence or global mindset is not limited only to direct contact with global agents.

In this study, the authors emphasized the role of direct intercultural contact in developing students' global mindset. Considering the students of national school has a minimal direct contact with global agents, it is important to look into another factor, i.e. indirect contact. Indirect contact such as media, literatures, and movies might contribute to the development of students' global mindset. Therefore, the role of indirect contact with global agents to the development of global mindset is an important thing to consider.

References

- Asian Development Bank Outlook. (2016). *Asia's Potential Growth*. Metro Manila, Phillipines: Asian Development Bank.
- Barua, A. (2016). Indonesia: Trudging through uncertain times. In *Asia Pacific Economic Outlook 2016* (pp. 7-12). United Kingdom: De Loitt University Press.
- Beechler, S., & Javidan, M. (2007). Leading with a global mindset. In M. A. Hitt, M. Javidan, & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *The Global Mindset: Advances in International Management, 19*, 105-130. Bingley: Emerald Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19006-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19006-9)
- Bhagat, R. S., Triandis, H. C., Baliga, B. R., Billing, T. K., & Davis, C. A. (2007). On becoming a global manager: A closer look at the opportunities and constraints of the 21st century In M. A. Hitt, M. Javidan, & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *The Global Mindset: Advances in International Management, 19*, 191-213. Bingley: Emerald Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19008-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19008-2)
- Cambridge International Examination. (2017, June 27). *Cambridge International AS & A Levels*. Retrieved from <http://www.cie.org.uk/programmes-and-qualifications/cambridge-advanced/cambridge-international-as-and-a-levels/>
- Cao, B., & Lin, W. Y. (2017). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: Effects of different modes of computer-mediated communication on intergroup relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 58*, 23-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.03.003>
- Cavusgil, S. T., Knight, G., & Riesenberger, J. R. (2008). *International Business*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Chang, M. C., Samer, A. S., Andrew, B. R., Sheldon S., Joppe, D. R., & Ritchie, S. (2013). *Teacher Reform in Indonesia: The Role of Politics and Evidence in Policy Making*. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-9829-6>
- Clapp-Smith, R., Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). The role of psychological capital in global mindset development. In M. A. Hitt, M. Javidan, & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *The Global Mindset: Advances in International Management, 19*, 105-130. Bingley: Emerald Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19005-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19005-7)
- Cushner, K., & Karim, A. U. (2004). Study abroad at the university level. In D. Landis, & J. M. Bennett (Eds.),

- Handbook of intercultural training Handbook of intercultural training* (pp. 289-308). London: SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231129.n12>
- Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education. (2016, June 15). *List of International senior high school based on region updated June 15 2016*. Retrieved from http://dikdas.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Daftar-SPK-berdasarkan-Wilayah-Jenjang-SMA_update-15-Juni-2016.pdf
- Early, P. C., Murnieks, C., & Mosakowski, E. (2007). Cultural Intelligence and the global mindset. In M. A. Hitt, M. Javidan, & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *The Global Mindset: Advances in International Management*, 19, 75-103. Bingley: Emerald Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19004-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19004-5)
- Gropello, E. D., Kruse, A., & Tandon, P. (2011). *Skills for the labor market in Indonesia*. Washington DC: The World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8614-9>
- Guan, J., & Dodder, R. A. (2001). The impact of cross-cultural contact on value and identity: A comparative study of Chinese students in china and in the U.S.A. *Mankind Quarterly*, 41(3), 271-288.
- Hitt, M. A., Javidan, M., & Steers, R. M. (2007). *The Global Mindset: Advances in International Management*, 19. Bingley: Emerald Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19001-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19001-X)
- Hitt, M. A., Javidan, M., & Steers, R. M. (2007). The Global Mindset: An introduction. In M. A. Hitt, M. Javidan, & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *The Global Mindset: Advances in International Management*, 19, 1-10. Bingley: Emerald Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19001-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19001-X)
- Institut Européen d'Administration des Affaires. (2015). *The global talent competitiveness index 2015-2016*. Fontainebleau, France: ADECCO, INSEAD, HCLI.
- Javidan, M., Steers, R. M., & Hitt, M. A. (2007). Preface. In M. A. Hitt, M. Javidan, & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *The Global Mindset: Advances in International Management*, 19, ix - x. Bingley: Emerald Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19011-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19011-2)
- Javidan, M., & Bowen, D. (2013). The 'Global Mindset' of managers: What it is, why it matters, and how to develop it. *Organizational Dynamics*, 42, 145-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2013.03.008>
- Kim, H. (2016). The rise of transnational education corporations in the Asia Pacific. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(2), 279-286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-015-0260-3>
- Konyu-Fogel, G. (2011). *Exploring the effect of global mindset on leadership behavior: An empirical study of business leaders in global organizations*. Southfield, Michigan: UMI.
- Kormos, J., & Csizer, K. (2007). An interview study of inter-cultural contact and its role in language learning in a foreign language environment. *System*, 35(2), 241-258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.10.010>
- Levy, O., Beecher, S., Taylor, S., & Boyacigiller, N. A. (2007). What we talk about when we talk about "global mindset": Managerial cognition in multinational corporation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38, 231-258. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400265>
- Lowe, J. (1999). International examinations, national systems and the global market. *Compare*, 29(3), 317-330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305792990290309>
- Meyer, M., Bushney, M., & Ukpere, W. I. (2011). The impact of globalisation on higher education: Achieving a balance between local and global needs and Realities. *African Journal of Business Management*, 15(5), 6569-6578.
- Natalia, M. S., & Pandia, W. S. (2012). *The effect of curriculum to students' persistence: A study in national standard and international standard junior high school* (pp. 51-61). Jakarta: Asosiasi Psikologi Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2015). *PISA 2014 results focused*. Paris: OECD.
- Panggabean, H. (2012). *The role of international study in building global competence* (pp. 73-83). Mind Set.
- Peng, R. Z., & Wu, W. P. (2016). Measuring intercultural contacts and its effects of intercultural competence: A structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2016.05.003>
- Kompas. (2017, September 27). *Human resource a key for changes* (p. 26). Kompas.
- Quacquarelli Symonds Limited. (2017, Juni 29). *QS World University Rankings 2018 | Top Universities*. Retrieved from *Top Universities|Worldwide university rankings, guides & events*. Retrieved from

<https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2018>

- Redding, G. (2007). The chess master and the 10 simultaneous components: but what if the game is poker? Implications for the Global Mindset. In M. A. Hitt, M. Javidan, & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *The Global Mindset: Advances in International Management*, 19, 49-73. Bingley: Emerald Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19003-3)
- Ridhwan, M. M., Wicaksono, G., Nurliana, L., Bary, P., Suryani, F. T., & Nugroho, R. S. (2015). *Competitiveness analysis and national industrial strategy in economic and free-trade society ASEAN*. Jakarta: Bank Indonesia.
- Spodek, H. (1983). Integrating Cross-Cultural Education in the Postsecondary Curriculum. In D. Landis, & R. W. Brislin, *Handbook of Intercultural Training*, 3, 81-101. New York: Pergamon Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-027535-2.50010-7>
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. New Jersey: Pearson Inc.
- Yakunina, E. S., Weigold, I., Weigold, A., Hercegovac, S., & Elsayed, N. (2012). The multicultural personality: Does it predict international students' openness to diversity and adjustment?. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36, 533-540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.12.008>
- Zakaria, J. N. (2017). *The effect of intercultural contact to global mindset of senior high school students in greater Jakarta area*. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya Jakarta.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).