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PART 1

Developing Leadership Capabilities in a Global World
CHAPTER 1.1

The Development of General Management Capabilities in a Global World

ROBERT F. BRUNER, Dean and Charles Abbott Professor of Business Administration, Darden Graduate School of Business, University of Virginia, ROBERT M. CONROY, J. Harvey Wilkinson Professor of Business Administration, Darden Graduate School of Business, University of Virginia, and SCOTT A. SNELL, E. Thayer Bigelow Professor of Business Administration, Darden Graduate School of Business, University of Virginia

Introduction

Many of the graduates of today’s business schools are well prepared to excel in applying the functional knowledge and skill they have acquired. The world needs people who can do this. Yet the business profession expresses a growing need for general managers and leaders, people who can knit together the work of many technicians, who take an enterprise point of view, and who create a whole that is greater than the sum of the parts. As business grows more global in form and content, the need for leaders who can synthesize activities across borders grows more urgent. The gap between what schools produce and what business needs is at the heart of a chorus of criticism of business education.

This chapter lays out some of the work we have undertaken at the Darden Graduate School of Business Administration to gauge the dimensions of this unfilled need, and the ways in which we can continuously improve our MBA program to meet the requirements of our students and global partners. In other words, we looked at both the “what” question of MBA learning, as well as the “how” question of program delivery. The process and results are relevant to other business schools as well to corporate executives who are concerned with developing the next generation of business leaders.
The “what” question: Competencies B-schools must build for global business

The recent AACSB report, *The Globalization of Management Education* (Bruner et al., 2011) challenged business schools’ foundational attitudes about the education of business professionals. Business today is not perfectly globalized; nor does it remain localized. Rather, in the terms of Pankaj Ghemawat (2007), it is “semi-globalized,” meaning that the effective business leader must understand both global forces and local contexts. And business schools should aim to produce graduates who are globally confident and competent. Today we graduate students who master the technicalities of working across borders and yet fail to listen, judge, and act effectively. There is more to global effectiveness than technical mastery: the AACSB report argues that schools should aim to prepare their graduates more deeply.

The ultimate ends of management education should include the development of competencies—the knowledge, skills, and attributes (KSAs) that distinguish successful managers and leaders. We know that, for decades, schools have focussed on functional knowledge. The “know what” factor in learning; the “what do you know”—do you know this formula, do you know these definitions, can you explain these relationships? But we also know that effective management relies on skills—the “know how” factor of learning; the ability to do things or more aptly, to get things done. And the third factor, perhaps more intangible but potentially more foundational, would be personal attributes. These are qualities of who you are—the “care why” factor imbedded in values, attitudes, and experiences that define who you are as a person. Why do you do things the way you do?

Ironically, these are not particularly new ideas to most global corporations. The notion of competencies grew in popularity with the publication in 1973 of a paper by David McClelland (1973) titled “Testing for Competence Rather Than for Intelligence.” Since then, experts in the area of leadership development have emphasized the importance of competency-based approaches to learning, development, and career management (McCall and Hollenbeck, 2002), and, generally speaking, corporate leadership development programs have followed suit. Talent management systems focus on the KSAs required for success (Price and Turnbull, 2007; Wright, Snell and Dyer, 2005), and more directly targeted to business schools, corporate recruiting and selection criteria for MBA students tend to privilege competency-based criteria that extend beyond technical knowledge alone.
This really suggests that business schools have an opportunity to achieve better alignment with our corporate partners by focussing on the whole individual—people who are truly well-rounded, not merely functional technicians of business; but people who have a broader set of skill-based competencies and personal attributes to succeed in a global environment.

The response of business educators to these concerns has too often been to target the usual suspects of functional expertise in management education. Surely, students need to master business issues and the functional tools that apply. However, students also need an orientation toward getting results, not merely analysis; the capacity to collaborate, to contribute to teams, and to get the most out of those teams that span cultures and differences in ethnicity—the ability to build relationships; the capacity to communicate very effectively, to listen well; the capacity to judge well in the face of ambiguity that derives from the complexity and dynamics of a global marketplace; and the capacity to think in terms of the entire enterprise and the linkages among functional specialties. We need to build in our students the capacity to tolerate risk—and the entrepreneurial initiative that it implies. We need to nurture in our students their qualities of integrity and honesty, the ability to inspire trust in those with whom they work. Too often business schools turn out students who are narrowly trained in areas of functional expertise and don’t understand the linkages across the fields of expertise.

We emphasize this long list to say that the challenges of managing in a complex global environment require graduates who are more than technicians; they must be leaders. In this context, how should business schools respond?

The “how” question: Our development model

The model of human resource development as seen from business schools has to adapt. This goes beyond what we teach to how we teach it. Henry Mintzberg (2004) goes so far as to say that business schools misconstrue management and so teach it in the wrong way.

At the heart of the criticisms is that much of business education centers on traditional classroom instruction focussed on delivering technical knowledge. And one might say that there is nothing wrong with that. Technical and functional knowledge will always be a primary contribution provided by management educators. However, by contrast, the best corporate development programs assess and develop their employees using a broad array of methods.
that include formal training, but also incorporate other experience-based methods that are real-world and real-time (Ready and Conger, 2007).

Not surprisingly, as Pankaj Ghemawat ably discusses in a related chapter, there is a gap between what schools say they do and what they actually deliver. The AACSB report provides further insights from its survey that contrast the curriculum and missions of business schools.

Functional and technical education are quickly commoditized, particularly those aspects that involve the kind of learning you can do sitting at a computer and working through trial and error processes—how to get the two sides of a balance sheet to balance, how to price a product, how to define terms, etc. That is rapidly gravitating to the Internet and to for-profit providers (Christensen, 2008) and (Christensen et al., 2002). Perhaps that is as it should be. But if we hope to differentiate ourselves by turning out the kind of professional that can successfully manage in a complex and dynamic global environment, then business schools frankly need to do more (Kedia and Englis, 2011) and they need to do things differently.

But the news isn’t all bad. The AASCB report gives nine in-depth case studies of what leading business schools have been doing to drive innovation. Contrary to the conventional view of business schools as lacking innovation, the case studies document a wave of experimentation. These cases suggest a shift away from what Khurana (2007) referred to as a “rules-plus-analytics” model of education toward a “principles-plus-implementation” focus on development of managers. This is a very different mindset.

It is an exciting moment in the field of management education to watch its development and to think about serving the needs of the business profession. Surely, some of the other 13,000 institutions of management education in the world are coming along in this direction. But the forces of globalization, technological change, and demographic shifts in the context of the recent global financial crisis are driving immense change in business schools right now.

Our approach: The program concept team

At Darden our mission is “to improve society by developing principled leaders for the world of practical affairs.” We are rapidly gravitating toward a new model that addresses the classic criticisms of management education, a model that focusses on management development, rather than mere training. A critical driver here has been globalization. More than anything, globalization
has placed a higher premium on people who can knit together the work of many technicians, who take an enterprise point of view, and who create a whole that is greater than the sum of the parts. In parenting, raising one child takes a certain set of capabilities. Raising three or more children requires the same basic set of capabilities but also requires more breadth since each child is the same yet unique in his or her own way. Globalization is like going from one child to three children. It is this realization that motivated us to take a comprehensive look at our programs.

In 2008, we created a Program Concept Team (PCT) of faculty and staff members to facilitate a comprehensive review of the Darden MBA program, and to bring to the school new concept designs and specific recommendations for improvement and innovation. Over an eighteen-month period, the PCT engaged students, corporate partners, alumni, faculty, and staff in a series of focus groups, interviews, surveys, and other forums in order to bring to light the most promising levers for change. The PCT asked, “What is the value proposition of management education for each of these stakeholders and how were we delivering against it?”

The PCT took an “outside-in” approach, grounding its work in the data gathered from our key stakeholders—this was in contrast to the inward-looking “inside-out” approach for which academia is famous. The approach purposefully followed the principles of design innovation: moving from exploration and pattern finding; to concept develop and strategy, to prototyping and piloting initiatives. At each stage, the PCT brought the data to the larger Darden community in order to ensure a continuous dialogue.

First, the PCT mapped the students’ experience, their highs and lows in stress and satisfaction, and particularly focussed on what students were able to demonstrate upon leaving business school. The mapping allowed us to assess the current state of Darden’s infrastructure for delivering the educational experience.

Second, this task force delved into the data gathered from corporate recruiters, learning among other things, that companies expect competency in functional knowledge/technical expertise. The recruiters reinforce the idea that a focus on competencies is increasingly seen as a basic expectation. Recruiters seek out MBA graduates who have a broader set of competencies, and who have a more deeply aligned relationship with the faculty.

Third, the PCT examined the MBA in context, the shifting ground of education globally, and the influence of demographic, technological, and
cultural shifts. The faculty formed working groups to benchmark other schools and to focus more deeply on implications for governance, culture, careers, and competencies.

Fourth, the task force synthesized all the data and findings, to look for patterns and trends that integrated the needs and interests of stakeholders. Through a series of day-long workshops, the school identified the most promising themes for innovation, and subsequently devised a strategic concept for transformation.

Toward a management development concept

The transformation plan can be summarized in Figure 1, depicting the key elements of an expression of our strategic intent to orient our programs toward management development and away from mere management training. Importantly, this shift does not abandon the core tenets of our program, such as a case-teaching approach that emphasizes a high engagement culture, student-centered learning, and an enterprise perspective. We were motivated by three premises: (a) the requirements for managerial success are more

Figure 1: Toward a Management Development Concept
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complex; the standard of high performance is rising; (b) it is necessary to be more explicit about how to use the entire program experience to deliver the learning; learning occurs not only in class but also in extracurricular activities, the career search, and in engagement with society; and (c) students must take greater ownership and navigate their individual course through the program.

The strategic intent of this shift in concept rests on five design pillars: (1) competency-based, (2) customized, (3) modular and agile to enhance experience-based learning, (4) integrated across the curriculum as well as co-curricular and career-oriented activities, and (5) leveraging a high engagement culture.

*Competency-based to develop the whole person.* As noted earlier, the next level to which management education must move is to focus on a broader set of competencies. Simply stated, the requirements for success are more complex, and the dynamics of global business require that students learn how to learn rapidly.

*Customized to charter a personalized course.* Management development is necessarily more customized to the company, and to the individual. One size doesn’t fit all. We found from our work at Darden that there are (at least) four different student profiles; students who come from different places and are approaching their careers in different ways. Students are challenged with trying to navigate all of the opportunities they have to build a competency portfolio for their career goals. A competency-based approach to the program needs to design in mechanisms for self-assessment, planning, challenge/learning, and feedback/coaching. If we are to create a learning experience that meets all of their needs, the program is must become more student-focussed.

*Modular and agile to learn from experience.* Learning doesn’t always occur in standardized blocks of time. For example, the reactions, concerns, and questions that students (and faculty) had to the Wall Street meltdown showed us that we need to respond real-time to learning opportunities. Other concentrated learning opportunities are designed to help students learn “where they are.” Increasingly, these opportunities were seen as being outside the traditional classroom, including field work and experiential projects that reinforce the ideas of learning by doing. This is especially true with regard to developing the ability to manage in a global environment. As every parent knows, no one can tell you what it is like to raise children. You need to experience it yourself and be able to learn and adapt as you go along.
Integrative to synthesize learning. Although Darden has a tradition of focusing on general management, at its core, management development is intensely integrative. It is more than breaking down the silos of a functional orientation. That’s a start, but our challenge is to combine what happens in the classroom, in clubs, in briefings, in global business experiences, in business projects, and the recruiting experience of students to create a synthesized learning experience. The synthesis also includes learning cumulatively over time through a sequence of experiences. From the standpoint of what a school needs to provide, it must present an incredibly challenging experience to students.

High engagement culture for collaborative learning. Management development follows the principles of adult learning, or andragogy (as opposed to pedagogy) (Knowles, Holton and Swanson, 2005). We seek to leverage a culture based on high engagement and collaborative learning. Students learn best from one another when they own the learning process, focus on problem-solving, and extract aspects that are particularly relevant to them, reinforced by lessons of experience, and pointed toward a decision based on reasoned principles.

Implementing the conceptual model: Three key processes

One of our strongest convictions is that a management development approach needs to be seen as continued evolution. It is a linked set of processes, rather than a checklist of one-time decisions. We focus on three processes:

1. Competency Identification and Refinement: How do we as educators and scholars of business engage in an ongoing conversation about the changing challenges of management and in that context define what success looks like?

2. Program Design: How do we continually update the program offerings to address these competencies, seeking continuous improvement and innovation, in program delivery?

3. Student Development: How do we help students plot a course through the program and navigate their learning and development?

The latter two are familiar for most schools, including Darden, for whom there are elements of those processes already in place. We review and update our
programs; and most schools offer some required curriculum, offering guidance on course selection based on career goals. However, the first may be new—or it may be making explicit and formal debates that were at best implicit and informal. However, regardless whether it is new or just making it explicit and formal, it will have a dramatic impact on how we view and implement the latter two items. As such the first item is a critical input to the whole process.

**Process 1: Competency identification and refinement**

What should our students learn, to succeed in “the world of practical affairs”? One of the major challenges of any leading MBA program is to identify what students should master during their time in a program. The goal of the PCT was to inform this identification process for the Darden MBA full-time program. We focussed on our mission to develop “principled leaders in the world of practical affairs.” And we also engaged in comprehensive discussions with our key stakeholders: students, faculty, alumni, and corporate partners.

At the outset, we should note that the real learning from our attempts to develop an initial list of competencies was how complex is the process itself. It is critical to understanding what constitutes managerial success, how that may be changing as the world of business evolves, and how to translate that into a compact set of competencies that would be meaningful to students, faculty and employers. We also learned that the process itself is valuable, demanding real clarity in thinking about business, management, and education. Figure 2 summarizes how we viewed the competency refinement process.

*Observation/Benchmarking.* The PCT examined a large number of competency models developed by different organizations. First we examined in detail the competency models for a total of 19 different firms for which we were able to obtain information.

*Review.* We also reviewed the work of subject matter experts (SMEs) (see Andrews and Tyson, 2004; Pink, 2006; Ghemawat, 2007), state-of-the-art thinking, and emerging research, as a comparison to the corporate data. Corporate models may tell us what is important to them today, whereas SMEs may give us insight to what is important for tomorrow (e.g., critical thinking).

In addition we examined several studies of competency models. The first was from the Center for Advanced HR studies at Cornell, “Summary
of Best Practices Findings: Leadership Development” (Sovina, Wherry and Stepp, n.d.). This examined the competencies used by 17 firms in different industries. Another study of 80 Indian and multinational firms was done by Asha Bhandarker (Bhandarker, 2008). Finally, we reviewed the leadership competencies discussed by Javidan and Dastmalchian (Javidan and Dastmalchian, 2009).

In addition to the above we studied the Harris/WSJ survey of MBA recruiters and some of the popular literature on competencies for success. The final source used was an article by Nigel Andrews and Laura Tyson (2004), then Dean of London Business School, who interviewed over 100 executives from global companies on the desirable attributes in MBA graduates. In this article the authors argue strongly for business education to adopt a more competency-driven model of education. Their major point is that business education is and has been mainly focussed on the transfer of knowledge under the assumption that the keys to managerial success were functional expertise. While this is still important, it is not the only thing that matters. We need to move away from a model of knowledge acquisition to one that emphasizes practical knowledge and experiential learning. To do this, Andrews and Tyson offer a version of the knowledge, skills, and attributes (KSA) model for competencies in manner similar to what we are proposing.
Synthesis. Finally, we cross-referenced the list of competencies that was
generated from the corporate data with the terminology that is currently
being used at Darden. While there are differences across all of the data exam-
ined, there was extensive overlap and commonality. During the spring 2009
meeting of the Darden Corporate Advisory Board (CAB) (with representa-
tives of some 30 firms among Darden’s most valued partners) the members
provided a set of attributes that they would like to see in MBA graduates. In a
survey, we asked the CAB members to tell us which competencies were most
important for making an initial hiring decision, which were most important
over the course of someone’s career, and how well Darden delivered on these
competencies.

One interesting observation on the set of competencies we identified is that
does not seem to be a “different” set of competencies that relate to globaliza-
tion but rather that some matter more. Clearly adaptability, a tolerance of
ambiguity, and the ability to learn quickly are always important but in a glo-
bal environment these stand out as competencies that matter.

Importantly, although this list reflects the synthesis of work we have done,
we have concluded that arriving at a final list should not be the goal of a com-
petency refinement process. Rather developing an mechanism for continu-
ally engaging in a conversation about what “success looks like” and what our
students should learn while in the program may be one of the most valuable
school-wide initiatives to engender continuous improvement and innovation.

This process, more than the list, is what defines a competency-based
approach to MBA education. We believe that this process may be important
to business schools as a whole, and particularly useful for connecting the
academicians with corporate partners. While the precise focus of each pro-
gram may differ, all programs, the full-time MBA program, and the executive
format programs should all be shaped by a view of what constitutes manage-
rial success, both today and tomorrow.

Process 2: Program (re)design

The second key process for a competency-based approach is the process of
designing (or continuously redesigning) the program. To be clear, this extends
beyond curriculum discussions alone. Traditional MBA programs typically
do not address the full range of skills and attributes necessary for managerial
success over a person’s career, nor do they explicitly address the roles that each
element of the program can play. By contrast, a management development
(competency-based) approach more closely mirrors the best corporate leadership development and talent management programs. These create and promote a broad set of learning opportunities—experiences, assignments, and challenges required to acquire, refine, and improve on a set of competencies important for being a successful manager.

Of course, in any program design, there are several tradeoffs that need to be reconciled. One is the duality of near-term versus long-term learning. We would suggest that while our intent is to provide clear value for early and long-term career success, the ultimate goal at business schools may be to help our students “learn how to learn.” The concept of learning agility implies that, while specifics may change, we hope to give our students the tools to adapt as the specific situation changes. In a global context this must extend to the capability of identifying and dealing with cultural differences. Learning agility is critical in this context.

The matrix in Figure 3 illustrates how the Program Design Process can map existing program activities onto a competency framework. Knowledge, skills, and attributes can be arrayed horizontally across the top, with

![Figure 3: Program design process](image)
program activities vertically along the side. The typical MBA program focusses mainly on the area of the matrix at the top left: knowledge delivered in the classroom. Please note: Functional knowledge is, and always will be, a primary contribution provided by MBA programs, but the most successful MBA programs of the future must also produce graduates who have competencies that extend beyond that.

Darden’s tradition has been to focus on a wider range of KSAs, including the area in the top right: what you know, what you can do, and who you are. However, this focus has emphasized the classroom experience, to the exclusion of co-curricular/career-related activities that are often viewed as competing for time with classroom learning.

Andrews and Tyson (2004) have noted the difference between knowledge-based classroom learning and skills-based experiential learning:

These are not simply different in content. They are different in essence. We can teach knowledge, but we need to train people in skills, and we can only develop attributes. This changes not only the “what” of management education, but also the “how” and “who” of the process.

We have leveraged our strength in collaborative learning, casework, high engagement culture, etc. But the kind of customized experiential learning approach we are discussing here requires a more customized, modular, flexible, agile, and experience-based approach to learning.

A competency-based approach reinforces the notion of a “program focus” that integrates curricular, co-curricular, and career-related learning experiences, drawing on each to help develop and reinforce the chosen competencies. This is particularly true for the skills and attributes that need to be practiced to be learned. The next step is to identify how each activity contributes to the competency based model.

Figure 4 illustrates the program design process. The mapping allows us to analyze two related elements of program design. First, we can look at a vertical slice of matrix to analyze one competency (e.g., decision-making) and all the program elements that help to develop it. Second, we can look at a horizontal slice of the matrix to analyze one program element (e.g., club activities) and all the competencies that it helps develop. The circles in each cell can visually display an assessment of whether the program area covers the competency well, partially or inadequately. This mapping process allows us to
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identify gaps and to guide students to the best combination of activities that meet their individual development needs.

Process 3: Student development process

The third key process in a competency-based approach is the student development process that focuses on experience-based learning. While the prior two processes are single, institution-wide processes, the student development process is one that each individual student needs to personalize, with the school providing the basic design and tools to assist them. At the most elemental level, this process reflects a talent-management cycle of: (1) assessment and planning, (2) challenge and learning-by-doing, and (3) support, coaching, and feedback.

Up close the process is more detailed for the individual student and more complex for the institution because the number of variations across all students can be quite large. How does each student plot a course through the program and navigate the terrain? However, the basic development process is clear. Based on the work of Groysberg and Cowen (2007), there are three
key components for developmental experiences to be of value: assessment, challenge, and support. As Figure 5 suggests, these components influence one another.

Assessment and planning. The first step is to assess an individual’s current performance for a set of competencies against some benchmark or desired level of competency. The second issue is determining a benchmark. Questions such as whether the benchmark is absolute or relative would need to be addressed. Once a set of competencies is selected and benchmarks are set, we must address the mechanisms to measure performance. We start with an advantage. Darden’s admissions process evaluates the students’ ability to succeed in the classroom along many dimensions, some of which could provide a starting point. However, we will need to adopt mechanisms such as 360-degree feedback to measure performance. The goal here is to identify areas and set targets for improvements. Once individuals can identify these, it is easier to plan and motivate change and learning. The key here is to identify a set of developmental goals. Currently, we do not do this in any formal way.

Assessment is an ongoing process. A strong feedback component is needed in order to maintain motivation. One question for any school is who can best perform this important component of the overall experience: faculty, staff, or outside experts?

Challenge and learning by doing. Groysberg and Cowen’s (2007) research shows that the key to development is to challenge individuals by placing them...
in situations where their current skills or perspectives are inadequate for addressing the challenge. Familiar situations only encourage individuals to fall back on past behaviors or assumptions. The questions for Darden were: Should we do this? Do we currently do this? And if we want to but don’t, how do we do it? The goal here is to get individuals to operate outside their comfort zone. Can we create mechanisms to help students select activities (classes and co-curricular activities) that create this discomfort?

Support coaching and feedback. This is an essential element. What structures are in place to provide support and encouragement? Without encouragement and support the stress induced by placing individuals in challenging situations will result in a negative attitude and only induce individuals to follow old patterns in which they feel comfortable.

These features can be incorporated into the student development process over the two years of a typical MBA program. A true management development model would incorporate the upfront assessment with feedback, coaching, and planning. Throughout the first year of the program there would be feedback and reevaluation of the student’s progress and needs. Figure 6

**Figure 6: Student development process: How do students navigate their learning?**
depicts the student development process. Based on the experiences during the summer internship, students would once again use assessment, feedback, and coaching to plan their activities in the second year.

Globalization and the management development approach

We began this chapter with an acknowledgment that globalization is perhaps the major force of change in management education. Our program development work at Darden suggests a range of considerations for educators as they strive to adapt to the implications of globalization. These include:

1. Competency Identification and Refinement. The framework of knowledge–skills–attributes offers a basis for assessing the completeness of the preparation of students to be globally confident and competent as managers. Perhaps most importantly, globalization will force a reconsideration of priorities of topics. The CAGE framework of Pankaj Ghemawat (2007), for instance, can test the suitability of knowledge and skills for a globally prepared graduate.

2. Program (Re)Design. The ideal global competencies can be added to the process framework shown in Figures 3 and 4.

3. Student Development Process. Student assessment and the engagement of students in the process of planning his or her developmental experience should now embrace the global competencies. Challenging students to extend the boundaries of their comfort zones is naturally promoted by foreign immersion experiences and field projects away from home.

In short, our three-part process can be adapted to respond to the special demands for management development in an increasingly global business environment.

Conclusion and implications for business leaders

About half of the worldwide expenditure on management education is showered upon educational activities within business enterprises themselves. As businesses seek to improve and accelerate the development of global leadership within their walls, they are experimenting actively with alternative approaches. Business schools should do so too.
Darden’s experience illustrates the intensity of reflective process and transformation necessary to define a new approach. Several important elements suggest the extent of this intensity:

- Shift from a focus on management training to a focus on management development.
- Enlargement of the scope of the development aspiration from mere knowledge (“know what”), to include skills (“know how”), and attributes (“care why”).
- An inclusive effort that reaches out to a large cross-section of stakeholders of the enterprise, rather than focussing inwardly in the classic secretive “skunkworks” model.
- Being fact-based: studying patterns in fresh data about the learning needs of students, rather than simply relying on ungrounded opinions.
- Emerging into a new framework for learning that is:
  - Competency-based.
  - Personalized to the student.
  - Integrative across specialties.
  - Highly engaging, modular, and agile.

We are not arguing that our transformational effort is applicable in its particulars to all enterprises. Tailoring will be warranted to suit the culture, administrative practices, and needs in different institutions. But we do argue that the transformational effort must be intensive to overcome the natural inertia of organizations and the human instinct to resist change and uncertainty.

Such an effort is only a beginning. It must be sustained through time in a continuous improvement effort simply because the best practices of management are constantly evolving as are the knowledge, skills, and attributes demanded by a profession that must manage in an increasingly complex global environment. A pre-eminent force of change is the globalization of business, which is changing assumptions about the proper mix of knowledge, skills, and attributes toward which we should strive for our students. Related to this is the question of the relevant scope of awareness that educators should seek to instill in their students and in executives: the AACSB task force report affirms the vital importance of instilling an awareness of the environment that is not merely local, national, or regional, but truly global in scope.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical thinking</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds interdependent partnering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds trust</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Acumen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Judgment (acumen)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sample of competencies by firms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champions Change</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an achievement environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates Teaching Opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customercleint Focused</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops Self and Others (Learning)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops Talent (Coaching)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging talent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Perspective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Acumen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Thinking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Acumen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a compelling “employee value”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence edge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity/Honesty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspires trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading/Coaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company:</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Motivates others</th>
<th>Negotiating skills</th>
<th>Networking builds relationships</th>
<th>Organizational knowledge</th>
<th>Passion</th>
<th>Performance Oriented</th>
<th>Planning and Organizing</th>
<th>Prioritizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Energy generation Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Petroleum Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Nuclear Energy Firm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services (Insurance)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Manufacturer (Defense)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting/Computer Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Manufacturer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Goods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Market Investment Bank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Private Equity Firm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and Life Insurance (Financial Services)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns and manages Government's direct investments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Engines, Air Conditioning, &amp; Elevators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Appliances</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Perspective</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesize data</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes risks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Player</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Savvy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat people with dignity &amp; respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values differences (Diversity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Frequency of competency descriptors—a study of 19 firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Descriptor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops self and others (Learning)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Networking builds relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results oriented</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team player</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Creates teaching opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical thinking</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Decision making skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer/client focussed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Engaging talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity/honesty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Financial acumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic perspective</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Forward thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions change</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Motivates others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Organizational knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Performance oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business judgment (acumen)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Takes risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thinking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence edge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Values differences (Diversity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ability to manage information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Builds interdependent partnering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Builds trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an achievement environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops talent (Coaching)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enterprise perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Functional excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology savvy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Have a compelling “employee value”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business acumen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prioritizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global acumen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Synthesize data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspires trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Treats people with dignity &amp; respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading/coaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 3: Summary of competency descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic areas</th>
<th>Collaborative / team player</th>
<th>Results orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Networking/Build Relationships</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Finance</td>
<td>Value differences/diverse cultures</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Macroeconomics</td>
<td><strong>Communication &amp; Interpersonal skills</strong></td>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Microeconomics</td>
<td>Listening and observation</td>
<td>Bias for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Sciences</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Marketing/Brand</td>
<td>Negotiation skills</td>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Account Management</td>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td>Courage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Management</td>
<td>Develop self and others</td>
<td>Risk tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Governance</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td><strong>Integrity/Honesty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
<td>Managing performance</td>
<td>Inspire trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Self awareness</td>
<td><strong>Learning agility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Develop talent (coaching)</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Management</td>
<td>Giving/receiving feedback</td>
<td>Champions/drivers of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Communication</td>
<td>Business analysis and judgment</td>
<td>Curiosity and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in Organizations</td>
<td>Dealing with ambiguity</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Management</td>
<td>Ability to make the complex simple</td>
<td><strong>Perseverance and Tenacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward thinking</td>
<td>Hard working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Issues</strong></td>
<td>Pattern recognition</td>
<td>Passionate and persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Demands excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td><strong>Enterprise perspective</strong></td>
<td>Boundless energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Customer/client focused</td>
<td>Desire to make a difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Strategic perspective</td>
<td>High intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td><strong>Social awareness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General management perspective</td>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Global awareness &amp; perspective</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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