

GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNIVERSITY SETTING AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR ADVANCING GLOBAL LEADERSHIP RESEARCH

Authors: Joyce S. Osland, Ming Li, Martha Petrone and Mark E. Mendenhall

This paper was published in *Advances in Global Leadership*, Volume 11. Citation is:

Osland, J.S., Li, M., Petrone, M., Mendenhall, M.E. (2019). Global leadership development in the university setting and future directions for advancing global leadership research. In J. Osland, M. Mendenhall & M. Li (eds). *Advances in Global Leadership* (vol. 11, pp. 347-366). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Copyright © 2025, Emerald Publishing Limited. *This Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) is provided for your own personal use only. It may not be used for resale, reprinting, systematic distribution, emailing, or for any other commercial purpose without the permission of the publisher (Emerald Publishing).*

ABSTRACT

*This paper summarizes the findings of the empirical papers in this volume and outlines future research directions for global leadership in general. We summarize the state of global leadership development in universities and recommend design criteria for these efforts. Given the popularity of study abroad as an integral component in many global leadership programs, we highlight common challenges for study abroad programs and the importance of taking an organization development approach. We conclude with future directions for global leadership development research in university settings, most of which emerged from the featured papers on this topic in this volume of *Advances in Global Leadership*. It is our hope that this chapter serves as a primer for both university program directors and researchers.*

Key Words: global leadership; global leadership development in universities; benchmarks; study abroad programs; study abroad best practices; recommendations for future research

In addition to reporting on advances in global leadership, it is our practice to keep a running list of future research needs in global leadership to inform scholars and track the field's progress. Early research in the field fell primarily into two categories: competency studies and global leadership development (GLD). As the field grew, additional approaches emerged: women global leaders, job analysis, cognition, social capital, networking, identity (self and cultural), typological theory, and responsible global leadership (Osland, 2018). Table 1 is an updated list of future research directions we have culled in part from past editions of *Advances in Global Leadership* as well as the current volume. We are pleased to report that the papers from the "Empirical Findings" section of volume 11 of *Advances in Global Leadership* (AGL) make a

valuable contribution to many of the identified research gaps. These contributions are summarized below.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Nelson's (in press) qualitative study examined how global leaders navigate complex global changes, an under-researched area in the field. The study makes unique contributions in the following categories of research gaps in Table 1: construct definition, scope of global leadership tasks and behavior, competencies, and dynamic processes and theory development. It is the first study to operationalize, select, and describe its sample based on the global leadership typology of Reiche, Bird, Mendenhall and Osland (2017) and should be a catalyst for future research to compare and contrast results based on global leadership roles and to discover which competencies are important in varying contexts. Furthermore, the study integrates global leadership with paradox theories (i.e., Lewis, Raisch, & Smith, 2016) and augments our understanding of global leadership behaviors and dynamic processes with respect to paradox, sensemaking and learning agility.

Vijayakumar, Morley, Heraty, Mendenhall and Osland (in press) conducted a systematic bibliometric literature review on the extant literature that relates to global leadership. It includes research that studied international managers, global managers, global leaders, global leadership, and expatriate managers. Their results reveal bibliometric and thematic patterns in the field, identifying important research themes, and "lenses" of scholarship, which contributes to a greater understanding of theory development. Seven core theoretical lenses focus on the two

main themes in this literature: global leader development and global leader effectiveness. The most cited research is from the GLOBE research project (House, Javidan, Hanges & Dorfman, 2002; Den Hartog et al., 1999). Interestingly, they found that most first authors are based in the United States, but the journals that publish the most articles are European-based. Ironically, given the key role Asia plays in global business, there are very few Asian scholars publishing in the more narrowly defined field of global leadership, the focus of AGL.

Deters (in press) introduced a new perspective of global leadership talent management -- an integrated acquisition process of global leadership talent selection. It includes not only attracting and selecting global leadership talent, but also training, development and retaining them. This widens the current research focus on training and development of global leaders. A range of guiding principles, success factors and practices are recommended for each stage of this new approach – attracting and mobilizing, selection, training and development, retaining and succession planning. Deters offers important insights for global corporate human resource practice. This new perspective also informs future research that integrates training and development of global leadership with other stages of global talent management.

Another systematic literature review in this volume was conducted by Hruby, de Mello, and Samunderu (in press). The authors present a thematic analysis of individual-level global mindset studies. The study contributes to the conceptualization, operationalization, and development of global mindset through attention to contextual variables such as level of analysis and measurement criteria. Their findings add to the literature on construct definition and theory development of global leadership by differentiating and integrating components of the global mindset construct and comparing other constructs related to global mindset and global leadership. Moreover, the findings also contribute to the areas of assessment instruments,

research design and training, and global leadership development by exploring issues associated with measurement criteria, congruence between methods, and tailoring training methods to various global career stages.

Nielsen's (in press) chapter is the result of three years doing engaged scholarship (Van de Ven, 2007) as an Industrial Ph.D. Fellow. Her case study describes middle managers in a Danish firm that adopted deliberate global mindset capability development as a vehicle for executing their global strategy. It contributes to understanding the interplay between the organizational context and the global mindset of individual managers and identifies a new set of dynamic processes. These middle managers utilized four practices that enabled global mindset: inclusive strategy co-creation, interactional synergy, imagined community building, and performance flexibility. This contextual analysis contributes to the construct definition of global mindset, a key aspect of global leadership. Furthermore, the study deepens our understanding of global leadership effectiveness through linking individuals' global mindsets to organizational outcomes.

GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNIVERSITY SETTING

A 2003 Rand Corporation study (Bikson, Treverton, Moini and Lindstrom, 2003) was the first to urge universities to develop global leadership curriculum, based on their prediction of a future shortage of global leaders in all sectors. That prediction seems to hold true in the business world since surveys of multinational corporations continue to document a scarcity of global leaders and inadequate leadership development programs, forcing some firms to cut back on their global strategies (DDI, 2018; Mallon, 2015). The World Economic Forum's (2013) research identified a

global leadership crisis in governmental and international non-profit sectors in 2013 as well. In the World Economic Forum's *Outlook on the Global Agenda 2015* (2015), 86% of the 1767 experts surveyed reported a global leadership crisis, based on their perception of the international community's failure to adequately address major threats, such as global warming, violence in the Middle East, and perceived failures in the global economy. Survey respondents went on to list the competencies required of global leaders: a global interdisciplinary perspective; long-term, empirical planning; strong communication skills; a prioritization of social justice and well-being over financial growth; empathy; courage; morality; and a collaborative nature. However, pointing to the multibillion dollar leadership development industry, Petriglieri (2014) questions whether there really is a leadership shortage:

“The question, then, is not whether we have enough leaders, or leaders with the right skills. It is what aims leaders are called to pursue, why, and who benefits. There is no shortage of leaders, and perhaps not even a crisis of leadership. There is a shrinking of collective imagination, a crisis of purpose—and much leadership development, with its overemphasis on leaders' skills and styles, is complicit in it” (Petriglieri, 2014).

Is the shortage a myth? Or, is the real problem that leaders are using their leadership training and skills for the narrow interests of those who benefit from and reward their behavior rather than being committed to leading for the common good, as Petriglieri (2014) argues? If the latter is true, the success of international service learning programs (ISLs) in developing responsible global leadership in business (for a review, see Stahl, Pless, Maak & Miska, 2018) might encourage leaders to focus more on the common good. Or have universities and organizations simply failed to prepare enough global leaders and develop them effectively? We cannot answer these questions without more research into the exact nature of the dynamics that underly the

scarcity that is signaled by numerous surveys (Oddou & Mendenhall, 2018). Nevertheless, the 2003 Rand study's prediction of scarcity, in terms of its results, was prescient.

A study of CEOs, senior executives, and other thought leaders indicated that 62% believe that business schools and professional organizations should be developing global leadership competencies, but only a small number had confidence that business schools (8%) or professional organizations (5%) were doing so (Gitsham et al., 2008). What has been the response of academe to this study, the Rand study, and other studies' (Oddou & Mendenhall, 2018) calls for global leadership curriculum development in academe and the heightened role universities should play in preparing future global leaders? There are no studies documenting academe's overall contribution to developing global leaders, and with few exceptions (e.g., Lobel, 1990), research is just starting to surface on university programs. In our view, these are the key questions confronting universities today: 1) Are they adequately preparing students, in terms of both quantity and quality, for the global leadership pipeline in all types of organizational sectors?; and 2) Do their methods effectively develop the competencies in students so they are equipped to eventually lead global organizations, understand complex global problems, and be motivated to resolve them? To begin answering these questions, we first examined existing university programs and courses to ascertain the current state of affairs of global leadership-related curriculum and programs in academe.

THE STATE OF GLOBAL LEADERSHIP CURRICULUM AND PROGRAMS IN THE UNIVERSITY SETTING

Most universities have been slow to develop global leadership curriculum. Benchmarking studies (Global Leadership Advancement Center, 2008; 2012; 2018) revealed that there was a limited number of university programs, degrees, and courses in 2008, and this trend held with a slight

degree of improvement in 2012, followed by a major leap, primarily in the number of programs, in recent years. This growth in global leadership courses and programs mirrors the increase in company training programs, global leadership research productivity (Mendenhall, Li & Osland, 2016; Vijayakumar, Morley, Heraty, Mendenhall & Osland, 2018), and doctoral programs (Tolstikov-Mast, Bieri, Walker, Wireman & Vaiman, in press), indicating the field's advancement as a discipline (Tolstikov-Mast, et. al., in press). The most recent benchmarking study (Global Leadership Advancement Center, 2018) yielded the following observations.¹

1. As we see in global leadership research (Mendenhall, Reiche, Bird & Osland, 2012), the term 'global leadership' lacks a shared construct definition and is used very broadly and in confusing ways. Many research articles with 'global leadership' really focus on comparative leadership or expatriate leadership or cross-cultural management. The same phenomenon exists in university programs and courses. Furthermore, some courses or workshops are simply repackaged with a 'global leadership' title, making outside evaluation and comparison difficult.
2. These terms are used frequently without clear distinctions by universities: global leadership, global citizenship, intercultural competence, global competence.
3. Some universities' global citizenship programs have similar aspects to global leadership programs, but they tend to place more emphasis on global issues and social justice and less emphasis on competency development than global leadership programs that exist in business schools.
4. Some programs were developed in response to goals set by professional organizations and accreditation agencies, which has been the case with engineering schools (e.g., Crumpton-Young, McCauley-Bush, Rabelo, Meza, Ferreras, 2010; Schuhmann, 2010).

¹ Thanks to Shyla Mallenahalli Chandrashekar Aradhya and Oceane Brouard for their help on this project.

5. It is easier to locate GLD programs than global leadership courses on the Internet. Some professors indicated that although the term ‘global leadership’ does not appear in the title of their course, the topic of global leadership has been integrated (either by adding modules or changing the pedagogical approach) into existing courses such as cross-cultural management and international management.
6. There are global leadership degrees or programs at the undergraduate, graduate, doctoral and executive level, but they are limited in number.
7. Several top-tier schools have executive programs labeled Global Leadership but include a diversity of business-related topics and themes, some of which are not specifically related to global leadership competencies and processes.
8. A small number of schools have global leadership certificate programs requiring real-world experiences and extra-curricular activities. These certificates appear on graduation transcripts.
9. Some global leadership programs refer to study abroad opportunities or enrichment opportunities for which students receive no course credit. There are several summer programs targeted at students or professionals from other countries that have a name that includes the term ‘Global Leadership.’ Most of these programs, however, do not include global leadership content.
10. It is often difficult to have a clear understanding about the actual content of global leadership programs or exactly how students will benefit from them based upon the information provided on their websites.

Possible Benchmarks for Global Leadership Programs

Based on research findings on global leadership and its development (e.g., Mendenhall, Osland, Bird, Oddou, Stevens, Maznevski & Stahl, 2018), we developed a list of benchmark criteria for GLD programs, found in Table 2., that seems most likely to result in higher impact programs.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

STUDY ABROAD AND GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Given the well-documented role of expatriation (e.g., Black, Morrison & Gregerson, 1999) and international service learning (e.g., Stahl, Pless, Maak & Miskof, 2018) in GLD, it is not surprising that many universities quickly turned to study abroad as a strategic pedagogical element in their global leadership or global citizenship programs. To a lesser degree, universities have begun to incorporate international service learning into study abroad programs. However, not all international experiences achieve lasting GLD learning outcomes. To understand why, this next section will address the history, challenges, and best practices in study abroad using the case of the United States as an example. The mandates for study abroad differ by country, but the challenges and high impact practices are often similar.

Looking Back to Look Forward—Why Even Study Abroad?

During the mid-2000's mandates for liberal education reform and global learning initiatives began emerging from all sectors of U.S. society. The increasingly interconnected and culturally diverse world underscored the moral, economic, technological, social, and political imperatives for impactful curricular and co-curricular interventions in higher education. Among the concurrent calls for reform throughout academia, the American Association of Colleges and Universities launched its Liberal Education and America's Promise Initiative (LEAP) in 2005. Its report, *College Learning for the New Global Century* points out that... "The world is being dramatically

reshaped by scientific and technological innovations, global interdependence, cross-cultural encounters and changes in balance of economic and political power...Today, it is clear that the United States---and individual Americans--will be challenged to engage in unprecedented ways with the global community, collaboratively and competitively.” (AAC&U, 2007, p. 6)

The Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (Lincoln Commission) released its report: *Global Competence and National Needs* in November 2005. The report detailed recommendations to dramatically increase and diversify study abroad participation in the United States. NAFSA, the Association of International Educators advocates for many of those goals that continue to guide study abroad initiatives at colleges and universities across the United States today. They include:

- Creating more globally competent American citizens
- Increasing participation in quality-controlled study abroad programs
- Increasing the diversity of students and institutions participating in study abroad
- Expanding locations of study abroad, particularly in developing countries
- Internationalizing U.S. higher education in part by making study abroad a critical component of undergraduate education.

At about the same time, in his book *Our Underachieving Colleges*, Derek Bok (2006) ‘indicted’ higher education for narrow mindedness focusing on cultivating students’ critical thinking while insufficiently preparing them for the jobs they will assume upon graduation. He urged higher education to incorporate the pedagogies, curriculum, and experiences that would foster the development of other requisite competencies including the abilities to *think* interculturally, *live* in diverse communities with understanding, tolerance, and mutual respect, and *understand*

international affairs, other countries, cultures and religions. The landmark Georgetown Consortium Project, a four-year study of over 1300 university students enrolled in 61 study abroad programs, confirmed Bok's contention. It found that traditional immersive study abroad practices (where students are left to their own devices while studying elsewhere in the world) are not at all predictive of intercultural competence development (Vande Berg, Connor-Linton & Paige, 2007). To paraphrase Martin J. Bennett, a well-known intercultural communication scholar: "Simply because students are in the vicinity of an intercultural learning opportunity does not mean they will have one."

Also in the mid-2000s the efficacy of higher education came under scrutiny. Margaret Spellings, then Secretary of Education, launched *The Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education*. The Commission's overarching goal was to stimulate a national discussion on the future of higher education and how effectively colleges and universities were preparing students for the 21st century workplace. Among the recommendations in its final report (U.S. Department of Education, 2006) was a call for higher education to change from a system primarily based on reputation to a culture of continuous improvement and innovation based on measurable student learning outcomes. It also advocated for standardized testing which would provide comparison points within and across institutions. Since that time accrediting bodies like the Higher Learning Commission, ACBSP (The Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs), the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), and ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology), increasingly require such data for evidence of effectiveness and continuous improvement. Many accreditation criteria encompass the abilities for students to function effectively cross culturally and gain global perspectives.²

² This historic perspective on study abroad was excerpted from Petrone, M. (April, 2013). Unpublished draft of the Global Assessment Project Report, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

In the last decade American universities have made great strides to meet these mandates by instituting global education requirements with an emphasis on studying abroad. Nevertheless, even the most innovative study abroad programs face common challenges rooted in both curricular and organizational issues and constraints (see Mendenhall, in press).

That was then, but this is now—or is it?

More students are engaging in study abroad, but internal assessment data often indicates that study abroad programming is still not having a significant impact on our students' intercultural development and global learning. In addition, many students cannot clearly articulate what they gained from their study abroad experience in job interviews. The next problem, the failure to integrate with local students or the local population while studying overseas, relates to both outgoing and incoming international students. Many students form class project teams and socialize outside of class only with students from their own country. For example, a Canadian study (CBIE, 2015) found that 56% of international students do not have Canadian friends. While universities may benefit financially from the presence of large numbers of international students, this in no way indicates that campus internationalization or global leadership development has been achieved by simply having a multicultural student body.

Why Not?

1. While a study abroad program can have impact; it is only one intervention. The cross-cultural learning students gain throughout their entire university experience must also be reinforced through reflection, on-going intercultural experiences, and focused learning.

2. Just as a global leader needs to be able to share and apply what is learned abroad, students need such opportunities. Most study abroad programs today are short term (less than eight weeks in length), and the majority of them are three weeks or fewer. Cultural engagement opportunities upon re-entry are limited and haphazard in nature.
3. Universities themselves are not global organizations. In-house policies and procedures often do not reflect an understanding of other cultural mores, norms, or organizational processes. University faculty and staff are not necessarily interculturally competent; nor do they all receive training in this area.
4. While study abroad is ostensibly for enhancing the global and intercultural competencies of students, study abroad offices by design and necessity focus on policies and procedures, the program application process, and risk management.
5. In some universities, the higher level administrative focus is about gaining a high ranking in the number of students who go abroad or bringing in large numbers of international students to help the bottom line, rather than the impact the program has on student's intercultural development and global mindset. While universities boldly state they have a goal of creating global leaders or global citizens they too often undermine their own goal by being more concerned with ranking than with program impact upon individual students.
6. While faculty are mandated to attend study abroad study abroad risk management and health and safety sessions, they are seldom required to attend training on ways to create programming that maximizes cross-cultural experiences and intercultural growth. Many faculty draw on their good instincts, teaching effectiveness, and personal cross-cultural experience to create impactful programming; however, it is not uncommon for faculty to have no relevant prior cross-cultural

experience or education to fall back upon when accompanying and teaching students during study abroad programs. Thus, university programs could have even higher impact if all trip leaders were trained and exposed to study abroad research and best practices.

7. Claiming a program advances global leadership development does not make it so.

Conversely, programs that intentionally focus on connecting the acquisition of intercultural and global knowledge, the reformulation of dispositions, and the development of skills to the complexities and subtleties of culture, social identities, and academic and global perspectives can help to develop global leaders.

Is it Possible to Create Higher Impact Programs that Foster Global Leadership?

The answer to the above question is, “Yes” – if the program is bookended with pre-departure cultural orientation and re-entry application sessions and intentionally incorporates intercultural curriculum and multiple forms of assessment in an experiential design with integrated guided reflection and scheduled and in-the-moment cultural mentoring by someone with cross-cultural and global leadership knowledge and experience. To foster global leadership, personal transformation has to be the centerpiece of study abroad programs (see Pasquarelli, Cole & Tyson, 2018), which means that careful attention should be paid to the faculty and staff leading them (see Anderson, Lorenz, & White, 2016). We should acknowledge, however, that for most students, we are really teaching ‘global readiness’ —the foundational attributes that help to develop global leaders. Only when students are tested and find themselves in a global context where they need to draw on those attributes, continue to make and learn from mistakes, seek more knowledge, and develop more skills and re-assess their worldviews, will they become full-fledged global leaders (Pless, Maak & Stahl, 2011).

An Organization Development Approach to Study Abroad

Ideally, study abroad programs are not just a barnacle attached to the underside of the university, but rather the reflection of a university-wide commitment to internationalization and maximizing study abroad for incoming and outgoing students. Table 3 indicates what this commitment looks like and indicates how the different components work together to create high-impact study abroad programs. In addition to a strategic vision, they require systemic implementation, academic goals, trained faculty, maximized training and experiences for students, and assessment of learning and development. It is very difficult to achieve this level of effectiveness without taking an organization development approach to change and coordinate the different elements in the study abroad system so that they are complementary. The same is true of GLD programs in business. Pioneers in the field noted that the best global leadership systems simultaneously developed people and the organization (Tichy, Brimm, Charan, Takeuchi, 1992). The challenge of doing so is perhaps even more essential and difficult in university programs than in business because of the larger number of fragmented internal stakeholders (e.g., administrative, student services, academic) and external stakeholders (e.g., partner universities or programs, accreditation bodies), and more diverse goals and attitudes among participants and faculty.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Although global leadership development is currently the fastest growing area of global leadership research (e.g., Mendenhall, Li & Osland, 2016), most of that research is geared toward business practitioners. The extant literature specifically focusing on GLD in university settings is extremely limited. Hence, the motivation behind *AGL Volume 11*'s "Call for Papers" in this area. One of the key messages of this volume is that all student-oriented global leadership programs are not equal. They vary primarily in terms of goals, structure and duration, curriculum design, multicultural composition, degree of immersion, transformational potential, assessment of student learning, integration with both academic and university learning objectives, and employability. They also differ in the degree to which their designs are grounded in GLD research and theory.

Several authors in this volume utilized Oddou & Mendenhall's model (2018) to evaluate the degree of experiential rigor and the quality of feedback in programs as a way to predict the likelihood of personal transformation (Herd, et. al., in press; Kalra, et. al., in press; Quirk & Gustafson, in press). For example, Kalra and her colleagues found that high levels of experiential rigor were critical factors in GLD in the three study abroad programs they studied; when experiential rigor was weak, less transformative GLD occurred. Also, the probability of enhancing experiential rigor in program design seems to increase when an institution in the host country has a strong and interactive relationship with the "sending" institution, as in the best practice case study of Rowe, et. al. (in press) and when rigorous pedagogies are designed upon solid developmental theoretical frameworks (Herd, et. al., in press).

Also, it seems that rigorous designs are not enough to enhance the probability of maximal GLD. As Quirk and Gustafson (in press) found, there were differentiating characteristics in students that can act as catalysts or dampeners of GLD and that sequencing of varying types of

experiential experiences have differential impacts on students' GLD. One of many findings resulting from the study abroad papers in this volume is the potential contribution and value of in-country experiences to develop global leaders. However, we cannot assume that international experiences are always preferable to in-country learning. What really matters is the design of the learning experience and its transformational potential. For example, an online class appears to be the least experiential possibility, but Mendenhall (in press) still found a way to maximize student transformation in that setting. A carefully designed interactive classroom or an assessment center could result in more personal learning than an unstructured, non-immersive, unmediated study abroad experience.

Finally, without doubt, how institutions organize graduate level programs in global leadership and produce future scholars in the field will have a profound impact on future students. Tolstikov-Mast and her colleagues (in press) have provided important "food for thought" for business schools who are considering institutionally venturing into the fast-growing field of global leadership.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN UNIVERSITY GLD RESEARCH

The complete findings in these papers provide a deeper, more nuanced understanding of student-oriented GLD and its effectiveness. As we would expect in an exploratory field, these studies are mainly qualitative with small samples. Therefore, we include their lessons in the form of future research questions listed in Table 4, along with our own suggestions for GLD research in university settings.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

It is our hope that this chapter will serve as a beginning primer for program directors and faculty, as well as global leadership scholars. Developing ‘global readiness’ and starting future leaders on their global leadership journey is one of the most valuable contributions university administrators, professors and staff can make.

REFERENCES

- AAC&U (2007). *College Learning for the New Global Century*, A Report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education & America's Promise (LEAP). Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities
- American Council on Education (2018). Leading internationalization: CIGE model for comprehensive internationalization. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>.
- Anderson, C. L., Lorenz, K., & White, M. (November 2016). Instructor influence on student intercultural gains and learning during instructor-led, short-term study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 28, 1-23.
- Anthony et al. (2015). *Standards of good practice for education abroad* (5th ed.). Carlisle, PA. The Forum of Education Abroad.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bennett, J. M. (2008). On becoming a global soul: A path to engagement during study abroad. In Savicki, V. (Ed.), *Developing intercultural competence and transformation: Theory, research and application in international education* (pp. 13-31). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Bhandari, R., & Chow, P. (2009). *Open Doors 2009: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York, NY: Institute of International Education.
- Bikson, T., Treverton, G., Moini, J., & Lindstrom, G. (2003). *New Challenges for International Leadership: Lessons from Organizations with Global Missions*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Black, J. S., Morrison, A., & Gregersen, H. (1999). *Global Explorers: The Next Generation of Leaders*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- CBIE. (June 2015). *The integration challenge: Connecting international students with their Canadian peers*. Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005). *Global competence and national needs: One million Americans studying abroad*. Washington, DC.

- Crumpton-Young, L., McCauley-Bush, P., Rabelo, L., Meza, K., & Ferreras, A. (2010). *Engineering leadership development programs: A look at what is needed and what is being done*. Journal of STEM Education, 11(3/4) 10-21.
- DDI, Global Leadership Forecast 2018. Development Dimensions International, Inc. Retrieved from [https://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/ey-the-global-leadership-forecast/\\$FILE/ey-the-global-leadership-forecast.pdf](https://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/ey-the-global-leadership-forecast/$FILE/ey-the-global-leadership-forecast.pdf).
- Deters, J. (2018). Global leadership talent selection as an integrated acquisition process: What makes a global leader? *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Gitsham, M. (2008). *Developing the global leader of tomorrow*. 1st Global Forum for Responsible Management Education, United Nations, New York, December 4-5, 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.unprme.org/resource-docs/MatthewGitsham.pdf>.
- GLAC Benchmarking Study. (2008). Unpublished study. Global Leadership Advancement Center, San Jose State University.
- GLAC Benchmarking Study. (2012). Unpublished study. Global Leadership Advancement Center, San Jose State University.
- GLAC Benchmarking Study. (2018). Unpublished study. Global Leadership Advancement Center, San Jose State University.
- Gustafson, J. & Quirk, S. (2018). Developing the Next Generation of Global Leaders: Proposing an Iterative Framework for Student Global Leadership Development. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Herd, A., Cumberland, D., Lovely III, W., & Bird, A. (2018). The Use of Assessment Center Methodology to Develop Students' Global Leadership Competencies: a Conceptual Framework and Applied Example. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action*. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Institution of International Educators.
- Hudzik, J. K. & McCarthy, J. S. (2012). *Leading comprehensive internationalization: Strategy and tactics for action*. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Institution of International Educators.
- Hruby, J., Mello, R. & Samunderu, E. (2018). Unpacking the Complexities of Global Mindset: a Multi-lens Analysis. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).

- Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) (2018). *Study abroad: High impact practice taxonomy*. Retrieved from:
[file:///C:/Users/000100686/Downloads/StudyAbroad-Taxonomies-20180212%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/000100686/Downloads/StudyAbroad-Taxonomies-20180212%20(1).pdf)
- Institute of International Education. *Open Doors Report (2017)*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Open-Doors-2017-Media-Information>
- Kalra, K., Szymanski, M., & Olszewska, A. (2018). Do all Roads Lead to Global Leadership? Three Approaches to Teaching Global Leadership in Modern Business Schools. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Mallon, D. (2015). The “What works” awards 2015: Lessons from the best report. Bersin by Deloitte, Deloitte Development LLC. Retrieved from:
<http://login.bersin.com/uploadedFiles/2015-whatworks-award-report.pdf>.
- Mendenhall, M., Reich, B. S., Bird, A., & Osland, J. (2012). Defining the “global” in global leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 493-503.
- Mendenhall, M. E., Li, M., & Osland, J. (2016). Five years of global leadership research, 2010-2014: Patterns, themes, and future directions. In J. S. Osland, M. Li, & M. E. Mendenhall (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership* (Vol. 9). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Mendenhall, M. E., Weber, T. J., Arnardottir, A. A., & Oddou, G. R. (2017). Developing global leadership competencies: A process model. In J. S. Osland, M. Li, & M. E. Mendenhall (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership* (Vol. 10, pp. 117-146): Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Mendenhall, M. E. (in press). Can Global Leadership be Taught Online? *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Montgomery, J. F., & Arensdorf, J. (2012). Preparing globally competent leaders through innovative study abroad experiences. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(1), 64-71.
doi:10.1002/jls.21230
- National Leadership Council for Liberal Education & America’s Promise. (2007). *College learning for the new global century report*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

- Nelson, J.A. (2018). Here be Paradox: How Global Leaders Navigate Change. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Ng, K.-Y., Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2009). From experience to experiential learning: Cultural intelligence as a learning capability for global leader development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(4), 511–526. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2009.47785470.
- Nielsen, R.K. (in press). Managerial practices of strategic global mindset: Forging the connection between individual competence and organizational capability. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Oddou, G. R., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2018). Global leadership development: Processes and practices. In M. E. Mendenhall, J. S. Osland, A. Bird, G. R. Oddou, M. J. Stevens, M. L. Maznevski, & G. K. Stahl (eds.) *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*. (3rd edition, pp. 229-269). London: Routledge.
- Osland, J. S. (2018). An Overview of the Global Leadership Literature. In M. E. Mendenhall, J. S. Osland, A. Bird, G. R. Oddou, M. J. Stevens, M. L. Maznevski, & G. K. Stahl (Eds.) *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*. (3rd edition, pp. 57-116). London: Routledge.
- Osland, J. S., Mendenhall, M. E., & Li, M. (2017). *Patterns, themes and Future Directions*. In J. S. Osland, M.E. Mendenhall, & M. Li, (eds.) *Advances in Global Leadership*, vol. 10, 253-262.
- Osland, J. & Lester, G. (in press). Developing socially responsible global leaders and making a difference: Global leadership lab social innovation projects. In L. Zander (ed.) *Handbook of Global Leadership: Making a Difference*. Cheltenham, UK: Edgar Elgar.
- Pasquarelli, S. L., Cole, R. A., & Tyson, M. J. (2018). *Passport to change: Designing academically sound, culturally relevant, short-term, faculty-led study abroad programs*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.
- Paige, M. R. (2005). *Internationalization of higher education: Performance assessment and indicators*. Center for the Studies of Higher Education. Nagoya, Japan: Nagoya University.
- Paige, M., R., Cohen, A., Kappler, B., Chi, J., & Lassegard, J. (2004). *Maximizing study abroad: A Student's guide to strategies for language and culture learning*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota

- Petriglieri, G. (2014). There Is No Shortage of Leaders. *Harvard Business Review Online*. Retrieved from: <https://hbr.org/2014/12/there-is-no-shortage-of-leaders>.
- Piaget, J. (1985). *The equilibration of cognitive structures: The central problem of intellectual development*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Stahl, G. K. (2011). *Developing responsible global leaders through International Service Learning Programs: The Ulysses experience*. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 10(2), 237-260.
- Rowe, W., Krause, W., Hayes, G., Corak, L., Wilcox, R. S., Vargas, Lt Colonel R., Varela, Lt Colonel F., Cordova, Major F., Azam, G., & Bopari, S. (2018). Canadian Global Leadership Students Weaving Dynamic Partnership in Ecuador: A Focus on the Relationship Building Process. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Schuhmann, R. J. (2010). *Engineering leadership education: The search for definition and a curricular approach*. *Journal of STEM Education Research*, 11(3/4), 61-69.
- Stahl, G., Pless, N., Maak, T., & Miska, C. (2018) Responsible Global Leadership. In M. E. Mendenhall, J. S. Osland, A. Bird; G. R. Oddou, M. J., Stevens, M. L., Maznevski, & G. K., Stahl (Eds.) *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*. (3rd edition, pp. 363-388). London: Routledge.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education*. A Report of the Secretary Commission Appointed by Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/final-report.pdf>
- Tichy, N., Brimm, M., Charan, R., & Takeuchi, H. (1992). Leadership development as a lever for global transformation. In V. Pucik, N. Tichy, & D.K. Barnett (Eds.), *Globalizing Management, Creating and Leading the Competitive Organization*: 47-60. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tolstikov-Mast, Y., Bieri, F., Walker, J. L., Wireman, A., & Vaiman, V. (2018). Global leadership studies and doctoral education: Advancing the discipline through a targeted curriculum. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- Vande Berg, M. Connor-Linton, J. & Paige, R.M. (2007). The Georgetown Consortium Study: Intervening in study abroad learning. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 18, 1-75.

- Vande Berg, M., & Paige, M. (2012) *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Vijayakumar, P., Morley, M., Heraty, N., Mendenhall, M. E. & Osland, J. S. (2018). Leadership in the global context: Bibliometric and thematic patterns of an evolving field. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 11 (in press).
- World Economic Forum (2015). *Outlook on the Global Agenda 2015: 3. Lack of leadership*. Retrieved from <http://reports.weforum.org/outlook-global-agenda-2015/top-10-trends-of-2015/3-lack-of-leadership/>.

Table 1. Suggested Directions in Global Leadership Research

Construct Definition	Specifying how global leaders differ from global managers, expatriate leaders, and domestic leaders in terms of context, roles, behavior, and cognitive processes; creating a construct definition that unifies the field, utilizing a typology of ideal types of global leaders in research samples; clarifying construct definition and levels of global mindset; differentiating constructs used in global leadership
Scope of Global Leadership Tasks and Behaviors	Carrying out observational studies of global leader behavior in different contexts, sectors and contingencies; task identification for different types of global leaders in varying contexts, sectors and contingencies; identifying work-life balance issues.
Competencies	Refining competency identification and frameworks; identifying global leadership capabilities in both teams and organizations (multiple levels of analysis); clarifying the relationship between global strategy and particular types of global leadership skills; delineating competency valence in differing contingencies, such as career stage.
Dynamic processes	Identifying and specifying cognitive processes related to global leadership; articulating interactive models employed by global leaders in different contexts and sectors; identifying the impact of the global environment on global leader processes and outcomes; shedding light on the micro-processes in which global leaders engage; investigating the relationship between global leaders and their followers and internal

	and external constituents; specifying the learning models global leaders use to develop themselves and others
Assessment Instruments	Developing additional and more rigorous assessment instruments such as: measures of the global context that determine the “degree of global” for specific leadership roles, leadership processes, and contingencies; developing organizational audits of global leadership capability, development processes and programs, and support; creating outcome measures of global leadership effectiveness, developing a taxonomy of high impact program characteristics to evaluate global leadership programs in universities
Global Leadership Effectiveness	Identifying different profiles of effective global leaders; creating performance measures; identifying contingencies that impact effectiveness and styles; identifying and defining antecedents of global leadership effectiveness; identifying the process of effective global leadership and its outcomes; investigating the impact of gender on actual and perceived effectiveness; establishing decision models that inform companies how many global leaders they need; looking beyond competencies to a holistic view of global leaders and what inspires them; determining the link between global leadership and competitive advantage and organizational outcomes.
Training & Development	Empirical testing of process models of global leadership development; performing comparison and cost-benefit analysis of training methodologies; carrying out longitudinal studies of developmental

	growth and training transfer; analyzing best practice studies across industries; identifying bridging mechanisms between individual-level dispositions and the development of global leadership capabilities; studying the temporal dimension and dynamic aspects of global leadership development; expanding training and development to a more holistic view of global talent management; carrying out more GLD research in university, public and non-profit settings; determining what training is most relevant and effective at different career stages
Theory Development	Bridging the micro-macro divide in theoretical and empirical work; studying the intersection of global leadership and other disciplines; applying and integrating traditional leadership theories to global leadership; articulating a being-centered, spiritual form of global leadership

Adapted from Osland, Li, & Mendenhall (2017). Patterns, Themes and Future Directions for Advancing Global Leadership. In J. S. Osland, M.E. Mendenhall, & M. Li (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership*, 10, 258-259.

Table 2. SUGGESTED BENCHMARKS FOR UNIVERSITY GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

- Curriculum rooted in research from the field of global leadership and relevant disciplines
- A carefully thought out global leadership competency model
- An emphasis on personal transformation
- Experiential learning activities that approximate real-life challenges of global leaders and provides them with valuable feedback
- Interactive learning methodologies, even in online courses
- Real action learning projects that require global leadership competencies and involve both peer and external feedback
- Assessment instruments that measure global competencies that can inform personal development plans and perhaps also be used as pre- and post-measures
- Self-reflection opportunities
- Coaching
- Peer coaching on global leadership competencies or projects
- Cross-cultural mentors
- High context/high challenge international experiences in other countries or diverse domestic settings
- Multicultural participants who learn and work together
- Leveraged program features, i.e., purposeful and maximum advantage is taken of participant composition, multicultural groups, projects, trips, and learning experiences
- Exposure to successful global leaders
- Program assessment to evaluate effectiveness
- Continuous improvement

Table 3. Study Abroad Best Practices – An Organizational Development Approach

STRATEGIC VISION

- Create a campus-wide comprehensive design for international education and study abroad
- View study abroad as part of campus internationalization efforts
- Establish a common understanding of the motivations and the goals of such an effort

SYSTEMIC IMPLEMENTATION

- Build a broad leadership team that is committed to advancing study abroad and internationalization
- Have dialogues involving campus leadership, governance, and internal and external clientele culminating in a shared understanding of the compelling rationale for comprehensive internationalization and maximizing study abroad
- Hold awareness-raising campaigns for the importance of diversity and international education and on campus opportunities for engagement
- Create university housing, residence hall environments, and food practices that welcome differing cultures
- Prepare registrar offices for work done under systems with differing contact hours, methods of measuring and counting, and different pedagogues
- Analyze the higher education context in target countries, including policies, priorities, structure, and operations for potential partnerships
- Develop a receptive campus environment that includes support structures and resources.
- Develop an institution-wide culture that supports comprehensive study abroad and internationalization
- Build faculty involvement in international activities
- Train faculty in intercultural competence, facilitation, and personal development
- Leverage the presence of international students at your university to encourage participation in study abroad programs
- Promote understanding and interconnection of university-wide study abroad efforts.
- Increase institutional recognition through awards or additional funding for campus units that improve/increase study abroad effectiveness

ACADEMIC GOALS (Curriculum and Faculty)

- Build a bridge between domestic diversity and global learning
- Combine interdisciplinary perspectives offered in intercultural communication, international studies, language, and education to create an effective approach to intercultural learning
- Consider how “English as a second language” programs (ESL) can be leveraged to help international students and university students – have global leadership students mentor ESL students
- Expand internship and service-learning opportunity sites abroad and at home
- Provide access to international, global, and comparative content and perspectives to all students in all majors
- Integrate study abroad experiences into the core curriculum and degree program

- Establish learning outcomes for study abroad experiences that incorporate discipline content, cultural knowledge and intercultural competence content.
- Establish learning outcomes for study abroad experiences that incorporate knowledge, attitudes and skills. and that contain
- Encourage all faculty to enhance international, comparative, and global perspectives in their teaching and scholarship
- Teach all faculty how to maximize study abroad for both SJSU and international students
- Determine the appropriate program duration necessary to meet academic goals

EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS

- Strong partnerships with foreign universities, programs and communities to mutual benefit
- Strong partnerships with domestic programs and communities to mutual benefit for study-abroad-at-home programs targeted at students who cannot leave the country for personal reasons
- Ensure that students understand their impact on the host country and their responsibilities as culturally-sensitive guests

MAXIMIZING STUDY ABROAD FOR STUDENTS

- Work with a variety of institutional and community based groups to welcome international guests, provide means to expand contacts, and build friendships
- Partner across campus to facilitate international students and scholars as valuable assets for overall internationalization efforts by developing outlets for their knowledge and skills, e.g., helping prepare students for study abroad in their native countries, using native language skills in teaching and research, and systematically providing cross-cultural contributions to classroom settings
- Include a pre-departure and ongoing orientation that assists participants in making appropriate personal, social, and academic adjustments
- Teach students required skills for the trip in pre-departure training
- Include understanding diverse cultures and intercultural skills as study abroad goals
- Tie study abroad to global citizenship and global leadership
- Offer tools that contribute to making the sojourn successful
- Intentionally design study abroad programs to be high contact and high challenge and to emphasize personal development.
- Encourage students to be responsible for their own personal development during international experiences
- Provide opportunities for mediated learning on study abroad experiences; ensure that trip leaders or virtual facilitators are skilled at mediating learning
- Help students reenter campus life after study abroad and apply their experiences to continuing internationalization of campus living and learning
- Encourage former participants of study abroad programs to collaborate with the campus education abroad office on promotional initiatives

ASSESSING STUDY ABROAD

- Identify outcomes and the desired student profile
- Choose appropriate assessment instruments to use pre and post
- If you're using a post test, maximize the possibility of transformation during the trip by ensuring that the study abroad experience is high contact and high challenge and involves mediated learning and, ideally, coaching.
- Measure demographic characteristics that influence outcomes (global and diversity exposure, bicultural background, etc.)
- Design performance measures for study abroad
- Have students set personal development goals prior to going, work on them abroad, and report on their progress when they return.
- Include community involvement and evaluation by host country supervisors if possible in performance evaluation

Source: This list was created by Joyce Osland (Global Leadership Advancement Center), based in part on Anthony et. al, (2015); Bennett, J. M., 2008; American Council on Education (2015); Hudzik, J.K. & McCarthy, J.S. (2012); IUPUI (2018); Paige, M.R. (2005); Vande Berg, M., Paige, R.M. & Hemming, K. (2012).

Table 4. Suggested Directions in Global Leadership Development Research in University Settings

Commented [JM01]: This final table might be best in landscape orientation.

- Which types of university GLD methods– for example, university GL assessment centers; domestic GL courses (e.g., traditional versus experiential), and various types of study abroad courses (multi-site, internships, short-term vs long-term, etc.) – are most effective?
- What type of assessments (e.g., psychometric, written and/or behavioral measures) prove effective in GL assessment centers (Herd, Cumberland, Lovely, & Bird, in press)?
- Do students who exhibit greater levels of engagement in a GL assessment center also exhibit higher levels of learning and GL development (Herd, et al., in press)?
- Do students with higher intercultural competence perform better in a GL assessment center and exhibit greater degrees of GL competency development (Herd, et al., in press)?
- Does openness to and acceptance of feedback predict greater degrees of GL competency development (Herd et al., in press)?
- Will students who find GLD exercises moderately challenging (with respect to complexity, affect, intensity and relevance) exhibit greater GL competency development, as opposed to those who find it under- or over-challenging (Herd, et al., in press)?
- Are these characteristics of GL experiences - complexity, affect, intensity and relevance – critical in GLD program design?
- Will students who receive individualized coaching develop more GL competency development (Herd, et al., in press)?
- Do students with GL personal development plans exhibit greater GL competency development than students who do not deploy such plans (Herd, et al., in press)?
- What is the impact of a particular start (e.g., clarifying the personal development plan (PDP) process, motivating students to have positive feelings about the process, and building trust in the professor) to an online GL course (Mendenhall, in press)?
- Under what circumstances is personalized online feedback on student development as effective (e.g., students are personally responsible and accountable for personal transformation; the instructor’s attitude in responding to weekly “accountability” self-reports is encouraging vs. critical, facilitative vs. directive, delegative vs. controlling, self-learning focused vs. expert-based mandating) or even more effective, than a face-to-face classroom experience (Mendenhall, in press)?
- How much time and effort in providing online personal development plan feedback (e.g., providing personalized, effective feedback as opposed to perfunctory, impersonal feedback) is needed to trigger student development (Mendenhall, in press)?
- What is the impact of symbolic modeling (mental rehearsal) (Bandura, 1977) in the form of compelling videos of professor “war stories” in online GL courses on student PDP efforts (Mendenhall, in press)?
- How can instructors build Bandura’s (1977) participative modeling (learning by actually reproducing behaviors) in both face-to-face and online GL courses?

- Are courses with assignments that inject experiential rigor and valuable feedback more effective than those that rely solely on more traditional methods (e.g., case studies, lectures, etc.) (Mendenhall, in press)?
- When and how do domestic experiences function as the foundation for later meaning-making and transformation during study abroad experiences? (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)
- What is the link between antecedent characteristics of participants and their transformational ability during the study abroad experience (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)?
- What demographic background characteristics (such as prior cross-cultural experiences, prior service learning experiences -- both domestic and international) influence the personal transformation that occurs in international service learning (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)?
- What personal competencies (e.g., regulating their emotional well-being, fitting in with the host culture, and engaging in meaning-making and identity development) mediate the transformational potential of study abroad experiences with higher levels of CAIR (complexity, affect, intensity, and relevance) (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)?
- How long and different do international service learning programs have to be in order to trigger constructive disequilibrium (Piaget, 1985) and personal transformation (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)?
- Should transformational experiences be sequenced to maximize transformational potential and the development of intercultural competencies and, if so, how (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)?
- Under what circumstances does the pre/post use of personal assessment instruments (e.g., the IES) benefit students and what form do those benefits take (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)?
- What is the role of unplanned experiences in study abroad trips? It is true that transformation is influenced less by *what happened* and more by *how* well equipped individuals are to respond to the experience (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)?
- What personal characteristics in students are necessary to build increased emotional resilience when students confront challenging study abroad experiences (Quirk & Gustafson, in press)?
- What is the most effective way to develop global followership in students (Komal, et al., in press)?
- Is mindful multicultural team GL training (e.g., Osland & Lester, in press) more effective than laissez-faire student teams?
- If GL study abroad programs develop trusting strategic partnerships with host country institutions, are students more likely to exhibit great GL competency development (Rowe, et al., in press)?
- What impact do international partnerships (e.g., university to university, university to foreign non-profits, etc.) and the level of trust they develop have upon university GLD programs (e.g., Rowe, et al., in press)?
- What types of action learning projects have the highest impact on developing GL competency (e.g., Rowe, et. al, in press)?
- What is the role of personal initiative in international service learning (e.g., Rowe et. al, in press)?

- What contribution does foreign language acquisition make to GLD? Does it enhance their GL learning and competency development?
- Do international students who integrate with local students exhibit greater GL learning and competency development?
- What student predispositions -- such as prior higher levels of intercultural competence (Ng, et al, 2009), greater readiness and motivation to learn (Mendenhall, Weber, Arnardottir & Oddou, 2017) – result in greater GLD learning?
- Under what circumstances are short-term study abroad GLD programs most effective?
- Under what circumstances are long-term study abroad GLD programs most effective?
- Under what circumstances are international internships most effective in developing students as global leaders?
- What type of training do faculty leaders of study abroad programs require to maximize global leadership development in students?
- What GL competencies are needed at different career stages? How can universities best develop those competencies?