

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329128734>

The Global Leadership Field and Doctoral Education: Advancing the Discipline through a Targeted Curriculum

Chapter · November 2018

DOI: 10.1108/S1535-120320180000011012

CITATIONS

2

READS

527

5 authors, including:



Yulia Tolstikov-Mast
Indiana Institute of Technology

5 PUBLICATIONS 16 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Jennie Walker
Ashford University

35 PUBLICATIONS 37 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Alicia Wireman
Indiana Institute of Technology

1 PUBLICATION 2 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Vlad Vaiman
California Lutheran University

65 PUBLICATIONS 1,325 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Host Country National Liaison Roles (HCNL) [View project](#)



Russian followership: roles and relationships with leaders [View project](#)

1
3 THE GLOBAL LEADERSHIP FIELD
5 AND DOCTORAL EDUCATION:
7 ADVANCING THE DISCIPLINE
9 THROUGH A TARGETED
11 CURRICULUM

13 Yulia Tolstikov-Mast, Franziska Bieri,
15 Jennie L. Walker, Alicia Wireman and Vlad Vaiman

AU:1

17
19
21 **ABSTRACT**

21 *Global leadership is a vibrant and still emerging field of study. As scholarship*
23 *grows in this area, the boundaries of the field become more defined. This has*
25 *a direct impact on curriculum selection for courses and degree programs*
27 *focused on global leadership. This article begins by exploring how emerging*
29 *areas of study become recognized as disciplines and applies this knowledge to*
31 *the global leadership discipline. We also look at doctoral-level degree pro-*
33 *grams in global leadership, comparing, and contrasting their offerings and*
approaches, and reflecting on global leadership doctoral education's role in
the ultimate crafting of the discipline. Finally, the curriculum strategies
within the doctoral program in global leadership at Indiana Tech are dis-
cussed to illustrate the complex and multidisciplinary approach required to
prepare global leadership scholars-practitioners.

35 **Keywords:** Discipline development; global leadership; doctoral education;
37 global leadership curriculum

AU:5

INTRODUCTION

Global leadership is a relatively young and growing field with multidisciplinary roots that have been gaining increased attention from both practitioners and scholars (Osland, 2018a). Although the field has accumulated a vast body of empirical and theoretical knowledge on diverse global leadership topics (Mendenhall et al., 2018), global leadership scholars have not addressed the disciplinary development of their field (Mendenhall et al., 2018; Whitaker, 2016). According to Richardson (2008), “academic disciplines are academically recognized fields of knowledge supported by an infrastructure capable of maintaining the discipline’s boundaries and developing the body of knowledge in that field” (p. 250). The Oxford English Dictionary explains that disciplines provide the agenda for a program of a study at different levels of higher education (bachelor, master, and doctorate) and, thus, define “belonging” of scholarship, scholars, and students (Simpson, Weiner, & Oxford University Press, 1989). Therefore, while a discipline and a field both refer to a scholarly area of study, a discipline represents a manifestation (e.g., dissemination and production of new knowledge) of that scholarship via physical components of academia: departments, degrees, curriculum, individuals who administer and advance the disciplines, as well as those educated in that discipline. As scholarship and degree programs in global leadership grow, and its boundaries are becoming more defined. This article explores how emerging areas of study become recognized as scholarly disciplines and the resulting implications for the global leadership field.

Several assumptions are important to this manuscript. First, there is some order and logic to the development of disciplines. Second, understanding the development of global leadership as a discipline has value. Third, higher education institutions are the pillars in developing and advancing disciplines. Fourth, doctoral education, with its mission to educate scholars in specific disciplines with a potential to conduct original research to add to the discipline, should be responsible for offering up-to-date knowledge of that particular field of study through its curriculum. Thus, offerings of programs and departments should be current and constantly refined and adjusted. The loop is to enrich empirical knowledge of a discipline, offer that current knowledge through the curriculum, and to use that curriculum to inspire forward-looking advances in a discipline. This is especially critical in young “high-pace” and practice-driven disciplines, like global leadership, where the speed of changes in a globalized world requires an understanding of new realities and ongoing preservation and dissemination of that new knowledge via curriculum.

The chapter starts by introducing a foundational approach to the emergence and existence of disciplines, disciplinary criteria, and doctoral education as a fundamental force behind the development of a discipline. Further, the manuscript discusses global leadership as a developing discipline and analyzes existing doctoral programs in global leadership. We support the view of global leadership as

processes and actions through which an individual influences a range of internal and external constituents from multiple national cultures and jurisdictions in a context

1 characterized by significant levels of task and relationship complexity. (Reiche, Bird,
Mendenhall, & Osland, 2017, p. 556)

3 Finally, the chapter presents an example, the PhD in Global Leadership Program
5 at Indiana Tech, and highlights the program's contribution to global leadership as
7 a discipline. To conclude, the manuscript explains a recent redesign of the global
9 leadership core curriculum of the program to better represent scholarly advance-
11 ments of global leadership as the field. It argues that a discipline is developed, in
part, through adjustments of disciplinary curricula. In turn, such adjustments
might inspire innovative scholarly thinking in the field, thus influencing the field
development. Consequently, a discipline and a field of study always go hand in
hand, and their advancements depend on their mutual influences.

13 **DISCIPLINE DEVELOPMENT AND DOCTORAL** 15 **EDUCATION**

17 The goal of this section is to explain the importance of a doctoral education in
19 the formation and advancement of a discipline. The understanding of this
21 importance elevates the role and responsibilities placed on institutional pro-
23 grams and departments representing disciplines. More specifically, the section
25 introduces the process and conditions for discipline emergence and finishes by
27 pointing out the influence of academia, doctoral programs in particular, in
advancing a discipline. Finally, it is stressed that upon graduation, doctoral stu-
dents become beacons of their disciplines. It is therefore paramount to provide
contemporary curriculum for discipline areas as well as help socialize students
into their discipline. This is especially relevant for young disciplines with less
defined boundaries to ensure relevant scholarly education and to direct disserta-
tion research to advance a discipline.

29 *Emergence of Disciplines*

31 Before we start, it's important to acknowledge the contribution of Dr Brett
33 Whitaker, PhD in global leadership program graduate and currently, an
35 International Coordinator and Assistant Professor of Leadership Studies at Fort
Hays State University. In his dissertation, Dr Whitaker (2016) drew attention to
37 a disciplinary development of academic fields and the elevated importance of
focusing on global leadership as a discipline. His multiple case study research,
highlighted later in more details, was the first empirical work on the status of
global leadership as an academic discipline. This manuscript was largely inspired
39 by that research.

41 The present view of a discipline emerged in the early nineteenth century as a
43 body of knowledge rapidly expanded from classical subjects (e.g., literature, lan-
guages, philosophy, and theology) to many other topics previously considered
45 supplemental (e.g., social sciences, natural sciences, and so on) (Abbott, 1988;
Gaston, 2010; Sowcik, 2011). The explosion of new disciplines in the twentieth-
century stimulated scholars' interest to explore the process of discipline develop-
ment. Currently, there are several main approaches for a new discipline creation

1 (Abbott, 2001; Becher & Trowler, 2001; Biglan, 1973; Lennard, 2007). One is
3 the general tendency of young academic areas to become increasingly distinct
5 from their parent disciplines (Becher & Trowler, 2001). As scholars expand
7 empirical and theoretical understanding of discipline's subjects, they encounter
9 unique findings and conceptualizations that demand a new system of categoriza-
11 tion around a stand-alone field of studies (Biglan, 1973). Under this method of
13 formation, the parent discipline provides almost all of the structure for the new
15 discipline, generally including scholars trained in the parent discipline, research
17 methods and foundational knowledge (Abbott, 2001). The examples of this
19 emergence can be seen in Statistics discipline that appeared out of Mathematics
21 (Becher & Trowler, 2001). Pascal, Pierre De Fermat, and other mathematicians
23 in the seventeenth century developed new theoretical understandings and proce-
25 dures that went far beyond the scope of traditional mathematics (Franklin,
27 2002), and this new stream of research founded the discipline of Statistics.

15 Another method for creating a new discipline is hybridization when several
17 existing fields have overlapping content focus leading to separating this focus
19 into a discipline (Becher & Trowler, 2001). According to Lennard (2007), the
21 initiation of this fusion usually takes place when researchers in each discipline
23 develop a deeper understanding of their subjects, realizing that its advancement
25 is strongly influenced by related disciplines. Biochemistry is an example of this
27 process, where Biology and Chemistry merged into a new academic area that
previously did not exist (Metzler & Metzler, 2001). Other examples include organiza-
tional behavior (management and psychology) (Moorhead & Griffin, 1995),
public administration (sociology, political science, and law) (Denhardt &
Denhardt, 2009), or pharmacology (medicine, biology, and chemistry) (Brater &
Daly, 2000). Through the hybridization process, the sum of disciplines provided
a better understanding of reality than one stand-alone discipline.

29 Overall, the nature of disciplines has been a subject of interest within the
31 scholarly community for at least half a century. Although the pathways for dis-
33 cipline development were suggested, they have not been scientifically evaluated.
35 In addition, to date, the exact instance when a particular academic area becomes
37 an autonomous academic discipline is still unclear (Cohen, 1998; Krishnan,
2009; Lennard, 2007). Another debatable issue is which specific criteria consti-
tute an academic discipline (Krishnan, 2009; Turner, 2001; White & Hitt, 2009).
The section in the following presents the most widely referenced publications on
discipline criteria with the goal of explaining which visible indicators should be
in place to evaluate a state of an autonomous academic discipline.

39

Academic Discipline Criteria

41 While there is no universally adopted set of criteria, there are several models
43 that offer a set of expectations for a discipline (Krishnan, 2009; Parsons & Platt,
1973; White & Hitt, 2009). Krishnan (2009) identifies six criteria, including (1)
45 an object of research, (2) a body of accumulated specialist knowledge, (3) theo-
ries and concepts that can organize the accumulated specialist knowledge, (4)
specific terminologies or technical language, (e) specific research methods

1 appropriate for the research requirements, and (5) institutional manifestation in
2 the form of subjects taught at universities, academic departments or colleges,
3 and professional associations. According to Krishnan (2009), emerging or young
4 disciplines might not have all criteria fully developed or might lack some criteria.
5 Therefore, disciplinary development should be treated as a continuum: the
6 more criteria a particular academic area meets, the stronger an argument is in
7 support of the existence of a discipline.

8 White and Hitt (2009) proposed a set of criteria that somewhat overlaps with
9 Krishnan's (2009), including (1) a knowledge base or set of theories, (2) distinctive
10 methods of inquiry, (3) a community of scholars, and (4) a tradition of scholarly
11 inquiry and activity. However, White and Hitt (2009) place greater emphasis on
12 the role of faculty (e.g., research interests and training) in shaping and defining
13 the discipline. Finally, the third widely cited set of criteria (Cowley & Williams,
14 1991) is the work of Parsons and Platt in their foundational book, *The American*
15 *University* (1973). In contrast to Krishnan (2009) and White and Hitt (2009),
16 Parsons and Platt (1973) argue that disciplines focus on professional benefits or
17 professional affiliation. Thus, rather than considering a discipline as a subject to
18 understand, a discipline should provide "belonging" that comes with power,
19 points of reference, and assistance. Parsons and Platt's (1973) discipline criteria
20 include: (1) exclusive powers to train and recruit; (2) power to judge in-groups
21 and out-groups; (3) responsibility for regulating quality of professional work; (4)
22 high social prestige; and (5) grounding in a specialized body of knowledge.
23 Overall, Parsons and Platt (1973) propose a view where a discipline serves not
24 necessarily to advance a field through research, but to engage in professional
25 activities based on the knowledge of a discipline as well as to invest in maintaining
26 the prestige of that discipline by focusing on its quality.

27 Overall, the literature on academic disciplines is limited and does not offer
28 universally adopted criteria to review a state of a discipline. At the same time, to
29 synthesize from the approaches presented previously, visual manifestations of a
30 discipline within academia seem to be the main requirement for a discipline.
31 This manifestation includes physical departments, relevant curriculum to capture
32 and disseminate a specialized body of knowledge (object, theories, terminology,
33 and research methods), and adequately trained professors who are aware of the
34 discipline's boundaries, engaged in professional associations, and can
35 advance knowledge of discipline's subjects with rigor. Table 1 offers the summary
36 of the disciplinary criteria and their main commonalities.

37 To conclude, although there is evidence that discipline areas emerge, hybridize
38 with other areas, establish a niche in research streams, and evolve over time,
39 there is no consistency in addressing a state of a discipline. Since a discipline
40 manifestation has been suggested as the main indicator of a discipline's existence,
41 and since that manifestation takes place within the academic environment, it is
42 valuable to view the influence of that environment. Specifically,
43 doctoral education has been the primary setting for a discipline's existence as
44 well as a conduit for developing skilled scholars for that discipline. Thus, doctoral
45 education (e.g., its program, mission, etc.) together with professors and students
are the main agents to establish disciplinary boundaries. The next section

Table 1. Academic Discipline Criteria.

Author	Criteria	Main Individual Emphasis	Common Requirement
Krishnan (2009)	(1) An object of research; (2) a body of accumulated expert knowledge; (3) theories and concepts based on expert knowledge; (4) specific language; (5) specific research methods; and (6) institutional manifestation	Emerged unique academic elements	Visual manifestations of a discipline within academia: (1) physical departments; (2) relevant curriculum to capture and disseminate a specialized body of knowledge; and (3) adequately trained scholars bound by a discipline and engaged in a professional association
White and Hitt (2009)	(1) A knowledge base or set of theories; (2) distinctive methods of inquiry; (3) community of scholars; and (4) a tradition of scholarly inquiry and activity	The role of faculty (e.g., research interests and training) in shaping and defining the discipline	
Parsons and Platt (1973)	(1) Exclusive powers to train and recruit; (2) power to judge in-groups and out-groups; (3) responsibility for regulating the quality of professional work; (4) high social prestige; and (5) grounding in a specialized body of knowledge	A discipline is a “belonging” to and engagement in professional activities	

will explore the processes by which academia influences discipline development. The primary emphasis is given to reviewing what is known about doctoral education as the main gatekeeper of disciplinary knowledge and doctoral students as receivers and future disseminators of that knowledge.

Doctoral Education and Doctoral Students as Agents for the Development of a Discipline

Influence of Academia on Disciplinary Development

Academic disciplines do not exist outside of academia but manifest themselves in institutions of higher education. Multiple authors (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 2005; Garland, 2009) point out that academic disciplines are socially constructed and exist when members of an academic community enact them through their professional interactions. Foucault (1972) refers to that alignment as “a system of control in the production of discourse” (p. 224). This system consists of processes, influencers, resources, and other factors that impact the structure and dissemination of disciplinary knowledge within a single institution (Becher & Trowler, 2001). Thus, academic disciplines are a part of a complex structure that offers curriculum compatible with institutional missions (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Garland, 2009).

1 Academic disciplines also comprised faculty who work within that higher
education structure, undergo peer review and tenure, and produce publications
3 within their disciplines (Garland, 2009). Faculty members actively engaged in
scholarship help shape the direction of a discipline's development. For example,
5 as faculty members of diverse established disciplines begin to recognize a new
academic area, they start producing distinct and valuable publications from the-
7 oretical, educational, and practitioner perspectives that distinguish that newly
emerged field (Stefani, 2011). Most of the scholarship is produced by faculty
9 within graduate programs, since those faculties have the most stringent require-
ments from accrediting bodies to engage in scholarly professional development
11 (e.g., Higher Learning Commission, 2016). New publications and their contribu-
tion to the creation of new empirical knowledge shape the direction of a new
13 curriculum.

15 *Doctoral Education and Curriculum Development*

17 Doctoral education plays an important role in disciplinary development because
it is the organizational context in which the next generation of scholars is
19 formed. The emergence of doctoral education in the United States dates back to
the mid-nineteenth century when urgency for advanced training in medicine and
21 law drove the development of graduate and postgraduate education in those
areas (Storr, 1969). From that point on, higher education institutions have been
23 investing in intellectual preparation in diverse fields to increase discipline-
specific mastery (Hyatt & Williams, 2011; Nerad, 2004; Storr, 1969). Currently,
25 doctoral training in the United States and other countries is part of almost all
the academic disciplines and focuses on learning the discipline and developing
27 research knowledge and skills to participate in the knowledge development of
that discipline (Crawford, Brungardt, Scott, & Gould, 2002; Hyatt & Williams,
29 2011; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008). Thus, graduate edu-
cation continues to be focused on "bringing the student to an understanding of
31 the conceptual structure of his [her] field at the frontier, and research that is
aimed to push the frontier a little further" (Rees, 1972, p. 144).

33 Research demonstrates that doctoral education does influence the ways schol-
ars think about their disciplines and how they conduct and disseminate their
35 research within the parameters of those disciplines (Saunders, Kolek, Williams, &
Wells, 2016). Those findings raise important questions about the social and orga-
37 nizational processes within doctoral programs that lead to knowledge generation
within a discipline (Saunders et al., 2016). A review of the literature on doctoral
39 learning highlights the complexity currently present in the approaches to advanced
learning and advanced degrees (Cumming, 2010). Expectations are evolving rap-
41 idly, ranging from new competencies for faculty (e.g., multidisciplinary
approaches and collaboration and mentoring of students) to more practice-
43 oriented approaches to education or increases in graduates' professional skills
(e.g., Crawford et al., 2002; Cumming, 2010; Hyatt & Williams, 2011; Walker
45 et al., 2008). A significant contribution to the doctoral education philosophy and
practices is *The Formation of Scholars* (Walker et al., 2008) book produced by

1 scholars at The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The
2 authors stress that shifts in student demographics, increased competition, growing
3 pressures for accountability, and decreasing investment present a new set of chal-
4 lenges for doctoral education. “In short, expectations are escalating, and doctoral
5 programs today face fundamental questions of purpose, vision, and quality”
6 (Walker et al., 2008, p. 3). The distinguished group of authors emphasized the
7 importance of reforming what is taught (or content) and how it is taught (pro-
8 cess). In other words, they highlight the role of curriculum and not only the final
9 product, dissertation, in doctoral education.

10 Several other studies report on the important role of curriculum design in
11 doctoral education as well as key features of innovative curricula. A point in
12 case is the mixed methods study, part of an Australian Research Council
13 Linkage Project, conducted by Cumming (2010) that provides a holistic picture
14 of the contemporary doctoral experience. Although conducted in Australia, the
15 study has applications to doctoral programs in the United States and other
16 countries. Based on a survey of 5,395 doctoral students and follow-up in-depth
17 interviews with 10 doctoral candidates, Cumming (2010) offered an integrative
18 model of a doctoral enterprise, including doctoral practices and arrangements as
19 the main components together with such elements as participants, academy,
20 community, and linkages among them. Doctoral practices comprised curricu-
21 lum, pedagogy, research, and work. These practices were found to be intercon-
22 nected rather than discrete activities within doctoral education. Additionally,
23 the curriculum was stressed as one of the main activities that involved everyone
24 participating in doctoral education, and it was linked to the academy, commu-
25 nity, and doctoral education infrastructure and resources.

26 Similarly, Golde and Walker (2006) argue the importance of a doctoral curricu-
27 lum that emphasizes the rigor of a discipline. The authors stress that doctoral
28 curriculum should teach to critically appraise mainstream advances in a discipline
29 considering realities of the globalized world, capture those new realities, cherish
30 traditions, and identify contradictions in science. The authors write: “Doctoral
31 program must encourage risk-taking and intellectual adventurousness while foster-
32 ing the importance of precision and rigor” (p. 66). They also continue:

33
34 The training of doctoral students is unquestionably meant to educate scholars who are profes-
35 sionally well equipped, are aware of the human and social side of the life of their profession,
36 can cope with rapid changes in the problem areas and in the very foundations of their disci-
37 pline, and can become, in due course, stewards of their discipline. (pp. 72–73)

38 A recurrent theme in those assessments (Golde & Walker, 2006; Walker et al.
39 2008) is that an innovative curriculum seeking to prepare graduates for scholar-
40 ship in a complex, globalized world should be interdisciplinary and globally ori-
41 ented. What this means is that programs should also reflect both international
42 and local scholarship within their curriculum. Doctoral programs in various dis-
43 ciplines have made attempts to move toward more globally focused cross-
44 disciplinary orientations and to engage in practice-relevant scholarship. These
45 trends include more intentional connections among diverse disciplines and
between academia and real-life social events (Walker et al., 2008). Thus, a key

1 goal of a doctoral curriculum design should be training PhD students in multi-
3 disciplinary and practitioner-oriented scholarship relevant to the stakeholders
outside of academia.

5 *Doctoral Students*

7 One of the main themes across doctoral education literature is the readiness of
9 doctoral graduates to carry on the legacy of their disciplines and represent their
disciplines in scholarship and practice. Upon graduation, [doctoral students]

11 long to be part of an intellectual community, and they are right to want that because the intel-
lectual community is not simply a feel-good atmosphere. It is the foundation for the core
work of doctoral education: building knowledge. (Walker et al., 2008, p. 7)

13 However, for many students, the transition to independence is quite difficult, as
15 they transition from being consumers of knowledge to creators of knowledge
(Gardner, 2008). Therefore, one of the educational goals for a doctoral program
17 should be to socialize students into their discipline, so that they are able to fit
within its intellectual community upon graduation. Socialization involves learn-
19 ing the culture of a particular group and adopting the values and attitudes of
that group to become part of the community (Gardner & Barnes, 2007).
21 Disciplinary socialization is particularly important in preparing graduates for
their careers (Austin, 2002). Through coursework, dissertation research, faculty
23 mentorship, and peer engagement, students start to embrace disciplinary norms
and consider relevant research questions, legitimate methodologies, work rela-
tionship, or expectations of writing in refereed journals.

25 Walker et al. (2008) introduced a term “stewardship” and addressed doctoral
graduates as stewards of the discipline – scholars “who will creatively generate
27 new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly
transform those understandings through writing, teaching and application”
29 (p. 5). Stewards of their disciplines also need to continue questioning reality and
strive to capture that reality within a modern context characterized by constant
31 changes and instabilities (Eklana, 2006; Gardner, 2008; Walker et al., 2008).

33 Disciplinary knowledge is not only important for scholarly advancements or
education. Doctoral students follow diverse career routes outside of academia,
35 including business, government, or nonprofit sectors.

37 Yet all are scholars, for the work of scholarship is not a function of setting but of purpose and
commitment. The profession of the scholar requires specialized, even esoteric knowledge. But
it also entails a larger set of obligations and commitments that are not only intellectual but
39 moral. (Walker et al., 2008, p. 4)

41 Thus, scholars-stewards should guard their fields and be committed to protecting
scholarly integrity from misrepresentation and corruption (Elkana & Klopper,
2016; Shulman, 2010).

43 Based on the previous research, we can conclude that academic departments
aid in the development of a discipline via *organizational practices* that legitimize
45 and reinforce disciplinary standards and boundaries and *scholarly research* con-
ducted by faculty, graduate students, and alumni through which the discipline

1 grows and progresses. *Doctoral education* specifically has been found to be
 3 important for disciplinary development: PhD programs is where the next genera-
 5 tion of scholars in the discipline are developed and groomed to be future stew-
 7 ards and creators of knowledge. Curriculum development is one key mechanism
 9 by which doctoral programs seek to shape and optimize these processes. In the
 subsequent sections of this chapter, we focus on the contribution doctoral pro-
 grams make in the advancement of global leadership as a discipline via curricu-
 lum development.

11 **A STATE OF GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DOCTORAL** 13 **EDUCATION**

13 Building on the conversation about the importance of doctoral education for
 15 discipline development, this section reviews current doctoral degrees in global
 17 leadership and analyzes the consistency of their offerings and approaches. The
 19 purpose of this section is not to provide an exhaustive analysis of existing global
 21 leadership terminal degree programs but to initiate a conversation about the
 23 consistency of offerings (e.g., program descriptions, concentrations, and curricu-
 25 lula). In addition, we admit that a number of research and nonresearch institu-
 27 tions award dissertations in the area of global leadership, and some studies are
 29 more rigorous than others (Mendenhall, Li, & Osland, 2016). However, those
 31 institutions do not grant doctoral degrees or offer areas of concentration in
 33 global leadership; thus, they are incomplete examples of disciplinary manifesta-
 35 tions. In addition, we agree that although some dissertations claim to be in the
 37 area of global leadership, they do not address it empirically but only as a phrase
 within a title (Mendenhall et al., 2016; Tolstikov-Mast, 2016). However, consid-
 ering a steady increase in the number of published dissertations on global leader-
 ship topics (463 in 2014, 485 in 2015, 511 in 2016, and 545 in 2017, as registered
 in ProQuest database), the fact that 29 universities (in the United States and
 Europe) produce dissertations with global leadership in their titles (Mendenhall
 et al., 2016), together with existing discrepancies and limited understanding of
 doctoral-level contributions to global leadership, a separate and in-depth analy-
 sis of a global leadership manifestation within a doctoral education is required.
 We hope the section in the following can inspire more rigorous and detailed
 studies on the contribution of global leadership doctoral education to global
 leadership disciplinary development.

39 *Global Leadership Doctoral Degrees Currently Available*

41 A web-based search revealed only seven doctoral-level programs in global lead-
 43 ership, all based in the United States. Potentially, there are additional doctoral
 45 programs at international universities that did not appear in the search due to
 issues of language translation or limited marketing. Given the small number of
 programs, all of them are analyzed as follows. The programs represent diverse
 types of doctoral-level degree programs (PhD, EdD DBA, and DM) from all
 sectors of higher education (public, private, for-profit, and not-for-profit).

1 There has been an ongoing debate about diverse doctoral degree offerings,
2 their quality, and focus on research (Gregory, 1995; Mendenhall et al., 2016;
3 Neumann, 2005). The traditional belief has always been that the PhD is a
4 scholar degree, while the EdD, DBA, and DA are professional doctorate
5 degrees (Association of Graduate Schools, 1979; National Board of
6 Employment, Education and Training, 1989; Neumann, 2005). However, limited
7 research in Australia, New Zealand, and Britain (Gallagher, 2000;
8 Gregory, 1995; Maxwell & Shanahan, 2000; Neumann, 2003, 2005; Shanahan,
9 1996) claims that PhD and professional doctorate degrees of those countries differ
10 only based on the admission expectation regarding candidates' experiences
11 and are similarly based on programs' purpose (scholarship-relevant education),
12 structures, and curriculum. Simultaneously, there is a group of studies in the
13 United States (Anderson, 1983; Brown, 1985; Dill & Morrison, 1985) that make
14 similar conclusions but base them exclusively on doctoral degrees in the field of
15 education. Due to limited and at times biased studies and the fact that the quality
16 of doctoral programs as well as approaches to doctoral education differ
17 depending on their institutional affiliations and countries (Mendenhall et al.,
18 2016; The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n.d.),
19 more research is needed to establish empirical certainty.

20 For the purposes of this exploratory investigation of the existing doctoral
21 degree-granting global leadership programs, the analysis is focused on PhD
22 as well as professional doctoral programs at the following institutions: Colorado
23 Technical University, Richfield University, California Intercontinental University,
24 and Walden University (for-profit colleges); Indiana Tech and Pepperdine
25 University (private, nonprofit universities); and Lamar University (a public institution).
26 Four of these programs are global leadership programs or some variation
27 (i.e., global leadership and change), and three programs have global leadership as
28 a concentration. These programs with global leadership as a concentration include
29 educational leadership (with a concentration on global educational leadership),
30 business administration (with a concentration on global business and leadership),
31 and public policy and administration (with a concentration on global leadership).
32 Additionally, four of the doctoral programs award a Doctorate of Philosophy
33 degree (PhD), while the other three programs include a Doctorate of
34 Management (DM), a Doctorate of Education (EdD), and a Doctorate of
35 Business Administration (DBA). The total enrollment of students in each program
36 could not be found.

37 In addition to institution and degree information, the seven programs'
38 required coursework was organized into a table (see Table 2). Since Neumann's
39 (2005) study identified three specific types of courses (e.g., research/basic courses,
40 content/specialization courses, and dissertation/thesis courses) for doctoral
41 degree programs (in education, management, law, and the creative arts), Table 2
42 shows the total credit hours in the program, credit hours for research/basic
43 courses, credit hours for content/specialization courses, and credit hours for
44 dissertation/thesis courses. All of the programs had courses that could be categorized
45 into research, content, or dissertation courses, and these programs' course
46 requirements were consistent. Although the programs' course credit-hour varied

Table 2. Global Leadership Doctorate Degrees and Required Credits.

School	Degree	Department	Program	Total Credits	Research Credits	Content Credits	Dissertation Credits
Colorado Technical University (for-profit)	DM	Business and Management	Global Leadership	96 (Each course is four credits)	12 (Basic methodology, quantitative, and qualitative)	48 (Management and global leadership)	36
Indiana Tech (private, and nonprofit)	PhD	College of Professional Studies	Global Leadership	60 (Each course is three credits)	18 (Basic methodology, qualitative, quantitative, design, and critique)	36 (Leadership and specialization)	12
Pepperdine University (private, and nonprofit)	PhD	Graduate School of Education and Psychology	Global Leadership and Change	68 (Most courses are three credits)	18 (Design, qualitative, multivariate, analysis, and publishing)	44 (Leadership)	6
Richfield University (for-profit)	PhD	Doctoral Degree in Global Leadership	Global Leadership	36 (Each course is three credits)	3 (Research methods)	24 (Global systems and information)	9
Lamar University (public)	EdD	College of Education and Human Development	Educational Leadership: Global Educational Leadership	60 (Each course is three credits)	21 (Academic writing, quantitative, qualitative, and seminar)	27 (Educational leadership development)	12
California Intercontinental University (for-profit)	DBA	Business Administration	Business Admin: Global Business and Leadership	60 (Each course is three credits)	6 (Academic writing and methods/stats)	33 (Economics, financial, management, and marketing)	15
Walden University (for-profit)	PhD	Public Policy and Administration	Public Policy and Administration: Global Leadership	88 (All but one are five credits)	38 (Research foundation, quantitative, qualitative, methods, and prospectus)	40 (Public policy and administration and specialization choice)	20

1 (i.e., five credits per course, four credits per course, or three credits per course),
3 the total credit hours are uniform, despite the fact that some programs are pro-
5 fessional doctorates, while others are PhDs. Even though it is unknown how
7 these courses are taught (a quality of instruction and content), it seems that each
9 of these program requirements are comparable in their institutional structures
and offerings aimed at providing knowledge of a discipline, understanding of
disciplinary boundaries, and the ability to conduct original research using
discipline-appropriate social science research methods (disciplinary criteria
offered by Krishnan, 2009; Parsons & Platt, 1973; White & Hitt, 2009).

11 In addition to exploring these seven course requirements, the programs'
13 mission and purpose statements were thematically analyzed. The mission and
15 purpose statements were coded using an inductive approach from qualitative
17 coding techniques (Richards, 2009). This data analysis process enabled the
19 researchers to look for common patterns among the repetitive statements.
Initial coding identified sample codes among the data (Hahn, 2008). Next,
themes were developed from the categories (see Table 3); these themes were
then used to determine similarities and differences among the programs' mis-
sion and purpose statements.

21 The various themes that emerged from the mission and purpose statements
23 included: developing managers for organizational success, developing people
25 into effective leaders, developing people into educators, finding solutions to
world problems, improving the lives of citizens around the world, developing
graduates into entrepreneurs, and helping communities. Further, these
themes were grouped into two categories: individual development and global
issues/change.

27 In the individual development category, even though the four themes focused
29 on developing an individual, the developmental goals differed per program, as
31 some programs claimed to strive to develop students into managers, leaders,
33 educators, or entrepreneurs. Thus, the analysis revealed unique rather than con-
35 sistent approaches to developmental goals. Still, it is unclear how programs' mis-
37 sions are translated into curriculum strategies and how effective the curriculums
39 are. In addition, more detailed analysis (case study research) is needed to help
41 understand the connection between the program's mission, curriculum, and
43 global leadership development models. At the same time, all of the programs'
45 developmental goals align with general conclusions from seminal literature in
global leadership, including the importance of developing global leadership com-
petencies, leading teams, transferring global leadership knowledge, and develop-
ing individuals to be global leaders (e.g., Adler, 1997; Ayman, Kreicker, &
Masztal, 1994; Brake, 1997; Caligiuri, 2006; Gessner, Arnold, & Mobley, 1999;
Gregersen, Morrison, & Black, 1998; Mendenhall et al., 2018; Petrick, Scherer,
Brodzinski, Quinn, & Ainina, 1999). Moreover, the development-related themes
are congruent with elements and approaches within the global leadership model
(Osland & Bird, 2018), as the themes emphasized the importance of connections
to next generations as well as leading responsibly across the globe and within
global and complex organizations.

Table 3. Global Leadership Doctorate Program Descriptions and Themes.

School	Program	Theme	Sample Code	Example Quotes
Colorado Technical University (for-profit)	Global Leadership	The goal is to develop managers for organizational success	Organization/Manager	[...] provide students with in-depth knowledge of management theories [...] to effectively participate in global organizations. [...] designed to encourage the professional development of managers [...].
Indiana Tech (private, and nonprofit)	Global Leadership	The goal is to develop person(s) into an effective leader	Leader/Leadership	These scholar leaders will understand their responsibilities and their roles as leaders [...]. [...] prepare scholars for leadership roles in complex organizations [...].
Pepperdine University (private, and nonprofit)	Global Leadership and Change	The goal is to develop researchers who educate organizational constituents	Research(er)	This program is designed to support and produce the cutting-edge leader-researcher who [...] understands the importance of education as the currency that enables organizations to thrive [...]. Candidates will acquire skills to lead important research studies and teach the next generation [...].
Richfield University (for-profit)	Global Leadership	Graduates will be able to find solutions to global/world problems	Global/World/Community	The program is focused on global perspectives, global problems and issues, and specific solutions [...]. [...] provides students with knowledge, research abilities, and leadership skills to develop solutions for global problems.
Lamar University (public)	Educational Leadership: Global Educational Leadership	Graduates are responsible to improve the lives of citizens all over the world through education	World	Graduates are prepared to work [...] to improve the lives of citizens of the world. [...] our responsibility and influence as educators extends to all regions and peoples of the world.
California Intercontinental University (for-profit)	Business Admin: Global Business and Leadership	Graduates will learn business and entrepreneurship to be more advantageous	Entrepreneurship	Individuals with inclination for [...] new business ventures and are ready for a business management career will receive more credibility and recognition [...]. The program prepares students for careers in the fields of business management, venture analyst, business relations management, business development consulting, business broker/owner, and business banker. [...] help developing regions build modern, sustainable communities [...]. Review effective sustainability frameworks [...] and gain strategies for building capacity for community change.
Walden University (for-profit)	Public Policy and Admin: Global Leadership	Graduates will be able to build capable and sustainable communities	Community/Region	

1 The second theme that emerged from the programs' mission statements is
2 global issues and change. Three programs had statements that focused on that
3 mission, and all of them centered on solving real-world problems and helping
4 communities around the globe. However, when comparing the theme to the
5 information within seminal literature on global leadership (Adler, 1997; Ayman
6 et al., 1994; Brake, 1997; Caligiuri, 2006; Gessner et al., 1999; Gregersen et al.,
7 1998; Harris, Moran, & Moran, 2004; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002; Mendenhall
8 et al., 2018), mentions and analysis of global change in the literature are very
9 scarce. In fact, Osland (2018b) commented that existing literature on global
10 change and global leadership is more anecdotal than empirical. She argued that
11 when it comes to global change, "it is more difficult to see what needs to be
12 done on a global level and understand all the underlying forces in a more com-
13 plex setting" (p. 325).

14 Even though the literature on global leadership fails to empirically address
15 global change, three of the evaluated institutions did emphasize global change
16 and global issues as their teaching missions. Simultaneously, two of the three
17 institutions are not strictly global leadership programs: One program focuses on
18 educational leadership (EdD) with a concentration in Global Leadership, while
19 the other one is a PhD in public policy and administration with a concentration
20 in global leadership. Thus, the programs with global issues and change missions
21 do not award a degree in global leadership but rather a degree in other subjects
22 (i.e., educational leadership and public policy and administration) with an
23 emphasis in global leadership. Although there is no connection between the field
24 of global leadership and global change emphasis of some programs' missions,
25 there is a connection between the primary degree fields and the missions. Both
26 educational leadership and public policy and administration areas have tradi-
27 tionally emphasized global change, real-world problems, and culturally diverse
28 communities (Farazmand, 2018; Grogan, 2013).

29 Overall, the doctoral programs' required coursework is consistent and aligns
30 with Neumann's (2005) research that categorizes doctoral coursework into three
31 types: research, content, and dissertation. At the same time, the mission and pur-
32 pose statements are not consistent or similar among the seven programs. The
33 programs lack congruency among their missions, and some of the programs do
34 not even have a major emphasis on global leadership. Since there is a lack of
35 consistency among the programs' developmental goals and themes, it is impor-
36 tant to study further how uniformity can occur among the doctoral programs
37 that emphasize global leadership.

39

Implications for Global Leadership Disciplinary Development

40 A few main conclusions emerge from the discussions on disciplinary develop-
41 ment, criteria, and manifestation in doctoral education, and from the analysis of
42 existing doctoral programs in global leadership. First, global leadership is still
43 an emerging field and a discipline that follows a hybridization path with over-
44 lapping scholarly advances across academic fields (Becher & Trowler, 2001;
45 Lennard, 2007). Osland (2018a) states,

1 There are numerous fields that global leaders would benefit from studying, such as interna-
2 tional affairs, economics, anthropology, and cross-cultural psychology, to name just a few.
3 However, the field of global leadership has drawn heavily from four fields of study in particu-
4 lar that address communicating and being effective across cultures (intercultural communica-
5 tion competence), working overseas (expatriation), managing around the world (global
6 management), and leading people from other nations (comparative leadership). (p. 21)

7 Consideration of diverse disciplinary perspectives promotes a multifaceted view
8 on global leadership phenomena within the context of cultural, social, political,
9 and economic trends. It also fosters diverse scholarship that deepens understand-
10 ing of global leadership realities.

11 Second, global leadership has physical manifestations of a discipline within
12 academia, including physical departments, programs, and relevant curriculum.
13 Currently, only one known study examined global leadership as a discipline.
14 Whitaker's (2016) exploratory multiple case research focused on the global leader-
15 ship education manifestations at three institutions of higher education offering
16 degree-granting programs in global leadership. Initially, Whitaker identified
17 fourteen existing global leadership programs, excluding certificates, minors,
18 unaccredited programs, programs offering degrees lower than the bachelor's
19 level, and cocurricular programs. Of that list, three programs were selected for
20 analysis based on the following sample selection criteria: accreditation, the long-
21 est span of the program's existence, and noncollege of business affiliation (to
22 have more multidisciplinary rather than one-discipline oversight). The study
23 explored the phenomenon of global leadership as a discipline and found evi-
24 dence of physical disciplinary manifestations across the three cases (e.g., curricu-
25 lum, learning outcomes, and students).

26 Although scholarly fields need disciplines to capture, develop, and dissemi-
27 nate field-related knowledge (Krishnan, 2009; Parsons & Platt, 1973; White &
28 Hitt, 2009), Whitaker discovered pragmatic reasons (e.g., university recruitment
29 strategies, financial considerations, and interests of individual faculty) to be the
30 primary force in establishing global leadership programs. In addition, the study
31 found two main similarities across the cases. First was the tendency for the
32 programs to be explicitly tied to "more established" or primary disciplinary area
33 (e.g., management, sustainable development, and theology). The second was a
34 values-based focus of the programs: each program exhibited a strong relation-
35 ship to unique value orientation (e.g., ethics, social justice, and Christian mis-
36 sion). Considering the limitations associated with a case study design (Yin,
37 2017), Whitaker's three cases demonstrated the existence of global leadership
38 programs. However, their relevance to global leadership as a discipline was not
39 clearly established. Future research could apply disciplinary criteria to provide
40 evidence about global leadership as a discipline and suggest a pathway for a dis-
41 cipline development that has not yet been scientifically evaluated.

42 Finally, there is encouraging evidence that global leadership is a growing field
43 as the number of global leadership publications, or a manifestation of the field's
44 scholarly development, has increased considerably (Osland, 2018c). In addition,
45 foundational research and conceptualizations, required by any discipline, show
the field is gaining maturity. Examples of foundational scholarship range from

1 works on a construct definition, understanding of global leadership tasks, behav-
3 global leadership, as well as literature on training and development (Osland,
5 2018c). Moreover, 11 volumes in the advances in global leadership series are the
7 testament of a strong commitment to develop the field by offering a platform to
share conceptual, empirical, and practitioner perspectives from authors across
the fields and continents (e.g., Osland, Li, & Mendenhall, 2017).

Overall, global leadership scholarship is in a state of emergence and growth.
9 Significant work has been done on synthesizing current developments of the
global leadership field and models, but most of these remain untested empiri-
11 cally. As Mendenhall, Reiche, Bird, and Osland (2012) state, “the field of global
13 leadership currently confronts both a threat and an opportunity to its potential
to evolve and progress” (p. 499). Fundamental issues are currently still under-
15 researched, including an understanding of global leadership as it relates to other
academic disciplines, the manifestation of global leadership programs at institu-
17 tions of higher education, and the state of its disciplinary development.
Nevertheless, limited evidence shows global leadership as a hybrid, emerging
19 discipline that represents an academically recognized fields, disseminates knowl-
edge supported by an academic infrastructure that attempts to define the disci-
21 pline’s boundaries, and focuses on understanding and further advancing the
body of global leadership knowledge in that field.

Drawing from conclusions about global leadership doctoral programs as
23 analyzed in thischapter, there are considerable consistencies in the curriculum
(although information about quality and content of curriculum has not been
25 reviewed). This uniformity may indicate an existence and even a certain maturation
of global leadership within doctoral education. At the same time, there are
27 important distinctions (programs’ missions) that are to some extent influenced
by differences in departmental main subject areas or university missions.
29 Differences in the doctoral programs are also a reflection of the newness of the
field: norms about what constitutes global leadership curriculum and how to
31 institutionalize global leadership education have yet to fully develop.

The next section offers an example of one doctoral program, the PhD in
33 Global Leadership at Indiana Tech. The program has been in existence since
2009 and has accumulated significant experience to reassess its role within the
35 global leadership discipline. Thus, in 2016, the PhD in global leadership pro-
gram decided to incorporate the latest scholarly and practice-driven advance-
37 ments of the field, promulgate those advancements via its core global leadership
curriculum and incorporate them within the discipline.

41 *Re-envisioning the Curriculum in Indiana Tech’s PhD in Global 42 Leadership Program*

43 All doctoral-level programs in global leadership have to make an important
decision on the boundaries of the required curriculum to appropriately prepare
45 future scholars and thought leaders in the field. As the comparative analysis of
programs revealed, the content tends to be linked to the aims of the program.

1 Indiana Tech's PhD program recognizes the diverse career paths and profes-
 3 sional goals of its doctoral students, which necessitates a broad and multidisci-
 5 plinary curriculum approach. Since global leadership is a developing field,
 7 re-evaluation and revision of the curriculum on a regular basis (i.e., every 1–2
 9 years) are also a key feature of this program. This section briefly discusses
 Indiana Tech's approach to developing global leadership scholars, from the
 alignment of the program's mission and vision in coursework to outcomes of
 learning via a transformational learning approach.

11 *Program Mission, Vision, and View on Global Leadership*

13 The mission of the program is to prepare leaders for productive careers in busi-
 15 ness leadership, research, teaching, and academic administration that take place
 17 in a complex global environment (Indiana Tech, 2017a). This is aligned with the
 broader organizational mission and vision at Indiana Tech, which is to provide
 learners of all ages, at various career levels, professional education that

19 prepares them for active participation, career development and advancement, and leadership
 in the complex, global society of the twenty-first century; and motivates them toward a life of
 significance and worth. (Indiana Tech, 2017b)

21 To enable doctoral students to pursue a variety of valuable professional paths,
 23 the program's curriculum is designed to build both scholarly and applied knowl-
 edge and skills.

25 The program's view on global leadership encompasses

27 an understanding of the global environment with its complexity; situational and environmen-
 29 tal challenges and opportunities; the interaction between environment, culture, social, political
 and economic trends; the organizational environment in its totality; and leading with a global
 mindset in the twenty-first century. (Indiana Tech, 2017b)

31 Thus, at the core of our global leadership definition is a *holistic vision* of global
 33 leadership, which considers the complex external and internal organizational
 35 contexts and environments, where interaction between global leaders and fol-
 37 lowers takes place. This perspective mirrors key features of the global leadership
 definition developed by Reiche et al. (2017), which stresses the complexity of
 tasks and relationships in interactions that take place across multiple national
 cultures. The holistic vision of global leadership in the program lends itself to a
 multidisciplinary curriculum.

39 *Developing a Multidisciplinary, Transformational Curriculum in* 41 *Global Leadership*

43 Global leadership scholarship draws from multiple disciplines and fields of study
 45 (Osland, 2018a). While the doctoral program has always had portions of curricu-
 lum drawn from a variety of fields since its inception, recent revisions have fur-
 ther emphasized and developed these complementary streams of knowledge.
 According to Carnegie President Lee S. Shulman,

1 The best doctoral programs attempt to discover the “sweet spot” between conservation and
change by teaching skepticism and respect for earlier traditions and sources while encouraging
3 strikingly new ideas and courageous leaps forward. (Walker et al., 2008, p. ix)

5 This was the spirit of the most recent curriculum revision in the program – to
balance rigor in traditional scholarship activities, materials, and research with
diverse perspectives and learning methods.

7 Since doctoral degrees are routes to many destinations – academics, industry,
entrepreneurship, government, and not-for-profit endeavors, among others –
9 the program aims to help scholar-leaders understand their responsibilities and
roles in conserving, expanding, and transforming organizations and in advancing
11 the discipline of leadership and practice in the global society. While building
strong, multidisciplinary scholarship is important for knowledge development, a
13 pedagogy of transformative learning is the catalyst for student development.
Transformative learning is a process whereby the faculty member stimulates
15 active learning, encouraging students to become critical, creative thinkers who
can then continue in this capacity beyond university (Haber-Curran &
17 Tillapaugh, 2015). This is particularly important for program completion, but
also has longer-term implications for these students becoming leaders of thought
19 and practice in the field. In an empirical study of transformative learning,
Stevens-Long, Schapiro, and McClintock (2012) posited that “Transformation
21 enables people to move toward habits of mind and habits of being that are more
inclusive, open, whole, and wise” (p. 184). This is important in doctoral educa-
23 tion, as the effects of doctoral education “ripple out across nations and genera-
tions” as doctoral students become faculty or become innovators in their
25 professions (Walker et al., 2008). It is equally important in the field of global
leadership, where inclusiveness and openness are vital in building the cross-
27 cultural understanding needed to work well in a global context. Student-
centered learning and dynamic curriculum design can tap into relevant strengths
29 and interests of students to enhance learning and fuel the passions that brought
students into the program, because they are key to the transformative learning
31 process. Methods for promoting transformative learning are profiled in the
examples of two core courses that were redesigned in the program: LDS 7002:
33 *Leadership in a Time of Global Change* and LDS 7005: *Global Leadership
Development*.
35

37 *Curriculum Redesign Strategy*

39 Indiana Tech’s global leadership curriculum was initially created in 2009 with
the PhD program’s inception. Coursework is facilitated virtually through an
online learning platform and complementary virtual teaching and communica-
41 tion tools. The core curriculum consists of 6 classes worth a total of 18 credit
hours. Courses include the following: *Leadership Theory & Research*; *Leading in
43 a Time of Global Change*; *Communications in Global & Diverse Contexts*; *Ethics,
Governance & Social Responsibility*; *Global Leadership Development*; and *Global
45 Talent Management*. In addition to the global leadership core, students complete
a research core with six courses focused on research methods, scholarly inquiry,

1 literature review, academic writing, qualitative and quantitative research design,
2 and statistical analysis. Subsequent to completing the research and global leader-
3 ship core, students specialize by taking an additional six courses in either *organi-*
4 *zational management* or *academic administration* fields before commencing their
5 dissertation phase.

6 While there have been minor revisions in prior years to the overall curriculum
7 and specific courses, the most recent endeavor was comprehensive and rigorous.
8 There were three phases in the revision: an initial evaluation of alignment with
9 learning objectives and representation of scholarship in the field, consideration
10 of relevant curriculum in related disciplines, and creation of new course designs.
11 In the first phase, the program leadership and a team of consultants with exper-
12 tise in global leadership performed a detailed evaluation of all core courses. This
13 phase sought to establish a firm foundation of scholarship from existing sources
14 in the field. It was also useful from a learning perspective to critically evaluate
15 the alignment between learning objectives, curriculum, and assessments. The
16 first phase was instrumental in identifying the potential scope of each course
17 that was needed for student learning.

18 The second phase in the curriculum design was a thoughtful analysis con-
19 ducted by program leadership considering interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary
20 connections that would enrich the coursework. Looking beyond disciplinary
21 boundaries allowed for a unique exploration of topic areas to stimulate intellec-
22 tual debate, critical analysis, and perspective building. For example, leadership
23 research drawn from organizational studies tends to look at leadership's effect
24 and influence on others, while the same topic of research in psychology adds
25 perspective on internal and affective impacts. Given time and workload limita-
26 tions within the courses, the second phase of analysis intentionally identified
27 only the most pertinent related disciplines for consideration.

28 Finally, in the third phase, faculties – subject matter experts – were chosen
29 to lead the redesign of specific courses. Each course at Indiana Tech was
30 assigned to faculty teams to promote diversity in the curriculum, with a lead fac-
31 ulty member representing the main content area and at least one other faculty
32 member representing another discipline (e.g., sociology, psychology, economics, and
33 political science). The faculty teams were charged with designing the course
34 experience, including overall curriculum, materials selection, dynamic learning
35 activities and assessments of learning, all with the learning objectives in mind.

36 Faculty teams were challenged to look beyond mainstream materials to inten-
37 tionally incorporate research and perspectives across cultures. While diverse
38 scholars do participate in academic research, limitations of language and access
39 to resources are believed to reduce representation across cultures. For example,
40 the majority of scientific research is produced by scholars in the United States
41 and Europe (King, 2004). Furthermore, 50% of journal articles are published by
42 only five companies located in the United States and England (Larivière,
43 Haustein, & Mongeon, 2015). As emerging economies assume increasingly
44 prominent positions in the world market (Wright, Filatotchev, Hoskisson, &
45 Peng, 2005), research within the field of global leadership is growing. Diverse

1 international perspectives were included in course materials to better prepare
students for research and work in those more global contexts.

3 The curriculum design also sought to ensure consistency across classes and
complementarity between the courses, especially within the research methods
5 core. For this purpose, faculty redesign teams communicated suggested changes
with each other, ensuring that topics did not overlap and were comprehensively
7 covered. To further strengthen the inter-linkages between coursework, relevant
chapters from foundational texts were leveraged across courses to provide
9 students with common frames of reference. Three of these texts include Bass
and Bass (2008), Bryman, Collinson, Grint, Jackson, and Uhl-Bien (2011),
11 Mendenhall et al. (2018), and various volumes of advances in global leadership
(Osland, Li, & Mendenhall, 2016; Osland et al., 2017; Osland, Li, & Wang,
13 2014). Furthermore, faculty developed research-based activities in which stu-
dents have the opportunity to apply theoretical and methodological knowledge
15 acquired in previous coursework in order to advance the student's research skill-
set toward readiness for the dissertation phase.

17 There was a specific effort placed on creating a dynamic blend of learning
activities in the coursework, including cognitive, social, and humanistic learning
19 methods, to foster transformative learning (Merriam, 2004). Traditional curricu-
lum designs in higher education tend to focus on cognitive learning methods,
21 such as reading, listening, case analysis, assessment, video, research projects,
23 observations, self-directed learning, presentations, quizzes, assessments, and
exams. They are useful for knowledge development and are the foundation for
25 transformational learning (Merriam, 2004) but are insufficient in isolation to
produce transformation in learners. They also do not always anticipate the mul-
27 titude and variety of cross-cultural challenges encountered by global leaders
(Mendenhall, 2006; Voorhees, 2001).

29 In contrast, social learning methods are important for perspective building,
as they facilitate learning from others' perspectives and experiences (Bandura,
1985). They include purposeful interactions with peers, mentors, and instructors
31 built through experiences, networking, diverse interactions, social media, games,
33 storytelling, small group projects, guest presentations, and service learning.
Interactions enhance a sense of community and intellectual development that
35 are vital to student persistence and scholarship (Walker et al., 2008). One chal-
lenge in the online learning environment is the absence of natural human inter-
37 actions; they must be intentionally designed into the course. This makes
discussions and small group work especially important in the online environ-
39 ment (Hill, Song, & West, 2009). They are also important in a doctoral program
where students' experiences vary widely. Informal and formal interactions foster
41 cross-pollination of knowledge and perspectives across the student body, enrich-
ing learning. However, these learning methods will not necessarily produce
43 intended results without appropriate alignment to learning objectives and sup-
port from faculty that these are indeed met. So, all social learning activities in
45 the curriculum redesign were designed with explicit instructions, deliverables,
and built-in progress evaluations for faculty to provide support and guidance.

1 Lastly, humanistic learning methods include experiences, reflective questions
2 and discussions, vivid examples, videos, improvisation, role-plays, perspective
3 building, music, and photos (Merriam, 2004). These methods bring learning to
4 life. They also perform a critical role in the adult learning process by helping
5 learners situate previous life knowledge and experiences with new learning
6 (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). Learning is hands-on or otherwise designed to engage the
7 emotions and experiences of the learner. This taps into the affective side of
8 learning. While these activities do have limitations in the online learning envi-
9 ronment, they are still possible with the intentional and creative design.

10 The comprehensive redesign of the global leadership coursework sought to
11 integrate the various types of learning which required a purposeful and collabo-
12 rative approach. While this involved time and resource commitments from both
13 faculty and program administrators, the end result is a rich, engaging curriculum
14 design that will benefit doctoral students in global leadership, as they develop
15 their scholarship and transform their mindset and skill set for becoming global
16 leaders in the field. Next, we introduce two course examples, which illustrate the
17 program's curriculum redesign process and which showcase important areas in
18 global leadership scholarship.

19
20 *Redesigned Coursework Examples: LDS 7002: Leading in a Time of Global
21 Change and LDS 7005: Global Leadership Development*

22 LDS 7002 and LDS 7005 are rigorous explorations of both leadership in a time
23 of global change and global leadership development from multidisciplinary per-
24 spectives. These doctoral-level courses examine the complexity of the intercon-
25 nections among the fields of Business, Psychology, Sociology and other social
26 sciences with respect to the course topics. This creates a more sophisticated
27 understanding of the phenomena explored. The assignments in these courses
28 also challenge students to demonstrate their learning through a combination of
29 theoretical analysis, research, and practical application. The theoretical analyses
30 contribute to building scholarship among students – especially those who are
31 aiming for academic careers. The research components prepare students for their
32 own dissertation studies aimed at advancing the discipline. In addition, the prac-
33 tical applications engage students in professional-level analysis and problem-
34 solving that will serve them well as potential consultants and practitioners.

35
36 *LDS 7002: Leading in a Time of Global Change*

37 LDS 7002 explores the change management process from a global perspective
38 by focusing on the drivers of change, types of change, models and techniques for
39 managing change, and difficulties with initiating and implementing change. The
40 main learning objectives are for the students to be able to develop theoretical
41 and practical perspectives on organizational change, to demonstrate knowledge
42 of effective change leadership, and to critically appraise theories from multiple
43 disciplines.

44 During the first half of the course, students explore change processes at the
45 macro-, meso-, and microlevels, drawing on political science, psychology, and

1 business literatures. The course starts with an introduction to key change theories, core concepts and vocabulary, and several practical case studies of organizational change initiatives. In the second week, students investigate global political changes, and how those macroforces shape organizational leadership. 3
5 In week three, the course readings and activities concern the mesolevel with a focus on the leadership of nonprofit organizations. During week four, students 7
9 explore micro-level interactions and investigate employee resistance and how leadership practices can help fuel or overcome resistance to change. The second half of the class introduces sociological, anthropological, and economic perspectives on change. The readings illustrate disciplinary variations in the research 11
13 questions posed and in the methodologies which are applied. Week five looks at how leaders manage relationships with different stakeholders and models of best practices for collaborations between corporations, governments, and nongovernmental organizations. Week six introduces social and cultural globalization processes and the norms and cultural variations that factor into organizational changes. In week seven, the focus shifts to macro-economic models accompanied by some current examples of how monetary and trade policies have shaped corporate leadership. During the final course week, students wrap up and present the findings from their final course chapters.

21 The course features weekly online asynchronous discussions, which provide students the opportunity to reflect on change contexts, to identify options that are available to leaders to manage change processes and overcome obstacles in order to embrace sustainable organizational change practice. Social learning (Bandura, 1985) is at the heart of the weekly discussions, which are centered around peer interactions, encourage substantive debates of different perspectives, and require critical thinking. The small online class sizes offer extensive opportunities for intimate, rich seminar-style debates. Both cognitive and humanistic learning methods informed the written assignments developed for LDS 7002: an article review, a global leadership speech, and an original case study on an organizational change initiative. Those deliverables are global context-centered and practice-oriented research assignments that require students to evaluate and apply the relevant change theories and concepts from the course and engage in critical thinking through evaluation and interpretation of real-life phenomena.

37 *LDS 7005: Global Leadership Development*

39 The faculty leads brought together research on global leadership, learning and development, human resources, organizational behavior, sociology, cross-cultural studies and social psychology to explore the theoretical foundations of and applied practices for developing global leaders. Learning objectives for the course include developing a firm scholarly understanding of adult learning and development in the context of global leadership, as well as knowledge of effective, applied practices in the field. The course comprised eight weeks of study, with each week devoted to unique topics. The curriculum is designed to foster transformative learning through exploration of new and varied perspectives in 45

1 the literature and to challenge students to demonstrate critical and creative
thinking in the learning activities and assessments.

3 The first half of the course begins with an examination of global leadership
as a developing discipline, including global leadership theory and practice, defi-
5 nitions of global leadership, discussion of global leader identity, and exploration
of global leadership development theory and practice. In week two, students
7 focus on global leadership competencies and the science/psychology of global
leadership. In both weeks one and two, research from the fields of psychology
9 and sociology is leveraged to explore issues of identity and leadership from mul-
tidisciplinary perspectives. Week three looks at global leadership development
11 models and methods, including the study of dynamic methods for global leader-
ship development. Models are important for organizing the many different com-
13 petencies that are considered to be critical for global leaders, as well as in
understanding the connections among them. Research from cross-cultural stud-
15 ies, psychology, and leadership studies is integrated heavily in week four, as
learning centers on culturally responsive global leadership development, with
17 specific study of the GLOBE research, schemas of leadership, and cross-cultural
leadership development for cultures and regions.

19 In the second half of the course, the focus shifts to developing global teams and
organizational cultures. Week five includes an introduction to talent management
21 issues, as they relate to developing global teams and psychological theories of
social comparison and social contact. Research is incorporated from the fields of
23 human resources, management, organizational behavior, and social psychology.
In week six, students study current issues in global leadership development includ-
25 ing the concept of global citizenship, “glocalization” and global leadership, and
social justice/social responsibility as distinctions in global leadership development.
27 Transformative learning is especially powerful this week, as the curriculum looks
at socio-political and socioeconomic issues that impact communities and peoples
29 within the scope of a global leader’s influence. Worldviews and personal experi-
ence are critically analyzed. Week seven looks at other current issues in global
31 leadership development, such as diversity topics and evaluating global leadership
development programs. The last week of the course, week eight, is devoted to the
33 final project presentations and course reflections.

Course learning activities include a blend of scholarly and practical readings
35 to build a strong knowledge base. Transformational learning is facilitated
through multiple points of intentional and guided interaction between students
37 and faculty to promote critical discussions and perspective building. These inter-
actions include synchronous web-based sessions, asynchronous weekly discus-
39 sions, and pairings – both required and optional – to work on projects
throughout the course. Transformational learning is enhanced through demon-
41 strations of learning, which include case study analysis, reflections, self-
assessment, and a recorded or live final PowerPoint presentation that requires
43 students to provide creative and critical analyses. The final project is a collabo-
rative, multiphase scholarly evaluation of leadership development in an organi-
45 zation that provides students with the opportunity to apply many of the class
concepts. Throughout the course, student engagement is enhanced with media

1 as well as choices regarding types of assignments and approaches to them. For
3 example, students may choose to write an in-depth research chapter, perform a
comparative analysis or produce a case study. In terms of the approach, students
may elect to work independently or in a small group.

5

7 *Implications of Curriculum Redesign for Global Leadership Disciplinary Development*

9 A comprehensive curriculum redesign effort requires resources. Administrators
and faculty need to invest a significant amount of time in order to undertake a
holistic course redesign, because it requires merging established key literature
11 with carefully selected studies from diverse disciplines and cultural contexts,
ensuring consistency with other courses, and following university and
13 departmental learning objectives to meet the needs of the doctoral candidates.
An iterative, multiphase redesign process, where administrators and faculty col-
laborate closely and share ideas at the various stages, seems best suited to
15 achieve those objectives. It is crucial to keep the entire educational program in
mind and to align course learning objectives with those of the department and
17 the university.

19 At Indiana Tech, this means that both academic and practitioner knowledge
is considered, and diverse learning methodologies are applied to successfully
21 realize teaching and learning goals. Similarly, having faculty teams, rather than
individual professors, work on the curriculum is especially relevant in a field like
23 global leadership, which is characterized by hybridization, multidisciplinary
roots, and globalized knowledge creation and application. Faculty teams can
25 bring knowledge from multiple disciplines to the table and offer diverse expertise
in literature, data, or practitioner case studies from around the world. In an
27 emerging discipline like global leadership, curriculum development involves
incorporating and aligning established disciplinary knowledge, that is our founda-
29 tional texts and the most cited scholarly journals, with subject relevant
research outside those boundaries. In doing so, the doctoral education helps pro-
31 mote the institutionalization of a disciplinary canon while reinforcing multidisci-
plinary connections and inspiring advances in the field.

33

35

CONCLUSION

37 The relationship between an academic field and its subsequent discipline is sym-
biotic. A recognized body of scholarship requires infrastructure to establish
discipline's boundaries to preserve and advance knowledge of the field
39 (Richardson, 2008). Additionally, as identified by a number of disciplinary
authors (Frost & Jean, 2003; Krishnan, 2009; White & Hitt, 2009), there must
41 be a tangible presence of academic programs teaching the curriculum in order
for a discipline to be considered in existence.

43

45 The manuscript offers several conclusions to connect global leadership as a
field of scholarly knowledge and as a discipline. First, global leadership is still
an emerging academic field and a discipline that follows a hybridization path
with overlapping multidisciplinary scholarly works (Becher & Trowler, 2001;

1 Lennard, 2007; Osland, 2018a). Second, global leadership has evidence of physi-
3 cal manifestations of a discipline within academia, at least based on the analysis
of seven doctoral programs in global leadership and Whitaker's (2016) explor-
5 atory multiple case study of three global leadership programs. Simultaneously,
as Whitaker (2016) discovered, pragmatic reasons rather than academic goals
7 have been the primary forces to establish global leadership programs. Although
these conclusions should be viewed in light of limitations (a number of doctoral
9 programs evaluated and case study design limitations (Yin, 2017), the manu-
script formulated valuable conclusions and established the need for more
research into global leadership and its disciplinary development.

11 Third, global leadership foundational research and conceptualizations,
required by any discipline, show the field is gaining maturity (Osland, 2018c).
13 Furthermore, the *Advances in Global Leadership* series demonstrate a strong
commitment to the field by consistently offering a platform to share conceptual,
15 empirical and practitioner perspectives from authors representing diverse aca-
ademic fields (e.g., Osland et al., 2017). Further research is needed to assess how
17 curriculum design shapes knowledge in the field of global leadership and how
global leadership doctoral education contributes to disciplinary development.
19 For example, an empirical analysis of global leadership dissertation research
and alumni research publications could establish causal links between curricula
21 and disciplinary research. In addition to the curriculum, it would be relevant to
investigate doctoral programs in terms of other relevant institutional features
23 (such as departmental structures, size, faculty body, administrative leadership,
or output) and social interactions (socialization processes, communication
25 models, or mentorship models). Doctoral education is an important mechanism
for disciplinary development, but as mentioned earlier in this chapter, it is not
27 the only force that shapes the advancement of a discipline, and those other fac-
tors should also be the subject of investigation. This could include research
29 on the content of peer-reviewed journals or special issues dedicated to global
leadership, development of various conferences and seminars, opportunities for
31 research funding, recognition of global leadership or its concepts in academic or
nonacademic settings, and so on. Such analyses will help us better understand
33 the state (or stage) of global leadership disciplinary development, consensus on
our knowledge bases, or changes in disciplinary boundaries.

35 The manuscript establishes that a visual manifestation of a discipline within
academia requires physical departments, relevant curriculum to capture and
37 disseminate a specialized body of knowledge, and adequately trained scholars
bound by a discipline and engaged in a professional association (Krishnan,
39 2009; Parsons & Platt, 1973; White & Hitt, 2009). Based on that, we have sev-
eral recommendations for global leadership scholar who would like to grow the
41 discipline. We would suggest engaging in conversations about the value of the
field as the discipline and establishing a robust scholarly agenda to understand
43 and enhance the discipline. Next, global leadership scholars span fields, and not
all of us work at a global leadership degree-granting school. That does not make
45 our contribution to the discipline development less valuable. A well-crafted
global leadership curriculum driven by the latest advancements in the scholarly

1 field could be designed at any institution. This curriculum can capture and dis-
3 seminate global leadership scholarship as doctoral students learn to become
stewards of the discipline through relevant coursework and well-guided disserta-
tion research.

5 Additionally, we can foster a curriculum that reflects the unique demands
7 of the global leadership field. At Indiana Tech, for examples, this means that
both academic and practitioner knowledge is considered and diverse learning
methodologies are applied to successfully realize teaching and learning goals.
9 It also means collaborating virtually with geographically diverse faculty and
students, promoting research across global contexts, exposing doctoral stu-
11 dents to multidisciplinary theorizing and research methods, or offering oppor-
tunities to explore global leadership literature produced by authors outside of
13 the United States.

15 Finally, to grow the field and its discipline, it is important not only to
adequately train scholars but also to engage them in meaningful professional
exchanges within a common professional association. It can be done by estab-
17 lishing and promoting a division within a current professional association or
forming an independent association to unite likeminded professionals, acade-
19 mics and practitioners, who are passionate about advancing understanding of
global leadership realities. Together, we can share, discuss, and debate our
21 scholarly agendas and curriculum strategies, define “belonging” of scholarship,
or consider applications of our research to global leadership practice. This unity
23 of efforts will contribute to the discipline development in a meaningful and pur-
poseful way.

27 REFERENCES

- 29 Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL:
The University of Chicago Press.
- 31 Adler, N. J. (1997). Global leadership: Women leaders. *Management International Review*, 37,
171–196.
- 33 Altback, P. G., Berdahl, R. O., & Gumport, P. J. (Eds.). (2005). *American higher education in the
twenty-first century: Social, political and economic challenges* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: The
Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 35 Anderson, D. G. (1983). Differentiation of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in education. *Journal of Teacher
Education*, 34, 55–58.
- 37 Association of Graduate Schools. (1979). *The degree of doctor of philosophy: A statement of policy*.
Washington, DC: Association of Graduate Schools.
- 39 Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the
academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94–122.
- 41 Ayman, R., Kreicker, N. A., & Masztal, J. J. (1994). Defining global leadership in business environ-
ments. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 46, 64–77.
- 43 Bandura, A. (1985). Model of causality in social learning theory. In S. Sukumune (Ed.), *Advances in
social learning theory*. Tokyo, Japan: Kaneko-Shoho.
- 45 Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial
applications*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA:
Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matters in different academic areas. *Journal of
Applied Psychology*, 57, 195–203.

- 1 Brake, T. (1997). *The global leader: Critical factors for creating the world class organization*. Chicago, IL: Irwin.
- 3 Brater, D. C., & Daly, W. J. (2000). Clinical pharmacology in the middle ages: Principles that presage the 21st century. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, 67(5), 447–450.
- 5 Brown, L. D. (1985). The structure and context of doctoral study in education from the perspective of students, alumni, faculty and deans. In L. D. Brown et al. (Eds.), *The quality of the doctorate in schools of education: A final report to the Ford Foundation*. New York, NY: Ford Foundation Library.
- 7 Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of leadership*. London: Sage.
- 9 Caligiuri, P. M. (2006). Developing global leaders. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 219–228.
- Cohen, A. M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 11 Cowley, W. H., & Williams, D. (1991). *International and historical roots of American higher education*. New York, NY: Garland.
- 13 Crawford, C. B., Brungardt, C. L., Scott, R. F., & Gould, L. V. (2002). Graduate programs in organizational leadership: A review of programs, costs and delivery methods. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(4), 64–74.
- 15 Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 17 Cumming, J. (2010). Doctoral enterprise: A holistic conception of evolving practices and arrangements. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(1), 25–39.
- 19 Denhardt, R., & Denhardt, J. (2009). *Public administration: An action approach* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- 21 Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J. L. (1985). EdD and PhD research training in the field of higher education: A survey and a proposal. *Review of Higher Education*, 8, 169–186.
- 23 Eklana, Y. (2006). Unmasking uncertainties and embracing contradictions: Graduate education in the sciences. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing Stewards of the discipline – Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (pp. 65–96). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from http://web.ceu.hu/yehuda_cid_science_elkana_bookversion.pdf
- 25 Elkana, Y., & Klopper, H. (2016). *The university in the 21st century: Teaching in the new enlightenment at the dawn of the digital age*. Budapest, Hungary: CEU Press.
- 27 Farazmand, A. (2018). *Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance*. New York, NY: Springer.
- 29 Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- 31 Franklin, J. (2002). *The science of conjecture: Evidence and probability before pascal*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 33 Frost, S. H., & Jean, P. M. (2003). Bridging the disciplines: Interdisciplinary discourse and faculty scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(2), 119–149.
- 35 Gallagher, M. (2000, December). New directions in Australian research and research training policy – Some questions for researchers. Paper prepared for the annual conference of The Australian Network for Higher Education Policy Research, Australian National University, Canberra, 708.
- 37 Gardner, S. (2008). “What’s too much and what’s too little?” The process of becoming an independent researcher in doctoral education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(3), 326–350.
- 39 Gardner, S. K., & Barnes, B. J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(4), 1–19.
- 41 Garland, J. C. (2009). *Saving alma mater: A rescue plan for America’s public universities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 43 Gaston, P. L. (2010). *The challenge of Bologna: What United States higher education has to learn from Europe, and why it matters that we learn it*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- 45 Gessner, M. J., Arnold, V., & Mobley, W. H. (1999). Introduction. In W. H. Mobley, M. J. Gessner, & V. Arnold (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. ii–xviii). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

- 1 Golde, C. M., & Walker, G. E. (Eds.). (2006). *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing*
2 *stewards of the discipline – Carnegie essays on the doctorate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 3 Gregersen, H. B., Morrison, A. J., & Black, J. S. (1998). Developing leaders for the global frontier.
4 *Sloan Management Review*, 40, 21–32.
- 5 Gregory, M. (1995). Implications of the introduction of the Doctor of Education degree in British
6 universities: Can the EdD reach parts the PhD cannot? *The Vocational Aspect of Education*,
7 47(2), 177–188.
- 8 Grogan, M., (2013). *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-
9 Bass.
- 10 Haber-Curran, P., & Tillapaugh, D. W. (2015). Student-centered transformative learning in
11 leadership education: An examination of the teaching and learning process. *Journal of*
12 *Transformative Education*, 13(1), 65–84.
- 13 Hahn, C. (2008). *Doing qualitative research using your computer: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks,
14 CA: Sage.
- 15 Harris, P. R., Moran, R. T., & Moran, S. V. (2004). *Managing cultural differences: Global leadership*
16 *strategies for the 21st century* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Elsevier.
- 17 Higher Learning Commission. (2016). *Determining qualified faculty through HLC's criteria for accred-*
18 *itation and assumed practices: Guidelines for institutions and peer reviewers*. Retrieved from
19 http://download.hlcommission.org/FacultyGuidelines_2016_OPB.pdf
- 20 Hill, J. R., Song, L., & West, R. E. (2009). Social learning theory and web-based learning environ-
21 ments: A review of research and discussion of implications. *The American Journal of Distance*
22 *Education*, 23(2), 88–103.
- 23 Hyatt, L., & Williams, P. E. (2011). 21st century competencies for doctoral leadership faculty.
24 *Innovative Higher Education*, 36, 53–66.
- 25 Indiana Tech. (2017a). *Global leadership*, Ph.D thesis. Retrieved from [http://catalog.indianatech.edu/](http://catalog.indianatech.edu/preview_degree_planner.php?catoid=2&pooid=222&returnto=78)
26 [preview_degree_planner.php?catoid=2&pooid=222&returnto=78](http://catalog.indianatech.edu/preview_degree_planner.php?catoid=2&pooid=222&returnto=78)
- 27 Indiana Tech. (2017b). University registrar. Retrieved from [http://catalog.indianatech.edu/content.](http://catalog.indianatech.edu/content.php?catoid=4&navoid=158)
28 [php?catoid=4&navoid=158](http://catalog.indianatech.edu/content.php?catoid=4&navoid=158)
- 29 King, D. A. (2004). The scientific impact of nations. *Nature*, 430(6997), 311.
- 30 Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learn-
31 ing in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4, 193–212.
- 32 Krishnan, A. (2009). *What are academic disciplines? Some observations on the disciplinarity vs. inter-*
33 *disciplinarity debate*. National Centre for Research Methods Working Paper. Retrieved from
34 http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/7831/what_are_academic_disciplines.pdf
- 35 Larivière, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The oligopoly of academic publishers in the digital
36 era. *PLoS One*, 10(6), e0127502.
- 37 Lennard, D. (2007). A grand unified theory of interdisciplinarity. *The Chronical Review*, 53(40), 49.
- 38 Maxwell, T. W., & Shanahan, P. J. (2000). Current issues in professional doctoral education in Australia
39 and New Zealand. Paper presented at the third international conference on professional doctor-
40 ates, “Doctoral education and professional practice: the next generation?”, Armidale, 10–12
41 September 2000.
- 42 McCall, M. W., Jr., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (2002). *Developing global executives: The lessons of interna-*
43 *tional experience*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- 44 Mendenhall, M., Li, M., & Osland, J. S. (2016). Five years of global leadership research, 2010–2014:
45 Patterns, themes, and future directions. In J. S. Osland, M. Li, & M. E. Mendenhall (Eds.),
46 *Advances in global leadership* (pp. 401–415). Bingley: Emerald.
- 47 Mendenhall, M. E. (2006). The elusive, yet critical challenge of developing global leaders. *European*
48 *Management Journal*, 24(6), 422–429.
- 49 Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., Stevens, M. J., Maznevski, M. L., &
50 Stahl, G. K. (Eds.). (2018). *Global leadership: Research, practice and development* (3rd ed.).
51 New York, NY: Routledge.
- 52 Mendenhall, M. E., Reiche, B. S., Bird, A., & Osland, J. S. (2012). Defining the “global” in global
53 leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47, 493–503.
- 54 Merriam, S. B. (2004). The role of cognitive development in Mezirow’s transformational learning
55 theory. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 55(1), 60–68.


- 1 Metzler, D. E., & Metzler, C. M. (2001). *Biochemistry: The chemical reactions of living cells* (2nd ed.).
San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- 3 Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (1995). *Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations*
(5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- 5 Mulvaney, P. (2015). Nanoscience vs nanotechnology: Defining the field. *ACS Nano*, 9(3),
2215–2217.
- 7 National Board of Employment, Education and Training. (1989). *Higher education courses and gradu-
ate studies*. Canberra, Australia: NBEET.
- 9 Nerad, M. (2004). The Ph.D. in the U.S.: Criticisms, facts, and remedies. *Higher Education Policy*,
17(2), 183–199.
- 11 Neumann, R. (2003). *The doctoral education experience: Diversity and complexity*. Evaluations and
Investigations Programme. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education Science and
Training.
- 13 Neumann, R. (2005). Doctoral differences: Professional doctorates and Ph.D.s compared. *Journal of
Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27(2), 173–188.
- 15 Osland, J. S. (2018a). The multidisciplinary roots of 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 ed., pp. 28–56). New York, NY:
Routledge.
- 17 Osland, J. S. (2018b). Leading global change. 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 ed., pp. 325–362). New York, NY: Routledge.
- 19 Osland, J. S. (2018c). 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 ed., pp. 57–116). New York, NY:
Routledge.
- 23 Osland, J. S., & Bird, A. (2018). Process models of global leadership development. 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 ed., pp. 179–199).
New York, NY: Routledge.
- 25 Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., Maznevski, M. L., Stevens, M., & Stahl, G. K. (Eds.). (2013).
27 *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- 29 Osland, J. S., Li, M., & Mendenhall, M. E. (Eds.). (2016). *Advances in global leadership*. Bingley:
Emerald Publishing.
- 31 Osland, J. S., Li, M., & Mendenhall, M. E. (Eds.). (2017). *Advances in global leadership*. Bingley:
Emerald Publishing.
- 33 Osland, J. S., Li, M., & Wang, Y. (Eds.). (2014). *Advances in global leadership*. Bingley: Emerald.
- 35 Parsons, T., & Platt, G. M. (1973). *The American University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
Press.
- 37 Petrick, J. A., Scherer, R. F., Brodzinski, J. D., Quinn, J. F., & Ainina, M. F. (1999). Global leader-
ship skills and reputational capital: Intangible resources for sustainable competitive advan-
tage. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13, 58–69.
- 39 Rees, M. (1972). Graduate education—A long look. In L. J. Kent & G. P. Springer (Eds.), *Graduate
education today and tomorrow* (pp. 139–151). Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico
Press.
- 41 Reiche, B. S., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M. E., & Osland, J. S. (2017). Contextualizing leadership: A
typology of global leadership roles. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(5), 552–572.
- 43 Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 45 Richardson, A. (2008). Strategies in the development of accounting history as an academic discipline.
Accounting History, 13(3), 247–280.
- Saunders, D. B., Kolek, E. A., Williams, E. A., & Wells, R. S. (2016). Who is shaping the field?
Doctoral education, knowledge creation and postsecondary education research in the United
States. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 35(5), 1039–1052.
- Shanahan, P. J. (1996). Professional doctorates other than the doctor of education in Australian uni-
versities: Some comparative data. In T. W. Maxwell & P. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Which way for*

- 1 professional doctorates: *Context and cases*. Proceedings of “Which way for professional doctorates” conference.
- 3 Simpson, J. A., Weiner, E. S. C., & Oxford University Press. (1989). *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 5 Sowcik, M. (2011). *The emergent and sustainable nature of leadership studies*. Spokane, WA: Gonzaga University.
- 7 Stefani, L. (2011). *Evaluating the effectiveness of academic development: Principles and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- 9 Stevens-Long, J., Schapiro, S. A., & McClintock, C. (2012). Passionate scholars: Transformative learning in doctoral education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 62(2), 180–198.
- 11 Storr, R. J. (1969). *The beginning of graduate education in America*. New York, NY: New York Press. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (n.d.). *About Carnegie Classification*. Retrieved from <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/2010/>
- 13 Tolstikov-Mast, Y. (2016). Global followership: The launch of the scholarly journey. In J. S. Osland, M. Li, & M. E. Mendenhall (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 9, pp. 109–150). Bingley: Emerald.
- 15 Turner, B. (2001). Discipline. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 23, 183–186.
- 17 Voorhees, R. A. (2001). Competency-based learning models: A necessary future. *New Directions for Institutional Research* (110), 5–13. **AU:6**
- 19 Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 21 Whitaker, B. (2016). *An analysis of the academic disciplinary development of global leadership education*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest (10248575). **AU:7**
- 23 White, W. M., & Hitt, F. J. (2009). Expanding leadership as a discipline. In S. Chen (Ed.), *Academic administration: A quest for better management and leadership in higher education*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- 25 Wright, M., Filatotchev, I., Hoskisson, R. E., & Peng, M. W. (2005). Strategy research in emerging economies: Challenging the conventional wisdom. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(1), 1–33.
- 27 Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

31 UNCITED REFERENCES

- 33 Creswell (2008), Mulvaney (2015), and Osland et al. (2013). **AU:3**
- 35
- 37
- 39
- 41
- 43
- 45

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

	Book: AGL-V011-3611725	Please e-mail or fax your responses and any corrections to:
	Chapter: CH011	

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions may have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list.

Disk use

Sometimes we are unable to process the electronic file of your article and/or artwork. If this is the case, we have proceeded by:

- Scanning (parts of) your article Rekeying (parts of) your article
 Scanning the artwork

Bibliography

If discrepancies were noted between the literature list and the text references, the following may apply:

- The references listed below were noted in the text but appear to be missing from your literature list. Please complete the list or remove the references from the text.**
- UNCITED REFERENCES: This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please position each reference in the text or delete it. Any reference not dealt with will be retained in this section.**

Queries and/or remarks

Location in Article	Query / remark	Response
AU:1	Please note that the author name ordering in the TOC and Chapter opening page differs from that given in the Runsheet. Kindly check and update	
AU:2	References "Abbott, 2001; Shulman, 2010" has not been provided in the list. Please provide the reference details.	
AU:3	Please check the uncited references Creswell (2008), Mulvaney (2015), Osland et al. (2013) and cite them appropriately in the text.	
AU:4	Please provide the complete editor names for Brown, L. D. (1985).	

AU:5	Please provide two more keywords to meet the book style requirement.	
AU:6	Please provide the volume number for Voorhees, R. A. (2001).	
AU:7	Please provide the retrieval address for "Whitaker, B. (2016)".	