JCAPS

A HOLISTIC AND INCLUSIVE MODEL FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICES: INTERCULTURAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Stephanie Calley, Biola University

International Student Services (ISS) offices have before them an opportunity to strategically cultivate the global leaders of the future. Yet, to cultivate global leaders, a change in structure, posture, and constituency is needed. Moving beyond providing compliance and transitional services, International Student Services offices can engage as co-educators through developing their constituency with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed of future global leaders. Moreover, with this change in posture, ISS offices can play a strategic role in bridging the divide between diverse others, assisting faculty, staff, and students in becoming more interculturally engaged. Towards that end, an ISS office at a faith-based, liberal arts university in Southern California instituted a holistic and inclusive developmental model based on the high-impact intercultural practices noted in the literature. This article outlines the changes the university instituted in structure, posture, and constituency, seeking to move from the marginalization to the development of international students through an Intercultural Leadership Development Program.

Within the realm of International Student Services, various models are employed to ensure compliance and retention of international students. Moreover, some Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) desire to provide compliance and retention and give opportunities to celebrate the cultures of international students through various co-curricular activities on and off-campus. Such celebrations may provide international students with opportunities to share aspects of their cultural backgrounds with other constituents at the HEIs. Yet, as HEIs pursue the goal of cultivating the global citizenship of all their constituents, International Student Services offices are often underutilized. In our age of prolific globalization, where all learners need to be engaged in intercultural learning for a myriad of reasons, the role of ISS offices should be re-examined. Rather than just compliance, retention, and basic cultural awareness, strategic cultivation of intercultural understanding, sensitivity, and competence should be embedded into the outcomes of such departments. This begs the question: What would it look like if International Student Services offices intentionally sought to cultivate their constituents towards becoming global citizens, the global leaders of the future generations?

Moreover, what if International Student Services offices were more inclusive in the services and programs to include not only traditional international students, but other students who have grown up internationally, such as children of internationally military parents, business parents, religious workers, and diplomats? Finally, what if programs provided by International Student Services offices were considered co-curricular diversity initiates aimed at bridging the divide between international and domestic, with a focus on an intersectionality of identities, rather than an identity based on nationality? Seeing the value of providing not only services, but also developmental programming for such students, a private, faith-based institution in Southern California did just that, and with transformational opportunities for students. Thus, this scholarship-to-practice article will provide the rationale for such a transformation of the ISS office, including the structure, posture, and constituency. Administrators and staff can utilize this case study for background information on Internationalization and how to incorporate Leadership Development Programs for their constituents.

MOVING TO INCLUSIVITY:
FROM INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS TO GLOBAL STUDENTS

First, I will address how International Student Services offices can move towards inclusivity in their constituency. Definitions of sub-groups of students will be considered, as well as some of the typical postures HEIs have towards these sub-groups.

International Students

International students are those who are attending a U.S. institution on a student or scholar visa. Historically, there has been a myriad of motivations for HEIs to recruit and retain international students. Yet, since 2008, the motivation to increase enrollment of international students on many U.S. higher education campuses is due to the need for tuition dollars, rather than in cultivating global awareness or global citizenship (Andrade, 2009; Collier, 2015; Killick, 2015; Slaughter & Cantewell, 2012). With a motivation focused on financial security, many HEIs have limited the diversity of the international students they admit, focusing on global partnerships that guarantee students from one nation or region. Thus, this motivation for financial security is juxtaposed to a posture of internationalization that would seek to intentionally diversify the student body, providing an opportunity for robust intercultural learning.

International Student Services offices are required by Federal Law to provide visa-compliance and transitional services to international students. Yet, few universities provide the necessary resources international students may need to flourish throughout their many years at the university, focusing on assisting students in orientation to the university and compliance within their visa status only (Andrade, 2009; Killick, 2015; Marginson, 2012). Thus, while the promotion of cultivating global citizens is still in full force amongst many universities, international students are often neglected (American Council on Education, 2015). Such a posture is not only unethical, but it is also missing the goal of the university in encouraging the global citizenship of their constituents, both domestic and international (Andrade, 2009; Killick, 2016; Marginson, 2012).

Moreover, rather than viewing international students as an asset to the university in terms of cultural exchange and global learning, many international students are treated as second class citizens at their host universities, either siloed into monocultural groups or encouraged to assimilate to the majority culture (Andrade, 2009; Brewer & Leask, 2012; Marginson, 2012; Montgomery, 2010). Furthering this neo-colonial othering, the utilization of the essentialist label of "international student" produces in-group/out-group distinctions based on one level of identity, visa status, rather than through a lens of multiplicity in their self-determined role and social identities (Dervin, 2016; Holliday, 2010; Koehne, 2005; Leask, 2015). Finally, often international students are spoken of with deficit language as having issues to be solved, such as limited language proficiency and cultural ways of interacting that are not appropriate (Evans, Carlin, & Potts, 2009; Marginson, 2012). Thus, as HEI's seek to develop their constituency with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed of future global leaders, the motivation for recruiting international students and their treatment as second-class citizens need to be transformed.

U.S. Global Students

Another key group of overlooked constituents is U.S. citizens with an international upbringing (Appel-Schumacher, 2015; La Brack, 2011). In a globalized world, many students coming to U.S. HEIs from international locations are not only international students on a visa. Such students include U.S. passport holders who spent a significant portion of their developmental years in international settings. These globally-mobile students include children of international religious missionaries, diplomats, military personnel, and business parents (Hayden, 2006; Van Reeken, 2011). Moreover, these students may include resident aliens, refugees, and international adoptees who have also spent most of their development years outside the United States (Van Reeken, 2011). Previously employed terminology for this group of students, such as third culture kids (TCK) or global nomads (GN), is too static and essentialist to represent these students whose social identities have been constructed by numerous factors in a globalized world (Hayden, 2006; Pearce, 2007; Rooney, 2018). Such terminology was

utilized out of a stagnant othering rather than an asset-based hybridity or fluidity of identities (Bauman, 2004; Rooney, 2018). Seeking to find a term that would be more inclusive of such students, Van Reeken (2011) utilized the term Cross-Cultural Kid (CCK). According to Van Reeken (2011), a CCK is a "person who is living in—or meaningfully interacting with—two or more cultural environments for a significant period of time during the developmental years of childhood" (p. 33). Although such a term is more inclusive, it also extends to children of minority groups in the United States, which is beyond the scope of this case study (Van Reeken, 2011). Thus, for this case study, the term U.S. Global Student is utilized. While the posture towards U.S. Global Students varies from university to university, typically, there are very few resources and services provided for their flourishing, leaving these students to decide if they will assimilate to the majority or identity with a specific cultural group (La Brack, 2011; Van Reeken, 2011). Yet, as with traditional international students, U.S. Global Students can be an asset to the university in terms of cultural exchange and global learning (La Brack, 2011; Van Reeken, 2011). HEI's need to recognize this sub-group of students and provide services and developmental opportunities for them, demonstrating their mattering.

Global Students

Moving away from essentialist labeling of international students, third culture kids, and global nomads, the administrators at the university at hand utilized the term Global Student to represent all students who have spent a significant portion of their developmental years outside of the United States before attending the university. Although there are many differences between what would traditionally be labeled international students, third culture kids, and global nomads, there are many similarities in the groups regarding the multiplicity of identities they must negotiate (linguistic, ethnicities, socio-economic, etc.) due to having been influenced in pluralistic environments such as international educational institutions. Moreover, these groups of students are not mutually exclusive. Many international students are also third culture kids or global nomads as well. Thus, the term Global Student is more inclusive of all students who have spent a significant portion of their developmental years outside the country of higher education. It is recognized that such a label of Global Students could be unwelcome by some. The goal here is to break down the wall between the essentialist notion of the international student other and U.S. passport holder whose development years were also spent outside of the United States. The goal is also to provide a sense of belonging and mattering to all Global Students, many of whom experience cultural dissonance engaging at their HEIs and have to negotiate their multiple identities in emerging adulthood.

Thus, by considering all types of Global Students, instead of just focusing on international students, HEIs would demonstrate their mattering. It also could increase the prospect for global contact on campus. Such an environment of inclusion of the many diverse students in higher education could empower global citizens who are engaged in advocating for transformation throughout the world (Killick, 2015). Proponents of such extensive contact note that it provides individuals increased and unprecedented opportunities for negotiation of identities, perspective-taking, and cultural humility, which could influence the promotion of counter-hegemony and democratization of societies (Killick, 2015). For the case study at hand, when the International Student Services office changed its posture towards these students and included all students who spent a portion of their developmental years outside the country, the number of students involved doubled. Moreover, a more diverse group of students involved in programming provided more opportunities for students to negotiate their values and sense of self as they navigated more cultural differences.

CHANGING POSTURE AND STRUCTURE: CULTIVATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

Now that I have considered the importance of the inclusivity of all Global Students, I will address the changes in posture and structure necessary for the strategic development of Global Students. Understanding the importance of educating all students to engage in a globalized world, many HEIs have taken systematic measures towards cultivating global citizens by realigning missional values and goals of the university, as well as the curricular and the co-curricular learning outcomes (Altbach, et al., 2012; Brewer & Leask, 2012; Knight, 2012; Leask, 2015). This phenomenon is known as the Internationalization of the university. Knight (2003) synthesized the many definitions of the Internationalization of HEIs as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural,

or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education" (p. 2). Through their internationalization, many HEIs seek to provide opportunities for the cultivation of intercultural relationships and the negotiation of ideas and identities in hopes that their constituents develop global mindsets and develop into global citizens (Andrade, 2009; Killick, 2015; Leask, 2015), or what some philosophers and sociologists have termed cosmopolitans (Holliday, 2010; Appiah, 2006). Oxfam described global citizens as those who are "aware of and understands the wider world - and their place it. They take an active role in their community, and work with others to make our planet more equal, fair and sustainable" (https://www.oxfam.org.uk). Thus, global citizens are any persons who are aware of themselves in the context of their role in the world (Killick, 2015; Leask, 2015; Schattle, 2007). Schattle (2007) clarified that being a global citizen begins with awareness of the multiplicity of identities and how those relate to others.

Regarding relating to diverse others, Paracka and Pynn (2017) stated, "Global citizens are flexible, inclusive and adaptive in orientation. They develop cognitive, affective, and behavioral flexibility to shift frames of reference according to the specific and unique cultural context in which they find themselves" (p. 47). Thus, global citizens display the skills, knowledge, and attitudes appropriate to specific cultural contexts. Yet, global citizens are not born; they are cultivated through diverse life experiences and training (Killick, 2015; Schattle, 2007).

Internationalization of the Curriculum

How global citizens are cultivated at HEIs is implicitly and explicitly connected to the internationalization of the curriculum (IoC). The goal of IoC is to "engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity and purposefully develop their international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens" (Leask, 2009, p. 209). In the recent past, HEIs considered the presence of diverse persons with global perspectives, such as international students, to be sufficient for this task (Leask, 2015). Empirical research into the impact of frequency of the interaction between domestic students and international students indicated growth in intercultural maturity for domestic students who engaged in conversation with their international peers (Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2013; Soria & Troisi, 2013). Yet, despite the resource of diverse persons and their viewpoints in cultivating a global perspective amongst students, more systematic implementation of diverse perspectives across the curriculum is necessary to impact all students (Leask, 2015; American Council of Education, 2017). Thus, the internationalization of the curriculum incorporates "international, intercultural, or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study" (Leask, 2015, p. 9).

Apparent in the definition and goals of IoC are implications for both the formal and informal curriculum (American Council of Education, 2015; Leask, 2015). In the arena of the formal curriculum, learning outcomes, the organization of learning activities, and assessment are essential to correlate (Leask, 2015). One strategy is to challenge dominant paradigms by infusing emerging or non-dominant perspectives through methodological choices in readings and activities (Leask, 2015). In the classroom, educators can utilize pedagogical strategies for increased contact between diverse others (Gregersen-Hermans, 2017). Gregersen-Hermans (2017) described this process, stating, "the curriculum has to include a series of pedagogical interventions that stimulate students to intentionally reflect on their and others' values and beliefs and the experience of engaging with culturally different others" (p. 76). To implement such strategies, assessments can be utilized from what has already been developed in the realm of intercultural competence or can be developed according to course needs (Leask, 2015; Gregersen-Hermans, 2017). On a developmental level, assessments such as the Intercultural Maturity Model serve as a holistic measure of students' growth in interpersonal, intrapersonal, and cognitive domains (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Also, to standardize outcomes and assessments across the nation, the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) implemented an Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric (2009) as well as a Global Learning Value rubric (2014), stemming from Bennett's (1986) and Deardorff's (2009) I.C. frameworks.

Internationalization of the formal curriculum strategically correlates learning outcomes on a university, program, and course levels. Yet, the formal curriculum also needs to be supported by the informal curriculum in a holistic manner (American Council of Education, 2015; Leask, 2015; Roberts, 2015). The informal, or co-cur-

ricular, aspects of U.S. universities include Student Affairs Divisions, Career Centers, Learning Centers, Writing Centers, and various Diversity Centers. Thus, concepts of learning outcomes, teaching interventions, and assessment can be implemented in these co-curricular domains, assisting in the strategic internationalization of the university at home (American Council of Education, 2015; Leask, 2015; Roberts, 2015). Of these areas of co-curricular support, International Student Services can play a major role by developing Global Students holistically. More specifically, this can be done by implementing Intercultural Leadership Development Programs that impact the Global Student body and provide cultural awareness to the greater university community. To understand the importance of leadership development programs in cultivating global citizens, I will provide a brief overview of their connections.

Co-Curricular Leadership Development Programs

Concurrent to the movement to internationalize the university, Student Affairs divisions have been concerned with the lack of ethical leaders who make decisions for the good of all humanity (Astin, 1993; Astin, 1996). Understanding how crucial the emerging adult years are in cultivating the skills, abilities, and knowledge needed to become ethical leaders, Student Affairs professionals sought to encourage global citizenship through the implementation of both curricular and co-curricular leadership programs (Astin, 1993; Astin, 1996; Astin & Astin, 2000; Bounous-Hammarth, 2001; Komives, et al., 2013). Subsequently, socially responsible leadership was recognized by the AAC&U (2012) as a key learning outcome for undergraduate students.

Though varying in curriculum, there are three basic categorizations for leadership programs: training, education, and development (Roberts & Ullom, 1989). To distinguish between these categorizations, Dugan, et al. (2011) provided this concise summary:

> *Training experiences* enhance student performance in leadership roles through an emphasis on skill building in areas such as conflict management, delegation, and effective communication. *Educational experiences* extend learning beyond functional training to improve students' leadership knowledge, capacities, and the transferability of these across a variety of contexts. *Developmental experiences* offer holistic approaches to student leadership learning characterized by an increasing complexity of self-understanding in diverse group contexts. These experiences offer opportunities for the refinement and internalization of core beliefs related to leadership as well as the exploration of complex issues. (p. 67)

Thus, there is a range of leadership program styles with various goals utilized by HEIs (Faris & Outcalt, 2001). According to Glass, Wongtrirat, and Buus (2015), "Leadership programs create social contexts that bridge students' social networks and forge the connections between otherwise distantly connected people" (p. 40). In their research, Dugan & Komives (2010) found that students who engaged in socio-cultural conversations with peers grew in their ability to engage in leadership. It was noted that conversations across a myriad of differences, more than just contact, developed participants. According to Dugan & Komives (2010), "These conversations may provide a platform for the development of listening skills, clarification of personal values and perspectives, and social perspective-taking" (p. 539). Moreover, the role of conversation with faculty in increasing ability to engage in leadership was noted (Dugan & Komives, 2010). Through the findings of their study, Dugan, et al. (2011) concluded that the complex content of the leadership program, including high impact curriculum and developmental experiences, was more impactful than the type or length of a leadership program. Finally, of co-curricular activities on campuses, leadership programs have the highest participation rate amongst both domestic and international students (Glass, et al., 2015).

From Providing Services to Developmental Programming

In light of the importance of the internationalization of the co-curriculum, including leadership development programs to augment intercultural learning, administrators should move beyond merely providing visa compliance and transitional services to Global Students. Taking a more holistic and inclusive approach to developing Global Students would mean that administrators would provide co-curricular developmental programming in

addition to services. Such programming should be utilized to encourage growth in self-awareness and others' awareness and intercultural skills, such as communication and conflict resolution. Programming could also provide opportunities to engage with diverse others in a team setting, modeling future engagement in a globalized world. Such programming should challenge explicit and implicit biases, as well as cultural chauvinism. These notions are often recognized as barriers to intercultural engagement in domestic diversity but are rarely discussed amongst Global Student populations. There is a naïve perception that Global Students are interculturally mature due to growing up in international environments. Yet, international living does not equate to intercultural sensitivity and understanding, which is cultivated through intentional engagement and dialogue with diverse others. Also, while Global Students may often be the targets of both micro and macro aggression at HEIs, they can also be perpetrators. Thus, providing opportunities for Global Students to become more culturally self-aware and others aware, rather than just celebrating culture, would be beneficial to their holistic development. In essence, providing such programming would be part of Global Students' journeys towards becoming culturally competent global citizens.

INTERCULTURAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR GLOBAL STUDENTS: A MODEL

With the foundation of empirical research into the impact of participation of leadership programs on their constituents, administrators at the aforementioned university developed, instituted, and assessed an Intercultural Leadership Development Program for Global Students. In the following, I will outline the specific changes made in the structure, posture, and constituency as a case study for other administrators to consider in their own program development.

Rebranding for Inclusivity

Prior to rebranding the department and instituting a new model, the International Student Services office at this particular university used a typical approach for a small to medium-sized university. For example, the International Student Services office provided transition and visa compliance services. Students were also provided with opportunities to get involved in clubs where they felt some sense of belonging- International Student Association, Chinese Student Association, etc. Although these clubs provided a sense of belonging to students, which is helpful for retention, they did not provide direct co-curricular learning, especially not intercultural learning. In a desire to provide holistic and inclusive developmental opportunities for all Global Students, the administrators at the HEI did a needs analysis with the Global Students as well as staff members. Focus groups, individual interviews, and surveys were utilized to understand to desires of the constituents. After this year-long process, administrators were able to rebrand the department as Global Student Programs and Development, demonstrating its change in constituency and focus. Also, as noted previously, it began to provide programming and developmental opportunities to any student who self-identified as Global. Prior to this change, only those on a student visa could receive support from this office. With this change in posture, the constituency doubled, and the makeup of the Global Student population was much more diverse. For example, prior to the change, the majority of the international students were from China and Indonesia. After the change, there were students from countries in Africa, South America, and Europe who felt more comfortable to take part in a more diverse group of students. For many, especially those with U.S. passports but who grew up internationally, this was their first space in which they felt they belonged at the university.

Moving from a services model to a developmental model meant that there needed to be multiple opportunities for Global Students to engage on different developmental levels. To do that, an Intercultural Leadership Development Program was established. This program served a dual purpose: to develop the participants in the program in intercultural leadership skills, and for the constituents to provide intercultural engagement opportunities to other Global Students and the entire student body. Participants in the Intercultural Leadership Development Program were Global Students in that they self-identified as one of the following: international students, children of international religious missionaries, international military personnel, international business parents, or international diplomats. Of the 400 Global Students at the specific HEI, roughly 10% participated in the

leadership program each year. To participate in the leadership program, students applied and were interviewed twice (once in a group and individually). This model was utilized to give Global Students practice engaging in an interview process, providing a model for future employment.

Team Structure

In order to provide an authentic working group experience, the Intercultural Leadership Program utilized a team structure. Each team consisted of four to eight Global Students working toward a specific goal, such as providing cultural/educational events at the university campus. Teams included: Community Groups, Community Events, Bridging Events, Music/Arts Events, and Media/Marketing. As such, each team had specific goals to meet the needs of the Global Student Community and to provide cultural awareness on campus. For example, Community Groups served as identity processing groups where students from multiple backgrounds had the opportunity to share their stories and engage with others in mutuality, openness, and respect. Community Groups also served as a point of contact for students experiencing cultural dissonance. The Community Events team provided opportunities for Global Students to connect through food and laughter, all while sharing their cultural backgrounds. The Bridging Events team provided cultural engagement opportunities to the wider student body through food, movies, and the arts on campus. Global students designed and implemented events that would bridge the cultural divides found on campus in a welcoming manner. The goal was to begin dialogue across national/ethnic lines. The Music/Art teams focused on large-scale events. Global Students were able to share their musical, dance, and arts with the wider student body. Finally, the Media and Marketing team utilized various social media platforms to share Global Students' personal narratives to combat the idea of the single story.

For each of these aforementioned teams, a student team leader was considered a "coordinator," responsible for the team's process and outcomes. The other members of the team were considered "interns." While all members of the teams received training, coordinators received personal mentorship as well. This delineation in terminology was considered helpful to many Global Students as they built their resumes for future employment and model levels of responsibility in future job placements. Applicants were placed on teams according to their strengths, as well as to increase the diversity makeup of each team to provide a robust intercultural experience. Diversity makeup included but was not limited to: passport countries, ethnicities, genders, majors, languages, Myers-Briggs typologies, strengths from Strengths Finder paradigm, ages, international experiences, and type of global student. Thus, the participants in the Intercultural Leadership Development Program experienced a microcosm of diversity. However, the mesosystem of the university was predominantly white, U.S. citizens, the participants in the leadership program were diverse. In this microcosm of diversity, participants engaged multiple times a week with team members from various nations, ethnic backgrounds, socio-economic statuses, gender identities, and personalities.

Assessment and Curriculum

As a co-curricular program, assessment was a necessary component which administrators focused on during the design and execution of the program. Thus, the following student learning outcomes were implemented and measured yearly:
- Students will demonstrate self-awareness
- Students will demonstrate awareness of diverse others
- Students will demonstrate understanding of intercultural team dynamics

Assessment of these outcomes consisted of a triangulation of direct and indirect evidence: 1) intercultural sensitivity measured by the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), 2) completion of a reflection assignment after attending an intercultural conference, and 3) a final presentation on how participation in the leadership program had impacted each participant's sense of self. In order to encourage the growth of students towards these ends, organizers of this co-curricular leadership program developed a curriculum for leaders in which they were trained throughout the academic year. The Intercultural Leadership Program utilized a curriculum built from concepts within the Relational Leadership Model, servant leadership theory, intercultural competence training,

and experiential learning theory. More specifically, the curriculum included the following:
- leadership paradigms- servant leadership, relational leadership, intercultural leadership
- intercultural competence paradigms such as the IDI,
- intercultural communication and conflict resolution styles,
- basic values training,
- implicit and explicit bias training,
- narrative training,
- social identities paradigms, and
- identities negotiation and formation.

Thus, global student leaders engaged in a scaffolded curriculum focused on intercultural leadership while simultaneously experiencing intercultural dynamics through working in a diverse team. The Intercultural Leadership Development Program's microsystem provided a diverse environment in which participants could engage. The context also had scaffolded inputs in an experiential learning environment. The participants in this program engaged on diverse teams with diverse others multiple times a week for nine months, thus providing ample opportunity to engage in an experiential learning cycle (Kolb, 2015). Participants also engaged in leadership training on specific topics every week while at the same time providing cultural awareness events on campus and reflecting on their experiences with one another. In essence, this particular leadership program was more than just an opportunity for students to learn about leadership; it was an opportunity for participants to work together towards a common goal while negotiating their sense of self. Thus, this leadership program could be considered a community of practice. There was mutual engagement amongst the participants as they had scheduled training and team meetings where they met together. Also, joint enterprise, or a common goal, was clarified by both student learning outcomes for all participants and student specified goals for specific events they executed. Finally, throughout the nine-month program, participants developed a shared repertoire as they engaged in specific leadership and identity concepts throughout training.

Benefits of Leadership Programs as Communities of Practice

While communities of practice are not inherently diverse, if they are, they can provide participants robust opportunities for self-reflection and intercultural understanding. Jackson (2014) noted, "Firsthand exposure to new communities of practice can compel individuals to reflect on and even question their behaviors, self-identities, values and beliefs" (p. 202). This holds true for participants in this research as they were compelled to reflect in their community of practice, cultivating knowledge and clarifying their sense of self. Yet, firsthand exposure to diverse others does not always determine openness to the process of negotiation with those diverse others. Regarding the importance of framing specific conditions in a community of practice with diverse others, Killick (2015) stated that "the most fundamental aspect of a successful inter-group contact situation is that it must involve acting- doing something together, not just being co-present" (p. 63). In essence, Killick (2015) emphasized the joint enterprise aspect of a community of practice as essential for individuals and groups navigating their own biases and prejudices. In accordance with previous researchers on intergroup contact, Killick (2015) asserted, "prejudicial attitudes across the groups may actually increase through contact" (p. 63). Yet, if there is mutual engagement and joint enterprise, participants can address their biases and prejudices. Killick (2015) explained, "If contact does lead to people coming to know and understand each other, then their prejudices diminish" (p. 63). Yet, such intercultural communities of practice do not just happen; they are created. Killick (2015) asserted that if participants in an intercultural community of practice are to be impacted positively, educators have a responsibility to "create the conditions of equality, create purposeful activity toward common goals, and give validity to the participation" (p. 65).

Developmental programming, more than just services, has the goal of cultivating the intercultural understanding and leadership skills of all Global Students. In this community of practice, Global Students gained self-awareness, others' awareness, and competence in intercultural teams. From pre-post assessment using the triangulation method described previously, Global Students who participated in this Intercultural Leadership Development Program grew in intercultural sensitivity and maturity as indicated by the Intercultural Develop-

ment Inventory (IDI). According to results, 70% of the Global Students who participated in the Intercultural Leadership Development Program increased their capacity to engage with diverse others with intercultural sensitivity. Even better, 72% who participated during their Sophomore and Junior years went on to be involved in other leadership roles on campus, namely, Residence Life, Student Government Association, Peer Academic Advisors, and domestic diversity programs, such as affinity groups. Thus, having been provided with a foundation for processing their own sense of self in leadership, they were launched out into other domains with knowledge, skills, and attitudes which would assist them in engaging with diverse others.

CONCLUSION

As a proposed model, Intercultural Leadership Development Programs can be utilized to cultivate the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of Global Students. Such programming is inclusive in that all Global Students could be involved and receive training in an intercultural community of practice. Also, in alignment with other co-curricular diversity initiates on campus, they would provide an opportunity for students who are often marginalized or required to assimilate to the majority culture to instead focus on asset-based identity development. It would also assist participants in understanding the intersectionality of their multiple identities rather than being classified by their national culture. Rather than just providing services to their constituents, International Student Services can cultivate their constituents towards becoming global citizens, the global leaders of future generations. Through addressing their postures, structures, and constituency, such offices can address the historical negligence of developing Global Students.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L.E. (2012). Internationalization within the higher education context. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 3-26). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

American Council on Education (2015). Internationalizing the co-curriculum part three: Internationalization and Student Affairs. Retrieved from https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Intlz-In-Action-Intlz-Co-curriculum-Part-3.pdf

American Council on Education (2015). Internationalizing the co-curriculum part one: Integrating international students. Retrieved from https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Intlz-In-Action-Intlz-Co-curriculum-Part-1.pdf

Andrade, M.S. (2009). The international student picture. In M.S. Andrade & N.W. Evans (Eds.), *International students: Strengthening a critical resource* (pp.1-24). U.K.: Rowan and Littlefield Education.

Appel-Schumacher, M. (2015). Global Nomads: A Resource Hidden in Plain Sight. *About Campus, 20*(2), 24–27.

Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers.* New York, NY: W.W. Horton and Company, Inc.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change.* Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Burns,

Astin, H. S. (1996). Leadership for social change. *About Campus, 1*(3), 4–10.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In: Paige, R. M. (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications* (pp. 27–70). New York: University Press of America

Bounous-Hammarth, M. (2001). Developing social change agents: Leadership development for the 1990s and beyond. In C. L. Outcault, S. K. Faris, & K. N. McMahon (Eds.)*, Developing non-hierarchical leadership on campus: Case studies and best practices in higher education* (pp. 34–39). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Brewer, B & Leask, B. (2012). Internationalizing the curriculum. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 245-265). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Collier, D. A. (2015, April). *Drifting toward academic capitalism: Comparing pre-to-post Great Recession trends of state appropriations operations revenue and undergraduate international student enrollment of some of America's elite public institutions.* Paper presented at the 2015 AERA National Conference, Chicago, IL.

Deardorff, D.K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3), 241-266.

Dervin, F. (2016). *Interculturality in education: A theoretical and methodological toolbox.* London, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on College Students' Capacities for Socially Responsible Leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(5), 525–549.

Dugan, J. P., Bohle, C. W., Gebhardt, M., Hofert, M., Wilk, E., & Cooney, M. A. (2011). Influences of Leadership Program Participation on Students' Capacities for Socially Responsible Leadership. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 48*(1), 65–84.

Evans, N.W., Carlin, D.B. & Potts, J.D. (2009). Adjustment issues. In M.S. Andrade & N.W. Evans (Eds.), *International students: Strengthening a critical resource* (pp.25-42). U.K.: Rowan and Littlefield Education.

Faris, S.K. & Outcalt, C.L. (2001). The emergence of inclusive, process-oriented leadership. In C. L. Outcault, S. K. Faris, & K. N. McMahon (Eds.), *Developing non-hierarchical leadership on campus: Case studies and best practices in higher education* (pp. 9-18). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Glass, C. R. (2012). Educational experiences associated with international students' learning, development, and positive perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 16,* 228–251.

Glass, C. R., Wongtrirat, R., & Buus, S. (2015). *International student engagement: Strategies for creating inclusive, connected, and purposeful campus environments.* Sterling,VA: Stylus.

Gregersen-Hermans, J. (2017). Intercultural competence development in higher education. In D. Deardorff & L. Arasaratnam-Smith (Eds.), *Intercultural competence for higher education: International approaches, assessment and application* (pp.67-82). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hayden, M. (2006). *Introduction to international education: International schools and their communities.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

Holliday, A. (2010). *Intercultural communication and ideology.* London, U.K.: SAGE Publications.

Killick, D. (2015). *Developing the global student: Higher education in an era of globalization.* New York, NY: Routledge.

King, P. M., & Magolda, M. B. B. (2005). A Developmental Model of Intercultural Maturity, *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 571–592.

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education, 33,* 2-3.

Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretive frameworks in the internationalization of higher education. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 27-42). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Koehne, N. (2005). (Re)construction: Ways international students talk about their identity, *Australian Journal of Education, (49),* 1, 104-119.

Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2013). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

La Brack, B. (2011). Domestic students or foreign? When U.S.-global nomads return "home" to college. In F. Eidse, E.N. Orr, G.H. Bell-Villada, N. Sichel (Eds.), *Writing Out of Limbo: International Childhoods, Global*

Nomads and Third Culture Kids. (pp. 313-331). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies of International Education, 13*(2), 205-221.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum.* New York, NY: Oxford.

Luo, J., & Jamieson-Drake, D. (2013). Examining the educational benefits of interacting with international students. *Journal of International Students, 3,* 85–101.

Marginson, S. (2012). International student security. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 207-221). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Montgomery, C. (2010). *Understanding the international student experience.* Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave, McMillian

Paracka, D.J. & Pynn, T. (2017). Towards transformative reciprocity: Mapping the intersectionality of interdisciplinary intercultural competence. In D. Deardorff & L. Arasaratnam-Smith (Eds.), *Intercultural competence for higher education: International approaches, assessment and application* (pp.39-49). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pearce, R. (2007). Culture and identity: Exploring individuals within groups. In M. Hayden, J. Levy, & J. Thompson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of research in international education* (pp. 128-139). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Roberts, D., & Ullom, C. (1989). Student leadership program model. *NASPA Journal, 27,* 67–74.

Roberts, D.C. (2016). Transitions and transformations in leadership. In S.R. Komives & W. Wagner (Eds.), *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development* (pp. 5-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

Rooney, M. (2018, Winter/Spring). Please don't call them TCKs. *I.S.: International School:* John Catt Educational Ltd.

Schattle, H. (2007). *The Practices of Global Citizenship.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Slaughter, S. & Cantewell, B. (2012). Transatlantic moves to the market: The United States and the European Union, *Higher Education, 63,* 583-606.

Soria, K. M., & Troisi, J. (2013). Internationalization at home alternatives to study abroad: Implications for students' development of global, international, and intercultural competencies. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18,* 261–280.

Van Reeken R.E. (2011). Cross-cultural kids: The new prototype. In F. Eidse, E.N. Orr, G.H. Bell-Villada, N. Sichel (Eds.), *Writing Out of Limbo: International Childhoods, Global Nomads and Third Culture Kids* (pp. 25-44). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK : Cambridge Scholars Publishing.