

# Mapping Internationalization of Curriculum onto School Psychology and Related Fields: A Systematic Review of Literature

Sanfeng Miao\*, Sanzhar Baizhanov, Courtney A Barrett

*Michigan State University, USA*

\*Corresponding author: Sanfeng Miao Email: [miaosanf@msu.edu](mailto:miaosanf@msu.edu)  
Address: 620 Farm Lane, Michigan State University, MI, 48824, USA

---

## Abstract

*This article presents a systematic review of 12 empirical studies examining internationalization of curriculum (IoC) in the fields of school psychology, counseling psychology, counselor education, and organizational psychology. Situated in the historical, sociopolitical context of the disciplines, we synthesized the purposes, strategies, and challenges of internationalization of curriculum in these fields. We argue that professional preparation programs, such as school psychology and related fields, provide a promising context to understand the complex nature of IoC through a disciplinary lens. The article raises concerns over the Western-centric and neoliberal approach to internationalization and emphasizes the need to consider disciplinary characteristics in all facets of the IoC process. The article contributes to the conversations on IoC by encouraging the field to think beyond what has been done and what is possible when it comes to curriculum internationalization across disciplines.*

Keywords: internationalization of curriculum, internationalization of the disciplines, school psychology and related fields, systematic literature review, critical perspectives

---

## Introduction

Internationalization is most often understood as the ways in which colleges and universities respond to globalization processes by engaging in binational and multinational relationships with individuals and organizations from other countries (Altbach, 2004; Knight, 2012). Internationalization had originally been conceived as a strategy driving institutions and, ostensibly, their top leadership. More recent theorization, such as the comprehensive internationalization framework, has understood internationalization as both a top-down and a bottom-up process (Hudzik, 2015; Hudzik & Stohl, 2012). International mobility, one of the most widely adopted approaches to internationalization, is criticized for being less accessible and inclusive (Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018). Defined as “the incorporation of international, intercultural and 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), curriculum internationalization is core to higher education

institutions' internationalization efforts due to its focus on both the domestic learning environment and international mobility.

There is no one size fits all approach to internationalization of curriculum across academic disciplines and programs (Leask, 2015; Green & Whitsed, 2012). Disciplinary and programmatic differences go beyond the content of the subjects, as disciplines are central to “ways of knowing, teaching, learning, and assessing to curriculum development” (Green & Whitsed, 2012, p. 156). Professional preparation programs, in particular, offer a unique opportunity to understand the interaction between the historical, sociopolitical, and structural context of a discipline, and the goals, values, and strategies of IoC. Professional preparation programs have a primary purpose of training students to gain entry into a specific occupational field (Stark, 1998). Internationalization of curriculum of these fields may be particularly important as they are training frontline professionals to work with individuals who have been directly influenced by globalization (e.g., international, immigrant, and refugee youth).

While international mobility continues to be the mainstream approach to internationalization, scholars have proposed various terms such as Comprehensive Internationalization (CI) (ACE, n.d.), campus internationalization (Paige, 2005), Internationalization at Home (IoH) (Beelen & Jones, 2015; Leask, 2015), and IoC to capture more inclusive and accessible means to internationalization that take people who cannot travel abroad into consideration. Among these terms, IaH and IoC are frequently used when one specifically examines the implications of disciplines because of their emphasis on the learning environments (e.g. Shahjahan et al., 2023; Kefala & Rönnerberg, 2023; Zadavec & Kočar, 2023; Bulnes & Louw, 2022). While some claim that the boundaries between IaH and IoC have increasingly blurred (Jones, 2013), IoC differs from IaH, a form of internationalization of the curriculum that centers the domestic learning environment (Beelen & Jones, 2015; Leask, 2015) because it encompasses both mobility and the curriculum in the domestic learning setting.

It is important to note that curriculum is broader than the content of a course. Fraser and Bosanquet (2006) suggested that curriculum is not only the structure and content of a subject area or program of study, but also the student learning experience and dynamic, interactive process of teaching and learning. Indeed, IoC has its unique emphasis on both processes or activities and student outcomes, aims, or other indicators of quality. The process attends to both the structure and content of the subject area or program of study and pedagogy, teaching, and student learning (Brandenburg & De Wit, 2011; Green & Whitsed, 2013). What adds to the complexity is that the process of internationalization is not value-neutral and may have harmful consequences (Stein et al., 2019). For instance, internationalization often reproduces the geopolitical hegemony of the Global North (Larkin, 2015). Additionally, in their rush for revenues and other international opportunities in the global economy, higher education institutions frequently fail to create culturally responsive learning environments for international students and scholars (Yao & George Mwangi, 2022). In the case of IoC specifically, the process of internationalization may consolidate the Western-hegemony by only incorporating superficial and tokenistic components of non-Western knowledge into the existing curricular (Stein, 2017).

In this literature review, we highlighted one subset of professional preparation programs, school psychology and related disciplines such as psychology, school counseling, counselor education, and organizational psychology, to understand how IoC is conceptualized and actualized within the disciplines. These disciplines have historical, theoretical, and practical overlap. The disciplines of psychology and counseling are considered “helping professions,” as their primary goal is to work with other individuals (e.g., clients, students) to support their well-being. Organizational psychology also has significant overlap with school psychology, with their common emphasis on institutional structures and systems, and the impact of those structures on individual functioning. The overlapping foci of these disciplines have resulted in some common elements in their training programs, including common theories covered (e.g., theories of mental health, theories of organizational functioning), research paradigms, and perspectives (e.g., values, worldviews). This study has conceptual significance for understanding IoC, as well as practical significance for understanding how practitioners working directly with youth affected by globalization have been trained. IoC may manifest differently across fields, as the sociopolitical and historical context of each field varies. For example, public education in the U.S. has a long history of colonialism, segregation, and inequality and school psychology, specifically, has played a critical role in the equitable access to education for students with disabilities (Fagan & Wise, 2000). These contexts may influence how IoC plays out in higher education settings. However, considerations about disciplines, particularly how the characteristics of professional preparation programs influence the process of curriculum internationalization, has been under-studied (Bulnes & de Louw, 2022; Shahjahan et al., 2023).

Practically, one of the primary goals of school psychology is to more effectively prepare future school psychologists to serve students impacted by globalization (e.g., non-native English speakers, students of color) who experience disproportionately poorer academic, social-emotional, and behavioral outcomes compared to their White counterparts

(Redding, 2019; Skiba et al., 2011). Meanwhile, disciplinary associations, accrediting bodies, and other professional organizations play an increasingly important role in defining field-specific international content and student learning outcomes (ACE, n.d.). Thus, it is important to understand how internationalization of the school psychology curriculum has manifested to prepare educators to interact with youth most affected by globalization. With that said, we reviewed and synthesized the literature to better understand the purpose, strategies, and challenges of IoC among school psychology and related fields (e.g., school counseling, counselor education, and organizational psychology), given their overlapping foci described earlier that may influence the IoC process. Thus, we aim to shed light on the characteristics of disciplines and their implications for IoC. We answered the following research questions:

1. What are the main characteristics of the internationalization of curriculum process in school psychology and related fields?
2. What are the scholarly and practical implications for IoC in school psychology and related fields?

## **Literature Review**

### **Internationalization of Curriculum**

Much of the internationalization literature in psychology broadly emerged from the sub-discipline of counseling psychology. Counseling psychology, as a discipline and corresponding graduate curriculum, originated in the United States (Alsoqaih et al., 2017). After World War II, as a part of the Marshall Plan in the 1950s, counseling psychology found its way to other regions of the world as a one-way exportation of psychological knowledge from the developed countries to developing countries in Asia, Africa, and South America (Coker & Majuta, 2015; Ilhan et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2013). Internationalization of school psychology, counseling psychology, and other related programs included ideologies of individualism, rationality, and empiricism that corresponded to North American values. Begeny et al. (2018), for example, reviewed literature discussing internationalization in school and educational psychology across geographical regions and found that the overall scholarship predominantly featured participants living in, and authors working in, North America or Western Europe. While there is a growing body of literature examining internationalization in school psychology and related fields, there is a lack of attention specifically paid to the development of curriculum (Bulnes & de Louw, 2022; Shahjahan et al., 2023). It remains unknown how IoC is conceptualized and actualized in these fields, nor how disciplinary and programmatic considerations inform curriculum development. This gap in understanding drove our literature review.

### **Curriculum in School Psychology and Related Programs**

Higher education professional preparation programs, such as school psychology and school counseling, seek accreditation from professional organizations to ensure their curricula are aligned with the entry-level requirements outlined by licensing bodies (Kratochwill & Shernoff, 2004). These entry-level requirements are country-specific, given that accrediting bodies exist within national regulation and legislation. In the U.S., these licensing bodies include state departments of education and state licensing bureaus that regulate the qualifications of professionals to protect the public whom they serve. These accreditation requirements might be considered institutionalized “blockers” (Leask, 2011), preventing strong IoC practices beyond individuals or specific institutions.

School psychologists and other school-based specialists are uniquely positioned to influence the lives of the many students coming from a broad range of racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. Professional preparation in these programs occurs at the graduate-level with several licensing bodies serving as the gatekeepers for entry into the occupation. For school psychology programs in the U.S., these accrediting bodies include the American Psychological Association and the National Association of School Psychologists. Curriculum in school psychology and other professional preparation programs must consider these requirements in order for the goals of professional preparation to be realized (Ysseldyke et al., 1997; Tilly, 2008).

Additionally, from its inception as a disciplinary field around 1900 (Fagan, 1992), school psychology and related fields (e.g., organizational psychology) have embraced an underlying positivist paradigm (Lather, 2006; Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995) perpetuated by U.S. legislation and the sociopolitical context. A positivist paradigm is based in the assumption that a “single tangible reality exists—one that can be understood, identified, and measured” (Park et al., 2020, p. 691). For example, school psychology training and practice in the U.S. is largely influenced by Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015) and Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA, 2004), which both require that the programs, interventions, and supports that school psychologists implement are supported by empirical studies, such as randomized controlled trials. These federal laws influence all related fields that practice within the context of public education (e.g.,

school counseling, school social work, special education) and other subdisciplines within psychology have been influenced by the same sociopolitical influences of the U.S. Not only does this legislation implicitly communicate an underlying positivist assumption, but school psychology graduate programs also focus on advanced training in quantitative methods in order to access or understand the evidence upon which effective practices are identified (American Psychological Association, 2018). It is currently unclear how disciplines geared towards preparing professionals for entry into an occupation with a positivist predisposition engage with IoC which may embrace different epistemological assumptions.

## **Research Methodology**

### **Search Strategy**

We conducted a quantitative systematic review, because the goals of our study aligned with the goals of systematic reviews described by Munn et al. (2018). These goals include confirming current strategies and identifying new strategies related to IoC of school psychology and related fields, investigating conflicting contexts surrounding the operationalization of IoC of school psychology and related fields, and informing areas for future research. This study adheres to the guidelines described in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (Page et al., 2020). Eligible studies were identified by searching ERIC and Scopus for articles. Search terms included internationaliz(s)ation OR internationaliz(s)ation of the curriculum OR internationaliz(s)ation of teaching and learning AND school psychology OR school counseling OR school social work OR counseling psychology OR clinical psychology OR special education.

In order for studies to be included, they needed to be (1) published in a peer-reviewed journal, between 1990 and 2021 (2) published in English, (3) included participants or programming in school psychology training or a related field (i.e., graduate programs in school counseling, school social work, counseling psychology, clinical psychology, industrial-organizational psychology, teacher preparation, or special education or undergraduate psychology programs), (4) included discussion of the curriculum, as defined as the program of study, students' experience of learning, or the interactive process of teaching and learning, and (5) collected empirical data using a variety of methodologies to describe strategies for internationalization of the curriculum. Studies were excluded if they (1) were published in non-peer-reviewed sources, such as book chapters or trade magazines, (2) were conducted in an unrelated field (e.g., business, nursing), (3) were conceptual in nature and did not include empirical data, or (4) did not discuss the curriculum (e.g., only described the conceptual definition of or rationale for internationalization).

Our inclusion and exclusion criteria were based on our research questions, the scope of study, our definition of curriculum, our language capacities, and our access to research data base. We decided to examine only empirical research because we were mainly curious about the operationalization of IoC in the fields of interest. Initially, our literature search was not constrained to literature exclusively centered on the U.S. However, we observed that the majority of the search results were primarily oriented towards the U.S. context. We recognize that IoC is a global phenomenon. However, given our roles as scholars based in the U.S., familiarity with the U.S. laws and regulations that influence the curriculum of school psychology and related fields within the U.S., we made a deliberate decision to limit the geographical scope of our study to the U.S.

### **Analysis of Literature**

The process of literature analysis was informed by the conceptual lens of geopolitics of knowledge (Mignolo, 2005), which recognizes that the dynamics of knowledge production and dissemination is under the influence of frameworks of colonial/decoloniality and post-coloniality (Shahjahan & Morgan, 2016). We used content analysis as a method, which is a flexible approach widely used for analyzing text data (Cavanagh, 1997). We followed Hsieh and Shannon's (2005) conventional content analysis approach to analyze our literature. After identifying articles that met inclusionary criteria, studies were first summarized based on their primary characteristics, including sample description and research context (e.g., study location), primary research questions, overarching research methodology, and primary results. Then, studies were qualitatively analyzed using an iterative process by all three authors. No automated tools were used (e.g., Rayyan) to ensure we had in-depth interaction with and understanding of the literature. First, each of the authors read three randomly selected articles meeting inclusionary criteria in order to identify other study characteristics of interest. We compared and identified several characteristics of the literature including assumptions of the study, theoretical framework, purported benefit or purpose of internationalization of curriculum, rationale or the context in which internationalization of curriculum emerged, and level of internationalization. Then, the three authors evenly divided the articles and highlighted the words and

phrases from the text that appeared to capture key ideas and concepts, which derived codes (Morgan, 1993; Morse & Field, 1995). Initial codes that were taken out of the texts included global citizenship development (Bhat & McMahon, 2016), graduates' employability (Griffith et al., 2012), intercultural competencies development (Hurley et al., 2013) financial support (Ng et al., 2012), faculty engagement (Nash et al., 2011), faculty competencies (Lau & Ng, 2012), study abroad (Bikos et al., 2013), and time commitment. Then, all three authors reviewed all the initial codes and independently identified axial or superordinate codes. Finally, the three authors discussed each of the axial codes until consensus was reached on the final categories of findings emerging from the literature: purpose of internationalization of curriculum, strategies for internationalization of curriculum, and challenges of internationalization of curriculum. We purposefully chose to name our results as "categories of findings" rather than "themes" as we summed up "a collection of similar data" and placed and ordered chunks of texts proximally (Morse, 2008, p. 727).

Guided by our critical framing, which acknowledges that internationalization is not a value-neutral process, and that the characteristics and constraints of individual disciplines can complicate internationalization, we collaboratively examined the codes and resulting categories by revisiting the texts throughout all stages of data analysis. Our aim was to identify instances where the internationalization of our focused disciplines might inadvertently reinforce Western-centric knowledge paradigms.

### **Positionality**

Our complex positionalities were influential to the approach taken to interrogate the literature. First, we are all people of color with Asian descent, with two of us being non-residents of the United States. Our nationalities, as well as racial and ethnic identities encouraged us to approach the analysis through a critical lens and interrogate the Euro-centric way of knowledge and knowing. For example, we are sensitive to how the literature positions international students and scholars in the mix of IoC and plural worldview, discussed later. We also paid attention to how internationalization was framed and whose framing was prioritized in the research. Additionally, coming from the fields of higher education administration (SM and SB) and school psychology (CB), our diverse disciplinary backgrounds were essential to our data analysis experience. We would provide feedback on each other's interpretations and engage in a collaborative analysis as we made meaning of the discourses in multiple texts. Our diverse professional training and identities allowed us to leverage unique bodies of knowledge, which offered both complementary and contradictory interpretations of the literature. For example, we had multiple discussions about whether we wanted to speak to a higher education audience or school psychology audience and how the different target audience would affect our approach to data analysis and presentation.

### **Limitations**

There are two main limitations in this study. The first limitation comes with the conceptualization of IoC itself. We must acknowledge that curriculum internationalization is not a concept that is adopted in every piece of literature that touches on the internationalization processes of the curriculum. Other terms such as internationalization at home, inclusive internationalization, internationalization at distance might be used in some studies when discussing the international dimensions of the curriculum. Further, international schools, college or career counseling, pastoral counseling, and references to decolonizing curricula were also excluded, which may have yielded different results. Limiting the search to keywords that specifically pointed to IoC may have excluded some relevant literature. Further, this literature review included only peer-reviewed publications in the English language and prioritized Western citation databases and indexes. Hence, there might be a broader list of notions relevant to IoC written in different languages. More importantly, as we critique the Euro-centric approach to knowledge and knowing, we are aware that by conducting a literature search, writing, and publishing in English, we as well participate in a system that reproduces Euro-centric ideologies. However, focusing on studies published in English allowed us to hone in on the external regulations and legislation that are discipline and country-specific.

## **Findings**

### **Search Results**

The initial search of the literature yielded 102 results. After removing duplicates and screening titles and abstracts for inclusion and exclusion criteria, 43 were retained for further discussion. Inter-observer agreement was calculated when reviewing the 43 studies for final inclusion in the study. For studies in which there was initial disagreement, all authors reviewed and discussed the study until consensus was reached on whether the study met inclusionary criteria. This resulted

**Table 1***Included Studies (N=12)*

Author(s)	Discipline	Country/Region of Focus
Ng et al. (2012)	Counseling Psychology	U.S.
Duan et al. (2011)	Counseling Psychology	U.S./Southeast Asia
Nash et al. (2011)	School Counseling	U.S.
Turner-Essel & Waehler (2009).	Counseling Psychology	U.S.
Bhat & McMahon (2016)	School Counseling	U.S./Australia
Wathen & Kleist (2015)	Counseling Psychology	U.S.
Hurley, Gerstein, & Ægisdóttir (2013)	Counseling Psychology	U.S.
Shannonhouse & Myers (2014)	Counselor Education	U.S.
Giordano (1996)	Counselor Education	U.S.
Griffith et al. (2012)	Organizational Psychology	U.S.
Jessop & Adams (2016)	Psychology	U.S.
Bikos et al. (2013)	Psychology	U.S.

in 12 studies included in the analyses. The PRISMA chart (see Figure 1) shows our literature search and selection process. The literature included in the analysis is shown in Table 1.

The included studies represented a variety of disciplines related to school psychology (see Table 1). Most of the studies were from counseling psychology ( $n = 5$ ), followed by school counseling ( $n = 2$ ), counselor education ( $n = 2$ ), undergraduate psychology education ( $n = 2$ ), and organizational psychology ( $n = 1$ ). All of the studies were at least partially based in the U.S. The majority of studies employed qualitative methods ( $n = 7$ ), followed by quantitative methods ( $n = 3$ ), and mixed methods ( $n = 2$ ).

### Approach

The papers included for analysis in this literature review approached their studies differently. Some studies took a mapping approach, where the authors sought to understand what the existing strategies were to internationalize the curriculum in psychology education (Ng et al., 2012, Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009; Griffis, 2012; Shannonhouse & Myers, 2014). Ng et al. (2012), for example, developed a checklist for IoC in counseling psychology. Similarly, through surveying psychology programs and interviewing faculty members, Turner-Essel and Waehler (2009) compiled a list of recommendations faculty members and higher education institutions could follow to advance internationalization work. On the other hand, some studies took an evaluation and assessment approach, by examining internationalization efforts in existing courses and programs with the goal of understanding the way courses operated and identifying potential areas of improvement (Nash et al., 2011; Duan et al., 2011). Oftentimes, evaluation and assessment were conducted through the lens of both faculty and student experiences. Duan et al. (2011), for instance, offered insights into the level of internationalization in the counselor education curriculum in the United States by investigating the experiences of U.S. trained counselors working in Asia.

Additionally, the literature represented diverse respondent groups throughout the collected empirical literature. In particular, the empirical literature included professionals in the field (Ng et al., 2012), graduate students (Lau & Ng, 2012), counseling psychologists (Duan et al., 2011), faculty members (Nash et al., 2011), and undergraduate students (Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009). While this diversity of perspectives provided a broad understanding of trends and issues implicating stakeholders, it procreated limitations in developing the conceptual implications of a specific nature, rather than general ones. In some cases, the sample population was represented by a single study that provided episodic evidence subject for analysis.

### Definition and Purpose

The examination of collected literature demonstrated a lack of shared understanding of what it meant to “internationalize the curriculum” or what an internationalized curriculum should be like. While it was apparent that internationalization of curriculum was important, it was also clear that this endeavor was still a work in progress. Whitsed et al. (2021) noted that definitional opaqueness was further complicated with verbs used to describe the components of

curriculum internationalization. The collected literature, in some cases, specifically used the term of internationalization of curriculum (Marsella & Pederson, 2004; Nash et al., 2011), while in other cases the authors defined internationalization of curriculum through curricular measures originated across the disciplines (Buczynski et al., 2010; Shannonhouse & Myers, 2014). Despite the differences, along with Western orientations and ethnocentricity of curriculum practice, the literature used Western-originated theoretical frameworks and approaches to define internationalization of curriculum. Knight's definition of internationalization that argues for integration of international perspectives was mentioned in the literature (Bhat & McMahon, 2016; Nash et al., 2011; Ng et al., 2012). Different from the process-focused definition, Griffith et al. (2012) used the definition of curriculum internationalization provided by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) that is outcome-focused. Specifically, the internationalized curriculum is a curriculum with an international orientation in content and/or form, aimed at preparing students for performing professionally or socially in an international and multicultural context and designed for domestic and/or foreign students (OECD, 1996 as cited in Griffith et al., 2012).

In the reviewed studies, the purpose of internationalization of the curriculum was intertwined with how internationalization of the curriculum was conceptualized. Overall, most arguments for internationalizing the counseling psychology curriculum included development of competencies, international competencies checklist (Ng et al., 2012), cross-cultural skills (Lau & Ng, 2012; Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009; Wathen & Kleist, 2015), and global psychological literacy (Takooshian et al., 2016) to communicate across cultural borders and integrate multiple perspectives. Certain studies provided alternative perspectives based on the notions of social justice, indigenization, and individual transformation beyond the professional and competency dimensions. One example is Giordano (1996), who discussed the movement of the counseling curriculum from a multicultural perspective developed from U.S. social and professional realities to international human rights.

Global engagement and transferability of the curriculum are two other points of discussion in the literature when conceptualizing IoC. Conceptualization at these levels took into consideration the factor of global powers and ethnocentricity of counseling curriculum. Jessop and Adams (2016), for example, focused on higher education institutions' "open, inclusive, reciprocal, and critical engagement with the diversity of the global community, toward the transformation of knowledge and praxis in psychology" (p.42). They further recognized the concerns over the hegemonic version of psychology originated from the Euro-American global power. Meanwhile, Duan et al. (2011) highlighted the transferable nature of internationalized curriculum, stating the approaches needed to be transformed to be applicable in other contexts and cultures, which challenged the Western-centric view of psychology curriculum.

## **Strategies**

Among many strategies the literature indicated, incorporating international perspectives into the course materials and students' classroom experience was the most prominent. Both Hurley et al. (2012) and Ng et al. (2012), for example, suggested incorporating non-U.S. focused readings in the learning materials and encouraging students to reflect on their bias and perspectives in course discussions. Ng et al. (2012) specifically addressed the need to focus on transferability of the course content to other cultures that are sensitive to international students' need to work internationally. While the literature emphasized the learning of domestic students (Lau & Ng, 2012; Lau & Ng, 2014), several scholars emphasized the role of international students who received training in the United States (Duan et al., 2011; Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009). The latter studies described assumptions in U.S. counseling psychology and weaknesses of internationalized curriculum such as the American-centric training content and process, the inattention and insensitivity of training programs to the international students' unique backgrounds and needs, and apparent inattention to internationalization in general (Lau & Ng, 2012; Ilhan et al., 2012).

Another commonly relied on approach was project-based initiatives. Giordano (1996), for example, reflected on program-level partnerships between a U.S. institution and a Greek institution, where faculty members from both countries co-taught. Studying abroad for in-training counselors, attending international conferences, and engaging in international collaborative projects were a few examples of how international learning opportunities expanded students' global horizon (Ng et al., 2012; Duan et al., 2011; Nash et al., 2011). Moreover, it was also recommended that lectures, conferences, visiting scholars, and festivals with an international focus should be integrated into the curriculum as a way to increase students' exposure to international matters (Nash et al., 2011).

Debates about new forms of internationalization in school psychology have also emerged with the development of technology. Takooshian et al. (2016) pointed to the rise of online courses and Internet-based technologies as influential to instruction and international points of view. Bhat and McMahon (2016) defined the use of information communication

technologies in counseling programs as an internationalization at home effort focused on expanding awareness beyond “ethnocentric monoculturalism”. E-based learning provided the potential to have more teachers and learners in the same “classroom” and more fluidly position themselves across different settings and conditions, culturally, economically, and politically (McWha et al., 2014).

Finally, studies also underscored the importance of expanding the personal and institutional capacities in internationalization endeavors. Studies pointed out that faculty’s interests, as well as their international competencies were central to IoC. Thus, faculty should be allowed to develop international relationships and contacts to encourage more meaningful personal and professional experiences. To expand institutional capacities, there was the need to recognize and use available structural incentives and supports that may assist faculty internationalization efforts (e.g., grants, policies, professional development opportunities) (Hurley et al., 2012). This viewpoint was reaffirmed by Shannonhouse and Myers (2014), who suggested that “it will be necessary for counselor education programs to provide training for both students and faculty to increase cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity” (p. 361).

## **Challenges**

The literature addressed various challenges when internationalizing psychology curriculum. First, conceptual misunderstanding about internationalization led to confusion among faculty and students when making efforts to internationalize the curriculum. Oftentimes, internationalization and multiculturalism were understood as interchangeable concepts. Whathen and Kleist (2015)’s arguments for internationalization of counselor education, for example, were built on the importance of developing students’ multicultural competence. Not having a clear distinction between international education and multicultural education is concerning. As Hurley et al. (2012) nuanced, situating internationalization in the multicultural environment might not be effective enough and thus “the relationship between counseling psychologists in the multicultural movement and international movement needs further examination” (p. 45).

The second commonly discussed challenge was the lack of commitment from a broad higher education institution community. Governmental, institutional, and professional policy regulations that did not align with internationalization initiatives hindered the process of IoC (Bikos et al., 2013). Besides, curriculum internationalization in psychology was most likely the endeavor of a few passionate faculty members and students, who felt unable to convince the entire program to prioritize such an endeavor (Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009; Jossep & Adam, 2016). A lack of interest from students was also raised by Bikos et al. (2012) as one of the barriers to internationalizing the curriculum.

Additionally, logistics such as financial constraints, technical difficulties, and assessment challenges were also common concerns presented in the literature (Griffith et al., 2012; Duan et al., 2011; Hurley et al., 2012; Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009). Students’ and faculty’s opportunities to participate in international activities such as attending international conferences and studying or training abroad were usually limited due to insufficient funding (Duan et al., 2011; Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009). Hurley et al. (2012) pointed to decreases in federal funding as a major barrier to internationalization efforts in counseling psychology. Scholars also suggested the need to provide technical support when using technology in virtual class settings (Bhat & McMahan, 2016). Last but not least, Nash et al. (2011)’s study unveiled the difficulties measuring intercultural competence. The authors also pointed out the mismatch between faculty’s expectations and students’ understandings of expected learning outcomes from internationalized curriculum.

## **Discussion**

How the literature approached IoC in school psychology and related fields complicates the paradigm in which these fields are situated. As previously mentioned, school psychology and related fields mostly function in the positivist paradigm with the underlying assumption that “single tangible reality exists” (Park et al., 2020, p. 691). We observed tension in the literature concerning whether and how multiple perspectives and realities should be integrated into the curriculum when the fields strived to internationalize. Most of the studies recognized the ethnocentricity of Western curriculum and argued for the necessity of studying diverse ways of being and providing an epistemic standpoint from which to think more critically about natural manifestation of one’s own experience (Jessop & Adams, 2016; Duan et al., 2011). Beyond the terms of “ethnocentricity of Western curriculum” (Marsela & Pedersen, 2004) other authors used the terms of “cultural encapsulation” (Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009) or “ethnocentric monoculturalism” (Bhat & McMahan, 2016) to describe challenges faced by the internationalization movement.

Further, as we mentioned earlier, many of the studies utilized frameworks originating from Western perspectives to understand internationalization of the curriculum. However, complications can occur when individuals from other



cultures did not share conceptualizations of social justice, equality, and human rights that were prevalent among U.S. counseling psychologists (Hurley et al., 2013), and the underlying assumption that the U.S. approach to counseling psychology is the norm. Therefore, future studies may consider reimagining the conceptualization of the key terms using an alternative approach to frame their research. For example, Shahjahan et al. (2023) adopted a grounded theory approach to analyze a substantial body of literature on curriculum internationalization across various geographical locations and disciplines without relying on a pre-existing internationalization framework.

However, when it comes to actualizing IoC in practice, it becomes obvious that there is a lack of further investigation concerning whether the process of internationalization can itself be Western-centric. Stein (2017) referred to IoC processes where “differential, historically accumulated institutional power of different knowledges and knowledge communities” (p. 33) are not the core of concern as “thin inclusion” (p. 33). Specifically, the “thin inclusion” of international perspectives in the curriculum focuses on inserting other perspectives and knowledge into the existing structure. Incorporating often superficial, tokenistic elements or areas of non-Western knowledge into existing curricular structures seems to be a strategic institutional means to manage difference (Nandy, 2000). Some scholars, for example, highlighted the possibility to incorporate international students’ knowledge in the process of curriculum internationalization (Duan et al., 2011; Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009). Few, however, focused on developing curriculum that may help international students become successful in different cultural contexts. As Stein (2017) suggested, the ideals of using international students’ perspectives, showcase how other knowledge and beings are “commodified as property belonging to the cultural archive and body of knowledge of the West” (Stein, 2017, p. 64).

Additionally, the neoliberal approach commonly taken when addressing IoC exemplifies the need for more attention paid to multiple perspectives and realities. A neoliberal approach refers to higher education as a private good provided for consumption of entrepreneurial students who seek to develop skills to be competitive in the marketplace (Jessop & Adams, 2016). The globalization of the counseling psychology profession focused on cultural competencies of graduates (Nash et al., 2011) and implementation of accreditation standards by professional associations (Wathen & Kleist, 2015), which reflect a neoliberal approach. However, there are other pressing global problems such as poverty, migration, overpopulation, international war and violence, rapid urbanization, and cultural disintegration (Marsella & Pedersen, 2004) that may be under-addressed in the curriculum internationalization discourse in the disciplines included in our study. We recognized the neoliberal ideas manifested in literature and believed that both the external accreditation process and the positivist paradigm in which these programs were situated contributed to the emphasis on neoliberal skill development trajectories.

On the other hand, we recognized the challenges for one to incorporate “thick inclusion” when internationalizing the curriculum in school psychology and related fields. As presented in the literature, challenges focused heavily on individual students and faculty without considering the disciplinary characteristics of school psychology and related fields. As previously discussed, the focus on development of student competencies aligned with the professionalization of school psychology and spread of the profession to other parts of the world (Duan et al., 2011; Takooshian et al., 2016; Wathen & Kleist, 2015). These external regulations and accreditation standards drive curricular decisions at the program level. While there are risks or limitations of not internationalizing professional programs or only incorporating “thin” internationalization, we must also recognize the risks associated with excluding or limiting existing content or competencies, such as risk of losing accreditation or harm done to future clients. That said, we are not suggesting that school psychology and other professional programs should disregard the accreditation organizations and other institutional and national regulation to avoid only “thin inclusion” of diverse perspectives. The literature we examined, however, did not delve into the tension between the urgency to internationalize the curriculum and the need to comply with the external regulations. Future scholars and practitioners should ensure they do not underestimate such tensions, nor overlook external regulations, programmatic culture, or other program-level factors.

## **Implications and Conclusion**

Public schools are becoming increasingly diverse (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2019) and students from racially, ethnically, linguistically, and culturally minoritized backgrounds have continually experienced disproportionately poorer outcomes compared to their White and Asian peers (Lacour & Tissington, 2011; Skiba et al., 2011). School psychologists and other school-based specialists have the potential to improve the outcomes of these students through assessment, intervention, and consultation practices (National Association of School Psychologists, 2010). IoCof these fields may be particularly important as they are training frontline professionals to work with individuals in public schools who have been directly influenced by globalization (e.g., international, immigrant, and refugee youth).

While internationalization approaches have primarily followed study abroad trajectories, recruitment of international students and faculty, regional area and language programs, there is a growing need for critical analysis of accumulated experience to develop a critically reflexive approach to curriculum development, curriculum conceptualization, and its implications for social justice and equity. IoC may replicate and perpetuate existing inequities, but it also has the capacity to change stakeholders' understanding of their own context, others' contexts, and the relationships implicating developed and developing countries.

The quest for integrating global and international perspectives in the current psychology curriculum signals the change in basic assumptions. However, to address the prevalence of the neoliberal perspective in the internationalization of curriculum and the tendency to operate IoC with "thin inclusion," more discussion on citizenship development and "thick inclusion" should surface as we are facing dire global problems more so now than ever before. In other words, without discrediting the importance of skill and competency development, studies about IoC in school psychology and related fields may look beyond individual gains and strive to educate students who are ready to contribute to a global common good. Meanwhile, scholars and practitioners should also recognize institutionalized "blockers" (Leask, 2011) in disciplines, such as resources and accreditation that prevent good IoC practice that occur at levels beyond individuals and higher education institutions.

Literature examined in this review provided rich scholarly discussions about what curriculum internationalization means, why it is imperative to internationalize the curriculum, ways to actualize IoC, and challenges to address in school psychology and other related fields. Conceptually, this literature review goes beyond the surface to encourage critical reflection on the potential negative consequences of curriculum internationalization when underlying power dynamics are left unaddressed. Further, this literature review outlined a broad spectrum of IoC components including diverse stakeholders, curricular and extra-curricular elements, underlying paradigmatic assumptions, and the impact of external governmental and educational institutions. This breadth of coverage can be particularly valuable for practitioners seeking to integrate international and global perspectives into the curriculum of school psychology and related fields.

While there are other countries and regions that have been active in researching IoC (i.e., U.K. and Australia), the empirical evidence of curriculum internationalization primarily represents U.S. psychology programs. Future research is needed to further diversify the sample of studies as well as the long-term and contextual features. As well, future reviews may broaden the search terms to include studies published in other types of outlets or potentially use terms other than IoC to address curricular and disciplinary issues. Future studies can also build upon this preliminary examination of research literature to provide insight into curriculum internationalization in school psychology and other professional preparation programs, while also investigating paradigmatic developments informed by different university and geographical settings. Our experience working across disciplines has been fruitful.

## References

- Asahina, Y. (2022). Contradiction as injustice: How senses of inequality differ across national contexts. *Sociology*, 56(4), 710–729. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380385211056212>
- ACE (n.d.) *Internationalization in Action*. American Council of Education. <https://www.acenet.edu/Research-Insights/Pages/Internationalization/Internationalization-in-Action.aspx>
- American Psychological Association (2018). *Standards of accreditation for health service psychology and accreditation operating procedures*. American Psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/standards-of-accreditation.pdf>
- Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education & Management*, 10(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2004.9967114>
- Alsoqaih, M. I., Elbedour, S., & Bastien, D. T. (2017). The internationalization of school psychology. *International Journal of Education and Human Development*, 3(1), 1–20. <http://ijehd.cgrd.org/images/vol3no1/1.pdf>
- Brandenburg, U., & De Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International higher education*, (62) 15–17. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2011.62.8533>
- Beelen, J. & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining Internationalization at Home. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European Higher Education Area* (pp. 59–72). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5)
- Begeny, J. C., Levy, R. A., Hida, R., Norwalk, K., Field, S., Suzuki, H., ... & Burneo, C. A. (2018). Geographically representative scholarship and internationalization in school and educational psychology: A bibliometric analysis of eight journals from 2002–2016. *Journal of school psychology*, 70, 44–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.07.001>

- Bhat, C.S. & McMahan, M. (2016). Internationalization at home for counseling students: Utilizing technology to expand global and multicultural horizons. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 38, 319–29.
- Bikos, L. H., DePaul Chism, N. F., Forman, R. L., & King, D. R. (2013). Internationalizing the U.S. undergraduate psychology curriculum: A qualitative investigation of faculty perspectives. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation*, 2(2), 116–131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032288>
- Bulnes, C., & Louw, E. de (2022). Towards a typology of internationalization at home activities in academic disciplines: a study conducted at a Dutch university of applied sciences. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 54(2), 332–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2022.2108376>
- Coker, A. D., & Majuta, A. R. (2015). Teaching group counseling in Botswana: Two US-trained counselors discuss experiences and share cultural considerations for practice. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 40(1), 102–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01933922.2014.992506>
- Duan, C., Nilsson, J., Wang, C. C. D., Debernardi, N., Klevens, C., & Tallent, C. (2011). Internationalizing counselling: A southeast Asian perspective. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, 24(1), 29–41.
- Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). (2015). *Pub. L.*, 114–95.
- Fagan, T. K. (1992). Compulsory schooling, child study, clinical psychology, and special education: Origins of school psychology. *American Psychologist*, 47(2), 236–243. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.47.2.236>
- Fagan, T.K. & Wise, P.S. (2000). *School Psychology: Past, Present, and Future* (2nd ed.). National Association of School Psychologists.
- Fraser, S. & Bosanquet, A. (2006). The curriculum? That's just a unit outline, isn't it? *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(3) 269–284.
- Giordano, F. G. (1996). Developing an overseas counsellor education program: Problems, issues, and educational implications. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 19(3), 329–340.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2013). Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalization of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1028315312463825>
- Griffith, R.L., Gabrenya, W., Steelman, L.A., Armon, B., Gitlin, B., Kung, M. (2012). Global organizational psychology: Internationalizing the training curriculum. *Psihologijske Teme*, 21(3), 383–398.
- Hudzik, J., & Stohl, M. (2012). Comprehensive and strategic internationalization of U.S. higher education. In *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education* (pp. 61-80). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218397>
- Hudzik, J. K. (2015). Integrating institutional policies and leadership for 21st century internationalization. *International higher education*, (83), 5–7. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2015.83.9075>
- Hurley, E.J., Gerstein, L.H., & Ægisdóttir, S. (2013). Examining internationalization in U.S. counseling psychology training programs. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 41, 724–749.
- Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA). (2004). U.S. Department of Education. <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/>
- Ilhan, T., Korkut-Owen, F., Furr, S., & Parikh, S. (2012). International counseling students in Turkey and their training experiences. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 34(1), 55–71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-012-9145-9>
- Jessop, N., & Adams, G. (2016). Internationalising the psychology of curriculum: Preliminary notes on conception and assessment of anticipated benefits. *Psychology Teaching Review*, 22, 41–52.
- Jones, E. (2013). Internationalization and student learning outcomes. In de Wit, H. (Ed.). *An Introduction to Higher Education Internationalisation* (pp. 107–115). Vita e Pensiero. <http://www.vitaepensiero.it/volumi/9788834324455>
- Kefala, A. Z., & Rönnerberg, L. (2023). Through the eyes of the disciplines - student perspectives and positionings towards internationalization-at-home. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2023.2168719>
- Knight, J., & International Association of Universities. (2006). *Internationalization of higher education: new directions, new challenges: 2005 IAU global survey report*. International Association of Universities.
- Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretive frameworks in the internationalization of higher education. *The SAGE handbook of international higher education*, 27–42.
- Kratochwill, T. R., & Shernoff, E. S. (2004). Evidence-based practice: Promoting evidence-based interventions in school psychology. *School psychology review*, 33(1), 34–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2004.12086229>
- Lacour, M., & Tissington, L. D. (2011). The effects of poverty on academic achievement. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(7), 522–527. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR.9000349>
- Larkin, A. (2015). North-South partnerships in Canadian higher education. In A. A. Abdi (Ed.), *Decolonizing global citizenship education* (pp. 141–155). Sense Publishers.

- Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 35–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390500450144>
- Lau, J., & Ng, K. M. (2012). Effectiveness and relevance of training for international counseling graduates: A qualitative inquiry. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 34(1), 87–105. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-011-9128-2>
- Lau, J., & Ng, K. M. (2014). Conceptualizing the counseling training environment using Bronfenbrenner’s ecological theory. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 36(4), 423–439. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-014-9220-5>
- Leask, B. (2011). Assessment, learning, teaching and internationalisation – engaging for the future. *Assessment, Teaching & Learning Journal*, 11, 5–20.
- Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315716954>
- Lee, D. L., Rosen, A. D., & Burns, V. (2013). Over a half-century encapsulated: A multicultural content analysis of the Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954–2009. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(1), 154–161. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0031002>
- Marsella, A. J., & Pedersen, P. (2004). Internationalizing the counseling psychology curriculum: Toward new values, competencies, and directions. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 17(4), 413–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070412331331246>
- McWha, I., Mji, G., MacLachlan, M., & Carr, S. C. (2014). Challenges and opportunities to developing south-north program partnerships. In R. L. Griffith, L. Foster Thompson, & B. K. Armon (Eds.), *Internationalizing the curriculum in organizational psychology* (pp. 17–40). Springer Science + Business Media. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9402-7\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9402-7_2)
- Mignolo, W. (2003). Globalization and the geopolitics of knowledge: The role of the humanities in the corporate university. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 4(1), 97–119.
- Morse, J. M. (2008). Confusing categories and themes. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(6), 727–728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732308314930>
- Munn, Z., Peters, M.D.J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018) Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Med Res Methodology*, 18, 143. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>
- Nandy, A. (2000). Recovery of indigenous knowledge and dissenting futures of the university. *The university in transformation: Global perspectives and the future of the university*, 115–23.
- Nash, E. R., Martin, I., Rowell, L., Hetherington, P., & Zgliczynski, S. (2011). The internationalization of a school counseling program at a Catholic university: Reflections generated by a Community of Practice. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 14(4), 487–506.
- Ng, K. M., Choudhuri, D. D., Noonan, B. M., & Ceballos, P. (2012). An internationalization competency checklist for American counseling training programs. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 34(1), 19–38.
- Page, M.J., McKenzie, J.E., Bossuyt, P.M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T.C., Mulrow, C.D...Moher, D. (2020). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021, 372. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- Redding, C. (2019). A Teacher Like Me: A Review of the Effect of Student–Teacher Racial/Ethnic Matching on Teacher Perceptions of Students and Student Academic and Behavioral Outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(4), 499–535. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319853545>
- Reschly, D. J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1995). School psychology paradigm shift. *Best practices in school psychology*, 3, 17–31.
- Shannonhouse, L., & Myers, J. E. (2014). Global links and gaps in counselor education programs: Establishing a baseline. *Professional Counselor*, 4(4), 353–362.
- Shahjahan, R. A., & Morgan, C. (2016). Global competition, coloniality, and the geopolitics of knowledge in higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(1), 92–109.
- Shahjahan, R. A., Miao, S., & Baizhanov, S. (2023). Actualizing curriculum internationalization: An integrated review. *Comparative Education Review* 68(2), 262–285.
- Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C. G., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review*, 40(1), 85–107.
- Stein, S., Andreotti, V., & Suša, R. (2019). Pluralizing frameworks for global ethics in the internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 49(1), 22–46. <https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v49i1.188244>
- Stark, J. S. (1998) Classifying Professional Preparation Programs, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69:4, 353–383, DOI: 10.1080/00221546.1998.11775140
- Stein, S., Andreotti, V., & Suša, R. (2019). Pluralizing frameworks for global ethics in the internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 49(1), 22–46. <https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v49i1.188244>

- Takooshian, H., Gielen, U. P., Plous, S., Rich, G. J., & Velayo, R. S. (2016). Internationalizing undergraduate psychology education: Trends, techniques, and technologies. *American Psychologist, 71*(2), 136–147.
- Tilly, W. D. (2008). The evolution of school psychology to science-based practice: Problem solving and the three-tiered model. *Best practices in school psychology V, 1*, 17–36.
- Turner-Essel, L., & Waehler, C. (2009). Integrating internationalization in counseling psychology training programs. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*(6), 877–901.
- Wathen, C.C. & Kleist, D.M. (2015). Internationalization of counselor education: Lived experiences of US counselors-in-training abroad. *The Qualitative Report, 20*, 59–83.
- Whitsed, C., Burgess, M., & Ledger, S. (2021). Editorial advisory board members on reimagining higher education internationalization and internationalization of the curriculum. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 25*(4), 348–368.
- Yakoboski, T., Perozzi, B. (2018). Internationalization for US student affairs. In *Internationalizing US student affairs practice: An intercultural and inclusive framework* (pp. 1–29). Routledge.
- Yao, C. W., Oates, E. Q., Briscoe, K. L., Buell, K. J., & Rutt, J. N. (2023). Re/Negotiating Race and Racialization for International Students of Color in the US. *Journal of College Student Development 64*(1), 79–95. <http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2023.0003>
- Ysseldyke, J., Burns, M., Dawson, P., Kelley, B., Morrison, D., Ortiz, S., ... & Telzrow, C. (1997). School psychology. *A blueprint for training and practice II*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Zadravec, K. A. & Kočar, S. (2023). The impact of academic disciplines on a constructively aligned internationalized curriculum. *Higher Education, 1–20*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01008-w>
- 

**SANFENG MIAO**, MA is a doctoral candidate in the Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education program at Michigan State University. Her research concerns the academic profession and international and comparative higher education. Sanfeng Miao email address is [miaosanf@msu.edu](mailto:miaosanf@msu.edu)

**SANZHAR BAIZHANOV**, MA is a doctoral candidate in the Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education program at Michigan State University. Sanzhar is an international student from Kazakhstan. His area of interests concerns curriculum internationalization, business education, geopolitics of knowledge, and global mindset. Sanzhar Bizhanova's email address is [baizhan1@msu.edu](mailto:baizhan1@msu.edu)

**COURTENAY A. BARRETT**, PhD. is an Assistant Professor in the School Psychology program at Michigan State University, a licensed psychologist in Michigan, and a Nationally Certified School Psychologist. Her recent work has examined effective graduate training tools and processes to develop capacity among future school psychologists. Courtenay A. Barrett's email address is [morsicou@msu.edu](mailto:morsicou@msu.edu)