International and Cultural Psychology
Series Editor: Anthony J. Marsella, Ph.D.

Frederick T. L. Leong
Wade E. Pickren
Mark M. Leach
Anthony J. Marsella *Editors*

Internationalizing the Psychology Curriculum in the United States

International and Cultural Psychology

Series Editor:

Anthony J. Marsella

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/6089

Frederick T.L. Leong • Wade E. Pickren
Mark M. Leach • Anthony J. Marsella
Editors

Internationalizing the Psychology Curriculum in the United States

Springer

Editors
Frederick T.L. Leong, Ph.D
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI, USA
fleong@msu.edu

Wade E. Pickren, Ph.D
Pace University
New York, NY, USA
wpickren@pace.edu

Mark M. Leach, Ph.D
Department of Educational
and Counseling Psychology
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY, USA
m.leach@louisville.edu

Anthony J. Marsella, Ph.D
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Honolulu, HI, USA
marsella@hawaii.edu

ISBN 978-1-4614-0072-1 e-ISBN 978-1-4614-0073-8
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-0073-8
Springer New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011936971

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

We dedicate this volume to those pioneer scholars of human behavior whose intellect, values, and moral code helped move psychology beyond the confines of national, cultural, and political borders:

Emile Durkheim (Sociologist)
Paolo Freire (Educator)
Francis H.K. Hsu (Anthropologist)
Martin Ibarra (Political Activist)
William James (Psychologist)
Otto Klineberg (Social Psychologist)
Edward Sapir (Social Linguist)

Preface

It is customary in most volumes to write a preface that typically discusses the motives, reasons, and circumstances that led to writing the volume. In the case of this volume, the editors' motives, reasons, and circumstances have arisen from a professional orientation involving life-long career interests and commitments to the study of cultural and international psychology, especially as the study revealed the biases, limitations, and inaccuracies of the Western psychology present throughout the teaching, research, and clinical practices in psychology. For the editors, these questionable characteristics were understandable as products of Western culture, but they were not acceptable, especially in a world that demanded an understanding and appreciation of the diverse people of the world and the validity and legitimacy of their psychologies.

Whether the population of interest was American ethnic and racial minority groups or international groups, it was clear that the Western psychology used to study them was a cultural creation – a set of assumptions, beliefs, methods, practices, and conclusions rooted within essential Western historical and cultural traditions regarding ways of knowing the world (epistemology), ways of acting in the world (praxiology), and ways of constructing views of human nature (ontology).

While the obvious ethnocentrism of Western psychology was not destructive or malicious in itself, it became obvious to many scientists and professionals across the world that there was a critical need to reconsider the content, roles, and functions of Western psychology as they were often indiscriminately applied in cross-cultural and international training, research, and services (e.g., Gergen et al. 1996; Marsella 1998; Mays et al. 1996; Moghaddam 1987; Sinha 1994; Sloan and Montero 1990).

It is important to recognize that the concerns of these scientists and professionals was not simply the need to study ethnic minority and racial groups and international populations accurately, but rather to acknowledge that in the course of studies, it was important psychologists using Western theories and methods understand the cultural roots and contexts of their approaches, and the consequences their conclusions could have for both resolving major domestic and international social problems, and for advancing psychology as a valid scientific body of knowledge and approach

to inquiry. Thus, it was a matter of conscience, ethics, and justice, and it is a tribute to the integrity of psychologists whose energies and voices advanced these concerns in an emerging global community.

There were many psychologists – ethnic and racial minorities and international – involved in changing the consciousness and course of psychology via critiques of the foundations of Western psychology. These psychologists helped establish a number of specialty areas in psychology from the post-WW II era to the present, including cross-cultural psychology, cultural psychology, ethnic minority and racial psychologies, indigenous psychology, and more recently, international psychology and global psychology. But it was not so much the specialties that are important, as the recognition that the cultural context of psychology's knowledge needed to be considered. There is no single date, nor single person, that we can point to as a turning point in this quiet revolution in thought that has now permanently altered psychology around the world, and that now serves as a major impetus for this volume. Clearly, there are scores of pioneer figures that could be cited, but this will have to await another publication.

Yet, even as we recognize the roles of individual psychologists from across the world, it is also necessary to cite the American Psychological Association (APA) itself, which served the important function of forming linkages with different international psychology organizations and agencies across recent decades. In addition, the APA also deserves credit for establishing the *Committee for International Relations* (*CIRP*) as a locus for addressing international concerns. Indeed, it was within *CIRP* that the idea of "internationalizing psychology" gained popularity and prominence in the early 1990s under the leadership of Joan Buchanan and subsequently, Merry Bullock. *CIRP* also provided leadership in developing APA Division 52 International Psychology) and its new (2011) APA journal, *Perspectives on International Psychology*, under the current editorship of Dr. Joan Gibbons.

Today, the issue of internationalizing the psychology curriculum is no longer the subject of debate and widespread resistance of past decades. Psychologists around the world are alert and responsive to the demands of our global era for understanding diverse people and for addressing major global challenges with a full consideration and respect for cultural and national sensitivities and resources. To that end, the present volume was prepared to serve as a resource for internationalizing the psychology curriculum in the USA. It is a beginning. There are many suggestions and much hard earned wisdom that will be found within the following pages. It is also clear that efforts should be made to internationalize the psychologies of other nations and other cultures. That is to say, develop indigenous and national psychologies, and recognize their inherent limitations and possibilities.

We live in a global community. Because of this, psychology and psychologists have responsibilities, obligations, and duties to respond with an understanding and respect for the diverse people of the world. From the following chapters to the closing appendix, it is our hope that the material in this volume will continue to advance psychology as a profession, science, and art that serves humanity and all life.

East Lansing, MI — Frederick T.L. Leong
New York, NY — Wade E. Pickren
Louisville, KY — Mark M. Leach
Honolulu, HI — Anthony J. Marsella

References

Gergen, K., Gulerce, A., Lock, D., & Misra, G. (1996). Psychological science in cultural context. *American Psychologist, 51*, 496–503.

Havel, V. (1987). *Living in truth*. London: Faber & Faber.

Marsella, A. J. (1998). Toward a global-community psychology: Meeting the needs of a changing world. *American Psychologist, 53*, 1282–1291.

Mays, V., Rubin, J., Sabourin, M., & Walker, L. (1996). Moving toward a global psychology: Changing theories and practices to meet the needs of a changing world. *American Psychologist, 51*, 485–487.

Moghaddam, A., (1995). Training for developing world psychologists. In S. Carr & J. Schumaker (Eds.) *Psychology and the developing world* (pp. 49–59). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Sinha, D. (1994). Indigenous psychology: Need and potentiality. *Journal of Indian Psychology, 12*, 1–7.

Sloan, T., & Montero, M. (Eds.) (1990). Psychology for the third world. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*, 1–65.

Contents

Internationalizing the Psychology Curriculum in the USA: Meeting the Challenges and Opportunities of a Global Era 1
Frederick T.L. Leong, Mark M. Leach, Anthony J. Marsella, and Wade E. Pickren

Internationalizing the History of Psychology Course in the USA 11
Wade E. Pickren

Internationalizing the Professional Ethics Curriculum 29
Mark M. Leach and Janel Gauthier

Developmental Psychology 51
Jill White and Melissa P. Schnurr

Internationalizing the Social Psychology Curriculum in the USA 75
Naomi Lee, Fathali M. Moghaddam, and Rom Harré

Personality Theory and Research: International Issues and Trends 95
Juris G. Draguns

Internationalizing Courses in Testing and Assessment 131
Barbara M. Byrne

The Psychology of Women and Gender in International Perspective: Issues and Challenges 157
Nancy Felipe Russo, Angela Grace Pirlott, and Adam B. Cohen

Internationalizing the Clinical Psychology Curriculum: Foundations, Issues, and Directions 179
Anthony J. Marsella

Internationalizing the Field of Counseling Psychology 201
Frederick T.L. Leong, Mark M. Leach, and Maria Malikiosi-Loizos

Internationalizing the Psychology Curriculum: An Emphasis on School Psychology Internationally 225
Thomas Oakland

Going Global: Internationalizing the Organizational Psychology Curriculum 245
Ann Marie Ryan and Michele Gelfand

Health Psychology 263
Frances E. Aboud

Internationalizing Peace Psychology 285
Daniel J. Christie and Noraini M. Noor

Playing Our Part: Crafting a Vision for a Psychology Curriculum Marked by Multiplicity 307
Wade E. Pickren, Anthony J. Marsella, Frederick T.L. Leong, and Mark M. Leach

Appendix A: Fifty Ways to Internationalize the Curriculum of "Western" Psychology 323

Appendix B: About the Editors 327

Appendix C: About the Authors 329

Index 335

Contributors

Frances E. Aboud, Ph.D. Psychology Department, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada, H3A 1B1
frances.aboud@mcgill.ca

Barbara M. Byrne, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus, School of Psychology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada
bmbch@uottawa.ca

Daniel J. Christie Department Psychology, Ohio State University, Marion, OH, USA
christie.1@osu.edu

Adam B. Cohen, Ph.D. Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA
adamcohen@asu.edu

Juris G. Draguns, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
jgd1@psu.edu

Janel Gauthier, Ph.D. École de psychologie, Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada
Janel.Gauthier@psy.ulaval.ca

Michele Gelfand, Ph.D. Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA
mgelfand@psyc.umd.edu

Rom Harré, Ph.D. Department of Psychology, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA
harre@georgetown.edu

Mark M. Leach, Ph.D. Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA
m.leach@louisville.edu

Naomi Lee, Ph.D. Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA
naomilee1@gmail.com

Frederick T.L. Leong, Ph.D. Professor of Psychology, Director, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA
fleong@msu.edu

Maria Malikiosi-Loizos Professor of Counseling Psychology, Faculty of Early Childhood Education, University of Athens, Athens, Greece
mmalik@ecd.uoa.gr

Anthony J. Marsella, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, USA
marsella@hawaii.edu

Fathali M. Moghaddam, Ph.D. Department of Psychology, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA
moghaddf@georgetown.edu

Noraini M. Noor Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Malaysia, Jalan Gombak, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Thomas Oakland, Ph.D. Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA
oakland@imap.coe.ufl.edu

Wade E. Pickren, Ph.D. Pace University, New York, USA
wpickren@pace.edu

Angela Grace Pirlott Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA
apirlott@asu.edu

Nancy Felipe Russo, Ph.D. Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA
Nancy.russo@asu.edu

Ann Marie Ryan, Ph.D. Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA
ryanan@msu.edu

Melissa P. Schnurr, Ph.D. Department of Human Development, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, WI, USA
schnurrm@uwgb.edu

Jill White, Ph.D. Department of Human Development, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, WI, USA
whiteji@uwgb.edu

Internationalizing the Psychology Curriculum in the USA: Meeting the Challenges and Opportunities of a Global Era

Frederick T.L. Leong, Mark M. Leach, Anthony J. Marsella, and Wade E. Pickren

Overview of Globalization

During the last decade, there has been an increasing recognition of the impact of globalization on what we do as social scientists. A recent book by Friedman (1999a), which has attracted considerable positive reactions across disciplines, has articulated a strong case for not just accepting an international perspective, but in embracing a worldview that he calls globalization. For Friedman, "(g)lobalization is not just a trend, not just a phenomenon, not just an economic fad. It is the international system that has replaced the cold-war system. And like the cold-war system, globalization has its own rules, logic, structures, and characteristics" (1999b, p. 42). In our view, Friedman's thesis has considerable relevance to psychology. Indeed, we propose that the embrace of a truly global perspective is not just a luxury at this point in our development. In contrast, we believe that learning from colleagues who are working in different cultural contexts is critically necessary if we are to develop the type of knowledge and the type of psychological understanding of human behavior that will be maximally useful to practitioners and researchers alike.

F.T.L. Leong (✉)
Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, Psychology Building, East Lansing, MI, USA
e-mail: fleong@msu.edu

M.M. Leach, Ph.D.
Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA

A.J. Marsella
Department of Psychology, University of Hawaii, Alpharetta, GA, USA

W.E. Pickren
Pace University, New York, NY, USA

F.T.L. Leong et al. (eds.), *Internationalizing the Psychology Curriculum in the United States*, International and Cultural Psychology,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-0073-8_1,

Although a latecomer to this recognition, Psychology has been struggling with this movement and trying to catch up. But what is globalization and how will it affect what psychologists do? To answer that question, we need to start with some definitions: The following definitions, found on the Web (Globalization Web site; URL: http://www.emory.edu/SOC/globalization/issues.html) represent current viewpoints:

> [T]he inexorable integration of markets, nation-states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before-in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before … the spread of free-market capitalism to virtually every country in the world (Friedman 1999b, pp. 7–8).
>
> The compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole … concrete global interdependence and consciousness of the global whole in the twentieth century (R. Robertson, *Globalization*, 1992, p. 8).
>
> A social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding (M. Waters, *Globalization*, 1995, p. 3).
>
> The historical transformation constituted by the sum of particular forms and instances of … [m]aking or being made global (i) by the active dissemination of practices, values, technology and other human products throughout the globe (ii) when global practices and so on exercise an increasing influence over people's lives (iii) when the globe serves as a focus for, or a premise in shaping, human activities (M. Albrow, *The Global Age*, 1996, p. 88).
>
> As experienced from below, the dominant form of globalization means a historical transformation: in the economy, of livelihoods and modes of existence; in politics, a loss in the degree of control exercised locally … and in culture, a devaluation of a collectivity's achievements … Globalization is emerging as a political response to the expansion of market power … [It] is a domain of knowledge. (J.H. Mittelman, *The Globalization Syndrome*, 2000, p. 6).

Put more succinctly, "Globalization broadly refers to the expansion of global linkages, the organization of social life on a global scale, and the growth of a global consciousness, hence to the consolidation of world society." While it remains highly controversial as to whether globalization will eventually be a positive or a negative force for the world, it is imperative that Psychology, as a social science, be cognizant of this development and begin to integrate its various models, theories, and perspectives into its curriculum if it is to remain relevant and viable.

It has become abundantly clear over the past decade that continuing immigration and migration, the Internet and other technologies, increased global business, and cheaper and more frequent airfare, has made previously disconnected societies more accessible and interconnected. In psychology, Marsella (1998) poignantly and persuasively asserted that a "global-community psychology," or a superordinate psychology, is needed to respond to the existing and emerging global context in which we live. He asserted that a global-based psychology would be distinguished by six issues: "(a) recognizing the global dimensions and scale of our lives, (b) limiting the ethnocentric bias in many existing theories, methods, and interventions, (c) encouraging the development of indigenous psychologies, (d) emphasizing the cultural determinants of human behavior, (e) using systems, contexts, and nonlinear conceptualizations of human behavior, and (f) increasing the use of qualitative, naturalistic, and contextual research methods (p. 1286)." Marsella further stated that utilizing these

approaches to tackling global issues of living may well promote psychology into one of the pivotal fields positioned to make a unique and continuing difference.

Psychology may actually be a bit behind the international curve when considered in relation to business, political science, economics, and a variety of other professions. American psychology has been questioned for being historically myopic and Anglocentric in its scope (Trimble 2001). There has been growing recognition in the various disciplines within psychology, that previously held assumptions, theories and practices, are culturally encapsulated. All theories are inherently biased in the sense that all stem from a particular worldview, or mental framework, yet in US psychology these theories have been used to explain a wide range of psychological phenomena on a global level. In essence, while these theories are possibly appropriate in some, though not even all, US contexts, they have also been used to explain phenomena cross-culturally, leading to questions of cross-cultural validity (Leong and Leach 2007; Leong and Ponterotto 2003). We need to assess the validity of our US theories internationally instead of assuming that they are universal. Not only does this expansion make intuitive sense but it is good science.

It has only been in recent years that US psychologists have given more serious consideration to the ramifications of promoting their theories in other cultures without concomitant research assessment. The multicultural movement over the past 20 years has given rise to multiculturally sensitive models with more inclusive worldviews. These models diminish the intrinsic ethnocentric bias associated with traditional psychological models (Pedersen and Leong 1997). Some authors have argued that internationalism is a natural outgrowth of the multiculturalism movement, whereas others view it as parallel to the multicultural movement.

There are other reasons for the shift toward internationalizing psychology. University environments have moved from emphasizing local and national communities to global communities. Part of this change is due to economic realities of continually decreasing funding and the need to look elsewhere for increased student revenue. However, a less cynical perspective is one in which September 11, 2001 underscored the lack of US independence and the increased interconnectedness of the world (Friedman 2005). Universities began to quickly reevaluate their historical foci and begin to prepare students who hold much more global ways of thinking about the world. They seek to educate students to possess the cultural skills to communicate and contribute to the betterment of a global society (Heppner et al. 2008). Concurrently, the social justice movement in the USA has gained tremendous prominence on college campuses. Combined with technological advances and increased ease to observe perceived injustices on a global level, the social justice movement now applies to all parts of the world and not solely the USA. Overall, universities are now considering changing their curriculum from an ethnocentric model to an international model. International exchange programs are increasing and universities promote the number of students involved in international learning. Additionally, international students comprise a more prominent role within universities. A mission of many, if not most, universities is to cultivate global citizens who can contribute to the betterment of societies rather than society. It is our contention that Psychology and psychology departments are well behind the curve.

Heppner et al. (2008), in their chapter on internationalizing counseling psychology, discuss nine challenges of the subfield that has equivalent relevance for the whole of this text. These will be discussed very briefly, with attention paid to psychology itself rather than counseling psychology specifically.

First, Overcoming our Ethnocentrism: For years US psychology dominated the theoretical and research literatures, though its role within the world community is quickly diminishing. Previously, it was difficult to engage in international research and discussions because of limited technological advances, though this is not the case anymore. US psychology developed and remained encapsulated and ethnocentric and, as mentioned above, has had a long history of Anglocentrism. In order for the field to advance and fully understand human behavior we must expand beyond our psychological borders.

Second, Enhancing Cross-Cultural Competence: For the applied psychology subfields (e.g., clinical, counseling), cross-cultural competence has become more prominent over the past decade (e.g., Heppner 2006). Unfortunately, it is difficult to define and even more difficult to teach and assess. Given the nuances associated with culture, future generations will have to create systematic research plans with international colleagues in order to better understand both international interventions and those closer to home.

Third, Cultural Sensitivity vs. Imposed Etics in Theory Development: As mentioned above, there has been an ethnocentric bias toward what has been called *imposed etics* (Heppner et al. 2008), or the assumption that Western models will work easily in other cultures. This universalism approach has fallen under criticism in the recent past (e.g., Ægisdóttir and Gerstein 2005) as it imposes external models without full consideration of local cultural context. Other, more recent models (e.g., Cultural Accommodation Model; Leong 2007) that incorporate both etic and emic perspectives have gained recent acknowledgement as viable approaches to cultural work.

Fourth, Supporting and Extending Indigenous Psychologies: Another way to reduce imposed etics is through supporting the development, maintenance, and advancement of indigenous psychologies to assist in solving US concerns. Many cultures outside the USA have been in existence for thousands of years and have knowledge bases that incorporate psychological factors from perspectives consistent with their culture. It is time we listen to our international colleagues and consider indigenous approaches to mental health that can either supplement or supplant our own interventions.

Fifth, Promoting the Integration of Multicultural and Cross-Cultural Foci: There has been an emphasis placed on US-based multicultural issues over the past 2 decades among psychologists, and some resistance to engaging in international work. Some claim that US psychologists should focus on issues closer to home whereas others believe that international activities are either an extension of multiculturalism or can help with US concerns, similar to the fourth challenge above. We agree with (Henderson et al. 2006; Heppner et al. 2008) who claim that we need to understand both local and international cultures. Both approaches share an interest in the necessity of incorporating culture into work, and its role in understanding human behavior. Through understanding the role of culture on both levels will we begin to engage in

better research methodologies, develop more robust therapeutic interventions, and better understand complex psychological phenomena.

Sixth, Promoting Cross-National Research Collaborations: There are two ways to conduct international research, through collaborations with international colleagues, or through research with immigrant or international groups in the USA. Cross-national research can be difficult, as it is time-consuming and requires, minimally, very good listening and communication skills, humility, effective coping strategies, patience, and a willingness to adapt. Multiple cultural assumptions become amplified when working with cross-national research teams, and some research projects become successful whereas others fail, simply due to cultural impasses. It is critical that US psychologists work in greater numbers with international colleagues and our hope is that this book will encourage the next generation of psychologists to do so. For readers interested in furthering their knowledge about engaging in cross-cultural research, a number of good texts are available (e.g., Matsumoro and Van de Vijver 2011).

Seventh, Promoting Culturally Valid Practice around the Globe: Interventions and therapeutic practices from outside the USA have gained greater acceptance in the USA. Meditation has become common for anxiety and other disorders, and the growing popularity of mindfulness interventions have their roots in Buddhist practices. It is evident that practitioners, educators, and supervisors can learn much from our international colleagues and incorporate this knowledge into our local practices.

Eighth, Enhancing and Promoting International Education: A growing issue in graduate psychology training programs is which approach to use to educate international, and US students. While some faculty maintain that they should teach a US approach to assessment, theories, and interventions regardless of student type, others argue that perhaps teaching a particular therapeutic approach, for example, may be inappropriate for a student wishing to return to her homeland upon graduation. More research is clearly needed regarding international students' attitudes toward their training content and its relevance once they return home. Faculty and US students can also learn a great deal from international students, as they often approach the world very differently than that found in the majority of training programs. A willingness to listen to alternative approaches to problem-solving or family interventions, for example, will enhance the profession overall. Finally, increasing students involved in study abroad programs will help promote international education. Currently, most training programs are not structured to allow for study abroad programs, and the profession needs to look further into increasing these opportunities.

Finally, Collaboration among Counseling Organizations: Though Heppner et al. (2008) originally discussed counseling organizations, collaborations can occur within practically any area within psychology, and surely those contained within this book. The American Psychological Association Office of International Affairs has directories of national, regional, and international psychological organizations (see http://www.apa.org/international/directories/index.aspx), making contact with international colleagues much simpler than even 10 years ago. The editors and authors of this book have found most international colleagues willing to discuss activities and projects, even among organizations, and have found these projects

rewarding. Reaching out to other organizations through joint discussions is a way to share common interests, understand cultural influences on your specialty area, and increase collaborative understanding.

Other models and strategies to internationalize clinical and counseling psychology have also been proposed (these are discussed in greater detail in these two chapters). For example, Marsella and Pedersen (2004) presented an article offering 50 ways to internationalize the counseling curriculum, based on a 1999 presentation on internationalizing the psychology curriculum at the American Psychological Association (APA) convention. The authors present actions that could be taken by the APA (e.g., Sponsor international meetings to address the idea of "internationalizing" the curriculum), three within psychology departments (e.g., Incorporate cultural explanations of human behavior into explanatory models and theories; Requiring a course in global and international problems; Form collaborative training and research programs with foreign universities), and one by universities themselves (e.g., Support foreign language dormitories). Regardless of the model presented, each of these authors, and many others, espouse a new way of thinking about approaches to, conceptualizations of, and the practical impact once a global understanding of psychology is introduced and incorporated into coursework.

Impact of Globalization on Psychology in the USA

In the USA, different sectors have been slow in recognizing this trend toward globalization. For example, it has been pointed out that only a small number of the members of the US Congress hold a passport. By implication, our political leaders tend not to have an international or global perspective on various social, economic, and political problems. The same pattern is also true within organized psychology in the USA. It took until 1997 for the American Psychological Association to organize a Division of International Psychology (Division 52). Within the APA, it has been the Committee on International Relations in Psychology (CIRP) that has spearheaded attention to international and cross-cultural issues in psychology. However, even as recently as 1999, the need for such an international perspective has been challenged by the Policy and Planning Board of the APA that recommended the termination or "sunsetting" of the Committee on International Relations in Psychology. Fortunately, this short-sighted recommendation was not adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association.

Within CIRP, one of the major initiatives has been the project to internationalize the psychology curriculum within the USA. Among the various activities in support of this project, CIRP organized a series of invited lectures from distinguished psychologists with international and cross-cultural expertise and perspectives at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association. During the 2001 APA convention in San Francisco, invited lectures on internationalizing the curriculum in different specialties of psychology were given by Dr. Anthony Marsella on Clinical Psychology, Dr. Particia Greenfield on Developmental Psychology, and

Dr. Fathali Mogghadam on Social Psychology. At the same convention, Dr. Juris Draguns, recipient of the International Award from CIRP also gave an invited lecture on international psychology. At the APA convention in Toronto in 2003, CIRP continued with this invited lecture series with Dr. Frederick Leong presenting on Internationalizing Counseling Psychology.

Toward Internationalization of the Psychology Curriculum in the USA

Building upon these invited lectures, the APA Committee on International Relations in Psychology (CIRP) discussed organizing a volume that would address the issue of internationalizing the curriculum in psychology in the USA more comprehensively. With the annual shifting membership of CIRP, it was finally decided that the volume should not be a CIRP sponsored volume. Instead, some of the CIRP members actively involved in the Internationalizing the Curriculum project decided to take the lead in producing the volume. In addition to the APA lectures sponsored by CIRP, the Editors also invited other distinguished colleagues to join us in the preparation of this volume so that other specialties of psychology will also be covered (e.g., Personality, Health Psychology, Industrial-Organizational Psychology). The first and second editors of the proposed volume have served on the APA Committee on International Relations in Psychology.

Therefore, in response to the globalization movement, we have assembled the current volume to address how psychology in the USA can respond to this challenge by internationalizing its undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Authors were invited to prepare their chapter from the perspective of teaching and preparing a course from their respective areas of expertise. In essence, if readers in these areas were interested in reconceptualizing their courses from the perspective of internationalizing their content and readings, they will benefit from the authors' presenting the field from an international perspective. This very well-respected group of authors was chosen because they are already familiar with much of the international literature in their subfield. Each is internationally known themselves and has contributed significantly and broadly to the global literature. Each of the chapters provide a content-specific overview of how the curriculum in psychology with regards to social, development, clinical, counseling psychology, etc., will need to be modified in order to present a much more global view of psychology. Each of the chapters share theories, models, and research from an international and global perspective related to a particular specialty within psychology. Both the undergraduate and graduate (professional) curriculum is addressed. Additionally, a generous reference list has been included in each chapter. An appendix in the text also includes a list of Web sites specific to each chapter that will allow readers to further pursue pertinent information specific to their interests. The appendix will also include Web site information about general international psychological organizations (e.g., International Union of Psychological Science [IUPsyS]; International Association of Applied Psychology [IAAP]).

Recognizing that cultural context are central to a true and accurate psychology, the authors describe how cultural, economic, political, and social factors in different countries frame individual experience and affect the science and practice of psychology. As psychology increasingly accepts that most "truths and realities" in psychology are inherently local to a given time and place (cf. Cushman (1995)), it seems particularly important for researchers and practitioners to develop and sustain a truly multicultural and international perspective. We hope that the volume will provide information and resources to help psychology faculty educate and train future generations of psychologists within a much more international mindset and global perspective.

Finally, though the authors are primarily from the USA this was intentional given that the *book is intended for US audiences*. The USA is the region where we aim to globalize psychology's curriculum, so we believe it would be appropriate to have all contributors from this country. However, each of these authors are global leaders in their respective fields and are extremely familiar with the literature outside of the USA They have all conducted international research, attended many international conferences, have well-respected international colleagues, and are as internationally familiar with their respective fields as is possible.

References

Albrow, M. (1996). *The global age: State and society beyond modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cushman, P. (1995). *Constructing the self, constructing America: A cultural history of psychotherapy*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ægisdóttir, S., & Gerstein, L. (2005). Reaching out: Mental health delivery outside the box. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27*, 221–224.

Friedman, T. L. (1999a). A manifesto for the fast world: From supercharged financial markets to Osama bin Laden, the emerging global order demands an enforcer. That's America's new burden. *The New York Times Magazine*, pp. 41–44, 61, 68–69.

Friedman, T. L. (1999b). *The lexus and the olive tree: Understanding globalization*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, & Giroux.

Henderson, G., Spigner-Littles, D., & Milhouse, V. H. (2006). *A practitioner's guide to understanding indigenous and foreign cultures: An analysis of relationships between ethnicity, social class, and therapeutic intervention strategies*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Heppner, P. P. (2006). The benefits and challenges of becoming cross-culturally competent counseling psychologists: Presidential address. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*, 147–172.

Heppner, P. P., Leong, F. T. L., & Chiao, H. (2008). A growing internationalization of counseling psychology. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 65–85). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Leong, F. T. L. (2007). Cultural accommodation as method and metaphor. *American Psychologist, 62*, 916–927.

Leong, F. T. L., & Leach, M. M. (2007). Internationalizing counseling psychology in the United States: A SWOT analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 56*, 165–181.

Leong, F. T. L., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2003). A proposal for internationalizing counseling psychology in the United States: Rationale, recommendations, and challenges. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*, 381–395.

Marsella, A. J. (1998). Toward a "global-community psychology": Meeting the needs of a changing world. *American Psychologist, 53*, 1282–1291.

Marsella, A. J., & Pedersen, P. (2004). Internationalizing the counseling psychology curriculum: Toward new values, competencies, and directions. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 17*, 413–423.

Matsumoro, D., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2011). *Cross cultural research methods in psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mittelman, J. H. (2000). *The globalization syndrome: Transformation and resistance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pedersen, P., & Leong, F. T. L. (1997). Counseling in an international context. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25*, 117–121.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Trimble, J. E. (2001). A quest for discovering ethnocultural themes in psychology. In J. G. Ponterotto, M. J. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 3–13). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Waters, M. (1995) *Globalization*. London: Routledge.

Internationalizing the History of Psychology Course in the USA

Wade E. Pickren

Courses and texts in the history of a scientific discipline play several roles. They may, for example, seek to keep alive the master narrative of the science or profession and celebrate who the heroes or authorities have been. They often articulate the progress of the science or show how barriers to development of practice or techniques have been overcome. Courses in the history of a field may serve to express the identity of the field as a growing science or science-based profession and how the field holds an essential unity despite apparent dissimilarities. All of these purposes and more have been true of the history of psychology.

The course in the history of psychology has almost as long a history as the discipline of scientific psychology. Very early in psychology's history in the USA, the course in the "history and systems" of psychology was taught as part of the undergraduate curriculum. Early textbooks focused mostly on the philosophical antecedents of experimental psychology – Descartes, Locke, Kant, both Mills, etc. – and one assumes that it was this material that formed the basis of instruction (Baldwin 1913; Brett 1912). By the late 1920s, however, such noted psychologists as E. G. Boring, Gardner Murphy, and Walter Pillsbury produced textbooks that incorporated some of the principal developments in psychological science since 1879 (Boring 1929; Murphy 1929; Pillsbury 1929). It is from this era that the term, "history and systems" dates, as the field of scientific psychology was thought to have developed as a series of interrelated ideas that had received various interpretations, thus leading to schools of psychology. This approach is still popular, as evidenced by such best-selling history of psychology texts as Schultz and Schultz (2008). The history and systems of psychology course became institutionalized after the publication of E. G. Boring's

W.E. Pickren (✉)
Pace University, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: wpickren@pace.edu

F.T.L. Leong et al. (eds.), *Internationalizing the Psychology Curriculum in the United States*, International and Cultural Psychology,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-0073-8_2,

1929 volume, *A history of experimental psychology*. Historian of psychology, John O'Donnell, has effectively argued that Boring's text, which was, after James's *Principles of Psychology*, probably the most erudite and learned book to appear in the field of psychology, established an intellectual hierarchy within the field in which experimental laboratory psychology was privileged over the application of psychology (O'Donnell 1979). This was Boring's intention, O'Donnell argued, in order to combat the rapid increase in the numbers of psychologists engaged in applications. Surveys of psychologists from the time indicate that Boring had cause for concern if he felt the hegemony of experimental psychologists to be threatened. The increase in the number of psychologists throughout the 1920s and 1930s was mostly in applied/professional fields (Napoli 1981). An examination of the growth of APA membership in this period shows that among APA members alone, the percentage of those engaged in applied research grew from 9.3% in 1916 to 39% in 1940 (Finch and Odoroff 1939, 1941).

The development and growth of the history and systems course reflected Boring's approach. Psychologists who taught undergraduate and graduate students were predominately those who had been trained in the ethos of psychology as an experimental science. For them, Boring's privileging of laboratory work made sense and applied work, while perhaps interesting and important, was not perceived as crucial to the history of the field. Boring's history of the field was also the dominant textbook at the time and continued to be so into the 1950s and 1960s, with a new edition of *A History of Experimental Psychology* appearing in 1950 (Boring 1950). By the 1960s, other textbooks began to appear, for example, Marx and Hillix's *Systems and Theories in Psychology* (1963) and Schultz's *A History of Modern Psychology* (1960). However, these texts and later ones more or less continued the approach taken by Boring. What has been the role and impact of such textbook histories?

As several historians of psychology have pointed out, textbook histories are not the same as historical scholarship (Furumoto 1989; O'Donnell 1993). Textbook histories in many scientific disciplines play important pedagogical and rhetorical roles. The pedagogical functions are primarily to give students a sense of the philosophical background of their discipline and an account of the progress of disciplinary knowledge. The rhetorical functions of such texts and courses are to inculcate a sense of identity or identification with the scientific field, psychology in our case, and the values of the scientific community at the time of publication. To use Boring's text as an example, Boring was clearly worried that the rapid growth of applied psychology was a threat to the scientific status of psychology. This was an era in which the relatively small number of publishing experimental psychologists was desperately seeking a sense of their legitimacy as a science vis-à-vis other natural and life sciences (Danziger 1990; Pickren 2007). Boring's core scientific values were invested in experimentalism. Thus, his textbook histories (1929, 1950), sought to establish experimental psychology as the only real psychology and by implication to diminish the status of applied psychology. Students, then, without it being baldly stated to

them, learned that a real psychologist was an experimental psychologist. What was not usually done by textbook authors was to actually contextualize the history of the field. By the mid-1960s, that began to change as a new generation of students and scholars began to create the scholarly field of the history of psychology.

In what is now widely considered a landmark article in the field of history of psychology, Robert Young offered a critique of the then current textbook histories, while also pointing the way toward serious scholarship in the history of the behavioral sciences (Young 1966). The nascent field needed, Young argued, to move beyond the celebratory, descriptive, and/or hagiographic approach then dominant. Young's article was part of a broader movement within psychology to establish a specialty field of research and scholarship; his article provided a key rationale for these efforts. In the same timeframe as the article, a national archives of American psychology was established – The Archives of the History of American Psychology. Two new scholarly societies emerged: Cheiron, the International Society for the History of the Behavioral Sciences and Division 26, within the American Psychological Association, now known as the Society for the History of Psychology.

These events were critical for the course in the history of psychology as well. The field began to grow, attracting members who were more advanced in their careers, while at the same time attracting young scholars interested in becoming specialists in the field. Two new graduate programs in the History and Theory of Psychology were founded, one at the University of New Hampshire and one at York University in Toronto. By the 1970s, then, there were a growing number of scholars who were producing critical, scholarly histories of psychology that sought to understand psychology, both in its scientific substance and its everyday practices, in the larger social, political, and cultural context. This scholarship has grown in the intervening years and now represents a large corpus of insightful, critical literature that has wide range both chronologically and topically. Wellesley psychologist–historian, Laurel Furumoto, summed up these new approaches in her insightful chapter on "The New History of Psychology" from the G. Stanley Hall Lecture Series (1989). This new history, Furumoto explained:

> tends to be critical rather than ceremonial, contextual rather than simply the history of ideas, and more inclusive, going beyond the study of "great men." The new history utilizes primary sources and archival documents, rather than relying on secondary sources, which can lead to the passing down of anecdotes and myths from one generation of textbook writers to the next. And finally, the new history tries to get inside the thought of a period to see issues as they appeared at the time, rather than looking for antecedents of current ideas or writing history backwards from the present content of the field.
>
> Furumoto (1989, p. 18)

The development of specialization in the history of psychology, among graduate students as well as among more senior faculty who discovered an interest in the specialty, has important implications for the course in the history of psychology. Before I examine that impact, though, it is worth asking the question of how the course itself has fared across the USA.

Current Status of the History, Course in the USA

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, a comprehensive survey of both undergraduate and graduate programs in psychology asked if the course was being taught, if taught, was it required, and what were the intentions of the department for the future of the course (Fuchs and Viney 2002). Of those who responded to the survey, the percentage of departments that offered a course in the history of psychology ranged from 83.5% at comprehensive universities to 76.4% at colleges offering only a BA. So, the history of psychology course remains one of the standard offerings at many US colleges and universities.

How has the new history of psychology that Furumoto articulated impacted the history of psychology course in the USA in these institutions? This is an important question, given that most of the professors who teach the course have not become specialists in the field, and it is especially pertinent because the North American undergraduate curriculum is the largest setting for the course in the history of psychology (Fuchs and Viney 2002). The development of a more historicized and contextualized history of psychology has had an uneven impact. In North American universities and colleges, there is often a tension between those whose academic specialty is the history of psychology and those who are nonspecialists but who enjoy teaching the course. The former often seek a critical perspective in the instructional materials, while the latter may prefer texts that portray the history of psychology as a forward march of scientific progress. Several surveys have found that professors still rely primarily on textbook histories, rather than organizing their course material around the use of primary sources or archival materials (Ciccarelli and Cushman 1999; Hogan et al. 1998). However, there is increasing evidence that some textbook authors have begun to incorporate a more critical and contextual approach in their coverage (e.g., Lawson et al. 2007; Schultz and Schultz 2008), while some authors have adopted a critical historiography in their coverage of the traditional topics of the course (e.g., Goodwin 2005; Leahey 2000), and a few textbook authors have begun to move beyond the typical topics to include material on women, racial and ethnic minorities, and professional practice in psychology (e.g., Goodwin 2005; Lawson et al. 2007; Pickren and Rutherford 2010). However, this coverage is usually in the form of a separate chapter at the end of the text, rather than integrated into the text. Pickren and Rutherford (2010), by contrast, have utilized a critical, social-constructionist approach that incorporates gender and race as part of the intellectual foundation of the volume, as well as featuring indigenization of psychological knowledge as part of the explanatory framework.

Apart from the recent volumes by Lawson et al. (2007) and Pickren and Rutherford (2010), there has been little attention paid in textbooks to the history of psychology as it has developed in other countries, other than accounts of scientific psychology's beginning in German, French, or British settings. Given the nature of our globalizing world, it is necessary for that to change.

The most rapid growth of psychology in non-European, non-American countries occurred after World War II. This is the topic for the next section. However, there

was a presence of modern psychology in several countries prior to the war. I give three examples here and will return to this in the last section. Miki Takasuna has documented the development of psychology in Japan, where Yujiro Motora brought experimental psychology from his study with G. Stanley Hall at Clark University in the 1880s (Takasuna 2006). Wundt's experimental psychology was brought to China early in the twentieth century and psychology continued to have a place in Chinese education despite the many shifts in government and ideology (Shen 2006). In India, a curriculum in the new psychological science was drawn up in 1905, but not implemented until 1915 at the University of Calcutta. Psychoanalysis was introduced into India in 1918 and continued to thrive there for many years (Hartnack 2001).

From History of Psychology to Histories of Psychologies

Since the end of World War II, psychology has experienced remarkable growth, not only in North America, but in Europe and in many countries around the world. The growth accelerated first in the USA. In response to policymakers' and the public's concerns about the nation's mental health and the perceived need to keep the USA competitive in the postwar world, funds for psychological research increased exponentially between 1948 and 1968. As a result the psychological disciplines, science and practice, became resource rich for the first time. This resulted in the golden age of psychological research, an era when available funds increased significantly each year. Funds for training clinical psychologists to help meet growing mental health needs grew dramatically and changed the nature of clinical psychology from a focus on school-related problems to a focus on assessment, diagnosis, and psychotherapy (Pickren and Schneider 2005). Large-scale programs sponsored by the Veterans Administration dramatically increased the number of clinical and counseling psychologists (Baker and Pickren 2007). One scholar has called this period the "Golden Age of Psychology" (Rice 2005). This growth in both numbers and funding resources was crucial for the rise to hegemony of US psychology in the 20–30 years after the war. These developments occurred in the context of the growing economic, political, and military influence of the USA. In this postwar era, the USA embarked on a long-term strategy to increase its influence in many parts of the world using a variety of means to do so. Economic influence, educational programs, covert use of intelligence agencies to undermine and overthrow governments perceived as hostile were all aspects of these strategies.

The influence of American psychology grew as well. This is the background for the development of psychology elsewhere in the world. In the postwar era, most of the European countries were in shambles, with significant losses of population, damaged infrastructure, and in some cases, nonfunctional governments. The various sciences suffered as universities and laboratory space and national organizations had been damaged. Prior to the war, many of the European countries had consistently attracted international students, typically from their colonies or former colonies. So,

France had students from many of their African colonies, Britain from what are now called the Commonwealth countries, especially India. Still, European countries remained for some time a desirable destination for higher education, especially graduate education. Within Europe, the structures of science were rebuilt, often with a lot of American help and with the concomitant American influence. In Britain, despite the strictures brought on by the war and diminished faculty, by the mid-1950s, there was significant activity in psychology, especially in cognitive psychology with the legacy of Bartlett and the contemporary work of scientists like Donald Broadbent (Boden 2006).

In this flux, many students from around the world came to the USA instead of going to Europe. Students came even from very poor countries, as the promise of education to aid in national development led many of these "developing" nations to fund thousands of their best and brightest for an education in the USA (Escobar 1995; Westad 2007). During the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s these students came to be trained in mathematics, physics, and other natural sciences. Psychology also benefited, as many sought graduate training as social psychologists, personality researchers, neuroscientists, clinical psychologists, and many other areas within American psychology. Many learned the dominant theoretical approaches of the time, whether some type of behaviorism, or later, cognitivism. And, of course, American psychologists traveled to other countries to conferences, to give workshops or serve as Fullbright Fellows. Personality psychologist David McClellan even extended his idea of achievement motivation – an approach that was thoroughly saturated with American capitalism dependent on American notions of individualism – to other countries, particularly India, to explain why such places were coming up short in their efforts to modernize (McClelland and Winter 1969).

Many of these students remained in the USA, but many took the psychology they learned back to their home land. In some countries, governments enlisted psychologists and other social scientists to use their expertise to help solve critical social problems, such as rural poverty in India (Sinha 1969, 1998). It was at this time, at this historical juncture, that many of the Western-trained psychologists discovered that the psychology they had learned in the West was not an adequate match for their own situation. Enough time has passed, that we can now have a historical perspective on these events and can see that this was the beginning of the modern indigenization movement in psychology. It is these histories that we now need to infuse into our history of psychology so that what we have is not a singular history of psychology but histories of psychologies.

Recent International Developments in the History of Psychology

In the last two decades, psychologists and historians in several countries have begun to write histories of the field within their countries. As in the USA, some of these histories are clearly intended to legitimize certain approaches and/or celebrate developments. There are, as well, some very serious and critical histories that are being