

© 2024, American Psychological Association. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the final, authoritative version of the article. Please do not copy or cite without authors' permission. The final article will be available, upon publication, via its

DOI: 10.1037/stl0000409

### **Going Global: Intersections of APA's *Guidelines 3.0* with International Foundational Competence Framework**

Susan A. Nolan, Department of Psychology, Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey, USA; [susan.nolan@shu.edu](mailto:susan.nolan@shu.edu); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6339-9563>

Jacquelyn Cranney, School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia; [j.cranney@unsw.edu.au](mailto:j.cranney@unsw.edu.au); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8731-440>

Fanli Jia, Department of Psychology, Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey, USA; [fanli.jia@shu.edu](mailto:fanli.jia@shu.edu); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7149-455X>

Lenka Sokolová, Institute of Applied Psychology, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University Bratislava, Slovakia; [lenka.sokolova@fses.uniba.sk](mailto:lenka.sokolova@fses.uniba.sk); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8535-5713>

Sahaya G. Selvam, Department of Education, Marist International University College, Kenya; [selvam@miuc.ac.ke](mailto:selvam@miuc.ac.ke); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1958-0805>

Dana S. Dunn, Department of Psychology, Moravian University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, USA; [dunn@morvian.edu](mailto:dunn@morvian.edu); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3434-2044>

Jasmine A. Mena, Department of Psychology, Bucknell University, USA;

[j.mena@bucknell.edu](mailto:j.mena@bucknell.edu); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7707-7602>

Aaron S. Richmond, Department of Psychological Sciences, Metropolitan State University of Denver, Denver, USA; [arichmo3@msudenver.edu](mailto:arichmo3@msudenver.edu); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3699-1347>

Michael A. Machin, School of Psychology and Wellbeing, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia; [tony.machin@usq.edu.au](mailto:tony.machin@usq.edu.au); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0967-6934>

Illia Yahiiaiev, Faculty of Psychology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine; [askamah@knu.ua](mailto:askamah@knu.ua); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1432-6821>

### **Author Note**

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Susan A. Nolan, Department of Psychology, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Avenue, South Orange, NJ 07079 USA.  
Email: [susan.nolan@shu.edu](mailto:susan.nolan@shu.edu)

### Abstract

As both the discipline of psychology and psychology post-secondary education are increasingly global in nature, there is a need for ways to communicate across countries and contexts to facilitate collaboration and mobility of programs, degrees, graduates, and faculty. As such, we believe that it is important that the American Psychological Association's third iteration of its *Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major* (2023) explicitly aimed as more international than its predecessors. Thus, we analyzed *Guidelines 3.0* through an international lens. Our first goal was to outline how the *Guidelines 3.0* Task Force embraced an international outlook and to describe how *Guidelines 3.0* may impact the internationalization of psychology curricula in the U.S. Second, we describe how *Guidelines 3.0* may be used in international contexts, offering specific international examples, and noting potential benefits of its international application, as well as cultural and regulatory challenges to its broader use. Third, we explore several other competence frameworks used around the world and identify similarities and differences compared to *Guidelines 3.0*. We conclude by highlighting the Beta Model of the *International Competences for Undergraduate Psychology*, the first international framework developed for undergraduate psychology curricula.

*Keywords:* undergraduate psychology, international competences, global citizenship, learning outcomes, psychological literacy

**Going Global: Intersections of APA's *Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major*****3.0 with International Competence Frameworks**

The prevalence of psychology post-secondary educational programs has been increasing internationally (McCarthy et al., 2012; Takooshian et al., 2016). Approximately 10 years ago, there were an estimated 4000 psychology education or training programs globally (Bullock, 2014), a number that almost certainly has increased since then; indeed, Shealy and colleagues note that psychology “is thriving as one of the most popular areas of study in universities all over the world” (p. 12; 2023). Beyond psychology, an International Association of Universities (IAU) survey found that more than 90% of institutions mentioned internationalization in their mission or strategic plan (Marinoni, 2019). (This percentage is markedly lower – about 70% – in North America.) Survey respondents cited “enhanced international cooperation and capacity building” and “improved quality of teaching and learning” as the primary benefits of internationalization (p. 25). But IAU survey respondents cited several challenges, including assessment of the quality of programs from another nation and determining “equivalences of qualifications, study programmes and course credits” (p. 26).

Broad international frameworks for post-secondary education, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Future of Education and Skills 2030 (2023), can contribute to the achievement of these benefits while mitigating challenges in communication and mobility concerning programs and degrees; however, we also need discipline-specific frameworks. For these reasons, it is noteworthy that the American Psychological Association's (APA) third iteration of its *Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major* (*Guidelines 3.0* hereafter; 2023) is the most explicitly intentional in including international inputs and considerations. In the current paper, we provide an overview of the

*Guidelines*' history; discuss the international nature of *Guidelines 3.0*; suggest ways it might help internationalize U.S. curricula; and consider both opportunities and cultural and regulatory challenges for it to have an impact beyond the U.S.

Subsequently, we briefly describe other competency frameworks used nationally, regionally, and internationally, exploring overlap with and differences from *Guidelines 3.0*. We particularly focus on the *International Competences for Undergraduate Psychology (ICUP)*, currently in a Beta Model, developed by an international team. All the authors of this paper were involved with both the APA Task Force that developed *Guidelines 3.0* as a member or international contributor and with *ICUP* as members of either the central or advisory committees.

### **An Overview of Guidelines 3.0**

The vision behind the three versions of the *Guidelines* is that psychological science is a high-impact undergraduate major that can lead to post-graduate employment or to a higher degree in psychology or another field. The APA Board of Educational Affairs (BEA) Task Force on Psychology Major Competencies, composed of a team of U.S. psychology educators, developed each iteration of the *Guidelines*. The particular vision of *Guidelines 3.0* is for psychology to empower individuals from diverse backgrounds to make a difference in their lives and communities.

APA convened the first Task Force in 2002. The first *Guidelines* (APA, 2007) delineated educational goals tied to the liberal arts versus those linked specifically to psychology. *Guidelines 2.0* addressed particular concerns, including the 10-goal structure which, though detailed, posed implementation challenges (APA, 2013). *Guidelines 2.0* distilled the 10 goals into five, thereby highlighting psychology's scientific foundation. *Guidelines 3.0* (APA, 2023) coincided with the Covid-19 pandemic, leading the Task Force members to reflect deeply on

design and delivery issues linked to the psychology major and the need to address social justice concerns. Thus, *Guidelines 3.0* consciously considered “changes in culture and context to prepare undergraduates who will function optimally prepared for contemporary life” (APA, 2023, p. 3).

*Guidelines 3.0* outlines five overarching goals: Content knowledge and applications; scientific inquiry and critical thinking; values in psychological science; communication, psychological literacy, and technology skills; and personal and professional development. Each goal has three to six outcomes. For example, one of the outcomes for “values in psychological science” is “Develop and practice interpersonal and intercultural responsiveness” (p. 13). Further, each outcome has 1 to 8 indicators at both the foundation (e.g., community college) and baccalaureate levels. For the outcome listed above, one of the foundation indicators is “Recognize how heritage, power, and privilege may produce differential access to opportunity” with a parallel baccalaureate indicator of “Seek equitable decisions and actions in allocating resources and opportunities” (p. 14).

APA recruited *Guidelines 3.0* Task Force members in various ways. They asked past members of the *Guidelines 2.0* Task Force were asked about their willingness to serve on the new Task Force, with the aim that about half of the new Task Force would comprise former members. The APA recruited new members through an open call from APA’s BEA. They designed the final Task Force to balance experience, gender, racial identity, geographic representation, and institution type (community college, four-year college or university). They issued a second open call to recruit people of color to emphasize the importance of equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI). LGBTQ individuals also were represented in the final group. The final Task Force included 13 psychology educators and two APA staff liaisons. Online meetings

began in January 2021 and the Task Force completed an initial draft of *Guidelines 3.0* in early 2022. The Task Force sought high school and international educators' perspectives throughout the process.

APA policies have a “shelf life” of ten years, so educationally related policy such as *Guidelines 2.0* must be revisited by APA's BEA every ten years. The *Guidelines 3.0* draft appeared online before it was finalized, allowing APA constituencies and interested members of the public (e.g., educators) the opportunity to make comments on the draft. The Task Force responded to all input, making revisions as necessary. The final version was approved by a vote of the APA Council of Representatives in August 2023.

### **The International Nature of Guidelines 3.0**

*Guidelines 3.0* is the most explicitly international of any of the three iterations. Indeed, the Task Force for this version explicitly included among its philosophical principles that “Psychological science should promote attention to different global perspectives and contributions” (p. 22). This principle highlights an emphasis on future graduates working in “interdependent global systems” (p. 23), especially as the academic discipline and practice of psychology grow worldwide. *Guidelines 3.0* encourage curricula to move beyond the traditional focus on psychological science based on researchers, participant samples, research questions, and gatekeepers (e.g., journal editors, granting agencies) who are Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) (Henrich et al., 2010). This is not to suggest that psychological science traditionally based on WEIRD methodologies is worthless; rather, *Guidelines* explicitly observe that “[p]sychological thinkers benefit from a conscientious pursuit of what we may learn from other countries and cultures” (p. 23). Less directly international, but no less important, other principles note the transformative nature of psychology, including with respect to “social

policy and cultural transformation” and the “value of diverse voices,” an emphasis on the diversity of ideas, and the need to work toward “a fair, just, and equitable society” (p. 22).

Moreover, for the first time in the history of the *Guidelines*, the Task Force consulted with an international constituency. Ten colleagues (out of 21 invited) from **Australia**, **China (Mainland** and Hong Kong), Colombia, **Kenya**, **Slovakia**, Turkey, and **Ukraine** provided extensive feedback on an earlier draft. (Countries represented by authors of the current paper are in bold.) The *Guidelines 3.0* document provides a brief overview of this process and rationale:

**Global considerations.** Our process involved conferring with both domestic and international experts on how educators across the globe deliver the discipline at the undergraduate level. Past versions of the Guidelines have been influential in setting expectations beyond the United States for undergraduate student performance. To those ends, we were careful to incorporate generic language that might be easier to apply across international boundaries. (p. 27).

More specifically, the Task Force gained several important insights through this process. Six of the 10 respondents were previously aware of the *Guidelines*. One observed that “this set of documents is possibly the most comprehensive readily accessible set of teaching resources for undergraduate psychology in the world” (p. 38). Some noted that national and regional policies (e.g., Bologna Process, Lunt, 2005) preclude institutional use; however, several respondents reported its use by individual instructors. Respondents valued the inclusion of internationalization, values and ethics, diversity and inclusion, social justice, career development, open science and transparency, and technology skills.

Some respondents, of course, offered criticisms as well. Respondents asked for an increased emphasis on psychological literacy and student values with respect to careers, and



noted sometimes unclear divisions between foundation and baccalaureate outcomes. They reported conceptual and language issues, including that the U.S. framework surrounding EDI differs from related constructs elsewhere, and that the U.S. meaning of “ethnicity” does not translate to many contexts and countries. Others encouraged a more global view of psychology’s history. The Task Force acknowledged these criticisms, writing that they “agree, and hope that the increased international emphasis in *Guidelines 3.0* will encourage broader conversations among U.S. instructors and between U.S. instructors and international colleagues” (p. 38).

The Task Force directly asked the respondents whether *Guidelines 3.0* were too U.S.-centric to have value in non-U.S. contexts. Most respondents thought they could be useful despite this orientation. One observed that “[i]t has a global outlook—and very conscious about it” (p. 38). Another said, “I don’t think it is too U.S.-centric to be useful, but it is clearly a U.S.-centric document” (p. 38). Yet another stated that “It would be interesting to have an international perspective on what undergrad psychology degree can do internationally,” (p. 38); an interesting foreshadowing of the International Collaboration on Undergraduate Psychology Outcomes project that we will discuss later.

In part, because of this valuable international input, the indicators in *Guidelines 3.0* include *direct* reference to the importance of international contributions to research, as well as the need for psychological science to address issues of global concern. For example, for Goal 2, scientific inquiry and critical thinking, one of the baccalaureate indicators is to “Incorporate international sources, including nonwestern researchers and samples, in research processes, where appropriate” (p. 11). And for Goal 3, values in psychological science, one of the baccalaureate indicators is to “Apply psychological principles to address issues of global concern (e.g., poverty, health, migration, human rights, international conflict, sustainability)” (p. 14).

Several indicators *indirectly* reference issues of global concern. For example, Goal 1, content knowledge and application, highlights the importance of understanding the sociocultural context and addressing intercultural conflicts. Goal 2, scientific inquiry and critical thinking, includes understanding researchers' values, worldview, and sociocultural context; considering socioculturally relevant research limitations, including limitations on external validity; and valuing qualitative research which "captures varied human experiences" (p. 11). For Goal 3, values in psychological science, several indicators address interpersonal and intercultural responsiveness (e.g., "Articulate the value of and seek opportunities to interact respectfully with people of diverse abilities, backgrounds, nationalities, and cultural perspectives"; p. 13). Other indicators for this goal discuss psychology's role in public policy and civic engagement. Indirect connections for Goal 4 (communication, psychological literacy, and technology skills) include understanding the role of culture in interpersonal communication, using psychological concepts to facilitate communication among people from diverse backgrounds, and using inclusive language. And for Goal 5, indicators mention adaptation to diverse cultural contexts, civic engagement, and the incorporation of diverse perspectives including when problem solving.

For the first time, *Guidelines 3.0* also explicitly references international trends in post-secondary education, in a section titled "International Implications of *Guidelines 3.0*" (p. 36). These trends include harmonization (a more flexible form of standardization) across programs within a region, as well as the enhanced mobility that harmonization fosters. The first and most prominent of these initiatives is the Bologna Process (European Commission, 2020), a series of reforms in post-secondary education that aims to create a harmonized and compatible post-secondary education across Europe. It was initiated in 1999 and aimed to enhance the mobility of students and faculty within Europe, improve the quality and transparency of post-secondary

education systems, and foster mutual recognition of qualifications and degrees across participating countries.

In another example, at the recommendation of one of the international consultants, *Guidelines 3.0* mentions the several-decades-old “Bogotá model.” This model acknowledges that some nations have both a dearth of mental health professionals and strong needs for such professionals due to chronic poverty and conflict. The Bogotá model provides a framework for those with undergraduate psychology degrees to help meet these needs by providing a range of clinical services in much of Latin America (Benito, 2009). *Guidelines 3.0* noted the wide range of stakeholders considered by the Bologna Process, the Bogotá model, and other international efforts, including employers, community organizations, and the public, which have traditionally not been considered in the U.S. (APA, 2023; Nolan et al., 2020).

In addition, *Guidelines 3.0* provides, in a specifically labeled section, a concise, accurate and stimulating discussion of psychological literacy (PL) and the related concept of global citizenship (GC), explicitly defining PL as the ability “to use psychological theory and empirical evidence to enhance or improve everyday decisions and daily life in general at local, national, and international levels” (p. 37), and concluding that “creating psychologically literate international citizens—those who see using psychological science to benefit all of humanity—is a good idea” (p. 37). Cranney and colleagues (2012) defined GC as “the understanding of global interrelatedness, and the capacity to live, work and contribute positively as a member of global communities” (p. iii); clearly GC is a transdisciplinary concept. Cranney and colleagues (2022b) argued that: (a) despite previous literature using the terms PL, ‘psychologically literate citizenship’ (PLC, which could be conceived as equivalent to the term ‘psychologically literate global citizenship’) and ‘global citizenship’ somewhat interchangeably – these concepts are

distinct; (b) the steps between PL, PLC and GC involve increased capability particularly in cultural responsiveness (see Nolan et al., in prep, b, for a definition), and in values and ethics (including that relevant to ‘serving the common good’); and (c) similar trajectories toward GC occur in other disciplines. We discuss PL again when we compare *Guidelines 3.0* and *ICUP*.

*Guidelines 3.0* observes that a move toward a common curricular and assessment language might foster its adoption outside of the U.S., while also noting that cultural and regulatory differences might hinder or even preclude their use in some contexts. In response to this, and similar challenges, *Guidelines 3.0* retains its commitment to remain aspirational. That said, *Guidelines 3.0* also issues a call to action for U.S. educators to internationalize their curricula. As *Guidelines 3.0* attests, “an ongoing conversation about similarities across countries and world regions might enhance both post-secondary education quality and mobility” (p. 41). In pursuit of this goal and at the behest of international contributors, the document provides international resources, including links to international research ethics standards and organizations that foster psychology learning and teaching. The authors of *Guidelines 3.0* hope that the document may have international impacts including the promotion of internationalization of curricula in the U.S.

### **The Potential Impact of Guidelines 3.0 from an International Perspective**

*Guidelines 3.0* issues a “Call to Action” which describes how they might be useful in the internationalization of curricula in the U.S. *and* for the development of curricula worldwide. For the U.S., previous iterations of the document, including *Guidelines 2.0*, have been widely adopted. One study of 439 undergraduate programs in the U.S. found that 82% of four-year programs developed learning outcomes and assessment strategies based on the document (Norcross et al., 2016). *Guidelines 3.0* will likely have a similar influence in the U.S., facilitated

by the fact that the structure of the Goals is largely the same. Because of its widespread use, the emphasis on internationalization in *Guidelines 3.0* might have an impact on curricula in the U.S. For example, the document is explicit in urging internationalization of program curricula, but also at the course/unit level. With respect to internationalization, *Guidelines 3.0* encourages educators to “consider the topics we choose, the research we cover, and the readings we assign” (p. 37). To facilitate educators’ ability to internationalize, the document provides links to readings about broad ways to encompass global curricular challenges (e.g., IJzerman et al., 2021), as well as seemingly smaller, but also important, ways to diversify examples, including names and photos, in our courses/units (Littleford & Nolan, 2013).

Countries beyond the U.S. have already implemented courses/units and programs aligned with *Guidelines 3.0*, such as indicator 1.4 “Utilize psychological knowledge to identify methods of preventing or addressing interpersonal and intercultural conflicts,” indicator 2.3 “Incorporate sociocultural factors in scientific research practices,” and indicator 3.2 “Develop and practice interpersonal and intercultural responsiveness.” For example, psychology undergraduate programs in Japanese, Korean and Chinese universities have included Cultural Psychology in their curriculum as a core course of exploring both universal and culturally specific processes that foster students’ intercultural development (Enns, 2016; Akimoto, 2016). Similarly, in Ukraine, all undergraduate psychology students are taught courses/units in cultural psychology (often called “Ethnocultural Psychology”), which address the cultural determination of mind and behavior, the cultural identity of groups, interaction between different cultures, and interethnic conflict. Several U.S. international campuses (e.g., Saint Louis University-Madrid; Kean University-Wenzhou; American University-Dubai) have also incorporated cultural and international perspectives into their foundational curricula for psychology majors. These

institutions aim to synchronize their programs with global teaching benchmarks, thereby enriching the excellence of their academic programs while encouraging worldwide interaction.

*Guidelines 3.0* has the potential to simplify the process for international institutions when it comes to evaluating and acknowledging undergraduate degrees from various countries. Any simplification of processes, in turn, can facilitate mutual recognition and improve the transferability of degrees among different institutions around the world, such as the Taiwan Psychology Network, the Korean Psychology Network (Wang & Heppner, 2015), and Indian Psychologists (Chaudhary & Sriram, 2020). Taking India as an example, Indian psychologists continue to face obstacles in integrating into “mainstream” psychology due to the regulated route which often requires education in Western countries. To address this challenge, if Indian programs implement *Guidelines 3.0* (e.g., Goal 5 “Personal and Professional Development”), these programs can help provide Indian students with the necessary skills for academic and career success in psychology, fostering global competence through homogenization of practices within Indian universities and globally.

*Guidelines 3.0* might also be useful in countries and regions that do not have an existing framework specific to psychology. For example, the *East African Qualifications Framework for Higher Education* (EAC, 2015) offers a “tool for harmonization of education and training systems and the qualifications attained” within its seven member states (i.e., Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda; p. 5). The Qualifications Framework provides five key learning outcomes for undergraduate degrees across disciplines that loosely correspond to the Goals in *Guidelines 3.0*. As two examples, *Framework Outcome 1*, “demonstrate knowledge and understanding in a field of study,” could link to *Guidelines Goal 1*, “content knowledge and applications,” and *Framework Outcome 4*, “can

communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences,” could link to *Guidelines* Goal 4, “communication, psychological literacy, and technology skills.” In this way, *Guidelines 3.0* might prove useful for adapting the *Framework* to the discipline of psychology. It is interesting to note differences in language between the two documents. Some language in the *Framework* expands on what *Guidelines 3.0* calls for. For example, in the ability to communicate, the *Framework* states the importance of communicating with both “specialist and non-specialist audiences” and highlights the importance of skills related to self-directed learning as an outcome of undergraduate studies, neither of which are explicitly included in *Guidelines 3.0*. Conversely, several relevant insights from *Guidelines 3.0* are not featured in the *Framework*, such as critical thinking and the discourse around values in psychological science. This example models how an interaction between *Guidelines 3.0* and national or regional frameworks could enrich both.

In addition, in the U.S., the inclusion of scholars who were born and raised outside the U.S. can significantly impact the shift in scientific and practical methodologies, thereby moving away from a U.S. ethnocentric perspective (Thalmayer et al., 2021) and fostering an interest in global issues and viewpoints (Consoli et al., 2022; Shealy et al., 2023). For example, according to 2016 data from the APA, approximately 7.8% of doctoral trainees in psychology programs were international students (Christidis et al., 2018). Institutions worldwide can more effectively assess students' competence and readiness for international academic progression by aligning curricula with specific learning objectives. This alignment also helps to mitigate the challenges faced by international students, such as unfamiliarity with educational expectations and uncertainties in career development (Consoli et al., 2022; Lee, et al., 2022).

Possibly the most significant goal in internationalization efforts is the development of

critical thinking skills (Cranney et al., 2022a). Various studies have shown that critical thinking skills levels and gains differ across countries (Fan & See, 2022; Van Damme et al., 2023). As noted above, critical thinking is not explicit in the *East African Qualifications Framework*. In China, research indicated that first-year university students had similar levels of critical thinking skills as first-year students in the U.S.; however, by the end of the fourth year, Chinese university students scored significantly lower than senior-year students in the U.S. (Loyalka et al., 2021). Moreover, research suggested that there were minimal gains in critical thinking skills in students from China, India, and Russia from the start of their first year to the end of their second year of university (Loyalka et al., 2021). This disparity underlines the necessity of cultivating critical thinking skills, and it reinforces *Guidelines 3.0* Goal 2, which focuses on “Scientific Inquiry and Critical Thinking.”

It is important, however, to consider potential challenges that may arise while implementing these guidelines internationally. Different countries might have distinct cultural contexts requiring careful adaptation and consideration when applying guidelines originally developed within a U.S. context (*Guidelines 3.0*). Other countries may have strict governmental control over their educational curricula, leaving little room for institutions or departments to implement extensive alterations (*Guidelines 3.0*; D’Amato et al., 2013). For example, Indian educators have engaged in considerable debate about the inclusion of ideas from Hindu scriptures in Indian Psychology textbooks rather than solely relying on U.S. textbooks (Chaudhary & Sriram, 2020). Similarly, the predominance of U.S.-translated psychology textbooks in China raises questions about the extent to which these materials reflect the unique psychological context and Indigenous knowledge of China (Duan & Li, 2022; Jing & Fu, 2001). Moreover, the Canadian Psychological Association has called for the implementation of



Indigenous perspectives in professional training (Ansloos et al., 2019) and the incorporation of “cultural curricula” in the training of school psychologists (Bernett et al., 2023). It is, therefore, crucial to highlight aspects of *Guidelines 3.0* that could help address these challenges. By promoting EDI in education, these guidelines offer a framework for enhancing cultural awareness and understanding.

### **The Intersections of Guidelines 3.0 and Other Competence Frameworks**

Professional psychologists, as well as graduates of undergraduate psychology programs who pursue other careers, should possess a broad range of competences to effectively address issues related to human thinking and behavior. Since its beginnings, in the early 1900s in some countries, psychology education has changed dramatically. Student and workforce mobility, as well as global challenges that impact psychological practices and research around the world, have led to some degree of convergence of national and regional guidelines. As the field expands globally, it becomes crucial to establish internationally recognized competences that ensure the quality and consistency of psychology education and that reflect the needs of graduates, whether they pursue a career in professional psychology (Papageorgi et al., 2023).

Perhaps the best known regional-international competences project specific to psychology education is in Europe. Following the Bologna Process (European Commission, 2020) and the EU Directive on professional qualifications, the European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations (EFPA) launched EuroPsy, the certification system for psychologists in Europe, in 2010. The EuroPsy framework (EFPA, 2023) aims to ensure high standards of psychology practice across Europe. Even though EuroPsy ultimately governs the training of professional psychologists, it inevitably guides psychology post-secondary education starting at the undergraduate level. EuroPsy defines seven domains of competences, including knowledge

and theory, research, assessment and diagnosis, intervention, communication and interpersonal skills, professional conduct, and supervision and consultation. Notably, EuroPsy also emphasizes the importance of lifelong learning and continuous professional development for psychologists.

Since the launch of EuroPsy, a more global initiative, the International Project on Competence in Psychology (2016) developed the *International Declaration on Core Competencies in Professional Psychology*. Less prescriptive than EuroPsy, and similar to *Guidelines 3.0*, the IPCP aimed to develop general competences, rather than standards, that might support education, accreditation, and certification specific to various local contexts.

Whether required, as with EuroPsy, or merely guidelines, as with IPCP and *Guidelines 3.0*, frameworks specific to psychology education may guide national or institutional decision-makers in developing standards and study programs in psychology that reflect international perspectives and educate psychology students to navigate global and local challenges. They highlight the importance of cultural diversity and communication skills, recognizing the need for psychologists to work effectively with individuals from diverse backgrounds. Furthermore, these frameworks emphasize research skills, ethical conduct, and professional values as crucial components of psychological practice. In the next section, we discuss the *International Competences for Undergraduate Psychology (ICUP)*; Nolan et al., in prep, b), a more recent set of guidelines that address undergraduate foundational psychology specifically, and that used these and other international educational frameworks as inputs in its development.

### **Guidelines 3.0 and the International Competences for Undergraduate Psychology (ICUP)**

The *ICUP* is a set of foundational competences developed by an international team of psychology educators that began its work in October 2022 in response to a call by some of the team for an undergraduate response to the IPCP (Cranney et al., 2022a). This project included a

central International Collaboration on Psychology Undergraduate Outcomes (ICUPO) committee that comprised 17 educators from 13 countries, and a larger advisory group, the International Reference Group on Psychology Undergraduate Outcomes (IRGUPO) that comprised 103 educators and upper-level psychology students from 39 countries.

Since its launch, the ICUPO has met virtually every month or two. In between these meetings, smaller working groups met to address process, terminology, and the drafting of outcomes. As part of the process, the ICUPO drafted a set of principles for drafting the competences. Two members of the ICUPO each drafted a model, and the committee founded an additional working group to integrate the competing draft models. The ICUPO engaged in iterative consultations with the IRGUPO every two to three months during the process and elicited feedback on the principles for drafting competences and on the draft competence models. The ICUPO released the most recent January 2024 Beta.R1 version of the *ICUP* as a preprint ([osf.io/6y38x](https://osf.io/6y38x)).

The Beta.R1 model consists of 24 competence statements grouped under *two core competence categories*: Psychological Knowledge and Psychological Research Methodologies & Methods, and *five Psychology-relevant competence categories*: Values & Ethics, Cultural Responsiveness & Diversity, Critical Thinking & Problem-solving, Communication & Interpersonal Skills, and Personal & Professional Development. The ICUPO constructed the Psychology-relevant competence categories to acknowledge that these areas, although often viewed as generic, are both informed by psychological science and applied in psychological contexts.

Over 40 frameworks and models nationally, regionally, and internationally informed the ICUPO processes that led to the *ICUP* model. As examples, the ICUPO considered international

(e.g., EuroPsy, EFPA, 2023; IPCP, 2016), and national competence frameworks for psychology post-secondary education (e.g., APA, 2013, 2023; Australian Psychology Accreditation Council, 2019), as well as broader post-secondary education frameworks, such as the OECD Future of Education and Skills 2030 (OECD, 2023). Specific to *Guidelines 3.0*, the ICUPO valued its: framework of outcomes and indicators nested within an overarching set of goals; focus on values and skills; and emphasis on EDI (with the caveat that these concepts are viewed differently across cultures and contexts). When ICUPO members gave presentations that provided an overview of processes, they included an overview of the main *Guidelines 3.0* goals and outcomes among the frameworks that they shared as an influence on those processes.

Given their focus on foundational psychology at the undergraduate level, *Guidelines 3.0* and the *ICUP* share several similarities. Both are relatively content agnostic – that is, they do not prescribe what specific content must be taught. They both focus on skills and values. They are both aspirational guidelines rather than mandatory regulations, and are intended to inform curricula and frameworks ranging from the program and institution level to the national or international level. They also both focus on psychological literacy and global citizenship.

Moreover, both address psychology's role in seeking solutions for society's grand challenges. One of the indicators in *Guidelines 3.0* is “apply psychological principles to address issues of global concern (e.g., poverty, health, migration, human rights, international conflict, sustainability)” (p. 14). *ICUP* is even more explicit in that it mentions the United Nations Sustainable Development goals (SDGs) in one of its competence statements and is indirectly related to many of the SDGs across several other competence statements (Nolan et al., in prep, a; United Nations General Assembly, 2015), and thus more direct in arguing for psychology education's role in addressing global challenges.

In contrast, there are important differences between the frameworks. *Guidelines 3.0*, although more explicitly international than its predecessors, is U.S.-centric, given its APA provenance. The Task Force members were diverse on several variables, but all were based at U.S. institutions. In contrast, the *ICUP* was conceived as an international framework, and ICUPO and IRGUPO members were intentionally recruited as geographically diverse. As such, *ICUP* is more likely applicable across diverse countries and contexts.

Although *Guidelines 3.0* provides an engaging discussion of psychological literacy in a later part of the document, it operationalizes PL as confined to a narrow set of (important and interesting) ‘applied’ student learning outcomes. In contrast, PL provides an overarching framework for *ICUP*, and Nolan and colleagues (in prep, b) speak to *both* ‘general’ and ‘group’ definitions in their description of PL as:

the intentional application of psychological knowledge, skills and values to achieve personal, work and community (local to global) goals. The **integration** and **application** of foundational psychology competences within an [undergraduate] program should lead to psychologically literate graduates. (p. 14; bolding added)

Despite this, we envision ways in which *Guidelines 3.0* and the *ICUP* might be used together. As one example, the Department of Psychology at Seton Hall University (USA) where two of this paper’s authors work is currently updating its undergraduate curriculum. A departmental working group, as part of its process, identified priorities for their department, and then went through *Guidelines 3.0* goals, outcomes, and indicators in a structured way to identify those most relevant for their priorities and revised some of them to reflect their own context. They then went through the *ICUP* competencies and statements in a structured way, and both added some to their departmental document and revised existing indicators to reflect *ICUP*

language and concepts. Similarly, the staff at the University of Technology Sydney adopted *Guidelines 3.0* goals, outcomes, and indicators as part of the curriculum mapping of their new undergraduate psychology degrees along with the APAC (2019) standards and institutional graduate attributes. The university might expand this process in the future to include the *ICUP* competences, especially as the APAC standards will likely be revised in the next few years, which presents further opportunities for internationalization.

### **The Importance of Internationally Informed Competences**

As psychology educators who were involved with the development of *both Guidelines 3.0* either as Task Force members or international consultants *and ICUP* as members of the central ICUPO or IRGUPO advisory group, we argue that any framework for undergraduate foundational psychology education must be either explicitly international or internationally informed. We previously noted the increasingly global nature of psychology and of psychology post-secondary education. As such, we need to educate students to have values and skills, and not just knowledge, so that they are workforce-ready in an increasingly global workforce. Curriculum development and related assessments must reflect this global nature, and be transferable to allow for mobility of students, educators, and graduates, and of courses/units, degrees, and credentials. Such international frameworks could foster communication and collaboration across countries and cultures, facilitating professional networks and creating a common scientific language.

We believe *Guidelines 3.0* and *ICUP*, to different degrees and relevant to different contexts, provide models for global dialog in ways that complement each other. As the *Guidelines 3.0* Task Force wrote about this document, “We hope *Guidelines 3.0* will inspire our colleagues to join this international conversation” (p. 39). We, the authors of this paper, hope

that that will be true for both *Guidelines 3.0* and *ICUP*, and will lead to more such collaborations among psychology educators around the world.

### References

- Akimoto, S. (2016). Teaching cross-cultural psychology: Insights from an internationalized on-campus course. In D. Gross, K. Abrams, & C. Z. Enns (Eds.), *Internationalizing the undergraduate psychology curriculum: Practical lessons learned at home and abroad*. (pp. 181–197). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14840-011>
- American Psychological Association. (2007). *APA Guidelines for the undergraduate psychology major*. <http://teachpsych.org/Resources/Documents/otrp/resources/apapsymajorguidelines.pdf>
- American Psychological Association. (2013). *APA Guidelines for the undergraduate psychology major*. <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/about/psymajor-guidelines.pdf>
- American Psychological Association. (2023). *APA Guidelines for the undergraduate psychology major*. <https://www.apa.org/about/policy/undergraduate-psychology-major.pdf>
- Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (2019). *Accreditation standards for psychology programs*. [https://apac.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/APAC-Accreditation-Standards\\_v1.2\\_rebranded.pdf](https://apac.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/APAC-Accreditation-Standards_v1.2_rebranded.pdf)
- Ansloos, J., Stewart, S., Fellner, K., Goodwill, A., Graham, H., McCormick, R., Harder, H., & Mushquash, C. (2019). Indigenous peoples and professional training in psychology in Canada. *Canadian Psychology / Psychologie Canadienne*, 60(4), 265–280. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000189>
- Benito, E. (2009). La formación en Psicología: Revisión y perspectivas [Formation in psychology: review and perspectives]. *Revista Psiencia*, 1(2), 1–12. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3331/333127085002.pdf>
- Bernett, P., Spence, S., Wilson, C., Gurr, E., Zentner, D., & Wendt, D. C. (2023). Canadian school psychology and Indigenous peoples: Opportunities and recommendations. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 38(1), 10–29.



<https://doi.org/10.1177/08295735231151281>

Bullock, M. (2014). International frameworks for psychology education and training: Overarching issues and principles. In R. K. Silbereisen, P. L.-J. Ritchie, & J. Pandey (Eds.), *Psychology education and training: A global perspective*. (pp. 63–73). Psychology Press.

Chaudhary, N., & Sriram, S. (2020). Psychology in the “Backyards of the World”: Experiences from India. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 51(2), 113–133.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022119896652>

Christidis, P., Lin, L., & Stamm, K. (2018). Just how severe is the shortage of school psychologists? *Monitor on Psychology*, 49(6). <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2018/06/datapoint>

Consoli, A. J., Çiftçi, A., Poyrazlı, Ş., Iwasaki, M., Canetto, S. S., Ovrebo, E., Wang, C. D. C., & Forrest, L. (2022). International students who became U.S. counseling psychology faculty members: A collaborative autoethnography. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 50(6), 874–910. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00110000221098377>

Cranney, J., Botwood, L., & Morris, S. (2012). *National standards for psychological literacy and global citizenship: Outcomes of undergraduate psychology education*. Final peer-reviewed report of ALTC/OLT National Teaching Fellowship. [https://groups.psychology.org.au/Assets/Files/Cranney\\_NTF\\_Final\\_Report\\_231112\\_Final\\_pdf.pdf](https://groups.psychology.org.au/Assets/Files/Cranney_NTF_Final_Report_231112_Final_pdf.pdf)

Cranney, J., Dunn, D. S., Hulme, J. A., Nolan, S. A., Morris, S., & Norris, K. (2022a). Psychological literacy and undergraduate psychology education: An international provocation. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 790600. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.790600>

Cranney, J., Morris, S., Norris, K., & Connolly, C. E. (2022b). Charting the psychological literacy

- landscape: Systematic review highlighting psychology education. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 913814. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.913814>
- D'Amato, R. C., Van Schalkwyk, G. J., Zhao, B. Y., & Hu, J. (2013). Understanding the development of school psychology in mainland China. *School Psychology International*, 34(2), 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034312453392>
- Duan, C., & Li, F. (2022). Advancing psychology of China: A call for paradigm shift. In S. Hua (Eds.), *Paradigm shifts in Chinese Studies* (pp. 201–234). Palgrave Macmillan Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-8032-8\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-8032-8_9)
- EAC. (2015). *East African Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*. <https://www.knqa.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/East-Africa-Qf.pdf>
- Enns, C. Z. (2016). Experiencing cultural psychology in Japan and East Asia. In D. Gross, K. Abrams, & C. Z. Enns (Eds.), *Internationalizing the undergraduate psychology curriculum: Practical lessons learned at home and abroad*. (pp. 73–90). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14840-005>
- European Commission. (2020). *The Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area*. <https://education.ec.europa.eu/education-levels/higher-education/inclusive-and-connected-higher-education/bologna-process>
- European Federation of Psychologists Associations. (2023). *EuroPsy: European Certificate in Psychology, EFPA Regulations on EuroPsy and Appendices*. [https://www.europsy.eu/\\_webdata/europsy\\_regulations\\_july\\_2023\\_ga\\_brighton.pdf](https://www.europsy.eu/_webdata/europsy_regulations_july_2023_ga_brighton.pdf)
- Fan, K., & See, B. H. (2022). How do Chinese students' critical thinking compare with other students?: A structured review of the existing evidence. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 46, 101145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101145>

- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- IJzerman, H., Dutra, N., Silan, M., Adetula, A., Brown, D. M. B., & Forscher, P. (2021, August 30). Psychological science needs the entire globe, part 1. *Association for Psychological Science Observer*. <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/global-psych-science>
- International Project on Competence in Psychology (2016). *International declaration on core competencies in professional psychology*. <https://www.iupsys.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/the-international-declaration-on-core-competences-in-professional-psychology-1.pdf>
- Jing, Q., & Fu, X. (2001). Modern Chinese psychology: Its indigenous roots and international influences. *International Journal of Psychology*, 36(6), 408–418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590143000234>
- Lee, H.-S., Knutson, D., Koch, J. M., Brown, C., & Keyes, C. (2022). The cross-cultural practicum training experiences of Asian international counseling students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 50(6), 845–873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00110000221100825>
- Littleford, L. N., & Nolan, S. A. (2013). Your sphere of influence: How to infuse cultural diversity into your psychology classes. *Psychology Teacher Network*, 23 (1). <http://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/ptn/2013/05/cultural-diversity.aspx>
- Loyalka, P., Liu, O. L., Li, G., Kardanova, E., Chirikov, I., Hu, S., Yu, N., Ma, L., Guo, F., Beteille, T., Tognatta, N., Gu, L., Ling, G., Federiakin, D., Wang, H., Khanna, S., Bhuradia, A., Shi, Z., & Li, Y. (2021). Skill levels and gains in university STEM education in China, India, Russia and the United States. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5(7), 892–904. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01062-3>

- Lunt, I. (2005). The Implications of the "Bologna Process" for the Development of a European Qualification in Psychology. *European Psychologist*, 10(2), 86–92.  
<https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.10.2.86>
- Marinoni, G. (2019). *Internationalization of higher education: An evolving landscape, locally and globally: IAU 5th Global Survey*. DUZ Academic Publishers.
- McCarthy, S., Dickson, K. L., Cranney, J., Trapp, A., & Karandashev, V. (Eds.). (2012). *Teaching psychology around the world* (Vol. 3). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Nolan, S. A., Bakker, H. E., Cranney, J., Hulme, J., & Dunn, D. S. (2020). Project Assessment: An international perspective. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 6(3), 185-197. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000217>
- Nolan, S. A., Cranney, J., Iliescu, D., Narciss, S., Foster, L., Goedeke, S., de Souza, L. K., Jia, F., Kumar, A., Morris, S., Tchombe, T. M. S., & Takang, K. T. (in preparation, a). International competences for undergraduate psychology: Relevance to the UN sustainable development goals.
- Nolan, S. A., Cranney, J., Narciss, S., Machin, T., Gullifer, J., Goedeke, S., de Souza, L. K., Job, R., Jia, F., Foster, L., Hulme, J., Iliescu, D., Ju, X., Kojima, H., Kumar, A., Tchombe, T., Waitoki, M., & IRGUPO.1 (in preparation, b). *Beta.R1 Version: International Competences for Undergraduate Psychology (ICUP)*. Preprint available at [osf.io/6y38x/](https://osf.io/6y38x/)
- Norcross, J. C., Hailstorks, R., Aiken, L. S., Pfund, R. A., Stamm, K. E., & Christidis, P. (2016). Undergraduate study in psychology: Curriculum and assessment. *American Psychologist*, 71(2), 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1037.a0040095>
- OECD. (2023). *OECD future of education and skills 2030: OECD learning compass 2030*.  
[https://issuu.com/oecd.publishing/docs/e2030-learning\\_compass\\_2030-concept\\_notes](https://issuu.com/oecd.publishing/docs/e2030-learning_compass_2030-concept_notes)

- Papageorgi, I., Falzon, N., Sokolova, L., Stuchlikova, I., Salvatore, S., Williamson, M., Foster, J., Pavlin-Bernardic, N., Beara, M., Bakker, H., & Dutke, S. (2023). Skills and competencies gained from a psychology bachelor's degree: European graduates' perspectives. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, 14757257231187532.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/14757257231187532>
- Shealy, C., Bullock, M., & Kapadia, S. (Eds.). (2023). Introduction to going global: Why psychologists should meet a world of need. In C. Shealy, M. Bullock, & S. Kapadia (Eds.), *Going global: How psychologists can meet a world of need* (pp. 3–13). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000311-001>
- 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, 136147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039977>
- Thalmayer, A. G., Toscanelli, C., & Arnett, J. J. (2021). What American psychology needs most is the majority world: Reply to Webster et al. (2021). *The American psychologist*, 76(5), 806. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000795>
- United Nations General Assembly (2015, September 25). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*, A/RES/70/1.
- Van Damme, D., Zahner, D., Cortellini, O., Dawber, T., & Rotholz, K. (2023). Assessing and developing critical-thinking skills in higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 58(3), 369–386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12563>
- Wang, C. D. C., & Heppner, P. P. (2015). Theoretical paper: The growing international perspectives within the Society of Counseling Psychology in the United States. *Counselling Psychology Review*, 30(2), 5–19.

<https://doi.org/10.53841/bpscpr.2015.30.2.5>