

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

to

Considering Cultural Responsiveness in the Creation of the *International Competences for Undergraduate Psychology (ICUP)* Model: What can Psychology Learn?

Jacquelyn Cranney¹, Susan A. Nolan², Julie A. Hulme³, Luciana Karine de Souza⁴, Waikaremoana Waitoki⁵, Fanli Jia², Sonja Goedeke⁶, Remo Job⁷, Michael A. Machin⁸, Aneesh Kumar⁹, Susanne Narciss¹⁰, Haruyuki Kojima¹¹, Therese Tchombe¹², Dragos Iliescu¹³, Judith Gullifer¹⁴, Xingda Ju¹⁵

- 1 School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
- 2 Department of Psychology, Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey, USA
- 3 Department of Psychology, School of Social Sciences, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, UK
- 4 Developmental and Personality Psychology Department, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil
- 5 Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao, University of Waikato, Aotearoa New Zealand
- 6 Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, Aotearoa-New Zealand
- 7 Department of Psychology and Cognitive Science, University of Trento, Rovereto, Italy
- 8 School of Psychology and Wellbeing, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
- 9 Department of Psychology, Christ University, Bengaluru, India
- 10 Faculty of Psychology, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany
- 11 Faculty of Humanities, Institute of Human and Social Sciences, Kanazawa University, Kanazawa, Japan
- 12 Department of Educational Psychology, University of Buea, Buea, Cameroon
- 13 Department of Psychology and Cognitive Science, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania
- 14 School of Psychological Sciences, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
- 15 School of Psychology, Northeast Normal University, Changchun, China

Author Notes

Jacquelyn Cranney: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8731-4402>
 Susan A. Nolan: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6339-9563>
 Julie A. Hulme: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6217-1815>
 Luciana Karine de Souza: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9641-6163>
 Waikaremoana Waitoki: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0174-0065>
 Fanli Jia: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7149-455X>
 Sonja Goedeke: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8362-4422>
 Remo Job: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2379-462X>
 Michael A. Machin: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0967-6934>
 Aneesh Kumar: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1081-7201>
 Susanne Narciss: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4280-6534>
 Haruyuki Kojima: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0942-3117>
 Therese Tchombe: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9096-5222>
 Dragos Iliescu: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5958-3920>
 Judith Gullifer: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7892-2975>

Correspondence concerning this Supplemental Material should be addressed to Jacquelyn Cranney, School of Psychology, University of New South Wales (UNSW), Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia. Email: J.Cranney@unsw.edu.au

Author Contributions

All authors contributed to the International Collaboration on Undergraduate Psychology Outcomes (ICUPO) project and the processes of cultural responsiveness (CR) infusion described in this manuscript, and were involved as respondents in the quantitative and/or qualitative approaches to indexing CR. The first two authors (Jacquelyn Cranney, Susan Nolan) were the equal ICUPO co-leaders, involved in the conception, design, and implementation of the project and this paper; the remainder of the authors contributed substantially to the project processes including CR infusion (in order of contribution), with Waikaremoana Waitoki playing a critical role in the positionality exercises. Jacquelyn Cranney wrote the first draft of the paper except for the qualitative analysis report, which was written by Julie Hulme. All authors commented on versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge funding received from the Association for Psychological Sciences Teaching Fund through the Small Grants program to Susan Nolan, Jacquelyn Cranney, Michael Machin, Judith Gullifer, and Fanli Jia. We thank Lori Foster, Veronica Boeta, Marc Eric Reyes (additional ICUPO Committee members), and all International Reference Group on Undergraduate Psychology Outcomes (IRGUPO) members for their contributions to the ICUPO project, and particularly for the current topic, Dawn Darlaston-Jones, Pat Dudgeon, Joanne Alexi, and Belle Selkirk. We also wish to thank the following students (some IRGUPO members) for providing paid or unpaid research assistance to this project: Kyleigh Colonna and Yuan Hao (Seton Hall University); Chang Liu (Monash University, Australia); Sorina Naidin (University of Bucharest, Romania); George Perron (Seton Hall University, USA); Monique Piggott (UNSW Sydney, Australia); Rija Sabeeh (Seton Hall University, USA); Valerie Sorrentino (Seton Hall University, USA); and Rebecca Tyler (UNSW Sydney, Australia). Finally, Susan Nolan thanks Seton Hall University for the sabbatical to work on this project, the Fulbright organization for providing a Fulbright Scholar Award which allowed her to work on this project in Australia, and the School of Psychology, UNSW Sydney, for hosting her during her stay from January to May, 2023.

Section 1: Additional Terms and Concepts Relevant to the *ICUP* Definition of Cultural Responsiveness (CR)

This Section contains important further information relevant to the Introduction section. Again, we suggest that all psychology researchers, educators and practitioners, regardless of their nationality, can benefit in terms of increasing their cultural responsiveness (CR), by considering these important aspects of critical cultural and Indigenous psychologies.

Decolonization

“...decolonization processes as those which seek to disrupt hierarchical relationships in three broad ways: (a) by acknowledging and interrogating the colonial social contexts in which individuals and institutions exist; (b) by advocating for social change, and (c) by amplifying marginalized voices, perspectives and forms of knowledge” (Cullen et al., 2020, p. 2012). See Tuck and Yang (2012) for a critique of this concept.

Indigenization

“Indigenizing” means integrating First Nations ways of knowing, being, and doing (e.g., APAC, 2022; Dudgeon et al., 2016).

Essential steps in the Indigenising process involve teaching and assessment strategies that increase learners’ awareness and knowledge of: (a) the intergenerational negative impact of colonization and racism on the physical and psychological health of First Nations peoples (e.g., Dudgeon et al., 2014); (b) the systemic racism within health, research, and education systems - including psychology - further contributing to such negative impact (e.g., Australian Psychological Society, 2016); and (c) the value of First Nations knowledge, particularly approaches to psychological health, such as the holistic and strengths-based Social Emotional Wellbeing Framework (e.g., Dudgeon et al., 2022; Wright et al., 2024).

Reflexivity

Firstly, reflexivity is considered a key tool to finding shared understanding in the intercultural space between Indigenous psychologies and Western psychological approaches (Nakata, 2007, 2013), as expressed by Darlaston-Jones (2015, p.42):

“Indigenous psychology has to be valued alongside the Western paradigm in a way that acknowledges both, but which encourages the critical reflexivity necessary for members of the dominant group to understand their own position relative to Indigenous peoples and the shared history of colonization.”

Secondly, Collins (2021) argues that reflexivity requires awareness and analysis of the intersections: “Intersectional paradigms remind us that oppression cannot be reduced to one fundamental type, and that oppressions work together in producing injustice” (p.18).

Thirdly, we note that reflexivity has been associated with concepts such as ‘critical consciousness’ or ‘conscientisation’, although there has been criticism of such (Tuck & Yang, 2012). In contrast, reflexivity is relevant to Cranney and colleagues’ (2022a) argument that one’s recognition of the multiple systemic influences upon one’s thinking and behavior can lead to the empowering potential to reciprocally influence those systems.

Fourthly, we note other significant scholarship regarding reflexivity and self-knowledge: Coulson and Homewood (2016), Kalibatseva and Yang (2024), Lazard and McAvoy (2017), McGuire-Adams (2021), Scrine et al. (2022), Thompson and Taylor (2021), Wilson (2009).

Cultural Safety

We note that CR as defined here differs from the concept of ‘cultural safety.’ Cultural responsiveness is a key feature of cultural safety. The developer of cultural safety, Irihapeti Ramsden (2002) defined the term in relation to safe practice through knowledge of the self, informed by dialogue with clients (and family). During this project it was argued by some ICUPO and IRGUPO members that foundational competences should include cultural safety rather than CR; however, Nolan et al. (2024) have counter-argued that CR, as a foundational competence, is a stepping-stone to (and part of) cultural safety, which should be a professional competence (see APAC, 2022). Cultural safety has been argued to be specific to colonized (‘settler’) nations (Ryder et al., 2017); however, cultural safety can also be more broadly conceptualized. For example, the Central Vancouver Island Multicultural Society (Royal Children’s Hospital, n.d.) define cultural safety as:

...an environment which is safe for people; where there is no assault, challenge or denial of their identity, of who they are and what they need. It is about shared respect, shared meaning, shared knowledge and experience, of learning together with dignity, and truly listening (p.4).

The development of the capacity to provide culturally safe environments usually involves unlearning (Ryder et al., 2017), which can cause high levels of discomfort¹, and educators need to manage such discomfort in constructive ways (Wilson, 2014).

CR, Psychological Literacy, and Global Citizenship

CR is related to the concepts of psychological literacy and global citizenship. Psychological literacy has recently been defined by Nolan et al. (2024) as:

...the intentional application of psychology 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.12-13).

Global citizenship has been defined as “the understanding of global interrelatedness, and the capacity to live, work and contribute positively as a member of global communities”

¹ Unlearning has featured frequently in the ongoing processes of ICUPO; for example, one ICUPO participant verbally commented: “...when our worldview is changing, it’s uncomfortable, it’s anxiety provoking, and I keep experiencing that with this project as well as the exciting learning... and I really appreciated the supportive, collaborative environment that has allowed me to kind of get up and keep going when I’ve had to change my mind, basically change my worldview because it’s been hard learning.” (May 2023 ICUPO Meeting)

(Cranney et al., 2012, p. iii). In considering the relationships between CR, reflexivity, and psychological literacy, Dudgeon et al. (2018) argue for an “*Indigenous psychology literacy*” (p.127) that is “based on the principles of social justice and human rights” and would thus “remain vigilantly self-reflexive, pedagogically innovative and dialogically responsive” (p.126). They also argue that “the education and training of psychology students and practitioners becomes an essential component in the change agenda, and psychological literacy within a de-colonized and critical pedagogy framework offers the methodology to achieve it” (p.124). This specific perspective on psychological literacy by Dudgeon et al. is closer to the concept of psychologically literate citizenship. Cranney et al. (2022b) argue that it is an intermediary step between psychological literacy and global citizenship, with each step involving more advanced development of CR. Based on Dudgeon and colleagues’ (2018) perspective, then, psychology education allows students opportunities to develop into psychologically literate citizens.

Section 2: Positionality Exercises 1 and 2: Further Detail

A pre-meeting exercise for the December 2022 ICUPO meeting was constructed by one of the Committee members (member A) based on the WERO: Working to End Racial Oppression resources (<https://wero.ac.nz/>). Committee members were asked to optionally scan some key readings on cultural responsiveness, and then **respond to the positionality questions** presented below. Instructions included: “Please note that your responses are intended to be private to ICUPO members.” This latter point led to the decision not to make the responses public. Nevertheless, in the Reflection, Committee members were invited to comment on the positionality tasks, and the impact is evident in Section 4.

1. What ethnic, racial, and cultural groups do I belong to?
2. How salient are these group identities to me?
3. How do I feel about being a member of these groups?
4. What factors influence the salience of these group identities and how I feel about being a member of these groups?
5. What changes would you like to see in psychology?
6. What actions do you take to try to bring about these changes? (e.g. collectives you belong to of people working towards the same goals)
7. What were the goals of one of your past projects?
8. Does your research/study help to reproduce the status quo, or produce transformative change, and if so who benefits? Who are excluded?
9. What political projects have your past research projects related to?
10. Any other positionality comments or self-reflections, relevant to this project?

At the May 2023 ICUPO Meeting, two experts in cultural responsiveness, ICUPO Committee member A, and IRGUPO member B, led a one-hour **positionality discussion**. After describing their own positionality, A stated that when starting to design curriculum, you need to understand who you are (and why you are doing this), who you are engaging, who this is for (not just for the student, nor just for the discipline). B stated that for decades, the discipline of psychology has been (in our words) ‘culture-blind’, claiming to be ‘value-free’ and ‘context-free’, marginalizing the voices of cultures other than that of the minority who dominate the discipline, and not clearly answering the question “how does this create a better world?” A pointed out that there is little consideration in her national curriculum of the social determinants of behavior, and there is little acknowledgement of racism in

international and national models of psychology education outcomes. *B* argued that through our current curricula, we may be perpetuating structural racism and ‘othering’. *A* indicated that the curriculum needs to be relevant to the students’ reality and their capacity to make a better future for themselves, and we as curriculum designers/deliverers need to better understand ourselves, in particular: Why are you doing this work? Why is it important to you?

Each ICUPO member then attempted to answer these questions. Moreover, toward the end of the meeting, each attendee was invited to give a ‘30-second thesis.’ Common concerns included: discontent with Western psychology which has produced only one kind of psychological knowledge to the exclusion of other psychological knowledge (and thus exclusion of other groups of people including students), and wanting to change this; wanting to open up the current system so that minoritized groups of students could be supported in achieving their goals; and wanting to better prepare all of our psychology graduates for their future personal, professional, and community roles.

Section 3: ICUPO Committee Member Survey: Quantitative Approach to CR

This Section presents the complete report of the quantitative CR survey study with the ICUPO Committee members. It was expected that average responding would appear to be relatively high, and that there may be reports of increased CR over the duration of the ICUPO project. The main paper presents a summary of this report.

A review of the literature revealed two scales with constructs congruent with the broad CR perspective taken in the ICUPO project: the Cultural Competence Self-Assessment (CCSA; CVIMS, 2021; based on the 2011 version, Nanaimo, Canada), and the Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire (MASQUE; Munroe & Pearson, 2006). It is important to note that these scales are not specific to a particular cultural group, but of course, were created by English-speaking scholars from North America.

With the MASQUE, participants were asked to “Please rate your agreement with the following statements using this 6-point rating scale: 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree)”; see Table SA3.2 (toward the end of this Section), with the subscales *Know* (e.g., “I realize that racism exists”), *Care* (e.g., “I am emotionally concerned about racial inequality”) and *Act* (e.g., “I actively challenge gender inequities”) indicated. It was expected that ICUPO Committee members would score highly on this scale.

A modified version of the CCSA was used, whereby only a subset (12 of the original 32 items) of the most suitable items under the *Awareness* (e.g., “I have a clear sense of my own cultural and diversity identity”), *Knowledge* (e.g., “I recognize that stereotypical attitudes and discriminatory actions can dehumanize and even encourage violence against individuals because of their membership in groups which are different from myself”), and *Behavior* (e.g., “I can effectively intervene when I observe others behaving in a discriminatory manner”) categories was chosen. To facilitate comparison, the same rating scale as that used in the MASQUE was used, in contrast to the original 4-point rating scale (1 = ‘never/not at all’, 2 = ‘sometimes/good’, 3 = ‘often/fairly good’ and 4 =

‘always/excellent’). The items are listed in Table SM3.1. Note that permission was granted from CVIMS to publish these items. In an extension of the original CCSA, for each item, participants were additionally asked: “Then indicate whether, since the start of the ICUPO project, your extent of agreement with each statement has (a) decreased, (b) not changed, or (c) increased.” The CCSA is a popular practical tool in many countries, but there appears to be little psychometric research. One exception is Argyriadis and colleagues’ (2022) study, whereby adequate reliability and validity was reported with a 30-item version. It was expected that ICUPO Committee members would score relatively highly on this scale, and that they may report increases over the course of the ICUPO project.

ICUPO Committee members (the authors) were invited via email (in late March 2024 – seventeen months after the first ICUPO meeting, nine months after the Alpha Model was presented at a conference, and five months after the Beta.R1 Model was placed on a public website) to complete these scales. Participants were told that their response data would be handled by a research assistant, and not viewed by other ICUPO members. Fifteen members indicated to the senior author that they had completed the survey. Six of these 15 were Native English speakers, seven were male, 12 were from the Global North. Missing from the sample were one member from the Global North, and one from the Global South. Ethics approval was obtained from the UNSW HREAP Panel C: Behavioral Sciences (HC No. 3801). The data of two respondents (identity unknown, given anonymity of survey) were excluded from analysis because the final informed consent question was not completed. The final sample was 13.

Tables SM3.2 and SM3.3 (at the end of this Section) present responses for each of the items in the two scales. Given the low number of respondents, we decided that descriptions and interpretations at the individual item level would be inappropriate.

Summary Table SM3.1 (essentially the same as Table 1 in the main document) presents the means and SDs for the CCSA. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.88, which compares well with Argyriadis et al.’s (2022) alpha of 0.73 (with 30 items). The Awareness and Knowledge subscales, and the Whole Scale mean ratings were all above 5 on the 6-point scale, indicating an overall high self-rating. The Behavior subscale mean rating was less than 5, suggesting the common difficulty in translating knowledge and attitudes into behavior. The variability for Knowledge appeared to be less than for the other two subscales. For all subscales and the whole scale, ‘Not changed’ and ‘Increased’ were equally indicated, and there were no ‘Decreased’ responses. The ‘Not changed’ responses may indicate the presence of a ceiling effect; that is, some ICUPO Committee members were possibly very high in cultural responsiveness at the beginning of the project. However, there were only 2 respondents who did not indicate any increase on any of the 12 items; one had a mean Whole-scale rating of 5.58, the other, 3.83. Argyriadis and colleagues (2022) used (a) a 30-item version of the 32-item CCSA (2021) scale (item wording not given), and (b) the original 4-point frequency-based rating scale. Frequency of choices of each of the rating options, rather than means and SDs, were provided. Nevertheless, there appears to be both a lower average rating, and much greater variability, in Argyriadis and colleagues’ sample of 300 health professionals in Cyprus. Argyriadis and colleagues reported a tendency for higher frequency of choosing the high rating options for

Awareness, followed by Knowledge, followed by Behaviors, indicating some similarity in the two samples regarding the Behaviors subscale.

Table SM3.1 also presents the means and SDs for the MASQUE items. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.847, which compares well with Monroe and Pearson's (2006) alpha of 0.80. The Know, Care and Act subscales, and Whole Scale mean ratings were all above 5 on the 6-point scale, indicating an overall high mean self-rating. Interestingly, the Care subscale appears to rate lower than the other two subscales and, similar to the CCSA, the variance for the Know subscale appears to be less than that for the other two subscales. Monroe and Pearson (2006) did not report subscale or whole-scale statistics with their sample of 422 undergraduate students, but from the individual item statistics (their Table 1), it appears that ratings were relatively high for the Know subscale (most rated above 5), but lower for the Care subscale scores, then lower still for the Act subscale. Moreover, it appears that the current sample rated more highly on all items (our Table SM3.2).

Table SM3.1

Mean (and SD) Agreement Ratings for the Cultural Competence Self-Assessment (CCSA) and Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire (MASQUE) Subscales and Whole Scale Scores, and CCSA Total Item Frequencies regarding perceived change since the beginning of the International Collaboration on Undergraduate Psychology Outcomes Project

Category/Item	Mean	SD	# Decreased	# Not changed	# Increased
CCSA					
4 Awareness Subscale items	5.19	0.69	0	25	27
4 Knowledge Subscale items	5.31	0.48	0	28	24
4 Behaviors Subscale items	4.69	0.63	0	27	25
12 Whole Scale items	5.06	0.55	0	80	76
MASQUE					
7 ' Know ' Subscale items	5.84	0.37	-	-	-
6 ' Care ' Subscale items	5.08	0.79	-	-	-
5 ' Act ' Subscale items	4.74	0.81	-	-	-
18 Whole Scale items	5.22	0.53	-	-	-

Note. A six-point rating scale was used, whereby the higher the number, the higher the agreement with the statement. $n = 13$ for all statistics.

Across the two scales, analysis of the current small sample's data yielded (1) high reliability, (2) an apparent tendency for higher self-ratings than for other samples in which these measures have been employed (CCSA: Argyriandis et al., 2022; MASQUE: Monroe & Pearson, 2006; however, see Kalibatseva & Yang, 2024), (3) a similar pattern with the

above-mentioned samples in terms of tendencies for the knowledge subscales to rate higher than the behavior subscales, and (4) an equal tendency to indicate perceived ‘No change’ and ‘Increase’ in agreement with CR statements across the project duration (only two respondents indicated no change on any statement). The first finding is surprising, given the small current sample. In terms of the second and fourth finding, any self-rating scale is subject to social desirability influences. Monroe and Pearson (2006) reported a low but statistically significant correlation between MASQUE and Crowne Marlow Social Desirability Scale scores but argued that the low shared variance provided “some evidence that the participants were providing authentic responses to the MASQUE” (p.826). In the current study, participants could choose to respond anonymously, and a research assistant anonymized responses prior to analysis, however, factors such as demand characteristics could have influenced the high self-ratings. Nevertheless, the third finding counters this interpretation to a certain extent. *If* alternative explanations can be put aside, the findings are: (a) as expected, ICUPO Committee members self-rated relatively (but not consistently) highly on these CR scales, which may be associated with their decision to engage in the ICUPO project (and the fact that many had substantial international experience); (b) this sample showed some similarity to other samples in terms of lower ratings for the behavior subscales, indicative of the difference between awareness/knowledge and behavior, and (c) this sample showed an equal tendency to indicate ‘No change’ and ‘Increase’ in CR aspects across the project duration.

Table SM3.2

Mean (and SD) Agreement Ratings for the Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire (MASQUE)

Item	Mean	SD
[<i>Know</i>]		
1	5.92	0.28
2	5.92	0.28
3	5.85	0.38
4	5.85	0.38
5	5.85	0.38
6	5.92	0.28
7	5.54	1.13
Mean rating for the 7 ' Know ' Subscale Items	5.84	0.37
[<i>Care</i>]		
8	5.15	1.28
9	5.23	1.42
10	5.23	1.01
11.	4.75	0.75
12	4.69	1.80
13	5.38	0.77
Mean rating for the 6 ' Care ' Subscale Items	5.08	0.79
[<i>Act</i>]		
14	4.77	0.93
15	4.54	1.20
16	4.38	1.26
17	4.92	1.19
18	5.08	0.86
Mean rating for the 5 ' Act ' Subscale Items	4.74	0.81
Mean rating for the 18 Whole Scale Items	5.22	0.53

Note. A six-point rating scale was used, whereby the higher the number, the higher the agreement with the statement; the words in square brackets indicate the subscale but these words were not included in the scale seen by the respondents. One word was changed from the original to be more suited to this project (#6: "English" to "my own"). $n = 13$ for all statistics.

Table SM3.3

Mean (and SDs) agreement ratings for the Central Vancouver Island Multicultural Society (CVIMS), and Total Frequencies regarding change since the beginning of the ICUPO project

	Category/Item	Mean	SD	# Decreased	# Not changed	# Increased
	[<i>Awareness</i>]					
1	I have a clear sense of my own cultural and diversity identity.	5.69	0.48	0	8	5
2	I am aware of any discomfort I may feel when I encounter differences in ethnicity, colour, race, religion, sexual orientation, language, or other forms of diversity.	5.00	1.00	0	8	5
3	I am aware of the assumptions that I hold about people of cultures/groupings different from my own.	4.92	0.86	0	6	7
4	I am aware of how my cultural perspective influences my judgement about what are 'appropriate', 'normal', or 'admirable' behaviours, values, and communication styles.	5.15	0.80	0	3	10
	Mean rating and total frequencies for the 4 Awareness Subscale Items	5.19	0.69	0	25	27
	[<i>Knowledge</i>]					
5	I will <i>really</i> listen to someone's answers before asking another question.	4.62	0.77	0	5	8
6	If I am working with a person of a different culture, ethnicity, etc. I understand that I may be perceived as a person with different degrees of power or privilege, and that I may not be seen as 'unbiased' or as an ally.	5.31	0.75	0	8	5
7	I recognize that achieving cultural competence involves a commitment to learning over a lifetime.	5.54	0.78	0	5	8
8	I recognize that stereotypical attitudes and discriminatory actions can dehumanize and even encourage violence against individuals because of their membership in groups which are different from myself.	5.77	0.44	0	10	3
	Mean rating and total frequencies for the 4 Knowledge Subscale Items	5.31	0.48	0	28	24
	[<i>Behaviors</i>]					

9	I can effectively intervene when I observe others behaving in a discriminatory manner.	4.31	0.75	0	8	5
10	I am actively involved in initiatives, big or small, that promote understanding among members of diverse groups	4.46	1.27	0	7	6
11	I work hard to understand the perspectives of others and consult with my diverse colleagues about culturally respectful and appropriate courses of action.	5.15	0.9	0	6	7
12	I know and use a variety of relationship building skills to create connections with people who are different from me.	4.85	0.9	0	6	7
	Mean rating and total frequencies for the 4 Behaviors Subscale Items	4.69	0.63	0	27	25
	Mean rating and total frequencies for the 12 Whole Scale items	5.06	0.55	0	80	76

Note. A six-point rating scale was used, whereby the higher the number, the higher the agreement with the statement; the words in square brackets indicate the subscale but these words were not included in the scale seen by the respondents. UK English in the spelling of the items was utilized. $n = 13$ for all statistics. CSSA = Cultural Competence Self-Assessment.

Section 4: ICUPO Committee Member Written Reflections

This Section presents the complete report of the qualitative analysis of the expectation that there would be evidence of increased cultural responsiveness in the diverse ICUPO Committee members. The main paper presents a summary of this report.

Methods

All members of the ICUPO committee were invited (via email) to contribute independently written reflexive statements regarding development of cultural responsiveness (CR) through the process of working with ICUPO. Nine members responded: 3 were male, 6 female; 5 were Native English speakers; 3 were from the Global South. Compared to the full Committee, there tended to be a greater proportion from the Global South, and a greater proportion of Native English speakers. Prompts used to guide the writing process are included in Appendix SM4.A. Each statement was up to 250 words in length. Participants were known to the group as a whole, and were identifiable; they were aware of this and nevertheless consented to the analysis of their data for the purposes of this paper. The reflections have now been anonymised and identifiable information has been redacted from extracts included in this Section.

Analytic process

Written statements were collated into a single document, and analyzed using inductive reflexive thematic analysis, as described by Braun and Clarke (2021, 2022). Inductive reflexive thematic analysis was considered appropriate as an analytic technique because the

data, while limited in word count, were rich and deeply personally reflective. Likewise, there is little prior research on the development of cultural responsiveness among academic staff across cultures, and in the absence of a guiding theoretical framework, thematic analysis can be considered a useful approach to inductively researching novel topics (Braun & Clarke, 2021).

The analyst for this aspect of the project (JH) is herself an active member of the ICUPO committee, who contributed a statement of her own (when she was not aware that she would be analyst). She therefore has an ‘insider’ perspective (Braun & Clarke, 2023), which enabled her to sensitively interpret the nuanced meanings presented in the reflective statements.

Familiarisation was undertaken through repeated close reading of the statements, with attention paid to the diverse cultural identities of the authors. Coding was undertaken iteratively, initially semantically and subsequently drawing on latent meaning, and sometimes merging codes as related ideas were identified and codes were refined.

On completion of coding, themes (and subthemes) were generated by searching for shared meanings across the codes and the entire data set. Theme generation was atheoretical, and themes were checked by comparing across codes and with the data to ensure alignment between participants’ reflections and the thematic structure. Finally, a reflexive account of the analysis was written, with extracts of data to illustrate meaning, with the credibility of the themes being revisited throughout. It is worth noting that although no formal checking of themes with the participants was conducted, they were engaged in the continuing work of ICUPO including the editing and approval of this manuscript, and so were able to correct any misinterpretations of their data through this process.

Analytic findings

Thematic analysis of the reflective statements generated four themes, and one subtheme, as seen in Table SM4.1. These will each be explored in turn within this section of the report.

Table SM4.1

Themes derived from thematic analysis of cultural responsiveness positionality statements

Themes	Subthemes
1.Challenge as a stimulus for growth	1a. Structured opportunities for growth
2.Never-ending journey	
3.The work of cultural responsiveness	
4.Transformations through cultural responsiveness: personal, curricular, students	

Theme 1: Challenge as a stimulus for growth

Everyone who contributed a reflective statement to this exercise commented on ways in which they felt that their cultural responsiveness had grown and developed through the project. While everyone remarked on the collegiality and inclusiveness of ways of working within the project, we had all experienced moments of challenge, when we realized that we had made assumptions based on our own cultural perspectives, and that those assumptions were not correct. For example, respondent A reflected on: “those uncomfortable and/or

‘aha’ moments, usually when interacting with [someone else], whereby I realised that I had made an incorrect assumption about the way that they think, feel, or behave, because that assumption was based on my, rather than their, cultural norms.” This extract captured both the shared sense of awkwardness and difficulty when an error was recognized, but also the sense of powerful and sudden insight that could be evoked in such circumstances.

Sometimes, these challenges arose spontaneously, as a result of sudden self-awareness at moments of “discomfort,” but participants also described times when they had both challenged and been challenged by colleagues. Participant E explained how it felt to be challenged, and how this challenge opened up their thinking to consider new ideas and perspectives:

“My colleagues from around the globe encouraged, challenged, and importantly, befriended one another. They suggested readings from perspectives new to me. They brought up ideas...that made us think beyond the agenda – particularly humbling, because...I had contributed to the boundaries of the agenda. And their input made me question my assumptions. Why, a colleague diplomatically asked...”

It was clear from the data that while challenges were sometimes deliberate, they were also done with compassion and thoughtfulness, as noted here in respondent E’s qualification that they were “diplomatically asked” a question about cultural assumptions. Respondent B remarked that “an interesting experience for me was in learning how to express my own appreciation of different ways of knowing and learning about psychology sensitively,” suggesting that group members recognized the discomfort of being challenged, and were concerned to support others’ learning whilst minimizing associated distress. This seems to have been recognized by those on the receiving end of challenges. Respondent A notes that she was able to “forgive myself, as long as I learned for future interactions,” while respondent G observes that, in ICUPO, we all learned as individuals and as a collective, saying “Cultural responsiveness entails bi-directionality and balance – in practice, an interesting and demanding experience for everyone; nevertheless, always fostering self-growth and... community growth.” The fact that we were all learning together somehow made the “uncomfortable” experience of both challenging and being challenged more bearable, because there was recognition that we were all imperfectly culturally responsive, that our intentions were mutually respectful, and that we were growing together as a community.

Subtheme: Structured opportunities for growth

While challenges could be spontaneous, occurring through our own discomfort when making mistakes, or when gently challenged by a colleague, they were also built into the process of ICUPO’s work. Respondents frequently referred to learning from events such as positionality exercises undertaken as homework or discussed in meetings, “thirty-second thesis” opportunities to allow everyone to express an opinion about anything they thought was important at the end of the meetings, completing the survey mentioned elsewhere in this paper, and other designed features of the working processes. As respondent D reports: “Positionality exercise is something that I would recommend to anyone as a way to check one’s beliefs and also to ensure that our actions are aligned with those beliefs. I appreciate the opportunity that was included in this project to have greater insight and understanding into my own place in the world as a culturally responsive person.” Likewise, respondent C noted that “The positionality exercise was a useful reminder of how our own values and beliefs may shape both our understanding of psychology as a discipline and our approach to collaborative work.” The structural design of the ICUPO process was a strong factor in

pushing group members to adopt reflexivity, self-awareness, and cultural responsiveness into their working practices, and to recognize their own cultural positionality.

Theme 2: Never-ending journey

At the start of the ICUPO project, we were all at different stages of development in terms of our understandings of our own positionality, and of others' cultural perspectives. Some group members observed in their reflective statements that they had previously been very much "inculcated" with particular cultural attitudes and ways of knowing and doing, while others were already strongly committed to working in ways that were culturally responsive. For example, respondent E wrote that "My ICUPO work has been one of my most formative professional experiences, including with respect to cultural responsiveness. I now realize that previous related work had inculcated me with a template for aims, process, and outcomes of such a project – a template challenged by collaborations with colleagues and our positionality work." Thus, respondent E may have started the project with quite fixed ideas about how things are done, but over time, they appreciated being open to different ideas and perspectives, and learning from colleagues from different cultures. Respondent E closes their reflection by saying "In writing this reflection, I re-read my initial positionality statements, and already my responses would be different, making clear the ongoing nature of cultural responsiveness."

This idea of growing cultural responsiveness over time was echoed even among participants who previously thought of themselves as relatively expert on such matters. For example, respondent F comments:

"I have always believed that I was culturally responsive and acted to ensure that my colleagues, students and friends were respected and safe when interacting with me. However, I am beginning to understand more about the dynamics of working in a very culturally diverse group and how important it is to critically reflect and keep asking myself if I have sufficient evidence to support my self-beliefs and if I am open to changing them!"

This growing ability to self-question, and to self-challenge, was something that many of us experienced. Respondent B, who also claimed some expertise from their work prior to ICUPO, said:

"I feel that I learned a lot about the importance of humility through this process. In undertaking the survey, I realised that cultural responsiveness is likely a lifelong and lifewide learning journey; I probably responded in similar ways to how I might have at the start of this process, but I now know more about what I don't know as well as what I do know. There is more recognition of the 'known unknowns' that can still inform my development."

This is an interesting quote, implying that the participant recognizes their development through the project and also that it needs to and will continue beyond the project. The concept of "known unknowns" hints that they are becoming aware of the directionality of future development, even if there is not yet a clear idea of what that means specifically.

This concept of ongoing development was echoed throughout many of the reflective statements. Respondent C offers us a slightly different perspective, from their experience of working with First Nations People in their own country, that still reflects the continual nature of learning about cultural responsiveness:

“Cultural responsiveness (along with the related concept of cultural safety) had already been a significant focus of my work given that in my country, we have legislative commitments to partnership with our country’s Indigenous people, and how to decolonise or indigenise western psychology has been an ongoing challenge. Work on ICUPO, including with colleagues who have worked in settings where western psychological concepts have not been questioned to the same extent, has helped to refine, crystallise and consolidate the concept of cultural responsiveness and how this may be applied across settings. It has also reinforced the need for cultural humility, and serves as a further reminder that developing cultural responsivity is an ongoing process.”

In this theme, then, we can observe how, whatever the starting point for the journey, whether group members started working with ICUPO as novices or experts, there is a sense that the development of cultural responsiveness is never-ending and ongoing.

Theme 3: The “work” of cultural responsiveness

In the themes we have explored so far, there may be a sense that cultural responsiveness is something that grows over time through our interactions with diverse others, and to some extent, this is true. However, our respondents also noted that being culturally responsive is effortful and active; in other words, it is a form of work.

This sense of the work-like nature of cultural responsiveness is perhaps best articulated by respondent A: “...because being culturally responsive does take self-motivated effort, and my energy is limited, so I have to make sometimes difficult choices.” This extract illustrates both the agency and the labor inherent in being culturally responsive; it is not something that most of us do naturally, it involves us making choices, and exerting ourselves. Likewise, as we saw earlier, respondent E referred to “an interesting and demanding experience for everyone.”

Cultural responsiveness involves recognizing what is difficult for those who are not like us, and taking actions to address barriers to engagement. Several respondents noted that the leaders of the ICUPO project worked actively to ensure that project working methods were inclusive. Respondent H remarked that “The team leads are very supportive and ensure that every minor suggestion or comment given is taken seriously..., regular updates and checks helped me to be part of the team.” Likewise, respondent I noted that “Understanding cultural diversity in this project’s processes and procedures demonstrated the starting point...” The work of the project leadership team in being culturally responsive was universally appreciated.

However, the work was not only done by the leaders, as other group members noted. Working within the ICUPO project required considerable cognitive effort to appreciate the diversity of cultural perspectives present in every meeting or item of correspondence. Respondent H summarised the intensity of the work involved:

“One of the primary challenges I have encountered is the diversity of educational systems and contexts represented within the ICUPO. Each country has its own unique history, cultural influences, and structures for psychology education. Trying to reconcile these varied perspectives in our collaborative publications has been both enriching and complex.”

Grasping the diversity and nuance was especially difficult for those for whom English was not their native language, as articulated by participant G:

“...sometimes I got a bit more time to talk or make a question, so I could think in a calmer way and try to process the language exchange in my head in order to speak not only a (somewhat) correct English, but mostly as clear as I could in terms of pronunciation. This is important for the communication in the project, otherwise, as most meetings are online and time pressured, you speak too fast, make grammar and sound mistakes, and lose people’s attention to your argument.”

The cognitive and emotional load of constantly seeking to understand multiple complex and unfamiliar diverse cultural perspectives, of learning and developing one’s own cultural responsiveness, of seeking to proactively design an inclusive process, and to challenge each other sensitively when appropriate, and especially of communicating about all of this in another language are elements of the “work” of cultural responsiveness.

Theme 4: Transformations through cultural responsiveness: personal, curricular, students

Whilst the work of ICUPO and the development of cultural responsiveness may have been challenging, uncomfortable, continual, and effortful, there was also a clear sense among participants that there were benefits and rewards to being a part of this process. These benefits included being able to see their own transformation and growth, as well as opportunities for further developing the curriculum they teach in their home contexts, and wider benefits for their local and global communities.

We have already seen the ways in which individuals experienced their own growth under the theme of ‘Never-ending journey’. In addition, respondents noted that they became aware of particular attributes and behaviors in the context of ICUPO. As participant E remarked, “the positionality work transformed my values and attitudes,” while participant I commented that “cultural responsiveness nurtures knowledge, attitudes and values.” Examples of such personal transformations included increased awareness of the importance of humility (respondents B, C, E), flexibility, open-mindedness, and respect (E), and “bi-directionality” or reciprocity (G). Respondent F observed that they had “experienced immense satisfaction” through participating in the project, because of the rich learning that they had undertaken. Finally, almost every participant commented that they valued their enhanced ability to reflect, to be self-aware and self-critical, and to question oneself: “I appreciate the opportunity that was included in this project to have greater insight and understanding into my own place in the world as a culturally responsive person” (D).

In terms of curricular transformation, several participants reflected on the relatively narrow psychology curriculum that they taught in their home institutions. Even in non-Western countries, they noted that most teaching focused on western psychological models. For example, participant H wrote:

“The perspectives and practices in [my country] were given due importance, and the team was keen to understand the ways and models used in [nation’s] institutions. These discussions also helped me reflect and discuss about teaching and learning of psychology in [nation] and understand the need for having a forum to discuss and document practices from [nation] and other parts of [continent]. Teaching psychology in [nation] has many challenges especially that the country is very multicultural and multilingual in nature. We largely teach western models and texts, but sometimes that limits us from taking into consideration cultural differences.”

This extract offers insights into the ways in which a formerly colonized, non-western university system has been inculcated by psychological models from its colonizers and

other western countries, and through taking part in ICUPO, this colleague was able to appreciate more deeply the limitations of such an approach, and the importance of raising awareness of their own cultural perspectives on psychology.

Other group members also discovered that there were opportunities for curriculum development from hearing about psychological perspectives from non-western cultures. Participant F noted how much they valued hearing from under-represented cultures about psychology:

“Several ICUPO members introduced non-Western psychological frameworks that have been overlooked in undergraduate psychology teaching in the U.S. Indigenous psychological theories from Australia, Canada, and New Zealand and Asian Psychology from China and India can offer valuable insights into how diverse cultural frameworks contribute to the teaching of psychology. Their insights have significantly influenced my approach to teaching cultural psychology because I have never considered these unique psychological frameworks in my previous course design.”

Similarly, respondent I shows us that cultures that are often under-represented in mainstream and westernized models of psychology have much to offer to other curricula: “This enlightens and sharpens capacity for how diverse cultures, especially [own nation] folklore, songs, dance, and parables, can be important in instructing cultural responsiveness.” Not only can teaching psychology from other cultural perspectives enhance the psychology curriculum, but it can also support the development of cultural responsiveness in our students.

The ability to develop our students’ cultural responsiveness, then, was the final step in this ‘transformation’ theme. As respondent C notes, engaging in ICUPO demonstrated how “our own values and beliefs may shape both our understanding of psychology as a discipline and our approach to collaborative work – and models a useful way of engaging students in critical reflection of how their unique backgrounds may influence their understanding and learning.” The ability to transform curricula through widening the cultural perspectives of psychology that we teach, will ultimately transform our students. “It is innately transformative and must incorporate knowledge (knowing), self-knowledge behaviors (being), and action (doing). Conclusively, this should constitute a strong educational psychology offering at the undergraduate level creating positive attitudes towards differences in changing the narratives” (respondent I). In other words, the indirect beneficiaries from the ICUPO project, if we are indeed transformed ourselves, and so transform our teaching, will be seen through our transformed students, who will in turn value diversity, develop cultural responsiveness themselves, and ultimately, contribute to a more inclusive and culturally safe society.

In addition to this rich qualitative analysis, it should be noted that of the nine respondents, six explicitly stated that their CR had increased as a result of being involved in this project; two commented on the positive inclusivity aspects of the project processes and experience; and one commented on the value of CR in the undergraduate curriculum (the latter 3 respondents were from non-Western nations).

Appendix SM4.A

“Prompts for your writing of the reflection include:

- Do you consider that your cultural responsiveness and appreciation of diversity has developed/increased during this project?

- If yes, give examples of (a) your learning experiences (if you participated in the positionality homework exercise – see spreadsheet [...], and/or the positionality exercise... please include comment on these) and/or (b) how the ICUPO processes/procedures supported that development. Your learning experiences may also have arisen from your interactions with other ICUPO Committee members, IRGUPO members, or others whom you have interacted with during the ICUPO project, or indeed, from the readings or other sources.
- If no, why do you think that is the case? How could the ICUPO processes/procedures have better supported that development?
- Please make any other comments that you think pertinent to the reader's understanding of the relevance of your developing cultural responsiveness (or not) during this project."

Section 5: Recommendations for Educational Leaders Responsible for the Design and Delivery of Curricula for which Cultural Responsiveness is One of the Intended Learning Outcomes

Implementation of these recommendations should facilitate, coordinate, and consolidate existing and ongoing efforts by dedicated classroom educators to support the development of cultural responsiveness in their students.

- (a) Commitment to cultural responsiveness should be displayed by the appointment of a university-wide, Faculty, and School/Department leadership team whose primary responsibility is the development of cultural responsiveness in both staff and students, with this commitment being replicated at all lower levels (e.g., see <https://www.keele.ac.uk/equalitydiversity/equalityframeworksandactivities/decolonisingthecurriculum/>);
- (b) This commitment should take the forms of: (i) relevant professional development for all staff, (ii) the appointment of staff with competence in these areas (e.g., Indigenous staff), (iii) collaborative curriculum design, with the aim of ensuring (iv) cultural responsiveness as an outcome of academic programs;
- (c) In particular, whole-of-program collaborative curriculum design and delivery by a program team could involve: (1) mapping the *ICUP* competences against the local (which may include national/regional) requirements, thus identifying any gaps, that is, *ICUP* competences that are not already being covered in the institutional curriculum; (2) undertaking research on existing Teaching and Assessment example strategies relevant to the 'gap' competences; (3) discussing and then deciding upon potential strategies for closing the gaps, that would complement and enhance existing curricular strategies; and (4) determining and implementing an implementation and evaluation plan, which would include input from stakeholders (e.g., students).

Section 6: Recommendations for Educational Leaders Undertaking Similar Projects

In the planning of the project, the consideration of inclusivity and cultural responsiveness should be made an integral part of the initial and ongoing internally and externally focused project processes.

1. Explicitly recruit diverse members with a wide range of demographic and professional characteristics, backgrounds, and experiences.
2. In doing so, it should be explicitly expected that all team members will continue to develop their own cultural responsiveness throughout the project;
3. To support that development, specific strategies need to be put in place, and we recommend the positionality tasks described in this paper, noting this can be challenging to organize, given the paucity of experienced, talented, and motivated cultural negotiators/educators;
4. Involve in the project people with specific competences on CR, at least as consultants, in order to be able to access a specific and reliable body of knowledge and practice.
5. Seek feedback from members of (at least some of) the relevant minoritized groups.

Supplemental Material References

- Argyriadis, A., Asimakopoulou, E., Patelarou, E., Andriopoulos, I., Patelarou, A., Paoullis, P., Zografakis-Sfakianakis, M., Argyriadi, A. (2022). Translation and validation in Greek of the Central Vancouver Island Multicultural Society Cultural Competence Self-Assessment Checklist for health professionals. *Population Medicine*, 4(May), 16. <https://doi.org/10.18332/popmed/150202>
- Australian Psychological Society (2016). The APS Apology to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. <https://psychology.org.au/community/reconciliation-and-the-aps/aps-apology>
- Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (2022). Annexure to the APAC evidence guide: Standard 3 Program of study, Criterion 3.8. https://apac.au/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Criterion-3.8-guidance-document_v1.1-final.pdf
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. Sage.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Conceptual and design thinking for thematic analysis. *Qualitative Psychology*, 9(1), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000196>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2023). Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common problems and becoming a knowing researcher. *International Journal of Transgender Health*, 24(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26895269.2022.2129597>
- Central Vancouver Island Multicultural Society [CVIMS] (2021). *Cultural Competence Checklist Revised 8-12-21* [Measurement instrument]. <https://www.cvims.org/resources/cultural-competency/>
- Collins, P.H. (2001). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Coulson, D., & Homewood, J. (2016). Developing psychological literacy: Is there a role for reflective practice? *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 13(2), 1–18. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol13/iss2/5>
- 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
- Cranney, J., Dunn, D.S., Hulme, J.A., Nolan, S.A., Morris, S., & Norris, K. (2022a). Graduate capabilities for undergraduate psychology education: A proposal. [Supplemental Material to Cranney, J., Dunn, D.S., Hulme, J.A., Nolan, S.A., Morris, S., & Norris, K., (2022a). Psychological literacy and psychology

- undergraduate education: An international provocation.] *Frontiers in Education: Educational Psychology*.
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2022.790600/full#supplementary-material>
- Cranney, J., Morris, S., Norris, K., & Connolly, C. E. (2022b). Charting the psychological literacy landscape: Systematic review highlighting psychology education. *Frontiers in Education: Educational Psychology*, 6 Article 913814,1-22.
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2022.913814/full>.
- Cullen K, Rhodes P, Brockman R, Hunt C, Langtiw CL. (2020). Decolonising clinical psychology: National and international perspectives. *Clinical Psychologist*, 24, 211–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cp.12228>
- Darlaston-Jones, D. (2015). (De)Constructing paradigms: Creating a psychology curriculum for conscientisation education. *The Australian Community Psychologist*, 27, 38-48.
- Dudgeon, P., Darlaston-Jones, D., & Bray, A. (2018). Teaching indigenous psychology: A conscientisation, de-colonisation and psychological literacy approach to curriculum. In C. Newnes & L. Golding (Eds.), *Teaching critical psychology: International perspectives* (pp.123-147). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group US. ISBN 978-1-1382-8834-8.
- Dudgeon, P., Darlaston-Jones, D., Phillips, G., Newnham, K., Brideson, T., Cranney, J., Hammond, S., Harris, J., Herbert, J., Homewood, J., & Page, S. (2016). *Australian Indigenous Psychology Education Project Curriculum Framework*. [Peer-reviewed] Perth, WA: University of Western Australia.
<https://indigenousspsyched.org.au/frameworks/#core-frameworks>
- Dudgeon, P., Derry, K. L., Mascall, C., & Ryder, A. (2022). Understanding Aboriginal models of selfhood: The National Empowerment Project's Cultural, Social, and Emotional Wellbeing Program in Western Australia. *International Journal of Environmental Research in Public Health*, 19(7), 4078.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19074078>
- Dudgeon, P., Milroy, H., & Walker, R. (Eds) (2014). *Working together: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander mental health and wellbeing principles and practice*. 2nd ed. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing.
<https://www.telethonkids.org.au/globalassets/media/documents/aboriginal-health/working-together-second-edition/working-together-aboriginal-and-wellbeing-2014.pdf>
- Kalibatseva, Z., & Yang, K. (2024). Student multicultural attitudes and ethnocultural empathy in psychology classes. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/stl0000404>
- Lazard, L., & McAvoy, J. (2017). Reflexivity in psychological research: What's the point? What's the practice? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 17(2), 159-177.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2017.1400144>
- McGuire-Adams, T., (2021). Settler allies are made, not self-proclaimed: Unsettling conversations for non-Indigenous researchers and educators involved in Indigenous health. *Health Education Journal*, 80(7) 761–772.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00178969211009269>
- Monroe, A., & Pearson, C. (2006). The Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire: A new instrument for multicultural studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(5), 819-834. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405285542>

- Nakata, M. (2013). The rights and blights of the politics in Indigenous higher education. *Anthropological Forum: A Journal of Social Anthropology and Comparative Sociology*, 23(3), 289-303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00664677.2013.803457>
- Nakata, M. (2007). The cultural interface. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 36, 7–14. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1326011100004646>
- 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 (2024). *Gamma.R2 Version: International Competences for Undergraduate Psychology (ICUP)*. Open Science Foundation. <https://osf.io/hkftu>. Preprint [Manuscript in preparation]. Accessed 19 December 2024.
- Ramsden, I. M. (2003). Cultural safety and nursing education in Aotearoa and Te Waipounamu. PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington. https://www.iue.net.nz/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/RAMSDEN-I-Cultural-Safety_Full.pdf
- Royal Children's Hospital (n.d.). *Cultural Safety Self Evaluation Tool* [Measurement instrument]. [https://www.rch.org.au/uploadedFiles/Main/Pages/diversity-equity-and-inclusion/Cultural%20Safety%20-%20Self%20Assessment%20Tool%20\(2021\).pdf](https://www.rch.org.au/uploadedFiles/Main/Pages/diversity-equity-and-inclusion/Cultural%20Safety%20-%20Self%20Assessment%20Tool%20(2021).pdf)
- Ryder, C., Mackean, T., Ullah, S., Burton, H., Halls, H., McDermott, D., & Edmondson, W. (2017). Development and validation of a questionnaire to measure attitude change in health professionals after completion of an Aboriginal Health and Cultural Safety Training Programme. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 48(1), 24-38. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2017.37>
- Scrine, C., Farrant, B., Michie, C., Shepherd, C., & Wright, M. (2022). Implementing genuine participatory action research with Aboriginal Elders: The Ngulluk Koolunga Ngulluk Koort project. *Action Research*, 20(2), 144-161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750320932974>
- Thompson, P. B., & Taylor, K. (2021). *A cultural safety approach to health psychology*. Springer Nature. ISBN: 9783030768515
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonisation is not a metaphor. *Decolonization, Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-40. <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>
- Wilson, A. (2014). Addressing uncomfortable issues: Reflexivity as a tool for culturally safe practice in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 43(2), 218-230. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2014.24>
- Wilson, T. D. (2009). Know thyself. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(4), 384-389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01143.x>
- Wright, A. Gray, P., Selkirk, B., Hunt, C., & Wright, R. (2024): Attachment and the (mis)apprehension of Aboriginal children: epistemic violence in child welfare interventions. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2023.2280537>