

SMITH, PAUL H., Ph.D. Transnational Faculty Work in Counselor Education: A Delphi Study. (2016)

Directed by Dr. James M. Benshoff and Dr. Laura M. Gonzalez. 132 pp.

The growth of the counseling profession worldwide paired with the effects of globalization have created more ways in which U.S. counselor education faculty work worldwide (Lorelle et al., 2012; Norsworthy et al., 2009b; Tang et al., 2012). This professional work often occurs within the domains of counselor education, counseling practice and development, and counseling research. Numerous professional trends illustrate these changes. Counselor educators continue to expand and develop counseling research globally (Pieterse et al., 2011), create global initiatives within the field (Ng et al., 2012), assist with the development of the counseling profession in other countries (Lueng et al., 2009; Stanard, 2013), work with international students (Lau & Ng, 2012; Ng & Smith, 2009), and lead educational programming, such as immersion experiences, within their roles as educators (Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010). Over the past few decades, the phenomena of globalization and, subsequently, internationalization within higher education, have facilitated the expansion of these global experiences of counselor educators. Fundamental to all of these various global experiences is working effectively and ethically with global partners (Norsworthy et al., 2009b), especially given differences in the practice of helping around the world (Brock, 2006) and potential negative impacts of spreading U.S. and European mental health practices to other countries (Mills, 2014; Staeuble, 2006; van de Vijver, 2013).

Given the complexities and ethical issues present in transnational work, surprisingly lacking within professional literature are guidelines for transnational

professional work within counselor education. Although some counselor educators have discussed their individual global experiences (e.g., Norsworthy et al., 2009b) and provided conceptual guidance for other educators (e.g., Draguns, 2013; Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007), no empirical research exists that gives guidelines for counselor educators about how to best work with other professionals transnationally.

When direction or guidelines are lacking within a certain research area, consensus opinion from relevant experts helps provide a framework for effective practice and development (Powell, 2003). Developing consensus opinion from experts in the counseling field regarding the transnational professional work offers U.S.-based counselor educators critical guidelines for their global engagement and professional work. The Delphi methodology was used in this study to develop a consensus opinion from the counseling experts.

Findings of this study indicate critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally. Overall, 69 items developed consensus by the expert panel as critical guidelines. The guidelines were thematically categorized in 6 areas: (a) Personal Attributes and Attitudes – General, (b) Personal Attributes and Attitudes – Counseling Related, (c) Context-Specific Characteristics – Knowledge, (d) Context-Specific Characteristics – Skills, (e) U.S. Counseling Expertise – Knowledge, and (f) U.S. Counseling Expertise – Skills. The majority of the guidelines were in the category of Personal Attributes and Attitudes, indicating the importance of these ideas to the panel. The findings of this study provide an initial framework for U.S.-based counselor educators when working transnationally. Because the panel only included U.S.-based

counselor educators, it will be important for future research to analyze the perspectives of non-U.S. counseling professionals involved in transnational work.

TRANSNATIONAL FACULTY WORK IN COUNSELOR
EDUCATION: A DELPHI STUDY

by

Paul H. Smith

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2016

Approved by

Committee Co-Chair

Committee Co-Chair

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation written by Paul H. Smith has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Co-Chairs

Dr. James M. Benshoff

Dr. Laura M. Gonzalez

Committee Members

Dr. Kelly L. Wester

Dr. Leila E. Villaverde

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As the adage goes, it takes a village to raise a child, or in my case, a doctoral student. A community of people has constantly supported me throughout my academic journey. To my co-chairs, Dr. Benshoff and Dr. Gonzalez, your support, encouragement, and insight have been invaluable for me in my development. You have never hesitated in your support of my ideas, and you guided those ideas to reach fruition in this dissertation project. Both of you have encouraged me to explore new territories of ideas as well as learn to follow my own compass. I truly hope to emulate your mentorship qualities in my future roles. Dr. Wester and Dr. Villaverde, thank you for your consultation and very helpful feedback throughout my process. Both of you have been invaluable members of my committee.

To the CED department and my cohort, all of you have been incredibly instrumental in my development. It will take years and years of reflection to fully unpack all that I have learned and gained from my years as a doctoral student. From day one in the department, I always knew this program was the perfect fit for me. The laughs, the tears, conversations, and the growth will remain with me. I look forward to always being connected to my CED family.

To my family, I love you all so much. Your unending support of me and my passions have never faltered. You believed in me, you cheered me on, you asked questions, and you were always accepting of my circuitous path to and through this program. Lastly, to my partner and best friend, Catherine, I love you dearly. You make me a better person by being close to you. You teach me what it means to live into my beliefs, how to be more thoughtful

to those around me, and how to live every day to the fullest. I am honored to travel together through life with you. Here's to many more beautiful years to come.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Rationale for the Study	1
Shifts in Counselor Education	4
Global Research in Counseling.....	6
Counseling Profession and Practice.....	7
Multiculturalism and Social Justice in the Counseling Profession.....	8
Gaps in the Literature.....	9
Statement of the Problem.....	11
Purpose of the Study	11
Need for the Study	12
Research Question	12
Rationale for Delphi Methodology	13
Definition of Terms.....	13
Organization of the Study	15
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	16
Overview of Globalization.....	16
Emerging Realities of Modern Higher Education	19
Counseling Profession and Globalization.....	22
Overview of Internationalization – Responsive to Globalization.....	25
Various Elements Internationalized.....	28
Internationalization and the Counseling Profession	29
Internationalization and Counselor Education.....	30
Internationalization and Counseling Practice	34
Internationalization and Counseling Research.....	38
Conclusion	45
Indigenization of the Counseling Profession in Non-U.S. Settings	46
Risks of Internationalization and Indigenization in Counseling Profession	48
The Current Problem of Languageing	51
Research on Globalization and University Faculty	53

Conclusion	54
III. METHODOLOGY	55
The Delphi Methodology	55
Research Question	58
Population and Sample	58
Data Collection and Analysis of Data Procedures	59
Sampling Procedures	59
Data Collection and Analysis.....	61
Round One	61
Content Analysis	62
Round Two.....	64
Round Three.....	65
Pilot Study.....	66
Modifications	67
Researcher Bias and Positionality.....	69
IV. RESULTS	73
Round One Results	74
Procedures.....	74
Demographics	75
Gender.....	75
Age.....	76
Time in the U.S.	76
Ethnicity and Race	78
Time as Counselor Educator	78
Faculty Rank as Counselor Educator	79
Importance of International Issues.....	80
Published in a Peer-Reviewed Journal.....	81
Leadership Positions	82
Professional Travel	84
Round One Questionnaire Results	86
Round Two Results.....	93
Round Two Questionnaire Results	94
Round Two Participant Scoring.....	100
Round Three Results.....	101
Round Three Questionnaire Results	101
Summary of Results.....	103

V. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	104
Overview of the Study	104
Demographics of Panel Members.....	106
Summary of Findings.....	107
Emergent Categories	107
Findings by Category	112
Personal Attributes and Attitudes	113
Context-Specific Characteristics.....	117
U.S. Counseling Expertise	119
Items Where Consensus was Not Reached.....	120
Implications for Counselor Educators	121
Assessment and Evaluation.....	122
Planning	123
Education	125
Development to Meet Guidelines	127
Future Research	129
Limitations	132
REFERENCES	134
APPENDIX A. RECRUITMENT EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS	145
APPENDIX B. NOMINATION EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS.....	147
APPENDIX C. ROUND TWO PARTICPATION REQUEST EMAIL	149
APPENDIX D. ROUND THREE PARTICIPATION REQUEST EMAIL.....	150
APPENDIX E. PARTICIPANT THANK YOU EMAIL	151
APPENDIX F. ROUND ONE OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS	152
APPENDIX G. INFORMED CONSENT.....	154
APPENDIX H. ROUND ONE DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE.....	157

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Gender Identity – Rounds 1-3.....	75
Table 2. Age – Rounds 1-3	76
Table 3. Born in U.S. – Rounds 1-3.....	77
Table 4. Time in U.S. for Those Not Born in U.S. – Rounds 1-3.....	77
Table 5. Years as Counselor Educator – Rounds 1-3	78
Table 6. Faculty Rank – Rounds 1-3	80
Table 7. Importance of International Issues – Rounds 1-3	81
Table 8. Published in a Peer-Reviewed Journal – Rounds 1-3	82
Table 9. Leadership Positions – Rounds 1-3	83
Table 10. Professional Travel: Number of Times – Rounds 1-3	84
Table 11. Professional Travel: Type – Rounds 1-3	85
Table 12. Years Outside U.S. Over the Past 30 Years for Professional Reasons – Rounds 1-3.....	86
Table 13. Round 1 – Representative Statements from Participants.....	88
Table 14. Round 1 – Trustworthiness of Categories and Subcategories	93
Table 15. Round 2 – Median and IQR of Representative Statements from Round 1.....	95
Table 16. Round 2 – Range and Mean Scores of Individual Participants’ Overall Ratings	100
Table 17. Round 3 – Median and IQR from Edited or Added Statements from Round 2	102
Table 18. Final Results—Median and IQR of Critical Guidelines.....	109

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale for the Study

Transnational work for counselor education faculty is becoming a growing part of their professional roles. Through scholarship, education programs, practice, and professional service, counseling faculty lead the U.S. profession in developing these global relationships (Norsworthy, Leung, Heppner & Wang, 2009; Tang et al., 2012). This type of professional work has been developing in the profession for many decades (Gerstein, Heppner, Ægistóttir, Leung, & Norsworthy, 2009). The extent and widespread nature of international relations within the counseling profession has increased due to the phenomenon of globalization (Lorelle, Byrd, & Crockett, 2012).

Over the past few decades, globalization has emerged as a dynamic force around the world – impacting many aspects of human life (Paredes et al., 2008; Stromquist & Monkman, 2014). The interconnected global economy and societies have made it easier to share information, trade, travel, and conduct business internationally. Researchers have articulated that these changes are increasing over time and affecting more and more people (Stromquist & Monkman, 2014). In the midst of these far-reaching changes, globalization influences peoples’ lives uniquely depending on context and situation. Notably, counseling and higher education have been directly and heavily impacted by globalization (Carnoy, 2014; Lorelle, Byred, & Crockett, 2012; Stromquist, 2007).

Students travel and study abroad at rates increasing each year (Santos, 2014); transnational and non-U.S. research is increasing (Pieterse, Fang, & Evans, 2011); knowledge is more easily shared across borders (Stromquist 2007; Paredes et al., 2008); and U.S. faculty are becoming more connected internationally – to other universities and other countries (Norsworthy et al., 2009b). These diverse evolutions in education elicit a fundamental question about culture and relevance – what is the benefit and relevance of the interconnectedness of education across borders? And how do we ethically engage in these emerging connections and new type of professional work? To these questions, researchers have offered their recommendations, ranging from open and democratic sharing to more judicious cross-cultural interactions (Andreotti, 2011; Norsworthy, Heppner, Ægistóttir, Gerstein, & Pedersen; 2009).

Counselor education also is facing many of the questions created by the phenomenon of globalization. Like higher education in general, counselor education is expanding domestically and abroad (Schweiger, Henderson, McCaskill, Clawson, & Collins, 2013) and is becoming more integrated in the global environment (Leung et al., 2009). International graduate students are continuing to come to the U.S. for counselor training (Ng & Smith, 2009). Simultaneously, counseling research is expanding beyond the U.S. and Europe (Pieterse et al., 2011; van de Vijver, 2013) and counseling faculty are becoming more involved in counseling around the globe (Norsworthy et al., 2009b; Tang et al., 2012). Additionally, questions are emerging about how applicable U.S. and European counseling methods are in other locations (Arnett, 2008). The National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC), for example, has created NBCC-International

(NBCC -I) to expand and develop counseling around the world in relevant ways depending on context (Leung et. al., 2009), despite not having empirical evidence of the applicability (Hinkle, 2014). There remain numerous cross-cultural challenges in this expansion and adaptation of counseling to different contexts (Draguns, 2013; Norsworthy et al., 2009a).

To address many of these shifts in the profession and educational system, some counseling faculty are advocating for the internationalization of counselor education and the counseling profession whereby counseling training programs and the profession intentionally adapt to meet emerging global needs (Lueng et al., 2009; Marsella & Pedersen, 2004; Ng, 2012). Internationalization is a movement within higher education to promote cooperation across borders and with educational programs and various nations (Kreber, 2009). Ng, Choudhuri, Noonan, and Ceballos (2012) and Marsella and Pedersen (2004) list internationalization recommendations for counselor training programs to become more globally relevant. These recommendations range from curricular changes to student diversity initiatives. Additionally, the scope of internationalization in the counseling profession is being clarified (Ng & Noonan, 2012). Research has been conducted to better understand the needs and experience of international counseling students (Ng & Smith, 2009) as well as to understand the experiences of non-U.S. clients working with U.S.-trained counselors (Sue & Sue, 2013). The dynamic shifts in the profession can be categorized into three areas: counselor education, research in counseling and the counseling profession. Within these three domains, counseling faculty are often the primary forces prompting and promoting international relations.

Shifts in Counselor Education

Within U.S. counselor education, numerous changes are occurring that indicate an increase in international interactions and an expansion of counselor training programs around the globe (Leung et al., 2009). Firstly, international students increasingly come to the U.S. for counselor training (Ng & Smith, 2009), although specific rates are unknown (Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007). Despite this gap in data, international students are coming to U.S. colleges and universities at increasing rates each year, especially for graduate education – up almost 10% from 2014 to 2015 (Institute of International Education, 2015). Due to this consistent flow of students into the U.S. for counselor training, therefore, researchers are focusing on these international students to ensure that their educational experience is relevant and appropriate given their cultural background. Recently, researchers have examined international students' experiences in counselor training programs thereby informing ways in which programs can create better learning environments for international counseling students (Ng & Smith, 2009, 2012). Although this research area is growing, many gaps in understanding international students experiences within counselor training remain.

Additionally, within U.S. counselor training programs, study abroad programs – often described as immersion experiences – are becoming more prevalent (Barden & Cashwell, 2014). These programs primarily focus on multi/cross-cultural learning goals for students aimed at personal and professional development (Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007; Smith-Augustine, Dowden, Wiggins, & Hall, 2014). Additionally, some programs

integrate service learning (Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010). Overall, immersion experiences serve to enhance and deepen the counselor-in-training's learning experience.

Gerstein and Ægisdóttir (2007) highlighted the importance of addressing international issues within counselor training programs as a means of training “social change agents” and to more holistically understand culture's impact on counseling (p. 123). The authors noted that there is limited literature on international topics in counseling journals and other publications to be used as training materials within counselor training. Yet there is evidence that international counseling educational materials have increased in recent years (Hohenshil, Amundson, & Niles, 2013; Moodley, Gielen, & Wu, 2013)

Nevertheless, there are challenges that emerge with this shift to a more international focus. Understanding how best to integrate global experiences and non-U.S. students into counselor training remains a challenge. Lau and Ng (2012) described some of the challenges that non-U.S. students face when returning to their home country after graduation, when they attempt to integrate their U.S. education into the local context. Also, Ng (2006) presented some of the challenges that U.S. educators have when working with international students. Current research about the overall internationalization of the counselor training programs is limited (Ng et al., 2012; Hurley, Gerstein, & Ægisdóttir, 2013). It remains to be seen how U.S. counselor training programs will continue to adapt to the needs of international students.

Global Research in Counseling

Based on many appeals to integrate international perspectives into counseling research (Arnett, 2008; Draguns, 2013; Leong & Ponterotto, 2003), more attention is being directed at international issues. Although progress towards this goal is slow and knowledge of the extent of progress is limited (Pieterse et al., 2011), there are visible signs that international topics and non-U.S. scholars are engaging in counseling research. Since 2010, one major counseling journal includes an article that addresses international topics in every issue (Hohenshil & Amundson, 2011). Also, numerous counseling texts have been published in the past few years that spotlight counseling in other countries (Hoenshil et al., 2013; Moodley, Gielen, & Wu, 2013; Moodley, Lengyell, Wu, & Gielen, 2015; Poyrazli & Thompson, 2013).

Despite these changes, there remain concerns that little is still known about counseling in other parts of the world as well as whether U.S. counseling methods are applicable in non-U.S. locations (Arnett, 2008; Gerstein et al., 2009). Addressing this international research gap presents a diversity of challenges. Firstly, the English language dominates counseling scholarship, limiting dissemination of knowledge from other linguistic origins (Draguns, 2001). Second, diversity of methodological concerns must be considered when researching groups cross-culturally (Ægisdóttir, Gerstein, Leung, Kwan, & Lonner, 2009). Finally, other educational researchers have argued that international research by U.S. scholars can create relational dynamics between researcher and researched that is embedded in colonial patterns of voyeurism and exploitation

(Andreotti, 2011; Staeuble, 2006). Clearly, counseling scholars face a number of fundamental challenges when engaging in international, cross-cultural research.

Counseling Profession and Practice

The counseling profession, like counseling research and training, is becoming more global in focus and practice. Within counseling practice in the U.S., counselors are working with more and more immigrants and people who identify with non-U.S. cultures (Chung, Bemak, Ortiz, & Sandoval-Perez, 2008). The trend of increasing immigration – up 44% since 1990 – will continue to affect counseling services and practice in the U.S. because counselors will need to develop appropriate skills and knowledge when working with clients from other countries (Chung et al., 2008).

Also, U.S. organizations and counseling faculty are assisting with the development of the counseling profession in other countries (Hinkle, 2014; Leung et al., 2009). NBCC-I assists with credentialing initiatives and mental health trainings abroad and the American Counseling Association (ACA) continues to support global professional development projects and conferences. Also, counseling faculty provide trainings and consultation to non-U.S. organizations and educational institution. Leung et al. (2009) categorized this assistance in three areas: 1) aid with certification and credential development, 2) aid with creation of education programs, and 3) aid with development of mental health training programs. Despite these widespread developments, little research has been conducted on the overall impact of these programs on local communities (Hinkle, 2014). Additionally, educational development projects and research abroad by U.S. organizations, including those being conducted by the counseling

profession, have been under scrutiny for decades and criticized as another way of expanding U.S. influence and superiority abroad, thereby ensuring the economic viability of those organizations (Andreotti, 2011; Kreber, 2009; Stromquist & Monkman, 2014; Staeuble, 2006). Thus, one of the major challenges of internationalizing the counseling profession centers on the ability of U.S. counselors to avoid the pitfalls of power and coercion that are historically embedded in international educational projects. The movement of multiculturalism and social justice in the counseling profession provides perspective in addressing these emerging transnational challenges in the profession, yet the conceptual and professional integration of these two movements within counseling is unclear.

Multiculturalism and Social Justice in the Counseling Profession

Multiculturalism and social justice has emerged in recent years as a fundamental movement within the counseling profession. Social justice refers to the act of participating in the movement to “ensure full participation of all people in the life of a society” with particular emphasis on those systemically excluded or discriminated against (p. xiv, Lee & Hipoloto-Delgado, 2007). Multiculturalism and social justice have emerged as the fourth and fifth force in the counseling profession, respectively (Ratts & Pederson, 2014), denoting their widespread professional significance. In fact, social justice is considered one of the primary ethical concerns within the profession (Herlihy & Dufrene, 2011). However, it is unknown how these movements are generalized to global professional interactions. Competencies have been established to describe how multiculturalism and social justice should be integrated into the counseling relationship

(Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, & McCullough, 2015), but neither competencies, best practices, nor consensus by leaders in the field have designated how these concepts should be applied within transnational professional relationships or work. Additionally, there exist many parallels between the multicultural and social justice movements in counseling and postcolonial movements in higher education in general, such as a focus on power dynamics and oppression.

Gaps in the Literature

Global relationships and professional experiences have been studied in higher education for many decades (Knight, 2004; Paredes et al., 2008). Within the last 20 years, particular attention has been on focused student engagement with various international experiences (Barden & Cashwell, 2014; Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010) and on faculty perspectives on how internationalization should be implemented within the profession (Ng & Noonan, 2012). There is emerging research on the actual implementation of internationalization that indicates increased amount of internationalization in higher education, such as additional research on international topics and expanding study abroad programs (Green et al., 2012; Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009). Additional efforts have been made to more fully understand ways in which counseling faculty propose how internationalization should proceed in counselor training programs (Ng et al., 2012) and the counseling profession (Ng & Noonan, 2012). Developing global partnerships is central to the internationalization movement in the profession, but there is no consensus within the profession about how this type of

professional work should function or be developed within the domains of research, training, and practice.

Given the converging phenomena of social justice efforts within the profession and heightened international involvement in the profession, it is surprising that there exist no recommendations for counseling faculty that illuminate how to best engage in transnational work around the world. Many researchers have emphasized the uniqueness and emerging prevalence of this type of professional work, but have not described clear suggestions for other counselors (Heppner et al., 2009; Norsworthy et al., 2009; Tang et al., 2012). Of the competencies that do exist, such as the current Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, & McCullough, 2015), the focus is primarily on the counselor-client relationship. In contrast, counselor education faculty often engage in professional collaborations, consultation, research and other activities relevant their specific role. Consequently, further elaboration on how counselor education faculty can best engage in this global professional work is needed.

Thus, so although there is more research on the phenomenon of internationalization and on the impact of global experiences on students in higher education, there remains no consensus opinion postulating how counseling faculty can best engage in this transnational professional work. As internationalization increases across higher education and global relationships and exchanges flourish, it is imperative to designate how counseling faculty can best develop these emerging and expanding partnerships within the domains of training, research, and practice. Additionally, it is

unclear within the profession about how the current ethos of multiculturalism and social justice in the profession intersects with transnational work. Without focusing on the ethical components of the transnational work (i.e., social justice), there exists the risk of reinstating power and superiority over global partners (Andreotti, 2011; Chung et al., 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Due to the large impact of globalization on all aspects of human life, understanding how counseling faculty can best engage in professional work around the globe is essential. Without having recommendations for type of work, the profession is limited in how it can best meet the educational, research, and practice-related challenges of the future given globalization. Competencies and best practices have provided the profession with constructive guidelines for counselors in various areas such as multicultural competence (Ratts & Pedersen, 2014) and supervision (Borders, 2014). These competencies and best practices are often developed using the opinion of those within the field deemed as an “expert.” Although research on global topics in the counseling profession is increasing because of increasing transnational interactions due to globalization and internationalization, no researchers have delineated how to engage in transnational work within the profession.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to develop consensus opinion from experts about how counselor education faculty should engage in transnational professional work. Borders (2014) proposed that professional competencies and best practices, while different, both

be understood as “critical guidelines” (p. 152). Using this more general phrase, the findings of the study will function as preliminary critical guidelines for counselor educators in their transnational work. This examination will address the emerging and interconnected global environment in which U.S. counseling faculty now reside due to globalization. The focus of the study is professionally specific to U.S.-based counselor education faculty due to the uniqueness of the profession in the U.S.

Need for the Study

As the profession of counseling expands both domestically and globally, there is minimal research suggesting how counselor education faculty should engage in transnational work. Presently, there only exist the opinions of counseling faculty in conceptual research articles (Marsella, 2011; Norsworthy et al., 2009b; Tang et al., 2012; van de Vijver, 2013). In the past few years, related studies have been focused on developing internationalization checklists for counselor education programs (Ng et al., 2012) and defining the scope of internationalization in the profession (Lau & Ng, 2012), but no researchers have provided guidance for counselor education faculty around how to best engage in transnational work. This study will address the following research questions:

Research Question

RQ1) What are critical guidelines for U.S.-based counselor educators when working transnationally?

Rationale for Delphi Methodology

Although there is emerging research about globalization and the counseling profession in recent years, there is no consensus opinion within the field about how to engage in transnational work in counselor education. Delphi methodology is a quantitative procedure to develop consensus amongst a group of experts within a certain area. Other researchers within the counseling profession have utilized the Delphi method when there was a lack of clarity around a topic such as research competencies (Wester & Borders, 2014) or important ethical issues in the profession (Herlihy & Dufrene, 2011). Powell (2002) emphasized that a Delphi study is ideal when there is uncertainty and/or absence of empirical evidence. Developing consensus opinion from experts can provide clarified insight about that specific problem or area. Because globalization has impacted the field of counseling so drastically, it will be important to delineate how counselor education faculty can best work transnationally. Similar to other research problems, the expert consensus opinion that emerges from the Delphi study will clarify this research problem as well as provide counselor education faculty with enhanced insight about guidelines for transnational work.

Definition of Terms

Globalization is understood as a multifaceted phenomenon that creates more interconnected economies and cultures across nations through exchange of goods, services, people, and knowledge (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2013; Paredes et al., 2008).

International refers to the actions and relationships between two or more nations. The term emerged as the preferred word in the eighteenth century for global interactions due to the growing importance of nations in organizing social and political life (Ashcroft et al., 2013).

Internationalization is “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). Professions, like higher education, are also internationalizing in a similar manner by integrating knowledge and applicability across cultures to create a more globally relevant profession (van de Vijver, 2013).

Non-U.S. is term that is used to describe people, experiences, and activities that originate from outside the U.S. or are considered “other” and outside the U.S. For example, oftentimes recent immigrants are socially considered “non-U.S./non-American” despite their U.S. location. In the feminist literature, the term “Other” is commonly used to describe that which is foreign, misunderstood, and marginalized (Andreotti, 2007; Spivak, 1988). “Non-U.S.” functions in a similar way.

Postcolonialism refers to the effects of European colonialism and the colonial period on cultures, societies, and nations. Vestiges of European colonialism as well as contemporary colonialisms are analyzed and critiqued within the postcolonial framework (Ashcroft et al., 2013).

Social Justice within the counseling profession “focuses on helping to ensure that opportunities and resources are distributed fairly and helping to ensure equity when resources are distributed unfairly or unequally” (p. 1, Fouad, Gerstein, & Toporek, 2006).

Transnational refers to the processes and interactions across nations. The term deemphasizes the importance of the nation in global interactions.

Transnational work, in this study, refers to a counselor educator's professional (i.e., counseling-related) work with others outside the U.S. Some examples of this work include collaborative research, leading a study abroad experience, coauthoring an article, teaching in a foreign school, and providing consultation.

Organization of the Study

The dissertation study is presented in five chapters. The first chapter provides an introduction to the research topic and dissertation study as well as a rationale for the relevance and importance of the research. The second chapter provides a review of the relevant literature pertaining to the study – namely, transnational issues in the counseling profession and counselor education. The third chapter outlines the methods used to conduct the study. The fourth chapter describes the results of the study. The final chapter provides a discussion of the study in relation to the field by noting the implications and limitations of the study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Given the focus on understanding counselor educators' roles in transnational professional work, this chapter will expand on describing the impact of globalization on higher education in general and counselor education in particular. Subsequently, the movement of internationalization in education and counseling will be described to elaborate on current trends within the profession. Various globally focused programs and initiatives will be highlighted to emphasize the changing nature of the profession and counselor education.

Overview of Globalization

Over the past few decades, dramatic shifts have occurred in how people connect to each other as well as exchange ideas and money around the globe (Knight 2004; Paredes, et al, 2008; Stromquist & Monkman, 2014). Due to technological advances and rapid integration of the global economy, it is commonplace to communicate, travel, and trade across borders. These changes emerge from centuries of growing international connection, but are amplified due to technological and economic shifts that have occurred in the past few decades such as the internet and cellular phones as well as global capitalism moving into locations accessing new markets (Knight, 2004). Widespread global immigration and increased military engagement are additional areas that have

Continued to grow in this highly connected new environment. These dynamic changes impact people around the globe in tangible, yet evolving ways. People now have access to knowledge and goods from around the world and, therefore, are influenced by various cultures. Due to significant human impact of globalization, it becomes imperative to critically analyze global relationships delineating how best to ethically and collaboratively engage with people around the world given the changing environment (Kreber, 2009; Stromquist, 2007). As will be discussed later, some researchers articulate that the current movement named “internationalization” addresses some of the negative impacts within globalization by focusing on collaboration and cultural humility when working with people from around the world (Leung, et al., 2009; Ng & Noonan, 2012; van de Vijver, 2013). Others discuss internationalization as merely an outgrowth and expansion of globalization (Stromquist, 2007).

Although it is quite difficult to define globalization due to its many features (Stromquist & Monkman, 2014), globalization has been described as a process by which ideas, people, money, technology, values, and any other tangible or intangible item are exchanged across nations (Knight, 2004). Gibson-Graham (2006) emphasized the rate at which these changes are taking place in their definition: “a set of processes by which the world is being rapidly integrated into one economic space” (p. 120).

Notably, globalization has emerged in recent decades as a phenomenon that describes the influence of worldwide economic, social and cultural influences on local communities and individuals (Ashcroft et al., 2013; Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009; Moodley et al., 2013). The effects of globalization on these communities depend

on local or individual context and history and vary worldwide (Knight, 2004). One of the primary features of globalization is that it is a phenomenon that cuts across geographical or national boundaries. Historically, this movement of ideas, goods and culture has been between distinct nations, yet now these exchanges occur across national boundaries. So while the term international was popularized during colonialism due to the significance of the European nation in global colonizing efforts, some suggest the term transnational more accurately denotes modern global exchanges and interactions in light of globalization (Ashcroft et al., 2013).

A second defining feature is that globalization operates through economic mediums – such as buying and selling products – as well as, social means – such as through institutions and universities (Knight, 2004; Paredes et al., 2008). As a result, the influence of the state/nation becomes less central as more and more people often trade and communicate through non-state means (Kreber, 2009; Qiang, 2003). The advancement of information technologies allows for the rapid movement of ideas, products and communication. Importantly, these new pathways of communication and exchange maintain some of the vestiges of domination and coercion present in colonial patterns (Staeuble, 2006), yet the vehicles of influence are often through economic and social means, such as financial influence and cultural oppression, rather than national power (Andreotti, 2007; Mills, 2014).

Notably, the impact of globalization depends on the particular features and location of a person, place or organization. So although globalization is inherently a global phenomenon fostering interdependence, the varied influences of globalization are

specific to context and situation. For example, a college student in rural sub-Saharan Africa will be impacted uniquely in their education based on available technologies and access to educational materials. By contrast, a college student in New York City is located in an epicenter of globalization with numerous global interactions undoubtedly present in classes with students from various countries all while having available technologies connecting her to people/information around the world. Because this varied impact depends on context, a wide variety of opinions exists about globalization ranging from vilification to praise (Brooks, 2003). As the next section will expand upon, globalization impacts higher education in parallel ways to the global economy – rapid communication, sharing of knowledge, and travel across borders are becoming fixtures in modern education.

Emerging Realities of Modern Higher Education

Due to these technological and economic changes, universities are facing a seismic shift in their conceptualizations of and experiences in higher education due to globalization. An example of this shift is the number of students studying abroad, outside their home country. The number of international students studying in higher education in the U.S. is nearing 900,000 students per year, up over 300,000 in less than ten years. Notably, 37% of these non-U.S. students are in graduate programs. Also, almost 300,000 U.S. students study in foreign country per year (Institute of International Education, 2015). Even though these statistics are only one element of globalization, the changing global economy and emerging technologies usher in significant transformations in how modern education is created, understood and implemented around the globe (Stromquist,

2007). Education is no longer siloed within distinct locations, languages or cultures. Some of these changes are seen in how academic research is being conducted collaboratively around the globe, how students and faculty travel to different countries for study, and how knowledge is created and shared quickly and widely. People, ideas and knowledge travel easily throughout the globe due to enhanced connectivity amongst educators and other stakeholders. Many authors have identified these changes as outcomes from the process of globalization (Knight 2004; Luke, 2010; Paredes et al, 2008; Tang et al., 2012).

As noted above, academics debate the exact nature of globalization but the definition revolves around the economic and technological changes that emerged and have grown since the mid-to-late twentieth century (Paredes et al., 2008; Knight, 2004; Stromquist, 2007). A distinguishing feature of globalization is the enhanced connectivity people have with others across borders. Oftentimes, those border crossings are quite literal – people moving across national boundaries. Students and faculty travel to countries outside their home location. Other border crossings are situated in technological or economic terms. The advent of the Internet, mobile communication, and enhanced infrastructure has created mediums for people to communicate in rapid and comprehensive ways. Enhanced communication has proved important for higher education for research and textbooks to be shared liberally around the globe and for educators and students to share knowledge and ideas quickly with each other (Carnoy, 2014). Although international students and travel have always been a part of university

experience, the pace of changes as well as enhanced global connections in the modern university are unprecedented.

Due to these economic shifts brought on by globalization, universities face higher competition due to more institutions that are accessible to a wide population and, simultaneously, additional revenue streams due to these newly accessible global students. What this has ushered in is the “entrepreneurial university” where the university is forced to compete on the world stage similar to for-profit businesses (Stromquist, 2007). Universities seek out revenue from outside grants, attract foreign students for higher tuition payments, and partner with outside businesses and organizations. In many ways, globalization has brought the modern university into a more economic arena whereby the university is now primarily understood as a tool for economic success – i.e., higher enrollment for the institution, job placements for students, productivity of faculty (grants, research), instead of a purely intellectual or philosophical experience (Stromquist & Monkman, 2014). Mohamedbhai (2003) noted how education is now being regarded as a “commercial product” in light of globalization (p.156). If universities take this stance of the commercialization of education, marketing the ‘product’ to non-U.S. students becomes a way to increase the number of paying students. So while the term globalization is often used quite liberally in academic discussions, in reference to higher education it denotes a very specific, yet broad, impact on how modern education is understood, constructed and implemented. These changes revolve around emerging universities’ international initiatives, shifting student demographics and expanding global connectivity.

Counseling Profession and Globalization

Similar to higher education, the counseling profession is increasingly influenced by globalization with regards to practice, research, education and overall connectedness to other counselors around the globe (Hohenshil et al., 2013; Lorelle, Byrd & Crockett, 2012; Ng, 2012). Counselors in the U.S., for example, serve clients with diverse national identities and cultural backgrounds that necessitate training to meet the needs of these clients (Kenney & Kenney, 2014). Additionally, immigration and other transnational exchanges create unique challenges for counselors to address the complications and challenges that arise for the affected populations (Chung, Bemak, Ortiz & Sandoval-Perez, 2008). Enhanced technological developments and changing global economic realities encourage counselor education to adapt to this new educational and professional environment.

In order to more simply understand globalization's effect on counseling, Paredes, et al. (2008) break down the processes of globalization experienced by counselors into three primary areas: exchange of goods/services, exchange of people, and exchange of knowledge. Through these global exchanges, goods and services become available to more people, generally at lower costs; people move from place to place for study and/or immigration; and technology expedites and democratizes the sharing of knowledge. Capitalism facilitates these changes by opening up new pathways for these exchanges to occur since money is often a fundamental part of these interactions.

Counselors, therefore, must prepare themselves to meet these changing environments, situations and needs brought on by globalization. Since counselors provide

assistance and services to people during challenging life moments, the emerging changes of globalization present unique obstacles to face with clients and with the profession at large. Heppner et al. (2009) located these challenges within the domains of training, research and practice. Some of the training challenges include the need to train culturally competent counselors able to work with clients from diverse nationalities and experience, as well as skills to collaborate with other counselors around the globe. Counseling research also provides an opportunity to more fully analyze human behavior across different countries and how counseling approaches and theories might interact with local cultures.

Lastly, Heppner et al., (2009) delineated how counseling practice in our global context could benefit from the convergence of multiculturalism and cross-national movements in the counseling field. The connection between these two relatively recent movements is apparent and their synergy in counselor education could assist the counseling profession in training practitioners to provide relevant, ethical and self-reflective practice to a wide variety of clients. Other authors have noted this connection between these two movements in our contemporary counselor education (Ng, 2012; Lee, 1997). Danziger (2006), however, warned that “the tendency to conceptualize social context solely in terms of ‘culture’ invariably goes hand in hand with a tendency to overlook the importance of power relationships” (p. 222). It remains to be seen how the cross/international movement will pair with or diverge from the multicultural and social justice movements in the profession. These various domains of counselor education,

research and practice mentioned above are important areas to focus on in this modern era of globalization.

Although many counseling researchers articulate the potential benefits of globalization, such as interconnectedness and information sharing, they also have noted potential perils, such as the proclivity of dominant influence of U.S./Eurocentric counseling models on local healing systems (Draguns, 2013; Marsella, 1998; Nassar-McMillan, Moore, Warfield, & Hayes, 2013). Although common sense might suggest that all counseling knowledge developed in the U.S. is not universal, knowing how to engage in knowledge sharing projects with non-U.S. partners is a foundational challenge to the profession that has been ushered in through globalization. Assuming that U.S.-developed theories and methods of counseling are effective around the globe has limited research support (Arnett, 2008). Such a perspective also comes with the potential to reinstate hierarchical relationships with many former colonial countries whereby western concepts of counseling and psychology are imposed as universal ‘truth’ (Kpanake & Ndoye, 2013; Norsworthy, et al., 2009a).

To address some of these challenges and dilemmas, some contemporary counselor educators articulate the emerging internationalizing of the profession and education as a step to best face the interconnectedness and interdependency of our modern society and economy (Leung, et al., 2009; Ng, 2012). To put it concisely: globalization has become a reality for all counselors – we are connected and continually influencing and being influenced by others worldwide. The question remains: how do we *best* engage in these new interconnected and interdependent relationships and work environment?

Overview of Internationalization – Responsive to Globalization

Within various disciplines and through various means, institutions situate the changes brought on by globalization as movement that necessitates a response (Knight, 2004). Why might institutions such as universities need to respond or change? Since globalization is oftentimes unregulated or underregulated by nations or corporations (Jones, 2000), institutions put in place policy changes and responses that help those organizations adapt best to the changing global environment. These responses, for many, are termed internationalization. Although there are numerous iterations of internationalization dependent on the specific field or stakeholders, the term internationalization can be understood – very generally – as a process or movement that is both *emergent from* and *responsive to* globalization (Knight, 2004; Ng & Noonan, 2012). Internationalization is *emergent* because it is a continuation of the process of more closely connecting our global community – a core element of globalization. It also is *responsive* because it intentionally reaches beyond economic forces to focus on social and human capital (Kreber, 2009; Qiang, 2003). In general, internationalization resulted from efforts by organizations to create policies and structures to address new questions brought on by globalization, such as how to be relevant to a wider audience across borders or how to ethically engage with global partners.

Despite this definition, various researchers have distinguished globalization from internationalization in different ways from unique perspectives. Some have maintained that internationalization is solely a response to globalization (Ng & Noonan, 2012; Knight, 2004; Stromquist, 2007). So, due to the diverse set of events and conditions

brought on by globalization, institutions and organizations often respond to those conditions to best meet their needs. The process of globalization generally refers to the indiscriminate and enhanced flow of essentially *anything* between countries (e.g., ideas, people, values, and technology; Knight & de Wit, 1997). Because of this enhanced ‘flow,’ professions and educational organizations respond by adapting parts of their structure to stay relevant and impactful in our changing world. Often in higher education, for example, programs ‘internationalize the curriculum’ to ensure relevance and applicability in our changing society (Kreber, 2009). Global perspectives are embedded in the classes and global evaluation criteria are developed to assess the various elements of the program.

For others researchers, globalization functions primarily from an economic perspective and the sociocultural aspects of various communities are thereby deemphasized (Paredes et al., 2008). Internationalization, then, situates these socio-cultural elements and respect of differences more centrally within international interactions (Ng & Noonan, 2012). So while globalization focuses on and operates with money as the central concept, internationalization hinges on a more holistic view of people and how they connect with each other. Educational programs, for example, might adjust their programs by including non-U.S. topics into the curriculum – not to financially benefit from the change but to make the information and education more relevant to a wider, non-U.S. student experience. As noted before, these systematic changes are often both emergent and responsive to globalization.

Because of the expansion of globalization, these different institutions develop such that they can best function in our globalized world. For example, in higher education many students from outside the U.S. come to the U.S. for higher education (i.e., globalization at work). U.S. higher education programs, then, respond to this changing student demographic by adapting their programs and course content so they are relevant to their new student body (i.e., internationalization at work). As another example, during the author's graduate program in counseling, he received a scholarship to study in the southern African country of Malawi for the summer. The graduate school prioritized international research and, therefore, awarded scholarships for this purpose; again, internationalization at work.

Recently, some have argued that internationalization efforts in higher education continue to be driven primarily by an economic rationale, such as admitting more international students to gain more tuition dollars (Stromquist, 2009). Thus, fundamental questions undergird the internationalization movement: Are these changes made for self/institutional-serving benefits? Is internationalization simply a part of globalization that invites higher education institutions to financially benefit from these recent global shifts? Although these questions cannot be answered concretely, it seems that some researchers have encouraged a level of skepticism regarding the blind acceptance of internationalizing higher education without the assessment of how it is being conducted and who is being impacted by it (Kreber, 2009; Luke, 2010).

Also, embedded in the internationalizing movement in higher education is the assumption that U.S./Western educators and administrators are able to effectively and

appropriately adapt programs to be relevant to global populations. Some researchers have challenged this assumption. For example, Luke (2010) stated, “Western universities’ attempts to educate the Other have been limited by an institutionalized Eurocentric myoptics, a standpoint which they remain largely unable to name or understand” (p. 60). So although institutions of higher education in the U.S. might want to internationalize, they might be limited in their ability to do so because of their encapsulated worldviews and experiences.

Various Elements Internationalized

Despite these fundamental questions, various elements of higher education are involved in increasing and expanding internationalization efforts. Although much of the current literature highlights internationalizing the educational curriculum (Kreber, 2009), there also are other parallel movements such as internationalizing professions (Ng & Noonan, 2012) and internationalizing histories (Brock, 2006). Internationalizing a profession emphasizes the importance of professional collaboration across borders to advance the global status of a profession and to adapt the profession to meet contextual needs (Ng & Noonan, 2012; van de Vijver, 2013). Internationalizing histories refers to the process of expanding the history of a discipline beyond the oft-cited Euro-American roots to include more complex histories inclusive of other contexts and developments (Brock, 2006). Based on these examples, internationalization is becoming many practical and theoretical projects at once that are responsive to globalization – which is affirmative of Knight’s (2004) comprehensive understanding of internationalization.

Internationalization and the Counseling Profession

Although the counseling profession in the U.S. has been involved around the world for much of the history of the profession, within the past 10-15 years particular emphasis has been placed on international issues in the counseling field (Gerstein et al., 2009; Hohenshil et al., 2013). The scope and meaning of internationalization in the counseling profession has been clarified through the work of one panel of experts in global counseling issues. In that study by Ng and Noonan (2012), internationalization of counseling was defined as follows:

Internationalization of the counseling profession is a multidimensional movement in which professionals across nations collaborate through equal partnerships to advance the practice of counseling as a worldwide profession. The goal is to provide and promote mental health wellness and intervention by empowering individuals and communities to meet their needs in culturally respectful and informed ways (p. 11).

These partnerships are intended to affect research, practice, and training within various systems in hopes of instilling global perspectives to local contexts (Leung et al., 2009). In addition to transnational partnerships, many in the field advocate for an internationalizing of counselor education programs and the entire domestic profession by adapting them to be more responsive to global concerns (Leong & Ponterro, 2003; Marsella & Pederson, 2004; Ng et al., 2012). Currently, there is little evidence describing how the counseling profession in the U.S. has internationalized due to the recent emergence of these professional efforts (Ng & Noonan, 2012). Nevertheless, Ng (2012) boldly articulated

that these internationalizing projects and movements represent the “sixth force” in counseling, following multiculturalism and social justice.

Others like Heppner et al. (2009) and Casas, Park, and Cho (2010) have attempted to merge multicultural and international movements in a synchronous partnership rather than keeping them as distinct entities or forces. Still others do not note any connection between internationalization and other movements in the counseling profession (Leung, et al., 2009). It remains to be seen how the various movements in the counseling field will respond to growing international interconnectedness as well as theorize and conceptualize those interactions. So while the scope of internationalization of the counseling profession has been clarified through the work of Ng and Noonan (2012), contextualizing internationalization within a global history and/or counseling history is less clear and depends on the viewpoints of different authors.

In the next sections, current internationalization efforts will be described under the headings of Leung et al.’s (2009) domains of internationalization in the counseling profession: research, practice and training. The domains will be entitled *counselor education*, *counseling practice*, and *counseling research*.

Internationalization and Counselor Education

Only recently have there been calls to internationalize U.S. counselor training programs (Marsella & Pederson, 2004; Ng et al., 2012; Turner-Essel & Waehler, 2009). These calls have become more numerous in recent years – challenging U.S. educators to create counselor education that is both relevant to our globalized world and attentive to current international issues. Some of the primary internationalization efforts visible

within counselor education are the increasing numbers of international counseling students and use of international immersion experiences as a part of counselor training. Additional internationalization areas, such as intentional changes to U.S. counselor education curriculum, typically have not been integrated across training programs.

Within the counseling literature, there exist diverse rationales for the importance of internationalizing counselor education. Ng and Smith (2009) explained how internationalization could create a more welcoming environment for international students attentive to their diverse needs and expectations from counselor education. This argument is especially relevant due to the increase in the number of international counseling students (ICSs) in the U.S. (Hasan, Fouad & Williams-Nickelson, 2008; Ng, 2006; Mori et al., 2009). ICSs often have adjustment concerns within the U.S. educational context (Killian, 2001) as well as linguistic challenges if coming from a non-English speaking location or if they have limited training in the English language (Ng, 2006). When returning to their home country after their U.S education, many ICSs, despite having found their counselor education valuable, experience a notable disconnect between what they were taught and the practice of counseling in their home countries (Lau & Ng, 2012). For example, for some of the study's participants, counseling terminology was difficult to translate and communicate to clients in their home countries. Therefore, since U.S. counselor education is educating a growing number of ICSs, internationalizing counselor education programs should allow for alternative perspectives of counseling (Marsella, 1998), attend to the diverse needs of ICSs (Ng & Smith, 2009) and include non-U.S. counseling issues in the curriculum (Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007).

Not only have many counselor education programs increased connections with the international community through integrating more ICSs with their departments, study abroad or international immersion experiences have become more popular within U.S. counseling programs (Barden & Cashwell, 2013; Santos, 2014; Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010) as well as throughout higher education (Larson, Ott & Miles, 2010; Lindsey, 2005). International travel experiences in counselor education have become a way for students to visit non-U.S. locations and enhance cross/multicultural competencies through purposeful reflection, experiential interactions with local communities, and effective pedagogy from facilitators (Barden & Cashwell, 2013; Santos, 2014).

Oftentimes, international immersion experiences contain many components that encourage participants to integrate their U.S. education with local, non-U.S. perspectives and knowledge. Tomlinson-Clarke and Clarke (2010) recounted the experiences of 14 graduate students who took part in a 3-week immersion trip to South Africa. During the trip, the students met with residents living with HIV/AIDS, conducted activities with local students, and participated in numerous educational seminars. Many authors have highlighted the importance of participating in experiences that illuminate the holistic lives of the community – taking language classes, visiting or staying in family homes, and observing local customs and traditions (Barden & Cashwell, 2013; Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010; Boyle, Nackerund, & Kilpatrick, 1999). Within the field of U.S. counseling, all of these activities are typically facilitated, or at least moderated, by a U.S. counselor educator or counseling professional.

Other researchers are starting to develop best practices when fostering these international experiences for U.S. students and counselors. For example, Santos (2014) constructed a theoretical framework for assessing international study programs for U.S. counselor education programs to provide an ethical and valuable cultural immersion program. Also, Bemak and Chung (2015) created a list of issues present in conducting group counseling internationally – whether through a graduate program or as a practicing counselor. These examples indicate how the field is starting to engage more holistically with immersion and travel experiences by developing foundational theory and best practices that guide these transnational interactions.

Immersion programs are not limited solely to graduate students but extend to other faculty and counseling professionals. For example, NBCC-I conducted multi-week learning institutes in Bhutan, Argentina and Malawi where participants had opportunities to provide services and conduct workshops, as well as learn about the local counseling profession (“Counseling Institutes in Argentina and Malawi,” n.d.). Another institute focused on counseling in Italy combines an experiential and historical tour of Italy with educational presentations on the state of counseling in Italy (“A Counselor’s View of Italy,” n.d.). Both these institutes are open to a wide array of participants in their counselor education and development – students, educators and practitioners. Additionally, these international and professional programs can foster collaboration on research and professional writing projects (e.g., Remley, Bacchini & Krieg, 2010).

All of these examples offer evidence that international immersion or travel programs have diverse learning goals such as cultural competency development of

students (Barden & Cashwell, 2013) or understanding the state of counseling in a foreign country (e.g., NBCC-I's international programs). Due to the strong connection to counseling graduate programs, graduate counseling faculty typically facilitate these programs primarily by providing educational and logistical support. For counseling students, this support is oftentimes provided in the foreign country as well as domestically, through pre and post-learning activities (Barden & Cashwell, 2013; Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010). Of the studies reviewed, the focus of immersion experiences is on student learning and development and less on faculty thinking through their role in the experience.

Internationalization and Counseling Practice

Domestic International Developments

Another area in which U.S. counselors are expanding programs to include an international focus is within domestic professional organizations. This development is due, not only to the growth of counseling abroad, but also because counselors in the U.S. are increasingly working with immigrants to the U.S. (Chung et al., 2008; Goh, Wahl, McDonald, Brissett & Yoon, 2007). In fact, immigration to the U.S. is up 44% since 1990 (Chung et al., 2008). Counselors, then, must learn and be aware about the unique challenges, such as acculturation stress, that immigrants face when making the transition to the U.S. (Yakushko, Watson & Thompson, 2008). Organizations and educational programs need to adapt to train and support counselors working with people who identify with various nationalities and recent immigrants (Sue & Sue, 2013).

For many professional organizations, the response to these emerging realities has been the formulation of international components or committees. Organizations such as the American Counseling Association (ACA) introduced the ACA International Counseling Interest Network in 2012 (Sandhu, 2012). The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) also has an International Interest Network (“ACES Resources,” n.d.). These groups provide members who share international interests the ability to connect online and at conferences, as well as to collaborate with peers. Due to the newness of these groups, it remains to be seen whether the impact of these interest networks on the larger professional organizations will be enduring.

Other similar fields, such as psychology, also have added international components to their U.S. organizations. The American Psychological Association (APA) created an international division (Division 52) in 1997 and, subsequently, a divisional journal in 2011 (“A Brief History of Division 52,” n.d.).

Non-U.S. projects by U.S. counseling organizations. In addition to changing U.S. programs to become more receptive to non-U.S. and international perspectives, U.S. counseling organizations have created initiatives outside of the U.S. to advance the profession of counseling within other countries. From large professional organizations (Hinkle, 2014; Stanard, 2013) to individual counseling departments and faculty (Coker & Majuta, 2015), U.S. counselors are increasing their work in other countries through education and professional development.

The ACA has been involved with developing and assisting with projects and initiatives around the globe for many years. These older international connections are

observed though connections within the U.S. and Europe due in large part to the shared history of the mental health profession between these two entities. For example, the ACA established a European branch over 50 years ago. In 2015, the ACA approved a wider-in-scope Mediterranean Region branch of the ACA as well as conducted the first ACA Asia-Pacific Conference. U.S. territories, such as the Philippines and Puerto Rico, also have received ACA support and have ACA branches in their locations (“ACA Divisions, Regions and Branches,” n.d.).

Another large counseling organization in the U.S. with international initiatives is Chi Sigma Iota International (CSI). CSI functions as an organization that promotes professional and academic excellence in counseling and currently has 280 active chapters (CSI, personal communication, July 23, 2015). Although the majority of CSI’s programs are focused on domestic counselor education and development, CSI does have chapters in non-U.S. locations such as Bhutan and the Philippines (“CSI Chapter Directory,” n.d.). However, despite the word *international* in CSI’s name, the non-U.S. chapters remain a very small part of the overall organization and many of them are not active members (“CSI Chapter Directory,” n.d.).

Oftentimes, U.S. counselor educators are involved with counselors in other countries either through their department or individually, independent of larger professional organizations (Coker & Majuta, 2015; Tang et al., 2012). These initiatives for U.S. educators take the form of research projects, consulting, and other professional collaborations. These partnerships emerge diversely and are dependent on the educator’s background, interests and international connections (Tang et al., 2012). Similarly, the

type of preparation a counselor educator receives to undertake international collaborations is likely to vary by individual.

Some of the most substantial work done by U.S. counseling organizations around the globe is through the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC). Although NBCC primarily functions as a certifying organization for U.S. counselors, a growing part of the organization (NBCC-International; NBCC-I) works with agencies, governments, and counselors around the world to develop the counseling profession and promote effective mental health care through community education and training (“Mental Health Facilitator (MHF),” n.d.). Beginning in 2003, NBCC-I has forged partnerships with large multinational agencies such as the World Health Organization and UNESCO as well as with small regionally-based groups to develop mental health care around the world. NBCC-I’s international programming ranges from career development initiatives through their Global Career Development Facilitator (GCDF) training to professionalization projects assisting counties to develop individualized certification and training requirements (NBCC International History, n.d.). The projects conducted in Europe work through NBCC-I’s European center, the European Board of Certified Counselors (EBCC) based in Portugal, with country-specific offices in Bulgaria, Germany, Greece and Romania.

One of the flagship transnational partnerships emerging from NBCC-I is the Mental Health Facilitators (MHF) program (Hinkle, 2014; Leung et al., 2007). The MHF program initiative creates collaborations between NBCC-I trained facilitators, some being counselor educators, and local paraprofessionals around the globe and offers trainings in

places that do not have a robust counseling profession or mental health resources. NBCC-I describes the MHF model as being culturally relevant to a wide audience and “advances the theories and techniques that are effective with diverse population” (Lueng, et al., 2009, p.119). These MHF trainings create new knowledge for participants about mental health and empower local individuals, including many who are not mental health professionals, to assist in meeting the mental health challenges in their communities. The specific content of the trainings is adapted to the context of the community that is receiving the training (Hinkle, 2014). Tools used within the MHF training seem to have wide variability in their application to different cultural contexts. For example, the author sat in on classes in Malawi where MHF trainings have been conducted. In one of the classes where MHF training materials were being used, there were examples in the workbook of skiing and jogging as stress relief. These topics confused the students and did not seem to resonate. Although other elements of the curriculum seemed to culturally fit for the students, other elements did not.

As observed through globally-focused domestic initiatives in the profession, shifting demographics in the U.S. and professional development projects in other countries, the nature of the profession and counseling practice is changing, expedited due to internationalization. The U.S. profession now has a global reach by influencing global counseling practices.

Internationalization and Counseling Research

In addition to counselor education and practice adapting to the globalized world, counseling research has been affected by and responsive to globalization. Through

collaborative international research and increasing international journal and book publications, there is evidence of internationalization within counseling research.

Counseling research with a cross-national/cultural emphasis has increased in recent years due to internationalizing of the profession and to calls within the profession to include research from other countries in U.S. counseling publications (Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007; Marsella & Pederson, 2004; Ng et al., 2011). Research collaborations between countries also have increased due to ease of communication, travel and international study (Norsworthy et al, 2009b).

Since the beginning of this millennium, more voices of counseling professionals have emerged articulating the need for the counseling profession to have a more global focus within research and academic publications (Arnett, 2008; Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007; Ng, et al., 2011). Arnett (2008) provided a critical review of articles published in *American Psychological Association* journals, emphasizing that 95% of the world's population (all non-U.S. people) is being neglected in psychological research. The premise of his argument and those other counseling researchers (e.g., Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007; Marsella & Pederson, 2004) is that restricting research to American participants conducted by American academics myopically focuses on a small subset of the world's population and produces results that may not be generalizable to those from other cultures or nations. Additionally, Draguns (2001) emphasized that because the English is the primary language in counseling and psychological research literature, this language barrier may prevent or discourage non-English research thereby creating a

monolingual discipline devoid of the culturally-specific features of other languages and the participation of non-English fluent researchers.

Despite this reality of English language dominance in U.S. and European journals, interest in international topics and practices is increasing in counseling publications. There is evidence that non-English language counseling journals are increasing around the world especially in locations with an older counseling profession (e.g. the Turkish Psychological Counselling and Guidance Association Journal) or journals that are inclusive of large regions of the world (e.g., the Interamerican Journal of Psychology). However, there are no identifiable statistics about the growth of non-English counseling journals.

Within major U.S. counseling publications, strides have been made to include international voices in journal and book publications. For example, in the flagship counseling journal, *Journal of Counseling and Development (JCD)*, there has been an internationally-focused article included in every issue since late 2009. Specific recommendations and resources have been articulated by *JCD* to accommodate journal submissions from other countries where research might look different and/or writing style and professional language might be different (Hohenshil & Amundson, 2011). Within the field of counseling psychology, from 1997 to 2009 there has been a 10% increase in internationally-oriented research in their two major journal publications (Pieterse et al., 2011). However, Gerstein and Ægistóttir (2007) evaluated publications in four counseling journals (*Journal of Counseling & Development*, *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *The Counseling Psychologist*)

from 2000 to 2004 and discovered that an international focus was only present in 6% of the articles. So, there have been only slight increases of this type of research. Leong and Ponterotto (2003) used thematic analysis to examine internationally-related articles in a counseling psychology journal from 1988 to 2001 and found that, despite the international emphasis, the articles primarily focused on the experiences of American counselors and psychologists.

In addition to the flagship counseling journals, other U.S. counseling journals have been focusing on international topics for many decades. For example, the *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy* began in 1951 and the *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling (IJAC)* started publication in 1978. *IJAC* continues to be a major publication outlet for international journal articles especially within the field of counselor education (Ng, 2012). In 2009, the *Journal for International Counselor Education* was started as an open-access journal focusing specifically on the unique professional identity and history of counselor education (Astramovich & Pehrsson, 2009).

Through journals and books, academic partnerships have emerged to include truly *inter-national* research – collaboration between counselors in different countries in the research and academic writing process. Some examples of these partnerships can be seen in authorships that are done collaboratively, across national boundaries. For example, Buyukgoze-Kavas, et al. (2010) conducted a study comparing the mentoring relationships of counseling students in Turkey and in the United States. As evidenced by this study, cross-border, comparative research is becoming more prevalent in counseling and

psychology (see also Kenny, Aluede & McEachern, 2009), but greater attention needs to be given to this area to more fully explore similarities and differences in the counseling process in different nations (Draguns, 2013; Norsworthy, et al. 2009a).

These collaborative international research projects, counseling histories, and the state of the profession of individual countries have been spotlighted by recent publications by counseling and counseling psychology researchers (e.g., Hohenshil et al., 2013; Moodley et al., 2013). These texts described the current state of counseling within countries around the globe, noting the development and specific scope of counseling practice. Many of the articles in the edited books involve authors working together across borders (e.g., Hohenshil et al., 2013).

Other texts have taken a case study approach to describing counseling in other contexts. In one example, the authors recruited counselors around the globe to submit a counseling case that illuminated features of the practice of counseling within each specific country (Poyrazli & Thompson, 2013; Moodley et al., 2015). Importantly, all of these books use the experiences of practicing counselors or educators who have worked or are working in the context they are writing about. What emerged from these books, taken as a whole, is a more textured understanding of counseling around the globe – one that not only describes the historical and practical elements of professional counseling but also gives life to the practice of counseling through vignettes and embodied examples.

Challenges of global counseling research

Despite these recent developments in counseling research and publications, some researchers caution counselors about the challenges embedded in researching and

publishing on counseling globally due to the variety of ways counseling is understood and practiced (Ægisdóttir et al., 2009; Arnett, 2008; Draguns, 2013; Staeuble, 2006)

For example, the history and development of counseling or psychology around the world is oftentimes placed within Eurocentric professional boundaries “where the boundaries of the discipline are defined by academic and professional organizational structures, not by the subject matter” (Danziger, 2006, p. 222). This argument is congruent with the current international counseling texts that focus on the professional development of counseling – where the term ‘counselor’ represents a precise job title or role (Hohenshil et al., 2013). The ontology of helping or healing around the world – what helping or healing means to a place, how it has been historically practiced, how it was expressed before professionalization – does not have a primary focus in current counseling literature. This excavation of the local origins of helping or healing is outside the purview of much of the current counseling and psychology literature (Brock, 2006). To expose a more locally-subjective narrative of counseling and psychology, current internationalization initiatives in psychology have attempted to expose “polycentric histories,” whereby alternative non-U.S./Eurocentric perspectives of psychology are acknowledged as legitimate and important rather than footnoted as minor details in the dominant, western discourse of psychology (Danziger, 2006).

Additionally, some researchers have resisted the reductionist approach of spotlighting countries and focusing solely on their practice of counseling or psychology (e.g., Brock, 2006; Danziger, 2006; Staeuble, 2006). They have argued that this mindset deemphasizes the complex inter/transnational development of counseling and counseling

or psychological practices that might exist outside what might be defined within the discipline. As Brock (2006) stated, “Work on ‘psychology [or counseling] in country x’ is by definition national, not international. We should be wary of replacing one type of parochialism with another” (p. 11). Thus, the risk faced by having counseling described in the literature country by country is the creation of an oversimplified narrative of the history and practice of counseling in non-U.S. contexts. Ignoring or deemphasizing the complex international exchanges that are a part of the global history of counseling creates a collection of simplified progress narratives of counseling whereby each country gradually professionalizes counseling. The development of counseling, oftentimes, has a much more intricate and complex evolution within a society that does not fit into a professionalization paradigm (Brock, 2006; Marsella, 2011).

Others note how a non-polycentric history affects U.S. education by assuming universality of psychology and counseling research and theories. Often in counseling and psychology, “American textbooks are usually local histories masquerading as universal histories” (Brock, 2006, p. 4). Arnett (2008) contended that the current psychological research is not generalizable to other places; it is an “incomplete science” because research has been primarily relegated to the U.S. and Europe. It then becomes essential to not only acknowledge how counseling develops out of unique and diverse local histories, but also encourage international and cross-cultural research to more fully understand counseling practice globally (Draguns, 2013; Marsella, 1998; Norsworthy et al., 2009b).

Conclusion

Overall, internationalization intends to open up alternative ways of looking at counseling and psychology around the globe – both as a complex professionalization moment (Ng & Noonan, 2012) and an effort to engage with alternative perspectives about what helping/healing has been and can be around the globe (Draguns, 2013; Danziger, 2006). These two movements in counseling and psychology research expose a tension present in the counseling profession – how can counselors and counselor educators write about and engage with counseling around the world? How can they, on one hand, describe the professional development within unique national backdrops, and on the other, explore the historically embedded traditions of helping outside of (or parallel to) the profession? The intellectual and academic work involved in these questions seems necessary to create effective counseling practice – grounding development of counseling professions in contextually-specific histories of communities and nations (Leung et al., 2009; Marsella, 2011).

Taken in entirety, the lens of counseling research is expanding to include alternate perspectives about counseling around the globe. Through initiatives of academic journals to have more internationally-related articles, books that describe the state of counseling in different countries, and theoretical texts on how to internationalize the profession, counselors and counselor educators are engaging with each other and with counselors around the globe through research to acknowledge the richness and diversity of counseling. Despite these developments, numerous authors have emphasized that more research needs to be done globally to continue to develop best practices in counseling and

psychology (Arnett, 2008; Draguns, 2013; Norsworthy et al., 2009). Further, other authors have noted the importance of creating theoretical frameworks for fostering ethical and effective global counseling partnerships (Ægisdóttir et al., 2009; Marsella, 1998). Although much progress has been made in counseling research to invite the articulation and development of unique expressions of counseling around the globe, much work has yet to be done.

As displayed by counseling research and practice trends in the profession, the goal then for many organizations is to indigenize the counseling profession in local culture – making it relevant and applicable to unique understandings of mental health and distress (Leung, et al., 2009; Ng & Noonan, 2012). One danger of internationalization and indigenization, however, is the risk that a Eurocentric and western ideology will be imposed on nonwestern traditions, thereby disrespecting and harming local healing systems (Lueng et al., 2009). In the next section, an overview of indigenizing the profession in other locations will be described as well as some of the risks of internationalization in the counseling profession.

Indigenization of the Counseling Profession in Non-U.S. Settings

Partially due to the enhanced transnational contact and research in counseling, some counseling practices prevalent in the U.S. and Europe are being integrated into other contexts. This integration or “indigenization” aims to merge local knowledge about healing with outside knowledge (Hinkle, 2014; Lueng et al., 2009). Singh (1997) articulated indigenous psychology and counseling as a behavioral science based in the lived experiences and realities of a particular context. Indigenization can be defined as a

process by which the local community creates practices that are relevant to the specific people of that community. Singh (1997) and Lueng, et al. (2009) demonstrated the importance of, what the authors call, “indigenization from within” and “indigenization from without.” Indigenization from within invites researchers to collaboratively understand, synthesize and develop theories about local ways of healing and understanding the world whereas indigenization from without is concerned with the contextually-specific relevance and adaptation of non-local ways of healing. The “from within” mindset is consistent with Gerstein and Ægisdóttir’s (2007) concept of an isomorphic solution which is defined as a slight change to an already existing solution in hopes of bettering the desired outcome. Although Lueng et. al (2009) described how both of these perspectives are needed in counseling and counseling research, indigenization from without is the most realistic as indigenization from within takes considerable resources. An example of indigenization from without is when the MHF program is conducted in a country and specific competencies and services are adapted or created in response to local needs and cultural contexts (Hinkle, 2014; Lueng et al., 2009). Programs are constructed from the original structure of the MHF training and adapted to fit the local perspectives and worldview. The model of MHF is intended to be adapted to fit culture- and context-specific circumstances, with expectations adjusted based on local stakeholders and structure and content revised dependent on local needs. This model seems to be a helpful first step as a part of Draguns’ (2013) hope for culturally relative interventions: “the goal of culturally sensitive planners of mental health services involved integration of traditional healing into comprehensive treatment programs” (p.424).

Taking into account the local or traditional ways of healing remains a central theme in the modern projects of indigenization.

Risks of Internationalization and Indigenization in Counseling Profession

Although many of the authors of the literature on internationalization champion the enhanced connections and partnerships opened up by globalization, there remain significant risks of engaging with others around the globe – especially considering power differences. There remain many critics of unbridled and widespread collaboration due to histories of oppression and production of homogenous systems of knowledge (Andreotti, 2007; Danziger, 2006; Mills, 2014; Santos, 2007; Staeuble, 2006). Because of the enhanced connectivity ushered in by globalization, hegemonic power (dominance of one group over others) is now conveyed through covert or less visible means (i.e., not national means). Many researchers articulate how higher education has been and continues to be used to spread the ideas and influence of a dominant group over others (Andreotti, 2011; Cantwell & Moldanado-Moldanado, 2009; Patel & Lynch, 2013). The Eurocentric mindset and worldview permeates higher education around the globe and Western epistemology is often considered the most developed, legitimate and valid (Andreotti, 2011). Thus, enhanced connectivity around the globe not only offers opportunities for collaboration and knowledge sharing, but also invites new ways to exert power over a local systems of belief and practice, including counseling (Marsella, 2007; Staeuble, 2006). Santos (2007) defined this history and current practice of exerting power over and above another body of knowledge as “epistemic violence,” or described another way “epistemic racism” (Andreotti, Ahenakew, & Cooper, 2011). In these practices, local

knowledges are devalued and considered less valid than western knowledges. The above authors emphasized that knowledge is not shared in a utopian and egalitarian context, but a context informed by various histories of privilege, colonialism, violence and oppression.

Danziger (2006) reminded the counseling profession of the importance to focus on these historical power relationships in global interactions. He noted that by simply analyzing a social context in terms of culture, these contextually-informed power relationships are ignored. And despite good intentions with global exchanges, Marsella (2011) explained how western involvement in nonwestern mental health services and education tend to “homogenize diversity, and in doing so, destroy critical ethnic identity resources” (para. 13). One cannot ignore the proverbial warning signs when engaging with people in other contexts than one’s own, especially when there is a history of power differential and oppression. Authors from francophone West Africa have emphasized that the “Euro-American egocentric concept of person” has been devastating to Africa’s mental health (p.37). Marsella (1998) described this phenomenon as “colonialization of the mind” (p.1288).

Blindly applying U.S. or western models of counseling in a foreign context is not only unhelpful but also can be damaging for the specific context and population. In 2011, the Pan African Network of People with Psychosocial Disabilities (PANUSP) issued a statement about the dark past of foreign mental health agencies working in Africa, primarily psychiatry (Pan African Network of People with Psychosocial Disabilities [PANUSP], 2011). The statement emphasizes the harmful effects of diagnosis. “Our

people remain chained and shackled in institutions and by ideas which our colonizers brought to our continent” (PANUSP, 2011, p. 2). They affirm that “There can be no mental health without our expertise...we are the experts” (PANUSP, 2011, p. 1). China Mills (2014) in her pointed critique of psychiatry’s impact in other countries wondered towards the end of her book whether “mental health can, or should, be global” (p. 151). As such, the various powers and histories involved should contextualize all global interactions, as well as, inform how we proceed with collaborating and partnering with nonwestern communities and organizations. Uncritically forming transnational counseling partnerships, as noted by the PANUSP statement and other mental health researchers (e.g., Danziger, 2006; Kpanake & Ndoeye, 2013; Mills, 2014), potentially elicits devastating results on the non-U.S. country.

Despite these power-filled and asymmetrical transnational relationships, Lueng et al. (2009) optimistically stated that organizations such as NBCC-I’s counseling initiatives are “implemented with full involvement of the host community without the disruption to its national integrity or identity” (p.118). Numerous international scholars and researchers remind us, however, that any interaction is *inherently* disruptive. Thus, the challenges are not to avoid disruption but to contextualize and historicize systems and interactions and advocate for local epistemologies and practice to be the source for appropriate solutions to local dilemmas (Andreotti, 2011; McCabe, 2007; Mills, 2014; Staeuble, 2004; Watters, 2010). For counselor educators, then, it is essential to be mindful of the ethical concerns present when engaging with global partners.

The Current Problem of Linguaging

With regards to language used in international higher education and counseling literature, the use of the terms internationalization and indigenization are problematic and seem to undermine the very ideologies that they aim to represent. Within internationalization, the focus is between-nation exchanges (*inter*-national) and places the importance of the nation as the distinguishing element of those contacts (Ng & Noonan, 2012; Knight, 2004). While many organizations operate by and through national identities (including most counseling organizations and associations), the nation as a function of exchange has diminished in importance due to globalization (Ashcroft et al., 2013; Kreber, 2009). Much of the world's diversity is not simply between nations, but also within nations so highlighting international interactions deemphasizes the variation within nations (Marsella, 1998). Also, using the nation as the foremost identifier in various global interactions can reemploy colonial narratives of nations oppressing and violating other nations and peoples (Andreotti, 2011). Simply viewing between-nation partnerships as equal or balanced ignores histories of imposition of western knowledge production and dissemination (Marsella, 1998).

The feminist literature offers the term transnational as an informative alternative to international, because many of the connection being fostered in light of globalization are across nations not between nations (Nagar & Swarr, 2010). Transnationalism takes into account the historical importance of the nation-state (notably, by keeping it in the name), but amends the prefix to *trans* or across. Viewing global interactions through a transnational lens seems to open new pathways of insight by looking at new non-national

connectivities ushered in by globalization as well as still accounting for the historical importance of the nation.

Indigenization is also potentially problematic as a term for cross-cultural practice and involvement in foreign communities. One on hand, it is a helpful term because it emphasizes the importance of local sources of knowledge about mental health and wellness when developing relevant helping professions in that context (Leung et al., 2009). On the other hand, within the current usages of the concept, there seems to be an underlying assumption that indigenization refers to a process of making a profession or system more developed from the perspective of the dominant partner. The primary example of indigenization cited by Leung et al. (2009) is NBCC-I's MHF program. The MHF model is explicitly built upon the western sciences, such as psychiatry, social work, and counseling, and the assumed "universality of mental stress, distress and disorders" (p. 9, Hinkle, 2015). As such, oftentimes indigenization assumes a level of Eurocentric scientific superiority; in other words, the premise of indigenization involves the belief that foreign systems of mental health need our knowledge, resources, and interpretive skills to adapt the local way of healing to better address local needs. This assumption of scientific superiority has not been validated or proven in research (Arnett, 2008; Danziger, 2009; Norsworthy et al., 2009a). As such, the language of indigenization, while in theory embodies the reflexive process of learning from and with others, in current practice, it involves the adaption dominant mental health practices for indigenous communities thereby reinstating the primacy and hegemony of Euro-American mental health epistemologies (Mills, 2014; Staeuble, 2006).

Research on Globalization and University Faculty

Many of the issues discussed so far illuminate the challenges that face U.S. counselors, specifically U.S. counselor educators, as they create policy and educational experiences that are relevant to the realities present in our changing world due to globalization. Although much work is being done through professional organizations, departments and universities, and by individual faculty to internationalize the profession, there is minimal research about the process itself (i.e., internationalization in counseling). The emerging research on internationalization importantly focuses on student experiences, mostly international student experiences (e.g., Ng & Smith, 2009, Ng & Smith, 2012). Ignored in the research are the experiences of counselor educators – the primary drivers of the internationalization movement in counseling. Although other fields have studied globalization and internationalization from the perspectives of university faculty overall (Finkelstein, Walker & Chen, 2013; Green, et al., 2013), there remains little research in this area of the counseling profession.

What research has been done in the counseling profession is very focused on specific elements of globalization and internationalization. For example, Ng (2006) conducted a study with U.S. counselor educators working with ICSs. Important findings emerged from his study about the varied perceptions and experiences working with students from different parts of the world. Another study focused on the effects of internationalization on whole departments and what international training opportunities were present (Hurley et al., 2013).

Although these studies attempt to gain a glimpse of the larger impact of globalization and internationalization on counseling departments and faculty, there exists no critical framework for counselor educators that serves as a metaphorical compass in their current and future transnational work in the profession. As described, the large diversity of transnational interactions present in the profession, the emerging development of counseling around the globe, and the complicated realities of Euro-American involvement around the world necessitate a compass for counselor educators – illuminating how to best engage in transnational work in the profession.

Conclusion

Counseling and counselor education have become more and more integrated into a global context. The influence of globalization and the movement of internationalization create additional and more frequent ways in which counselor educators connect to other counselors globally. Given the growth of global involvement for U.S. counselor educators as well as the global diversity of counseling practices and professions, it is necessary to create critical guidelines delineating how counselor educators should best engage with other professionals around the globe.

In the following chapter, the author describes the methods for a study aimed at addressing the aforementioned research gap. The chapter includes information about the Delphi methodology, participant selection, research question, data collection and analysis, researcher bias and positionality, and results from the pilot study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Current trends in the counseling profession display increasing global contact and emerging internationalization within counselor education programs. Despite these growing transnational avenues for professional work in counselor education, there does not seem to be a consensus on guidelines for counselor educators when engaging in this unique type of professional work. In order to provide a framework for counselor educators to engage in transnational work, it is essential to develop guidelines that clarify guidelines for counselor educators when engaging in transnational work. The purpose of this study is to develop consensus from a panel of experts describing critical guidelines for transnational work for U.S.-based counselor education faculty.

The Delphi Methodology

The Delphi methodology is a multi-phased data collection method that uses a panel of experts to develop consensus around a problem (Linstone & Turoff, 2002; Powell, 2003). Embedded within the method is structured communication amongst the group which helps facilitate the consensus and maintains relative anonymity (Doughty, 2009; Herlihy & Dufrene, 2011; Linstone & Turoff, 2002). Whereas in other methods the group of participants in the study is referred to as the sample or population, within the Delphi method they are referred to as the panel of experts (Powell, 2003). The strength of

the study depends on expertise of the panel in regards to the problem analyzed.

Although the researcher determines who is eligible for participation, experts are chosen based on their credibility as experts with the target audience (Powell, 2003). Generally, Delphi studies involve three to five rounds of questionnaires with the experts. However, some researchers indicate that significant and new information is limited beyond three rounds (Powell, 2003; Vasquez-Ramos, Leahy, & Hernandez, 2007). The initial questionnaire is created by the researcher, based on existing literature and previous research findings. The data collection can begin with open-ended questions about the research problem. The expert panel is then asked to respond to the various elements of the questionnaire using Likert scaling or rank ordering. After this initial round, the researcher provides the panel with quantitative analysis of the questionnaire – typically, central tendency and dispersion. Once each participant becomes aware of the opinions of the group, she/he can decide whether to alter individual responses in light of the additional information. In order to reach final consensus from the panel of experts, the researcher must set the criteria for consensus before the study. Based on the researcher's criteria, items that do not develop consensus from the group after all rounds are discarded from group consensus yet can be relevant for analysis after the study (Doughty, 2009; Powell, 2003). The end result of this iterative process is the list or description of the expert consensus.

The Delphi methodology fit the research goals of this study because it allowed the development of expert consensus about transnational work in the counseling profession – an expanding and emerging phenomenon. Because many Delphi studies have been

conducted via a web-based structure (Doughty, 2009; Herlihy & Dufrene, 2011; Wester & Borders, 2014), this format enabled the researcher in the present study the ability to reach experts in a diversity of geographic locations. Face-to-face contact or print-based materials are not essential in this methodology making it structurally suited for this study.

Participants in the current study were U.S. counseling experts in global counseling issues. This decision was made in order to develop consensus about the nature of transnational work within the field of counseling. Participants were limited to counselor education faculty because the population of interest is solely counselor education faculty. Because counseling has a unique and growing professional identity within the U.S., it was important to limit the participants to counselor educators to focus the consensus opinion on a single field. Additionally, the findings of the study likely have greater relevance for counselor educators.

This investigation involved two phases. The initial phase was a pilot study to develop preliminary open-ended questions that were used with the expert panel. The pilot study combined current research in global counseling professional work with the opinion of an expert in transnational issues in the field of counseling. After the initial questionnaire was developed, Phase 2 of the study began. Phase 2 involved three rounds of data collection with the panel. The open-ended questions were used during the initial round. The researcher then identified the themes or categories from the open-ended questionnaire using content analysis. Content analysis is the most common way to identify themes from this phase in the Delphi method (Powell, 2003; Wester & Borders,

2014). Representative statements from the participants' responses were identified that included all ideas from the Round 1 of data collection.

After the initial round, the representative statements were sent back to the expert panel to be rated on a 1-7 Likert scale, with 1 indicating Strongly Disagree and 7 indicating Strongly Agree. As suggested by Wester and Borders (2014), in the initial round, the panel will be able add new items, edit items and be encouraged to provide their rationale for scoring on each item. For purposes of analysis and rating, median and interquartile ranges (IQR) were used to understand the variability in responses. These calculations are common tools to determine consensus in Delphi methodology (Doughty, 2009; Wester & Borders, 2014). For purposes of this study, consensus was determined by the items that met a minimum cutoff of a 6.0 median score on the 7-point Likert scale. If items met the consensus cutoff, the items would be retained as guidelines if their IQR score did not exceed 1.0. These cutoffs were chosen so that the consensus guidelines represent both high agreement and low variability of responding. Items of consensus represent critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally.

Research Question

1. What are critical guidelines for U.S. counselor educators when working transnationally?

Population and Sample

The overall population of interest for this study was counselor education faculty member engaging in transnational work in the profession. This study focused on the consensus of faculty experts in the field of international, global, and/or transnational

issues in the counseling profession. Criterion-based sampling was used to initially collect individuals who met certain criteria for invitation to the panel. Having specific criteria helps limit the variance in the sample and assists in choosing the participants eligible for the panel (Powell, 2003). The criteria used for selecting the panel was multifaceted and open-ended in order to capture the various ways counselor education faculty can engage in transnational work in the profession. The criteria included indication of sustained transnational work in multiple professional areas (e.g., research, consultation, service/immersion projects, leadership).

Data Collection and Analysis of Data Procedures

The overall study was divided into three rounds of data collection with data analysis after each round. The first step in the study was to identify experts for participation in the study. Once identified and confirmed as participations, the study consisted of three rounds of data collection. Between each round, the researcher analyzed the data and organized the data for resubmission to the group of experts.

Sampling Procedures

The size of the group of experts is determined by the extent of the investigation and the availability of experts. Oftentimes, the decision is left up to the researcher (Powell, 2003). Clayton (1997) recommends 15-30 participants with a heterogeneous makeup for a Delphi study, although Powell (2003) mentioned that the group can be as small as 10. The researcher aimed to have a panel of 10-20 experts used to develop consensus. This range is congruent with other counseling studies (Herlihy & Dufrene, 2011; Wester & Borders, 2014), and Murphy (2002; as cited in Powell, 2003) mentions

that there is very little evidence that increasing the amount of participants has a positive effect on reliability or validity. The researcher was able to obtain 9 participants for Rounds 1 and 2 and 7 participants for Round 3.

As numerous researchers have emphasized, the strength of the study depends on knowledge and experience of the expert group (Linstone & Turoff, 2002; Powell, 2003; Wester & Borders, 2014). To create a list of potential participants, the researcher identified counselor education faculty with extensive international research, professional service, teaching, consultation and/or other professionally-related experiences evidenced on their curriculum vitae, departmental website or other professional association website. The researcher examined these sources from the counselor education field to compose a heterogeneous group with different types of international experiences. For this study, it will be required that each participant have demonstrated sustained involvement in transnational work within multiple professional areas, such as research, teaching, or leadership. Initially, the researcher considered establishing specific criteria for inclusion in the study (e.g., a certain number of professional trips abroad or a certain number of internationally-related professional publications). But the researcher decided against this option because some potential participants, with extensive and in-depth global experiences, might have been excluded with very specific and confined criteria for inclusion. The pool of participants was open to any practicing counselor education faculty employed within the U.S., regardless of nationality or citizenship status.

Contact was made via email with potential participants who meet the criteria for involvement with international issues as a counseling faculty (see Appendix A). The

contacted individuals were also encouraged to nominate their peers that who met the criteria for the study (see Appendix B). This snowballing technique paired with purposive sampling is common in Delphi studies (Wester & Borders, 2014). The researcher initially aimed to gather 20 participants for the study due to the variable attrition rate (18%-70%) with the Delphi method due to the multiple rounds necessary to complete the study (Doughty, 2009; Powell, 2003; Stone, Fish & Busby, 2005; Vasquez-Ramos et al., 2007; Wester & Borders, 2014). To reduce attrition in the study, the researcher added an incentive to encourage participation. If participants finished all rounds of data collection, they were eligible for a random drawing of a \$250 Delta Airlines gift card.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection occurred over a one-month period and involved three separate rounds.

Round One

The first round of data collection was focused on gaining initial responses to the open-ended questions created and modified during the pilot study (see Appendix F). The questions were based on issues and ideas in professional literature relevant to this research area as well as the structure of other Delphi Round 1 questionnaires (e.g., Herlihy & Dufrene, 2011; Wester & Borders, 2014). These questions were placed within an online survey tool (Qualtrics). Email addresses of potential participants were procured from department websites or professional association websites. The researcher emailed potential participants asking for their participation and/or nomination of peers who fit the criteria for the study. If potential participants wanted to nominate an individual for

participation in the study, they were instructed to forward the nomination email to that particular individual. The demographic question included questions about one's transnational work to ensure that potential participants demonstrated that they met the criteria of the study (see Appendix H). A link was included in the initial email that directed potential participants to the informed consent to participate in the study, a demographic questionnaire, and the initial open-ended questions with text boxes for their responses. Importantly, the brief demographic questionnaire included a section to describe the nature of their international experiences in the counseling profession.

The researcher kept the initial open-ended questionnaire open for responses for approximately two weeks after the initial correspondence. Two reminder emails were sent to all potential participants before the closing date for submission to the Round 1 questionnaire.

Content Analysis

The researcher collected data from Round 1 and analyzed the data using content analysis (Graneheim & Lundman, 2003; Hays & Singh, 2012; Krippendorff, 2013). In general, content analysis is a process to examine written documents or texts in order to identify clusters or themes in responses (Crowe, Inder, & Porter, 2015; Hays & Singh, 2012). In this study, the clusters or themes are described as categories and subcategories. An additional coder was used for this process to enhance trustworthiness of the data analysis. Before engaging in content analysis with the coder, the researcher discussed the process of content analysis and explored the biases and positionality of the coder regarding the content of this study.

In addition to developing categories, representative statements or items were developed by the researcher and coder from the participants' responses in Round 1. Representative statements were developed to distill the overall panel responses into codes or items that include all of the ideas present in Round 1 responses. Through consensus dialogue with the researcher and the coder, a final list of representative statements was developed. Developing representative statements in Round 1 of data collection is typical of other Delphi studies (e.g., Powell, 2003, Wester & Borders). These statements were used with participants in Round 2.

To enhance trustworthiness of the content analysis process, it is recommended to use multiple people in the analysis process and to statistically evaluate the reliability of the coding process (Graneheim & Lundman, 2003; Krippendorff, 2013). Once categories and subcategories were developed from Round 1, definitions and example items for these categories and subcategories were developed (see Appendix I). Next, in order to practice using these categories and definitions, the researcher asked peer doctoral students to respond to the Round 1 questions. The researcher and coder then individually categorized these responses into categories and subcategories. Once consistent application of the categories and subcategories was achieved with the trial data, the researcher and the coder moved on to the actual data. Once the researcher and coder categorized the actual participant's responses separately, the researcher calculated Cohen's kappa, a measure of reliability. This was done to assess and ensure the trustworthiness of the categories and subcategories with the participants' responses. Cohen's kappa is a statistic that indicates the intercoder agreement for qualitative analysis (Graneheim & Lundeman, 2003). An

online calculation tool was used to assess Cohen's kappa. A minimum kappa value of 0.8 is aimed for because this statistic represents very high agreement between the coders (Landis & Koch, 1977). Because a sufficient kappa was met (see Table 14), the next round of data collection could commence.

Therefore, after analyzing the data and creating statements from Round 1 using content analysis, the researcher input all representative statements into the online survey tool. Next to each statement was a Likert scale rating, from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree), which will be used to assess the level of agreement each participant has for each statement. The items were organized by category and subcategory.

Round Two

Next, the researcher emailed each participant with their responses from Round 1 as a reminder of their individual responses. Additionally, a link to rating form of the panel's representative statements was sent to each participant so each participant could compare their Round 1 responses with the overall representative statements from the panel. Each participant had the ability to rate each statement using the Likert scale based on her or his level of agreement whether that item should be a critical guideline. A definition of critical guideline was provided in this round. Also, each participant had the ability to comment on each statement indicating how she or he would add, edit or clarify the statement. Space was provided if she or he wanted to add additional statements. These comments were integrated into Round 3. The data was analyzed using the IQR and median whereby an IQR less than 1.0 and median greater than 6.0 denoted consensus

from the panel. Items that did not develop consensus were eligible for editing during this round. The panel in Round 3 would rerate these edited items.

Items that did not meet the median or IQR thresholds and were not edited by the panel were excluded from Round 3. Although some studies include these items in further rounds to ensure that the panel does not desire these items as critical guidelines (Wester & Borders, 2014), the researcher decided to not include in these items in further rounds for multiple reasons. First, attrition was a concern due to the initial low participation in the study. Adding more in-depth questions to further rounds might negatively impact attrition. Thompson (2009) recommends the structure and process of the Delphi study to be feasible given the participants and the research question. Also, Thompson describes the very limited amount of new information typically gained after the initial ratings (Round 2) in a Delphi study. Due to these reasons, the researcher decided to have limited questions in Round 3+ to reduce attrition and because it was not anticipated that much new information would emerge in later rounds.

Round Three

For this round, the goal was to develop consensus with the statements that were added, altered or edited from the expert group. Only items that did not develop consensus were eligible to be edited. The researcher integrated the comments from the group about the statements and altered the statements accordingly. These select statements were sent to the group for rating on the Likert scale. Text boxes for comments (i.e., edits or additions) were included in this round as well. Similar to the data analysis in Round 2, the researcher analyzed the responses to determine which statements developed consensus

within the expert group by calculating the median and IQR. No additional rounds were needed because no new items were developed nor non-consensus items edited in this round.

Common guidelines specify that items with an IQR of 1.5 or less should be retained (Jenkins & Smith, 1994; Stone et al., 2005). For this study, a conservative IQR of 1.0 or less was used to indicate those items that had low variation of responding in the panel. In order to determine the importance of each statement, it is suggested that the median score for each statement retained be over 6.0 on a 7-point Likert scale (Jenkins & Smith, 1994; Stone Fish et al., 2005; Wester & Borders, 2014). By using both an IQR of less than 1.0 and median of 6.0, the ultimate consensus statements have low dispersion of ratings amongst participants and high importance or agreement. The researcher reported on and analyzed the final consensus statements in Chapter IV. These consensus statements indicate what the expert group believes to be critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally.

Pilot Study

The pilot study explored the relevance and importance of the open-ended questions to be used for the initial round of the Delphi method. Additionally, the pilot study was used to clarify participant questions and inclusion criteria for the study. The researcher met face-to-face with an expert consultant in global counseling work to review and refine questions that are focused on the research problem and research questions. The expert was a counselor education faculty member at a Southeastern university (not the

institution of the researcher), who met the criteria for inclusion in the study and had extensive professional experience around the world with counseling.

When meeting with the expert, the overall research questions were reviewed to analyze their congruence with the research topic area. It is essential to create open-ended questions that directly focus on the research problem (Powell, 2003). The expert thought the research questions were clear and appropriate to be asked as open-ended questions to the participants. To be clearer for participants, he suggested that some language changed in the open questions. Within the various sections of the study and research questions, he noted that “education” might be clearer term than “training.”

The expert in the pilot study also was asked about the inclusion criteria for the study. He agreed that the areas of service, scholarship and professional travel were satisfactory areas for participant inclusion into the study. He suggested that international travel criteria be required for participation due to the importance of having global experiences with the nature of this study. Lastly, he suggested the study focus on counselor education faculty instead of counseling-related faculty (i.e., counselor education and counseling psychology faculty). He believed that there would be sufficient experts to participate in this study within the counselor education field, and that this study would make a larger impact if focused solely on counselor education. Some of the changes suggested by the expert consultant were integrated into the structure of the study.

Modifications

Based on the pilot study, the proposal seminar, and consultation with the dissertation committee members, several modifications were made to the study. First, the

initial research questions were changed from research questions to interview questions. Several faculty members in the proposal seminar indicated that they believed that the research questions were not research questions, but interview questions. A single research was developed out of this feedback. Also, the interview questions (i.e., the open-ended questions in Round 1) were modified through consultation with committee members after the proposal seminar. This action was taken to make the questions more focused and ensure that the questions would elicit the responses hoped for in this study. Additionally, the fundamental research question was changed to focus on the idea of transnational work versus transnational relationships. This change was made because some at the dissertation proposal indicated that this study was not focused relationships, because it was only studying one part of that relationship (i.e., that of the U.S.-based counselor educator). Therefore, the concept of work, while still addressing some elements of the professional relationships, focused more on the overall professional activities from the perspective of the U.S.-based counselor educators.

Additionally, some changes were made regarding the structure of the methodology. During the proposal seminar, numerous faculty members suggested the inclusion of more details about the process of content analysis, due to its centrality within the Delphi method. They also encouraged the used of an additional coder in the content analysis to ensure trustworthiness. Both of these modifications were added to the study. Another faculty member stated that the Delphi should not be limited to a certain number of rounds, but be open to as many rounds are necessary to develop consensus. This change was made to the structure of the study.

Lastly, an incentive was added to the study during Round 1 of the study. Due to low initial participation, the researcher consulted with committee members and added an incentive to participation for those who completed all rounds of data collection. Appropriate changes were made to the IRB study materials and the informed consent form. The incentive was the chance to win one \$250 Delta Airlines gift card through a random drawing at the conclusion of the study. In summary, this chapter explained the Delphi methodology and procedures in the current study. The next chapter, Chapter IV, will provide a summary of the results of the study.

Researcher Bias and Positionality

Before researching a certain topic or group of people, it is important to explore one's biases and positionality related to that research. One's biases include values, experiences or beliefs that may influence the research process and outcomes (Singh & Hays, 2012). Positionality refers to the importance of reflecting on one's placement within many intersecting contexts and identities and how those relate one's research (England, 1994). For this section, the researcher will utilize the pronoun "I" to indicate the significance of the self and self-reflexivity within the research process (Cousins, 2010). The "I" is especially central in this study because globally focused research is often embedded in traditions of otherizing, colonialism, and oppressive actions (Danziger, 2009).

Through this research, I am assessing the opinions of U.S.-based counselor educators about their transnational work experiences with non-U.S. based partners. Non-U.S.-based individuals, have been historically excluded from being represented in

counseling research (Arnett, 2008). However, I do not claim that this research includes the voices and perspectives of those living and working in non-U.S. contexts.

Just as Mills (2014) noted in a description of her positionality, “For me to confess now that I am white and I am a woman seems to mean everything and nothing” (p. 14). Some argue that simply naming one’s intersecting social categories, such as gender and race, is very important but insufficient when reflecting on the complexities of positionality. Noting one’s experiences related to a research area and the textual experiences, such as critical engagement with books, classes, and conversations, are also valuable in the reflection (Cousins, 2010). Although it remains common in the social sciences to outline or bracket the researcher biases to limit the impact of the biases in the research, it is simultaneously emphasized that the researcher, inclusive of various beliefs and identities, is an inherent part of the research process (Singh & Hays, 2012). As such, I will briefly note some of my intersecting social identities and relevant personal and textual experiences with the topic and content of this study.

Although this study is based in surveying opinions of U.S.-based counselor educators, the aim of the study is to provide guidelines for transnational work. For this reason, the global focus of the study highlights certain privileged categories that I embody. It is important for me to be self-reflexive about how these privileged identities might influence the research process (e.g., emphasizing certain ideas or arguments over others). Most of my visible social categories, such as male and white, have provided me with many social privileges throughout my life. I am especially aware of other privileged

social categories, such as American, doctoral student, and economically privileged, when addressing global issues in the counseling profession.

In addition, my global experiences have informed my interest and motivation in this research area. I have primarily spent time in other countries as a student or an intern – notably, further emphasizing certain privileges. Through study abroad programs and structured internship programs, I have spent time in countries such as Ethiopia, India, and Italy. The time spent in each of the locations ranged from one to five months. I have partnered with numerous local organizations and people for various reasons, such as farming education or public health research. Related to the topic of this study, I have not only seen the potentially negative impacts of transnational work, but been a part of them. For example, when I was researching occupational health trends with a local organization in northwestern India, we surveyed the needs of local migrant workers. Based on the results of these surveys, we developed health trainings and health kits for the migrant workers. We did this because there was funding for the project from donors, despite the fact that the surveys indicated that the migrant workers were meeting their own health needs through the support of community members. My complicity with that which I critique is evident in this example (i.e., partnering with non-U.S. communities in an unhelpful, hierarchical and non-collaborative way).

As Parker (1999) emphasizes the importance of reading ourselves into the problem, the aim of this study is not to locate myself outside of the critique of transnational work and research, but to also place myself within that research question itself. Thereby, what emerges out of this study is also an existential, reflexive, and deeply

personal question: given my positionality, how do I best engage with others transnationally given my professional role? Through various experiences I have hypotheses and biases about this question. I have formed beliefs about the dangers of transnational work – especially given postcolonial histories and certain relational privileges. I also have seen the personal benefits of cross-cultural and transnational exchanges such as gaining knowledge from other perspectives and challenging my preconceived notions of the world.

The textual engagement with my positionality in this research area has been structured into the dissertation process and informed by coursework in my doctoral cognate, Women and Gender Studies. Through courses and texts focused on feminist, postcolonial, and critical studies, I have been invited into a critical discourse about my location in the research process, why and how certain research questions are asked, and who benefits from the research. I have learned that asking a problematic research question, given my positionality, does not negate the significance of that question, but rather, invites me into a self-reflexive stance with the research and participants. By reflexively engaging in the process, I aspire to be a part research that addresses my ever-changing positionality with the research and participants through reflection, dialogue, and critique.

Overall, this chapter explained the Delphi methodology, procedures in the current study and my researcher bias and positionality. The next chapter, Chapter IV, will provide a summary of the results of the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this Delphi study was to answer the following research question: What are critical guidelines for U.S.-based counselor educators when working transnationally?

This chapter will be divided into three distinct sections. The first section will review the results of Round 1 of the study. During Round 1, the expert panel responded to open-ended questions about transnational work related to counselor education, with the purpose of creating/exploring ideas that could serve as guidelines. The second section will review the results from Round 2. During Round 2, the expert panel was asked to evaluate and rate the representative statements based on their level of agreement from Round 1 of the study on a 1-7 Likert scale. During this round, each participant was given the opportunity to add or edit statements that they felt needed to be changed or were missing from the list, with the purpose of generating consensus on the proposed guidelines. Additionally, they were encouraged to provide a rationale for their proposed changes. The final section will review the results from Round 3. In Round 3, the additions or edits to the representative statements were sent back to the panel for rating on the same Likert scale. The panel was given the opportunity to edit or add items that

were presented in this round, with the purpose of generating consensus on the proposed guidelines. No additional rounds of data collection were needed for this study.

Round One Results

Round 1 of the study involved asking the panel for relevant demographic and professional information in addition to responding to seven open-ended questions about transnational work related to counselor education (see Appendix F). The seven open-ended questions were focused on eliciting their opinions about critical guidelines related to transnational work in counselor education. The open-ended questions were grounded in current literature in counselor education and parallel to other Delphi study open questions that were focused on developing best practices or competencies (e.g., Wester & Borders, 2014). Participants received emails describing the nature of the study, reasons for their nomination, and a link to the consent form and Round 1 study questionnaire.

Procedures

Thirty individuals were identified as eligible for this study based on the professional visibility of their expertise in this area; subsequently, the researcher found all of their email addresses on professional or academic websites. After sending out 30 participation request emails, 2 of the emails were returned as undeliverable. All 30 of these potential participants also were sent a nomination email, which was a request to forward the email to individuals that they believed fit the criteria of the study. Interestingly, this method of nomination did not seem to gain any additional participants in the study. Of 28 emails that were sent directly to potential participants, 9 individuals

fully participated in Rounds 1 and 2 of the study (n=9, Response rate = 32.1%). 7

individuals participated for Round 3 (n=7, attrition rate = 22.2%).

Demographics

Some participants did not fill out all elements of the demographic questions due to two possible reasons. First, not all questions applied to all of the participants. Second, participants could have chosen to not respond to one or more questions. Consequently, the number of responses for each question varies.

Gender

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about gender identity. Good representation from both female and male participants was maintained throughout all rounds of data collection.

Table 1
Gender Identity – Rounds 1-3

Gender Identity	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
Female	4	44.4%
Male	5	55.6%
N=9		
Round 3		
Female	4	57.1%
Male	3	42.9%
n=7		

Age

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about age. Although various ages were presented on the panel, many of the participants were between the ages of 30 to 39 (n=4 in Rounds 1 and 2; n=3 in Round 3), and a majority of the participants were under the age of 50 (n=6 in Rounds 1 and 2; n=5 in Round 3).

Table 2

Age – Rounds 1-3

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
30-39	4	44.4%
40-49	2	22.2%
50-59	2	22.2%
>60	1	11.1%
n=9		
Round 3		
30-39	3	42.9%
40-49	2	28.6%
50-59	1	14.3%
>60	1	14.3%
n=7		

Time in the U.S.

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about whether one was born within the U.S. Of the nine participants in Rounds 1 and 2, 5 (55.6%) of the participants were not born in the U.S. Participants that were not born in the U.S. have been living in the U.S. for various amounts of time (see Table 4).

Table 3

Born in U.S. – Rounds 1-3

Born in U.S.	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
Yes	4	44.4%
No	5	55.6%
N=9		
Round 3		
Yes	4	57.1%
No	3	42.9%
n=7		

Table 4

Time in U.S. for Those Not Born in U.S. – Rounds 1-3

Time in U.S. (years)	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
<10	2	40.0%
10-20	1	20.0%
>20	2	40.0%
n=5		
Round 3		
<10	2	66.7%
>20	1	33.3%
n=3		

Ethnicity and Race

All nine (100.0%) participants responded to the questions about ethnicity and race. These two items are being reported together because some participants reported racial and ethnic categories in opposing text boxes. Also, because this question was open-ended in the demographic questionnaire, all responses were unique. Due to specificity of some of the responses, the researcher is not disclosing the exact ethnicities or races listed to preserve the anonymity of participants. The overall trends in responses represent a wide diversity of ethnicities and races, including Chinese, Indian, Caucasian, Asian, and Latino.

Time as Counselor Educator

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about the number of years that they have been a counselor educator. A wide spectrum of years as a counselor educator was indicated through the participants' responses. A majority of participants in all rounds have been a counselor educator for less than ten years (n=4 in all rounds).

Table 5

Years as Counselor Educator – Round 1-3

Years	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
<5	2	22.2%
5-9	2	22.2%
10-14	1	11.1%
15-19	3	33.3%
>20	1	11.1%
n=9		

Round 3

<5	2	28.6%
5-9	2	28.6%
15-19	2	28.6%
>20	1	14.2%

n=7

Faculty Rank as Counselor Educator

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about their rank as a counselor educator. Many different faculty ranks were represented in the panel. A majority of the panel indicated the rank of assistant or associate professor (n=5 in all rounds).

Table 6

Faculty Rank – Rounds 1-3

Rank	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
Adjunct	1	11.1%
Assistant	3	33.3%
Associate	2	22.2%
Full	3	33.3%
n=9		
Round 3		
Assistant	3	42.9%
Associate	2	28.6%
Full	2	28.6%
n=7		

Importance of International Issues

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about the importance of international issues in their work as a counselor educator, responding with ratings of 8 or higher on a scale from 0 (Not Important at All) to 10 (Extremely Important).

Table 7

Importance of International Issues – Rounds 1-3

Importance (Scale: 1-10)	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
8	4	44.4%
9	1	11.1%
10	4	44.4%
n=9		
Round 3		
8	4	57.1%
9	1	14.3%
10	2	28.6%
n=7		

Published in a Peer-Reviewed Journal

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about whether they had published a journal article related to international counseling issues in a peer-reviewed journal. A majority of the panel indicated that they have published between one and five articles (n=5 in all rounds). One participant indicated that she or he has not published an article that met the question's criteria.

Table 8

Published in a Peer-Reviewed Journal – Rounds 1-3

Number of Journal Articles	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
0	1	11.1%
1-5	5	55.6%
6-9	2	22.2%
>10	1	11.1%
n=9		
Round 3		
0	1	14.3%
1-5	5	71.4%
6-9	1	14.3%
n=7		

Leadership Positions

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about having held a leadership position in a counseling organization related to international issues. A majority of the panel in all rounds has held a leadership position that fit the criteria of the question (n=6 in Rounds 1 and 2; n=5 in Round 3). Of the six participants in Round 1, three (50.0%) reported holding leadership positions in more than one organization.

Table 9

Leadership Positions – Rounds 1-3

Years in Leadership	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
0	3	33.3%
1	1	11.1%
2	1	11.1%
3	2	22.2%
6	2	22.2%
n=9		
Round 3		
0	2	28.6%
1	1	14.3%
2	1	14.3%
3	2	28.6%
6	1	14.3%
n=7		

Leadership positions of participants were within a diversity of counseling organizations. These organizations included the National Board of Certified Counselors International (NBCC-I), the International Association for Counselling (IAC), and the International Registry of Counsellor Education Programs (IRCEP). Some participants listed their involvement with international committees or interest groups within larger U.S.-based counseling organizations, such as the American Counseling Association (ACA) or National Career Development Association (NCDA).

Professional Travel

All nine (100%) participants responded to the question about experiences traveling outside the U.S. for professional reasons related to their role as a faculty member. Of the nine participants in Rounds 1 and 2, eight (88.9%) indicated that they had traveled outside the U.S. within their role as faculty member. The number of times that the 8 participants traveled outside the U.S. ranged from two to over fifty times.

Table 10

Professional Travel: Number of Times – Rounds 1-3

Number of Times	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
0	1	11.1%
1-9	3	33.3%
10-19	4	44.4%
>20	1	11.1%
n=9		
Round 3		
0	1	14.3%
1-9	3	42.9%
10-19	2	18.6%
>20	1	14.3%
n=7		

Of the Round 1 and 2 participants who had traveled outside the U.S. for professional reasons (n=8), seven reported the reasons for these trips (n=7). The most common reason for professional travel indicated by the panel was presenting in another

country. Due to the nature of this question, it is unclear whether participants indicated multiple reasons for a single trip (e.g., one trip for research and presenting).

Table 11

Professional Travel: Type – Rounds 1-3

Type of Travel	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
Research	6	85.7%
Study Abroad	3	42.9%
Teaching	5	71.4%
Presenting	7	100%
Consulting	5	71.4%
n=7		
Round 3		
Research	5	83.3%
Study Abroad	3	50.0%
Teaching	4	66.7%
Presenting	6	100%
Consulting	5	83.3%
n=7		

All 9 (100%) participants responded to the question about total time outside of the U.S. for professional reasons related to counseling over the past thirty years. Based on the results, the panel has spent a wide spectrum of years outside the U.S. A majority of the panel has spent less than three years outside the U.S. (n=6 in Rounds 1 and 2; n=5 in Round 3). This question does not take into account the amount of time that the

participants have spent outside the U.S. for other reasons (e.g., non-counseling related living or traveling).

Table 12

Years Outside U.S. Over the Past 30 Years for Professional Reasons – Round 1-3

Years	Frequency	Percentage
Rounds 1 and 2		
0.1-0.5	2	22.2%
0.5-1.0	2	22.2%
1.1-3.0	2	22.2%
3.1-5.0	2	22.2%
5.1-7.0	1	11.1%
n=9		
Round 3		
0.1-0.5	2	28.6%
0.5-1.0	1	14.3%
1.1-3.0	2	28.6%
3.1-5.0	2	28.6%
n=7		

Round One Questionnaire Results

The Delphi Round 1 open-ended questionnaire included 7 questions that participants could respond to in the provided text boxes. There were no length limits placed on the content they could include in the text boxes. The following questions were included in the Round 1 questionnaire:

1. What makes a U.S.-based counselor educator well-qualified to engage in transnational professional work?
2. What specific knowledge and skills should U.S. counselor educators have when engaging in transnational professional work?
3. What considerations should there be when working transnationally given cultural, social and professional differences?
4. What do you believe is lacking in transnational professional work related to counselor education?
5. Oftentimes the U.S. is perceived as the source of counseling knowledge or expertise. How should one account for that reality when working transnationally?
6. How should one promote equity (i.e., fairness or justice) when working transnationally?
7. Do critical or best practice guidelines vary based on the nature of the transnational work related to counselor education (e.g., consultation, immersion/study abroad program, research, teaching)? If so, how?

All 9 participants in Round 1 responded to all of the questions. Some members responded very briefly (e.g., a few words) while others wrote multiple paragraphs in their responses. Results were compiled by the researcher. Study IDs were assigned to each participant's set of responses. Each Study ID was connected to the participant's email address in a password-protected file separate from study data.

Utilizing the content analysis method described in Chapter III (Hays & Singh, 2012; Krippendorff, 2013), the primary researcher worked with an additional coder to analyze

participants' Round 1 responses. Results indicated 78 distinct codes or representative statements. The identification of representative statements for relevant areas identified in the responses is a central part of content analysis (Crowe, Ender, & Porter, 2015). Subsequently, the primary researcher identified categories and subcategories from the statements. These statements were thematically categorized into three distinct primary categories. Each primary category had two distinct subcategories, resulting in a total of six distinct subcategories. Consensus dialogue, as suggested by Graneheim & Lundman (2004), with the additional coder was reached about the categories and subcategories. Definitions for each category and subcategory were developed by the primary researcher and the coder (see Appendix I).

Additionally, there were some similarities between the categories and representative statements with the initial open-ended questions. For example, the second initial question asked the panel specifically about knowledge and skills needed when working transnationally. Multiple subcategories specify skills and knowledge needed when working transnationally. Also, some of the representative statements are very related to the initial questions. For example, the final initial question asked the panel about best practices when working transnationally; and there are two representative statements that mention the nature of best practices when working transnationally.

Table 13

Round 1 – Representative Statements from Participants

Category: Personal Attributes and Attitude

Subcategory: General

Is interested in working transnationally, in general
Is committed to working transnationally, in general
Is committed to working transnationally with a specific context or country
Is committed to developing longer-term relationships with individuals in a specific context
Appreciates and respects cultural differences
Is humble
Is flexible
Has a personal openness to share knowledge
Has a personal openness to receive knowledge
Has a personal openness to share resources
Has a personal openness to receive resources
Has a curiosity about learning others' worldviews
Is aware of one's own power and privilege in transnational work
Is cross-culturally competent
Rejects the notion of transnational work as a vacation or tourist activity
Rejects the urge or tendency to "work for" and, rather, intends to "work with" with transnational partners
Is aware that transnational work requires more than a multicultural approach
Is aware of one's own personal and cultural worldview
Is aware of one's own biases and cultural blindspots
Is aware of one's reasons and intentions for working transnationally
Is aware of one's own tendencies and preferences when working in a non-U.S. setting (e.g., food, sleeping, ways of communicating)
Is aware of others' perceptions of one's actions
Is willing to learn local customs and language
Recognizes the limits of one's own values and beliefs in another context
Recognizes the potential of being exploitative when working transnationally
Has experience working with diverse populations
Considers personal readiness before engaging in specific transnational work
Is willing to be influenced and affected by transnational experiences
Has a high tolerance for ambiguity
Has a desire to serve others
Is patient in the process of transnational work
Values immersion experiences as form of learning

Category: Personal Attributes and Attitudes

Subcategory: Counseling Related

Has a curiosity about learning other helping or counseling-related practices and knowledge

Is aware that one's counseling knowledge and research is often based in U.S. contexts

Recognizes that there are many sources of counseling knowledge and expertise, not only the U.S.

Recognizes the importance of indigenous knowledge in healing and counseling-related work

Is aware that one's expertise in U.S. counseling might not be relevant depending on the context

Does not view transnational work as solely a way of expanding/spreading U.S. counseling knowledge

Has a strong professional identity as a counselor

Has had quality training in doctoral-level counselor education

Is aware that different educational systems require unique applications of counselor training

Is aware that the developmental level of counselor education is different in different contexts

Values cross-cultural, comparative counseling research

Category: Context-Specific Characteristics

Subcategory: Knowledge

Understands the specific context (e.g., history, social practices, beliefs) when working transnationally

Understands indigenous healing and counseling-related practices when working in a new context

Has knowledge of local cultural norms related to foreigners (e.g., social expectations in a certain cultural context)

Knowledge of research differences within different countries (e.g., IRB procedures)

Understands how best practices regarding one's work depend on context (e.g., location, community, culture)

Understands how best practices regarding one's work depend on the nature of the work (e.g., research, teaching)

Has knowledge of overall global issues

Has knowledge of global counseling issues and trends

Has knowledge of appropriate teaching strategies

Category: Context-Specific Characteristics

Subcategory: Skills

Actively learns about relevant non-U.S. counseling theories and histories
Is able to adapt one's knowledge and skills into the local context
Applies relevant knowledge from academic literature
Is able to work effectively with a translator when necessary
Is able to determine the limits of one's skills and knowledge within a specific context
Ensures that transnational partners know that their knowledge is valuable
Communicates clear expectations around collaborative activities (e.g., authorship on a manuscript)
Communicates relevant professional ethics and legal issues with clarity
Communicates cultural differences and bias with others in transnational work
Listens and understands the local needs or desires
Can work collaboratively with transnational partners
Proactively reaches out to others in new context
Can identify and define the specific nature and scope of one's transnational work
Invites relevant critique to U.S.-based knowledge
Models equity (i.e., fairness/justice) in interactions
Engages in concrete efforts in work (e.g., projects, meetings, advocacy activities)
Invites transnational partners to decide how they want to incorporate new knowledge
Consults with relevant professionals before working in a certain context
Can integrate multicultural competencies into a transnational context
Can engage in advocacy in context
Can engage in social justice work in context

Category: U.S. Counseling Expertise

Subcategory: Knowledge

Understands the history, scope, and nature of counseling in the U.S.
Has knowledge of issues present in academic/professional literature about transnational work and U.S. counselor education
Understands U.S.-based cultural worldviews
Understands cultural bias inherent in U.S. counseling and counselor education

Category: U.S. Counseling Expertise

Subcategory: Skills

Can communicate the nature and scope of the U.S. counseling profession

n=9

Each primary category had two subcategories. To ensure trustworthiness, the researcher and additional coder separately coded each meaning unit or participant response into one of the subcategories or multiple subcategories, based on the respective subcategory definition (see Appendix I). To measure intercoder reliability, Cohen's Kappa was used (Krippendorff, 2013). Using an online calculation tool, an overall Kappa of 0.860 was calculated indicating an appropriate level of agreement between the researcher and coder regarding the categories and subcategories with participants' responses. A kappa value of 0-0.2 indicates little to no agreement between coders, 0.2-0.4 indicates low agreement, 0.4-0.6 indicates moderate agreement, 0.6-0.8 indicates moderate to high agreement, and 0.8-1.0 indicates very high agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977). Some participants' responses elicited high agreement between the researcher and coder (e.g., participant 3, 6, and 9) while others elicited less agreement (e.g., participant 5 and 8; see Table 14). After calculating the kappa, the researcher and coder discussed items where differing subcategories were assigned to participant responses to examine the discrepancies. Responses where the participant commented very briefly and directly elicited higher agreement, whereas longer responses that contained more nuanced or vague language caused for less agreement with the researcher and the coder.

Table 14

Round 1 - Trustworthiness of Categories and Subcategories

Overall Kappa = 0.860

Individual Participant Responses	Kappa
1	0.827
2	0.907
3	1.000
4	0.871
5	0.727
6	1.000
7	0.821
8	0.668
9	1.000

n=9

Round Two Results

Round 2 involved participant ratings of each representative statement developed in Round 1. The 9 participants were emailed and invited to participate in Round 2. All 9 participants from Round 1 participated in Round 2 (n=9, response rate = 100%). Participants were instructed to rate each item using a Likert scale (1-7). The Likert scale ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7). Their prompt for rating the items was “please rate each item based on your level of agreement if that particular item should be a *critical guideline*” for U.S.-based counselor educators when working transnationally. Critical guidelines, similar to professional competencies and best practices, serve as standards and guidance for effective, ethical, and successful practice within a certain area.” Participants also were given an opportunity to add or edit specific items below each subcategory grouping.

Round Two Questionnaire Results

The Round 2 questionnaire included 78 items that were representative statements from the participants open-ended responding in Round 1. The questionnaire instructed participants to rate each item based on their level of agreement whether that item should be a critical guideline for counselor educators working transnationally. A Likert scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) was used for each item. Results from this round were organized in a table that indicates the median score and interquartile range (IQR) for each item.

For this round, median scores varied from 5 to 7 and IQR scores varied from 0 to 2. Of the 78 items, 68 items met the cutoff of the minimum median of greater than or equal to 6 and the maximum IQR of less than or equal to 1. Specifically, only 1 item did not meet the minimum median and 9 items exceeded the maximum IQR permitted in this study. Items that did not meet the criteria for median and IQR scores, and were thus removed from further analysis, were spread across categories.

Table 15

Round 2 – Median and IQR of Representative Statements from Round 1

Please rate each item based on your level of agreement if that particular item should be a “critical guideline” for U.S.-based counselor educators when working transnationally	Median	IQR
Category: Personal Attributes and Attitudes		
Subcategory: General		
Is interested in working transnationally, in general	7	2
Is committed to working transnationally, in general	7	1
Is committed to working transnationally with a specific context or country	6	2
Is committed to developing longer-term relationships with individuals in a specific context	7	1
Appreciates and respects cultural differences	7	0
Is humble	7	1
Is flexible	7	0
Has a personal openness to share knowledge	7	1
Has a personal openness to receive knowledge	7	0
Has a personal openness to share resources	7	1
Has a personal openness to receive resources	6	2
Has a curiosity about learning others’ worldviews	7	0
Is aware of one’s own power and privilege in transnational work	7	0
Is cross-culturally competent	7	1
Rejects the notion of transnational work as a vacation or tourist activity	7	0
Rejects the urge or tendency to “work for” and, rather, intends to “work with” with transnational partners	7	0
Is aware that transnational work requires more than a multicultural approach	7	1
Is aware of one’s own personal and cultural worldview	7	1
Is aware of one’s own biases and cultural blindspots	6	1

Is aware of one's reasons and intentions for working transnationally	6	1
Is aware of one's <u>own</u> tendencies and preferences when working in a non-U.S. setting (e.g., food, sleeping, ways of communicating)	7	1
Is aware of others' perceptions of one's actions	6	1
Is willing to learn local customs and language	6	1
Recognizes the limits of one's own values and beliefs in another context	7	1
Recognizes the potential of being exploitative when working transnationally	7	0
Has experience working with diverse populations	6	1
Considers personal readiness before engaging in specific transnational work	6	1
Is willing to be influenced and affected by transnational experiences	7	1
Has a high tolerance for ambiguity	7	1
Has a desire to serve others	7	1
Is patient in the process of transnational work	7	1
Values immersion experiences as form of learning	7	1

Category: Personal Attributes and Attitudes

Subcategory: Counseling Related

Has a curiosity about learning other helping or counseling-related practices and knowledge	7	2
Is aware that one's counseling knowledge and research is often based in U.S. contexts	7	0
Recognizes that there are many sources of counseling knowledge and expertise, not only the U.S.	7	0
Recognizes the importance of indigenous knowledge in healing and counseling-related work	7	1
Is aware that your expertise in U.S. counseling might not be relevant depending on the context	7	0
Does not view transnational work as solely a way of expanding/spreading U.S. counseling knowledge	7	0
Has a strong professional identity as a counselor	6	1
Has had quality training in doctoral-level counselor education	7	1

Is aware that different educational systems require unique applications of counselor training	7	1
Is aware that the developmental level of counselor education is different in different contexts	5	1
Values cross-cultural, comparative counseling research	6	2

Category: Context-Specific Characteristics

Subcategory: Knowledge

Understands the specific context (e.g., history, social practices, beliefs) when working transnationally	6	1
Understands indigenous healing and counseling-related practices when working in a new context	6	2
Has knowledge of local cultural norms related to foreigners (e.g., what are expectations in a certain social context)	7	1
Knowledge of research differences within different countries (e.g., IRB procedures)	6	2
Understands how best practices regarding one's work depend on context (e.g., location, community, culture)	7	0
Understands how best practices regarding one's work depend on the nature of the work (e.g., research, teaching)	7	1
Has knowledge of overall global issues	6	1
Has knowledge of global counseling issues and trends	6	1
Has knowledge of appropriate teaching strategies	6	1

Category: Context-Specific Characteristics

Subcategory: Skills

Actively learns about relevant non-U.S. counseling theories and histories	6	1
Is able to adapt one's knowledge and skills into the local context	7	2
Applies relevant knowledge from academic literature	6	2
Is able to work effectively with a translator when necessary	7	1

Is able to determine the limits of one's skills and knowledge within a specific context	7	1
Ensures that transnational partners know that their knowledge is valuable	7	0
Communicates clear expectations around collaborative activities (e.g., authorship on a manuscript)	7	1
Communicates relevant professional ethics and legal issues with clarity	7	0
Communicates cultural differences and bias with others in transnational work	7	1
Listens and understands the local needs or desires	7	0
Can work collaboratively with transnational partners	7	0
Proactively reaches out to others in new context	7	1
Can identify and define the specific nature and scope of one's transnational work	6	1
Invites relevant critique to U.S.-based knowledge	7	0
Models equity (i.e., fairness/justice) in interactions	7	1
Engages in concrete efforts in work (e.g., projects, meetings, advocacy activities)	7	0
Consults with relevant professionals before working in a certain context	7	0
Can integrate multicultural competencies into a transnational context	7	1
Can engage in advocacy in context	7	1
Can engage in social justice work in context	7	1
<hr/>		
Category: U.S. Counseling Expertise		
Subcategory: Knowledge		
<hr/>		
Understands the history, scope and nature of counseling in the U.S.	6	1
Has knowledge of the issues present in academic/professional literature about transnational work and U.S. counselor education	7	1
Understands U.S.-based cultural worldviews	7	0
Understands cultural bias inherent in U.S. counseling and counselor education	7	0
<hr/>		

Category: U.S. Counseling Expertise		
Subcategory: Skills		
Can communicate the nature and scope of the U.S. counseling profession	7	1
n=9		

Participants also were encouraged to add or edit items that they thought should be changed or added by providing this opinion in the text box after each section. Many of the participants wrote in the text boxes. The majority of the responses were commentary on the methods of the survey or opinions about some of the items. For example, one participant wrote: “It would help if the items were numbered for reference.” Another stated, “I do not have any change suggestions. However, I believe all of the above items are critical, but some of them may be more suitable to be guidelines than some others.”

There were some specific additions or edits suggested by some participants. For example, one participant stated that, “The item on willingness to learn local customs and language should be two different items. I believe it is vital to learn local customs, but often it is not necessary to learn the language (if interpreters are readily available).” Also, another participant stated, “I disagree with the idea that a person should be considered ‘fully competent’ or an ‘expert’ to be interested and to engage in transnational work.” If the comments referred to an item that did not develop consensus in this round, the comments were edited by the researcher into representative statements for rating in Round 3.

Round Two Participant Scoring

In addition to calculating median scores and IQR scores for each item, the researcher also calculated statistics on each participant's ratings in Round 2. This assessment was done to observe average scores and how variable participants' ratings were on the 1-7 Likert scale. The statistics of mean and range were calculated to determine a panel member's average score and range of scoring. Only two (22.2%) of the nine had an average score of lower than six. Four (44.4%) of the nine had a range of two or lower, indicating that those members only used a maximum of three of the seven Likert scale options for all the items.

Table 16

Round 2 - Range and Mean Scores of Individual Participants' Overall Ratings

Panel Member	Mean	Range
1	6.95	1
2	6.19	2
3	6.79	2
4	6.63	3
5	6.27	6
6	5.94	6
7	6.46	2
8	5.77	4
9	6.55	3

n=9

Round Three Results

Round 3 was intended to allow participants to rate non-consensus items that were added or edited from Round 2. Based on participants' comments in Round 2, 3 items were developed or edited for Round 3. The 3 items were submitted to participants for rating in Round 3 using an online questionnaire. To ensure that the panel was aware of why these items were added or edited, the anonymous comments from Round 2 were included below each item in this round.

An email was sent to the 9 participants that participated in Rounds 1 and 2 that invited them to participate in Round 3. 7 of the 9 participants participated in Round 3 (n=7, response rate = 77.8%). This indicates a 22.2% attrition rate from Rounds 2 to 3.

Round Three Questionnaire Results

The Round 3 questionnaire initially included 7 items that may be critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally. Due to a researcher mistake, only 3 items will be analyzed. 4 items from Round 2 were edited based on participant comments that should not have been altered or included in this round. Because those items previously developed consensus from the panel in Round 2, those items should not have been edited or included in Round 3. The researcher sent these items to be rerated by the panel because each item in this round was either added by a participant in the comment box or edited in Round 2. Consensus and non-consensus items that were not edited by any participant from Round 2 were not resubmitted to the panel for rerating.

The questionnaire instructed participants to rate each item based on their level of agreement whether that item should be a critical guidelines for counselor educators when

working transnationally. The same Likert scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) from Round 2 was used for each of the Round 3 items. Results from this round were organized in a table that indicates the median score and interquartile range (IQR) for each item. Participants also were given the opportunity to add or edit items in this round by commenting in the provided text boxes. Comments submitted by participants did not necessitate another round of rating.

For this round, the median scores for the 3 items was 7 and the IQR scores varied from 0.5 to 3.5. Only 1 (33.3%) items met the criteria for the minimum median ($>$ or $=$ 6) and maximum IQR scores ($<$ or $=$ 1) permitted in this study. 2 (66.7%) of the items exceeded the maximum IQR score.

At the conclusion of Round 3, the online survey tool was closed and the data from the final round was analyzed.

Table 17

Round 3 – Median and IQR from Edited or Added Statements from Round 2

Please rate each item based on your level of agreement if that particular item should be a “critical guideline” for U.S.-based counselor educators when working transnationally	Median	IQR
Category: Personal Attributes and Attitudes		
Subcategory: Counseling Related		
Is aware of cross-cultural, comparative counseling research	7	0.5
Recognizes that one does not need to be an “expert” before engaging in transnational work	7	1.5
Category: U.S. Counseling Expertise		
Subcategory: Knowledge		

Understands indigenous counseling-related practices within the U.S.	7	3.5
---	---	-----

*The 4 items included by researcher mistake in Round 3 are not included in the table; n=7

At the conclusion of Round 3, the online survey tool was closed and the data from the final round was analyzed. A thank you email was sent to the participants in Round 3 (Appendix E). Finally, the researcher randomly determined a winner of the incentive for participation (a gift card). An email was sent to the winner indicating her or his prize.

Summary of Results

The open-ended responding from Round 1 of this study led to the development of 78 representative statements of the participants' responses. Of the 78 items in Round 2, 68 (87.2%) items met the necessary median and IQR criteria for inclusion as a critical guideline for counselor educators when working transnationally. Based on participants' Round 2 comments, items were added or edited for rating in Round 3. Only 1 (33.3%) item from Round 3 met the necessary median and IQR criteria for inclusion as a critical guideline. Cumulatively from both Rounds 2 and 3, a total of 69 items met the criteria for critical guidelines for this study. Of the 69 items that met the criteria for critical guidelines, 14 (20.3%) had a median of 6 and 55 (79.7%) had a median of 7. Due to the nature of this study, the rank of importance or necessity of each item that met criteria for critical guidelines is unknown. The ranked importance or necessity of each critical guideline could be an important area for future research. The meaning of these results for the field of counselor education will be discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In Chapter IV, results of the study that developed consensus on critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally were presented. In this chapter, a brief overview of the study is provided, results are discussed, and limitations of the study are noted. Also included in this chapter are implications for counselor education in the U.S. and areas for future research.

Overview of the Study

The growth of the counseling profession worldwide paired with the effects of globalization have created more ways in which U.S. counselor education faculty work globally (Lorelle et al., 2012; Norsworthy et al., 2009b; Tang et al., 2012). Numerous professional trends illustrate these developments. Counselor educators continue to expand and develop counseling research globally (Pieterse et al., 2011), create global initiatives within the field (Ng et al., 2012), assist with the development of the counseling profession in other countries (Lueng et al., 2009; Stanard, 2013), work with international students (Lau & Ng, 2012; Ng & Smith, 2009), and lead educational programming, such as immersion experiences, in their roles as educators (Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010). Over the past few decades, the phenomena of globalization and, subsequently, internationalization within higher education, have facilitated the expansion of these

global experiences of counselor educators. Fundamental to all of these various global experiences is working effectively and ethically with global partners (Norsworthy et al., 2009b), especially given differences in helping practices around the world (Brock, 2006) and potential negative impacts of replicating U.S. and European mental health principles and practices to other countries (Mills, 2014; Staeuble, 2006; van de Vijver, 2013).

Surprisingly lacking in the professional literature are guidelines for transnational professional work within counselor education. Although some counselor educators have discussed their individual global experiences (e.g., Norsworthy et al., 2009b) and provided conceptual guidance for other educators (e.g., Draguns, 2013; Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007), no empirical research exists that offers guidelines for counselor educators about how to best work with other professionals around the globe.

To this end, the purpose of this study was to develop, through consensus of relevant experts, critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally. While there has been research on U.S. programs regarding internationalization and international students (Ng et al., 2012), no study has focused directly on the professional work that U.S.-based counselor educators engage in transnationally.

To answer this study's research question, the Delphi method was used to develop consensus from a panel of experts. The Delphi method is known for its usefulness in developing consensus about a specific topic from a group of relevant experts. A total of 9 participants participated in the majority of the study. Participants were current counselor education faculty members who had sustained international involvement within the

profession through areas such as research, teaching or consulting. Three rounds of data collection and analysis were used to generate data and compile themes. In the first round of data collection, participants initially responded to open-ended questions about their opinions on transnational work in counselor education. In Rounds 2 and 3, content analysis was used to develop representative statements from these opinions and, subsequently, the statements were organized into categories.

An additional coder was used in Round 1 to ensure trustworthiness of the categories applied to participants' responses. An overall Cohen's kappa of 0.860 was reached indicating sufficient intercoder agreement. Then in Round 2, participants rated the 78 representative statements developed from Round 1 responses. Sixty-eight of these items developed consensus by having been rated by the group at the cutoff median ($>$ or $= 6$) and interquartile range ($<$ or $= 1$). Round 3 involved rating items that individual participants wanted changed or added from the list of statements. In this round, the panel rated a total of 3 items and one item came to consensus. Cumulatively in Rounds 2 and 3, 81 statements were rated by the panel – not including the 4 statements that had reached consensus in Round 2 and were included in Round 3 due to a researcher mistake. In total, 69 statements developed consensus from the panel as critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally.

Demographics of Panel Members

A critical element of the Delphi method is the intentional selection of well-qualified panel members (Powell, 2003). It is recommended that the panel is also heterogeneous in nature, thereby having a diversity of perspectives and experiences

represented in the panel. Although the panel in this study did not meet the threshold of 10 participants, typically the minimum mentioned in other studies (Doughty, 2009; Wester & Borders, 2014), it did include 9 participants for Rounds 1 and 2 – the most significant rounds of this study.

The panel had diversity represented in numerous ways. First, 5 of the 9 participants were not born in the U.S. This is particularly significant because of the global focus of this study. Additionally, those not born in the U.S. have been in the U.S. for variable periods of time, ranging from a few years to over twenty years. Diversity was also well represented in the categories of age, gender, race, ethnicity, faculty rank, and number of years as a counselor educator.

Expertise of the Participants' expertise in working transnationally in counselor education was assessed through a variety of methods of involvement, such as teaching or conducting research outside the U.S. All but one member had traveled outside the U.S. for professional reasons. The one member that indicated that she or he did not travel outside the U.S. for professional reasons was not born in the U.S., and has been in the U.S. for less than 10 years. Most participants had traveled outside the U.S. on many occasions for a variety of professional reasons. In summary, participants met the necessary criteria to be considered "expert" by the definition of this study.

Summary of Findings

Emergent Categories

The expert panel came to a consensus on 69 items as critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally. Thirty-nine items are in the category

of Personal Attributes and Attitudes, 29 of which are in the subcategory of General and 10 items in the subcategory of Counseling Related. Items in this category are related to individual values, qualities, interests or beliefs. The subsections denote whether that element is counseling related or general. General refers to any personal attributes or attitudes that are not directed related to counseling or counselor education.

In the second section, 25 items are in the category of Context-Specific Characteristics, 7 of which are in the subcategory of Knowledge and 18 are in the subcategory of Skills. These items refer to knowledge or skills that are directly related to the specific transnational context.

Finally, 5 items are in the category of U.S. Counseling Expertise, 4 of which are in the subcategory of Knowledge and 1 item is in the subcategory of Skills. These items refer to knowledge or skills related to one's expertise in the U.S. counseling profession or U.S. counselor education. Additional definitions of the categories and subcategories, which emerged through the content analysis stage, are available in Appendix I.

Most consensus items (n=55 items, 79.7%) rated by panel members had a median score of 7. Fourteen (20.3%) of the items had a median score of 6.

Items that had the highest median score (7) and the lowest IQR score (0) are the items that had the highest agreement amongst the panel and lowest variance of rating, indicating that most of the panel strongly agreed that these items are critical guidelines for transnational work. Twenty-two (32.4%) of the consensus items met this threshold (median=7, IQR=0). These high-agreement and low-variance items were spread across categories and subcategories.

Table 18

Final Results – Median and IQR of Critical Guidelines

Please rate each item based on your level of agreement if that particular item should be a “critical guideline” for U.S.-based counselor educators when working transnationally	Median	IQR
Category: Personal Attributes and Attitudes		
Subcategory: General		
Is committed to working transnationally, in general	7	1
Is committed to developing longer-term relationships with individuals in a specific context	7	1
Appreciates and respects cultural differences	7	0
Is humble	7	1
Is flexible	7	0
Has a personal openness to share knowledge	7	1
Has a personal openness to receive knowledge	7	0
Has a personal openness to share resources	7	1
Has a curiosity about learning others’ worldviews	7	0
Is aware of one’s own power and privilege in transnational work	7	0
Is cross-culturally competent	7	1
Rejects the notion of transnational work as a vacation or tourist activity	7	0
Rejects the urge or tendency to “work for” and, rather, intends to “work with” with transnational partners	7	0
Is aware that transnational work requires more than a multicultural approach	7	1
Is aware of one’s own personal and cultural worldview	7	1
Is aware of one’s own biases and cultural blindspots	6	1
Is aware of one’s reasons and intentions for working transnationally	6	1
Is aware of one’s <u>own</u> tendencies and preferences when working in a non-U.S. setting (e.g., food, sleeping, ways of communicating)	7	1

Is aware of others' perceptions of one's actions	6	1
Is willing to learn local customs and language	6	1
Recognizes the limits of one's own values and beliefs in another context	7	1
Recognizes the potential of being exploitative when working transnationally	7	0
Has experience working with diverse populations	6	1
Considers personal readiness before engaging in specific transnational work	6	1
Is willing to be influenced and affected by transnational experiences	7	1
Has a high tolerance for ambiguity	7	1
Has a desire to serve others	7	1
Is patient in the process of transnational work	7	1
Values immersion experiences as form of learning	7	1

Category: Personal Attributes and Attitudes

Subcategory: Counseling Related

Is aware that one's counseling knowledge and research is often based in U.S. contexts	7	0
Recognizes that there are many sources of counseling knowledge and expertise, not only the U.S.	7	0
Recognizes the importance of indigenous knowledge in healing and counseling-related work	7	1
Is aware that your expertise in U.S. counseling might not be relevant depending on the context	7	0
Does not view transnational work as solely a way of expanding/spreading U.S. counseling knowledge	7	0
Has a strong professional identity as a counselor	6	1
Has had quality training in doctoral-level counselor education	7	1
Is aware that different educational systems require unique applications of counselor training	7	1
Is aware of cross-cultural, comparative counseling research	7	0.5

Category: Context-Specific Characteristics

Subcategory: Knowledge

Understands the specific context (e.g., history, social practices, beliefs) when working transnationally	6	1
Has knowledge of local cultural norms related to foreigners (e.g., what are expectations in a certain social context)	7	1
Understands how best practices regarding one's work depend on context (e.g., location, community, culture)	7	0
Understands how best practices regarding one's work depend on the nature of the work (e.g., research, teaching)	7	1
Has knowledge of overall global issues	6	1
Has knowledge of global counseling issues and trends	6	1
Has knowledge of appropriate teaching strategies	6	1

Category: Context-Specific Characteristics

Subcategory: Skills

Actively learns about relevant non-U.S. counseling theories and histories	6	1
Is able to work effectively with a translator when necessary	7	1
Is able to determine the limits of one's skills and knowledge within a specific context	7	1
Ensures that transnational partners know that their knowledge is valuable	7	0
Communicates clear expectations around collaborative activities (e.g., authorship on a manuscript)	7	1
Communicates relevant professional ethics and legal issues with clarity	7	0
Communicates cultural differences and bias with others in transnational work	7	1
Listens and understands the local needs or desires	7	0
Can work collaboratively with transnational partners	7	0
Proactively reaches out to others in new context	7	1
Can identify and define the specific nature and scope of one's transnational work	6	1
Invites relevant critique to U.S.-based knowledge	7	0
Models equity (i.e., fairness/justice) in interactions	7	1

Engages in concrete efforts in work (e.g., projects, meetings, advocacy activities)	7	0
Consults with relevant professionals before working in a certain context	7	0
Can integrate multicultural competencies into a transnational context	7	1
Can engage in advocacy in context	7	1
Can engage in social justice work in context	7	1
<hr/>		
Category: U.S. Counseling Expertise		
Subcategory: Knowledge		
<hr/>		
Understands the history, scope and nature of counseling in the U.S.	6	1
Has knowledge of the issues present in academic/professional literature about transnational work and U.S. counselor education	7	1
Understands U.S.-based cultural worldviews	7	0
Understands cultural bias inherent in U.S. counseling and counselor education	7	0
<hr/>		
Category: U.S. Counseling Expertise		
Subcategory: Skills		
<hr/>		
Can communicate the nature and scope of the U.S. counseling profession	7	1
<hr/>		

Findings by Category

The following research question was addressed in this study: What are critical guidelines for U.S.-based counselor educators when working transnationally? The expert panel members provided their opinions related to this question through open-ended responding and, subsequently, the rating of representative statements. Consensus items developed by the panel were sorted into three primary categories. These categories are a

central element of content analysis (Graneheim & Lundham, 2003), the method used to code panel members' Round 1 responses. Results of this study, namely the consensus critical guidelines, will be discussed in context of each category as related to the research question and relevant professional literature.

Personal Attributes and Attitudes

The first category of Personal Attributes and Attitudes are items that reflect characteristics of an individual, such as values, interests, beliefs, or qualities. Many items in this section emphasize the importance of self-awareness (e.g., “is aware of one’s own personal and cultural worldview”). Similar to existing multicultural guidelines, such as the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies, self-awareness is designated as integral to cross-cultural interactions (Ratts et al., 2015). Specific to other international recommendations within the profession, issues around self-awareness have been mentioned as very important by other counselor educators (Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007). Other counselor educators also have highlighted the important of personal self-awareness of one’s own cultural biases (Ægisdóttir et al., 2009; Nassar-McMillian et al., 2014), congruent with items in this section. Overall, the panel members developed consensus on many items regarding self-awareness.

Other items in this category referred to personal qualities or temperaments, such as humility or flexibility. Despite these items developing consensus, some panel members did not believe these items should be included or they wanted them rephrased. One member commented, “It is unclear whether some items are personality constructs (humility, flexibility) while others are personal attributes and attitudinal constructs

belonging below (openness to resources). I would suggest that it is much cleaner to frame items NOT as aspects of personality.” Another member stated, “Humility as a critical guideline gives me pause. First, how socially constructed within specific cultures is this idea?” Although these personal qualities are not specifically mentioned in related literature, cultural humility is a common idea in cross-cultural interactions within the counseling profession (Hook, Davis, Owen, Worthington, & Utsey, 2013).

Some items were very specific about a counselor educator’s collaborative and open attitude when engaging in transnational work. For example, one item refers to the willingness to learn local customs or languages. Other items refer to a personal openness to share knowledge and resources. These attitudinal items display the importance of collaboration and one’s willingness be affected or altered by the transnational work. Collaboration, as an idea, has been consistent in the literature regarding counseling-related transnational work (Lee, 1997; Norsworthy, et al., 2009b; Stanard, 2013).

Some items emphasized specific past experiences or identities that the panel deemed important for transnational work. For example, having a high-quality doctoral education or having worked with diverse populations require past experiences in a particular area or with certain people. Also, cross-cultural competence and a strong professional identity as a counselor were identities that require past experiences or development. Other than cross-cultural competence (Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007; Lorelle, Byrd, & Crockett, 2012), the ideas presented within this area seem to be new recommendations about the importance of preparation or competence prior to transnational involvement by counselor educators.

Despite the originality of these ideas in relation to transnational preparation, many of the ideas are imbedded in standards for counselor education, such as the Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Education Programs (CACREP, 2016). The items related to past experiences or identities (e.g., cross-culturally competent) seem to be connected to specific items necessary for CACREP accreditation of a doctoral program, such as culturally relevant understandings of counseling or research (Section 6 B1f and B4l, CACREP, 2016). So, therefore, many CACREP-graduated doctoral graduates might already be very familiar with the ideas present with those items. But, importantly, one item states “is aware that transnational work involves more than a multicultural approach” thereby indicating that the nature of this work requires attitudes or attributes in addition to those standards embedded in a doctoral-level CACREP education. The open-endedness of this item does not indicate what “more than a multicultural approach” might entail or require.

Finally within this category, many items refer to one’s positionality in transnational work. Positionality refers to the conditions of an interaction or social experience. For example, one item refers to the power and privilege embedded in transnational work. Other items emphasize the importance of being aware of the limits of one’s expertise or values within a specific context. Awareness of the social context and one’s place in that cross-cultural context is very present and emphasized in relevant literature (Danziger, 2006; Lueng, et al., 2009; Mills 2014). Items in this section, related to positionality, add to the clarification of how counselor educators can begin to address one’s positionality in transnational work. This is particularly important for transnational

work due to the potential differences present within that interaction and work, such as differences of power in a relationship. Many of the items, directly or indirectly, refer to concept of power and influence within transnational work because of various histories in the mental health field. U.S. mental health professionals have traditionally imposed mental health knowledge around the globe and assumed the superiority of Western knowledge (Danziger, 2006; Mills, 2014). The items about positionality bring attention to the importance of contextual and historical influences on transnational relationship in counselor education.

Overall, the items in this category represent over half of the list of critical guidelines (n=38). This fact highlights the importance the panel placed on attitudes and attributes of counselor educators involved in transnational work. When relating the list of critical guidelines to a comparable, but not parallel, list of counseling-related competencies, there appear to be some differences. With the U.S.-focused Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC, Ratts et al., 2016), there seems to be a greater emphasis on the skills and actions taken by the counseling professional based on the number of items included in their competencies. There are proportionally less attitudes and attributes included within the MSJCC. Logically, most items in the MSJCC focus on the professional counseling relationship, whereas this study's guidelines focus on other types of professional relationships. Although no strong conclusions can be made in this comparison, due to the distinctive nature of each list, the panel in this study indicated through their consensus the significance of one's attributes and attitudes when working transnationally.

Context-Specific Characteristics

The next category in the consensus critical guidelines is Context-Specific Characteristics. Items in this category refer to specific knowledge or skills related to the social and cultural context in which one is working. Items within the Knowledge subcategory focused on knowledge about the specific context in which one is working, overall global knowledge and knowledge about how best practices might be followed dependent on context or type of work. These items seem to emphasize the need to know about the specific place one is working and global issues that might be relevant to one's work there (counseling and non-counseling). The recommendation about the extent of this knowledge is unclear within the guidelines. Previous recommendations about learning specific knowledge in a cross-cultural context are present in the counseling profession (Ratts et al., 2015; Sue & Sue, 2013). Although recent books in the counseling profession examine and elaborate on knowledge about counseling practices around the globe (e.g., Hohenshil et al., 2013; Moodley et al., 2013; Poyrazli & Thompson, 2013), items in this section do not focus on the importance of knowing about counseling practices in the specific context. Rather, the focus of the guidelines is more general, about social practices and histories, as well as, general global knowledge (e.g., current global events or major trends). Due to this emphasis, it seems important to be knowledgeable of other characteristics (e.g., general history, social norms) before understanding specific counseling practices within a certain context.

Items within the Skills subcategory of Context-Specific Characteristics emphasize actions involved in transnational work for counselor educators. Many ideas within this

subcategory connect to other ideas in the critical guidelines and also emphasize some level of competence or aptitude in implementing those ideas. For example, in other subcategories the importance of collaboration is present, yet in this section the item about collaboration states “Can work collaboratively with transnational partners.” Therefore, based on these guidelines, one should not only be aware of the importance of collaboration in the transnational context, but one must be able to truly work in a collaborative way. Other counseling researchers have clarified and suggested how to develop these transnational collaborative relationships (Norsworthy et al., 2009; McCabe, 2007; Wand & Heppner, 2009). Nevertheless, due to the dominant theme of collaboration in these guidelines, learning and understanding more about how to develop these collaborative relationships is an important area for future research.

Other ideas present in the Skills subcategory relate to specific actions that are part of transnational work. Items such as “Engages in concrete efforts in work (e.g., projects, meetings, advocacy activities)” or “Is able to work effectively with a translator when necessary” highlight the importance of certain elements of the transnational work that might be overlooked by someone new to this type of professional work.

Numerous items in the Skills subcategory connect to the importance of self-awareness and appropriate actions based on that awareness. For example, the item “Is able to determine the limits of one’s skills and knowledge within a specific context” stresses someone’s ability to determine the relevance of her or his skills. Another item, “Can identify and define the specific nature and scope of one’s transnational work” indicates the ability or skill in being able to describe the extent of one’s work activities

(e.g., How is one expecting to develop research partners in a certain location? Or what does consultation entail with a certain institution or university?). Persistent within counseling literature is the significance of one's actions or skills when engaging in cross-cultural exchanges (Ratts et al., 2015; Sue & Sue, 2013). This theme is affirmed within the results of this study.

Finally, in a similar study to this one, recommendations were made for U.S.-based counselor educators concerning their internationalization efforts in counselor education programs (Ng et al., 2012), but the skills involved with that study have few parallels with this study due to the distinctiveness of each type of activity (i.e., domestic internationalization vs. transnational professional work). Therefore, critical guidelines regarding transnational skills for counselor educators have not been clarified before the current study.

U.S. Counseling Expertise

The final category, U.S. Counseling Expertise, includes items that reference knowledge and skills related to one's expertise in the U.S. counseling profession or U.S. counselor education. Items in this category contain guidelines for knowledge and skills that a counselor educator should have about U.S. counseling and U.S. cultural worldviews when working transnationally. Although the guidelines (n=5) in this category were not numerous compared to other categories, the items highlight the importance of one's U.S. experiences in counselor education and counseling. Especially relevant to consulting or teaching transnational activities, the guidelines in this category place importance on sharing information about the nature or development of the U.S.

counseling profession and counselor education. Many other countries are developing their counseling professions and look toward the U.S. for support and consultation regarding the counseling profession (Gerstein et al. 2009; Hohenshil et al., 2014). It seems logical that the panel developed critical guidelines that support this historical trend of U.S. professional and developmental support of counseling around the globe. The guidelines clarify the specific U.S.-based knowledge and skills that are important when working transnationally.

Nevertheless, many of the guidelines for working transnationally in current literature are focused on the ideas present in the other categories of the crucial guidelines, such as context-specific skills or self-awareness (Gerstein & Ægisdóttir, 2007; Lorelle, Byrd, & Crockett, 2012; Wang & Heppner, 2009). Items in category entitled “U.S. Counseling Expertise” represent important guidelines for counselor educators that have not been extensively discussed in related literature.

Items Where Consensus was Not Reached

There were items about which the expert panel did not reach consensus in Rounds 2 and 3. A total of 12 items either had a median or IQR score that was outside acceptable limits for this study. Items that did not reach consensus were present in all categories. Some of these items referred to one’s interest in or commitment to transnational work. For example, the items “Is interested in working transnationally, in general” and “Has a curiosity about learning other helping or counseling-related practices and knowledge” refer to one’s inherent interest in the type of work one is doing. The panel did not reach

consensus on whether this intrinsic interest was essential for transnational work in counselor education.

Interestingly, the panel also did not come to consensus on the item “Is committed to working transnationally with a specific context or country” but reached consensus on the items about commitment to transnational work in general and the commitment to developing longer-term relationships. This distinction is significant in that panel members agreed on the importance of commitment to relationships, rather than to overall countries, cultures, or contexts. The focus on relationship building in the transnational context is also present and emphasized in counseling literature (Norsworthy, et al., 2009b; Tang et al., 2012; Wang & Heppner, 2009). Other items that did not result in consensus from the panel were in reference to knowledge of context-specific counseling practices and research in the transnational context.

Implications for Counselor Educators

Understanding critical guidelines for counselor educators when working transnationally provides clarity and direction for counselor educators when engaging in this unique type of professional work. This study represents important research about how counselor educators can best participate in transnational work – an emerging phenomenon and trend in counselor education (Tang, et al., 2012). Results of this study can be used to guide or assess current transnational work within the profession, inform counselor educators about important considerations in initiating new types of transnational professional work, as well as inform training and education of future counselor educators who might engage in this type of professional work. Due to the

complexity and diversity of transnational professional work in counselor education, the guidelines clarify and distill the most important elements to consider for ethical and culturally-competent practice when working transnationally. The guidelines, therefore, can be used for assessment, planning, and educational purposes.

Assessment and Evaluation

Already, many counselor educators are involved globally in the profession. From programs like the Mental Health Facilitator (MHF) program through NBCC-I (Hinkle, 2015) to study abroad programs (Santos, 2014), many counselor educators are currently working transnationally as part of their research, teaching, and service. Results from this study can guide individual counselor educators in their self-assessment or self-evaluation of how they are working transnationally. The guidelines' emphasis on self-reflection and awareness seem particularly important for evaluation purposes – especially for those who might already have knowledge and skills to work in a particular context. For example, the Personal Attributes and Attitudes category has the potential to provide a level of accountability for counselor educators in certain areas, such as how they understand their work or their level of commitment to this type of work. Specific guidelines could be used as a “checklist” to ensure that the guidelines are being addressed in specific transnational work activities and relationships. Where there are gaps in an individual counselor educator's knowledge or skills, it might be necessary for the individual to learn more in certain areas (e.g., knowledge about cultural norms related to foreigners) or act in different ways (e.g., consult with local professionals).

The list of critical guidelines has a particular focus on the process of transnational work, not the only outcomes. As an evaluation tool, the guidelines could reorient and refocus the transnational work on observing the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of the work (i.e., how professionals from different countries communicate and work collaboratively). Some of the interpersonally focused items might bring attention to how well one is listening and understanding the transnational partner or, possibly, how well one is preventing exploitation in their work. These intrapersonal items might help raise counselor educators' personal awareness around certain topics, such as readiness for this type of work or cultural biases in a certain context.

Additionally, the critical guidelines emphasize collaboration through many of the categories. For a counselor educator using these guidelines to self-evaluate their transnational professional work, it would be important to assess her or his actions based on transnational partners' evaluation(s) as well. Although this particular idea did not emerge as a critical guideline in this study, it seems like an essential consideration based on overall themes in the guidelines.

Planning

Due to the increase of internationalization and global initiatives within the profession (Ng, 2012; Norsworthy et al., 2009b; Stanard, 2013), many programs or activities are bound to increase within the profession. Initiating these work-related experiences, such as research projects or consultation activities, can be a daunting task, especially because global education and training is, oftentimes, not built into counselor education (Ng et al., 2012). The skills and knowledge-related critical guidelines in this

study can be used as a framework for what a counselor educator might need to learn or practice before engaging in transnational work. For example, has the counselor educator worked with a translator before? Has the counselor educator learned about the specific context in which she or he will be working? Questions like these emerge from the guidelines to effectively plan a transnational work-related activity. Other critical guidelines such as “Can integrate multicultural competencies in a transnational context” seem to take practice and might be better to assess or evaluate these guidelines.

Some of the critical guidelines in this study can serve as indicators for counselor educators about the nature of transnational professional work. For example, some items reference tolerance of ambiguity, the importance of patience, and the need to be flexible. These qualities seem particularly important for those counselor educators contemplating transnational work. Not only do they serve as critical guidelines, but these qualities also indicate some key features necessary for successful and respectful transnational work based on the expert panel in this study.

Some of the critical guidelines seem to highlight and bring distinct attention to the planning phase of transnational work. For instance, one item describes how it is important to assess one’s personal readiness for this type of work. Another item stresses the need to know the scope and nature of one’s work. Yet another guideline mentions that U.S. expertise might not be relevant in the other context. Therefore, some of the guidelines are particularly important during the planning and initial phases of transnational work (e.g., knowledge of scope and nature of the work, awareness that one’s expertise might not be relevant or complete). An important implication of this

study is the importance of many of these critical guidelines for the planning stages of transnational work.

Education

The critical guidelines resulting from this study can serve as educational tools for future counselor educators through formal means, such as masters or doctoral programs, or informal means, such as mentoring or professional development. Due to increased global and internationalization efforts in the profession (Ng et al., 2012), future counselor educators increasingly are likely to be involved in some type of transnational experiences in their professional roles. Other research has provided helpful guidelines for counselor education programs to best internationalize their programs given our globally interconnected and changing educational environment (Marsella & Pedersen, 2004; Ng et al., 2012). The guidelines from this study can serve to supplement these other guidelines. For example, Ng and others' (2012) internationalization checklist for U.S. counselor education programs encourages counselor educators to travel outside the U.S. for a variety of professional reasons, such as researching and study abroad. Findings in this study seem to build on Ng and others' (2012) recommendations by further clarifying how to engage in global work as a counselor educator.

Similar to many of the internationalization guidelines or checklists, it is important to embed global training and education into counselor education. Implications from this study are more directly related to doctoral-level counselor education programs (versus masters-level programs), because doctoral programs serve to train future counselor educators. This study's critical guidelines could help future counselor

educators be more aware about what transnational professional work might look like, what education or development it might require, and the elements of this work that are different than U.S.-based work. Other lists of competencies or best practices seem to serve a similar educational role in doctoral-level counselor education (e.g., Herlihy & Dufrene, 2011; Wester & Borders, 2014). Although not a direct intention of the guidelines, the results of this study could help guide preparation or education of counselors or counselors-in-training about international study abroad or immersion programs – especially due to the prevalence and growth of these programs (Barden & Cashwell, 2013; Santos, 2014).

Additionally, the critical guidelines could help doctoral students and future counselor educators realize the limits of one's formal U.S. counselor education in preparing them for transnational work. Numerous critical guidelines mention the recognition of the limits of using U.S. counseling knowledge and skills outside of the U.S. Other research affirms this limitation (Arnett, 2008; Norsworthy et al, 2009a).

Relevant to the culture and practice of counseling in the U.S., there seem to be many elements of the critical guidelines that align with the core values and principles of the counseling profession. These similarities could help transition the guidelines into meaningful learning within doctoral training. For example, the importance of listening and understanding (i.e., empathy) as well as the recognition the limits of one's own values are foundational to counseling practice. Those ideas also are represented in the list of guidelines. The guidelines could serve as introduction to a discussion on how transnational profession work parallels U.S. counseling practice and, then, note points of

departure for the different activities. In conclusion, there are numerous ways that the critical guidelines from this study could be used in preparing future counselor educators in doctoral training programs for transnational professional work.

Development to Meet Guidelines

Although not a direct focus of this study, it is important to consider the developmental elements involved for those aspiring to meet the critical guidelines set forth by the findings of this study. This study does not outline or operationalize how to meet these guidelines, but one can hypothesize and intuit certain developmental aspects based on the findings. Other researchers have created development models that have parallels with the developmental progression that counselor educators might move through as they aim to meet this study's critical guidelines. For example, the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) has been used to facilitate cultural competency development across numerous educational and professional fields, including mental health (Pernell-Arnold et al., 2012). A core part of the model is a progression from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism, whereby an individual ideally accepts, adapts to, and integrates elements from another culture (rather than being defensive or resistant to other cultures). Training programs for mental health practitioners, like developed by Pernell-Arnold et al. (2012), might have strong applicability and relevance for counselor educators who desire to work transnationally. Within this study's critical guidelines, there is much focus on one's ability to accept and appreciate cultural difference and the openness to a variety of differences (e.g., differences of helping, language, practices). There is also much attention on the

development of self-awareness and reflexivity. Inherent within the DMIS is a holistic approach to cross-cultural competence inclusive of many topics covered in the critical guidelines. It would be important to adapt the DMIS, or other applicable developmental models, to the specific and unique positionalities of U.S.-based counselor educators working with transnational partners.

Additionally, when analyzing the development of counselor educators relative to these critical guidelines, it is important to consider what types of experience facilitate that development. The members of the Delphi panel in this study had a wide diversity of experiences that informed their opinions about transnational work in the profession. One of the guidelines even mentions the importance of a certain type of transnational experience for counselor educators (i.e., immersion experiences). But it remains unclear about exactly what specific experiences help facilitate growth and development to meet these critical guidelines. It seems intuitive to conjecture that the more hands-on experiences integrated into the local community, such as immersion experiences research projects, would prove more valuable as a learning experience. Other counseling literature supports the potential learning and cross-cultural development that can occur through immersion experiences (Barden & Cashwell, 2013). Alternatively, other less integrated or hands-on experiences, such as conference presentations, seem to offer less learning opportunities about the local context due to the limited contact with the community. International conferences presentations seem to be the most common or accessible form of international travel for counselor educators, based on the prevalence with this panel, but comprehensive and in-depth learning might be very limited through these experiences.

Additional research could clarify the specific types of learning experiences that assist counselor educators' development towards the critical guidelines delineated in this study.

Future Research

This study represents an initial investigation into guidelines for U.S.-based counselor educators when transnationally. Although the critical guidelines developed in this study indicate an important first step in critically analyzing transnational work in the profession, it will be important to continue the research in this area in additional ways.

One of the first steps to build on this research study is to further understand the lived experiences of counselor educators working transnationally. As displayed by many guidelines in this study, transnational work in counselor education is very diverse, complex, and dependent on many contextual factors (e.g., people involved, location, nature of the work). Developing a more complete understanding of the features of transnational work from the perspectives of U.S. counselor educators will further clarify this emerging trend in the profession and highlight additional needs in the profession, such as education or research. Guidelines from this study also can serve as a framework for counselor educators to understanding and analyzing their transnational experiences. In current counseling literature, counselor educators have documented their transnational experiences (e.g., Coker & Majuta, 2015; Wang & Heppner, 2009), but there has been no qualitative research on a group of counselor educators about their overall experiences and development through these experiences.

Another important research area to explore is the lived experiences of transnational professional partners of U.S. counselor educators. Many of the guidelines in

this study indicate the inherent risks for other communities and individuals in undertaking transnational work, such as exploitation or imposing values. Therefore, it is essential to more fully understand perspectives of the transnational partners in order to assess factors such as positionality, perceived applicability of U.S. counseling knowledge, or the individual impact of the professional partnership. Various methodologies could be suited for this research goal depending on the research purpose. For example, case study or ethnographic research could provide in-depth analysis of the experiences transnational partners when working with U.S.-based counseling professionals or educators. Interview-based research with a larger sample could highlight and develop themes based on the experiences of those individuals. Potential results from these qualitative studies could have implications on the ethics of transnational partnerships or what makes for effective partnerships. The overall lack of global representation in previous counseling-related research, as noted by Arnett (2008), severely limits the perspectives represented in our research and, therefore, a full understanding of non-U.S. individuals and communities regarding mental health practices and knowledge. It is important to address this gap in future counseling research. Further understanding the experiences of transnational partners of U.S. counseling professionals and educators seems like a helpful starting point.

On a larger scale, it is important to research the impact of various U.S. counseling-related projects in other countries. Researching the community and social impact of these projects, in addition to the partnership itself, could illuminate the overall outcomes of the projects. For example, although NBCC-I's Mental Health Facilitator

program purports to help address contextual and community-based mental health needs (Hinkle, 2015), there has not been comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program on local communities. Other transnational programs, oftentimes, only have limited or anecdotal evidence of effectiveness (e.g., Coker & Majuta, 2015; Leung et al., 2009). Other educational researchers and journalists (e.g., Mills, 2014, Watters, 2010) have noted the negative impacts of U.S. mental health influence in other countries. Therefore, it is imperative to more comprehensively understand the impact of U.S. counseling partnerships on specific transnational communities.

Finally, based on related educational research (Andreotti, 2009), global mental health research (Mills, 2014) and conceptual research in psychology (Danziger, 2009; Staeuble, 2006), there have been many calls to decolonize and decenter mental health from the focus on U.S. knowledge and skills. Many of the critical guidelines in this study have elements of this decolonization, such resistance to exploitative actions, the limits of one's knowledge in other contexts, and the focus on power in privilege in the partnerships. Findings from the current study suggest the importance of clarifying the steps and methods of this decolonization. Although related items in the critical guidelines are helpful concepts, they provide few actionable steps in transnational contexts.

Andreotti (2011) outlined ways to engage in these actionable steps in teacher education, and Mills (2014) proposed what this decolonization might look like regarding psychiatry. Notably, decolonization is relatively new concept in counseling literature (Marsella, 2011). Future research could address such questions as: how might indigenous knowledge and practices be affirmed and amplified given the context of current global

mental health practices and systems of knowledge? How might U.S. professions resist the tendencies to negatively influence or exploit global communities?

In summary, there is much future research potential related to this study. Although, only a few future research possibilities have been outlined in this section, there are numerous other research possibilities in this topic area. The emerging nature of transnational work in counselor education, due to globalization and internationalization, offers much research potential – both domestically and globally.

Limitations

As with any study, there are limitations. One limitation is researcher bias. The researcher has numerous international experiences inclusive of living abroad, studying in other countries, conducting research in other countries and observing counseling in other countries. These experiences inform how the researcher imagines transnational relationships in the counseling profession. The Delphi method was structured in a way that only allowed participants to rate and evaluate core statements, thereby limiting the influence of researcher bias on the results. An additional coder was used to categorize the data to increase trustworthiness.

The second limitation was the size of the expert panel. Rounds 1 and 2 included 9 members, while Round 3 included only 7 members. Recommendations for the Delphi method generally recommend 10 as the minimum threshold for an expert panel (Doughty, 2009). The small size of the panel, despite the heterogeneous nature of the panel, might indicate an absence of additional perspectives necessary to develop consensus on the guidelines that ensure the generalizability to the field of counselor education.

Importantly, another limitation was the nature of the participants in this study. Only U.S.-based counselor educators were used in the expert panel. Excluded from this study were counseling psychology faculty. Although counseling psychology and counselor education have unique professional identities, there are numerous similarities with the two professions' international involvement. Nevertheless, the generalizability of the findings of this study is primarily focused on counselor educators.

Arguably most significant, missing from this panel are experts that do not reside in the U.S. While this decision was made to exclude counseling professionals outside of the U.S. due to the uniqueness of the profession in the U.S. and for feasibility reasons, such as language differences, not including non-U.S. professionals limits the diversity of perspectives included in this study. This limitation presents an important consideration and possibility for future research.

REFERENCES

- A Brief History of Division 52 (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://div52.org/about-us/a-brief-history-of-division-52/>
- A Counselor's View of Italy. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://olhcc.edu/events/docs/Web-Page%20082514-for-Italy-May-2015.pdf>
- ACA Divisions, Regions and Branches (n.d.). Retrieved from: <https://www.counseling.org/about-us/divisions-regions-and-branches>
- ACES Resources. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://www.acesonline.net/resources>
- Ægisdóttir, S., Gerstein, L. H., Leung, S. A., Kwan, K. K., & Lonner, W. J. (2009). Theoretical and methodological issues when studying culture. In L. H. Gerstein, P. P. Heppner, S. Ægisdóttir, S. A. Leung, & K. L. Norsworthy (Eds.), *International handbook of cross-cultural counseling: Cultural assumptions and practices worldwide* (pp. 89-109). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Andreotti, V. (2007). An ethcial engagement with the Other: Gayatri Spivak on education. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practice, 1*, 69-79.
- Andreotti, V., Ahenakew, C., & Cooper, G. (2011). Epistemological pluralism: Challenges for higher education. *AlterNative Journal, 7*, 40-50.
- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist, 63*, 602-614.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffen, H. (2013). *Postcolonial studies: The key concepts* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Astramovich, R. L., & Pehrsson, D.-E. (2009). Advancing counselor education: Fostering international perspectives and open access scholarship. *Journal for International Counselor Education, 1*, 1-6.

- Barden, S. M., & Cashwell, C. S. (2014). International immersion in counselor education: A consensual qualitative research investigation. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 42*, 42-60.
- Bemak, F., & Chung, R. C.-Y. (2015). Critical issues in international group counseling. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 40*, 6-21.
- Brock, A. C. (2006). Introduction. In A. C. Brock (Ed.), *Internationalizing the history of psychology* (pp. 1-15). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Borders, L. D. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Another step in delineating effective supervision. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 68*, 151-162.
- Boyle, D. P., Nackerud, L., & Kilpatrick, A. (1999). The road less traveled: Cross-cultural, international experiential learning. *International Social Work, 42*, 201-214.
- Cantwell, B., & Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalisation and internationalisation in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 7*, 289-306.
- Carnoy, M. (2014). Globalization, educational change, and the national state. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization & education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 21-38). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Clayton, M. J. (1997). Delphi: A technique to harness expert opinion for critical decision tasks in education. *Educational Psychology, 17*, 373-386.
- Coker, A. D., & Majuta, A. R. (2015). Teaching group counseling in Botswana: Two U.S.-trained counselors discuss experiences and share cultural considerations for practice. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 40*, 102-116.
- Counseling Institutes in Argentina and Malawi. (n. d.). NBCC-International. Retrieved from: http://www.nbccinternational.org/What_is_happening/Counseling_Institutes_in_Argentina_and_Malawi
- Cousin, G. (2010). Positioning positionality: The reflexive turn. In M. Savin-Baden & C. H. Major (Eds.), *New approaches to qualitative research: Wisdom and uncertainty* (pp. 9-18). London: Routledge.

- Chung, R. C-Y., Bemak, F., Ortiz, D. P., & Sandoval-Perez, P. A. (2008). Promoting the mental health of immigrants. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86*, 310-317.
- Crowe, M., Inder, M., & Porter, R. (2015). Conducting qualitative research in mental health: Thematic and content analyses. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 49*, 616-623.
- CSI Chapter Directory, (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://www.csi-net.org/search/custom.asp?id=1037>
- Danziger, K. (2006). Universalism and indigenization in the history of modern psychology. In A. C. Brock (Ed.), *Internationalizing the history of psychology* (pp. 208-225). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Draguns, J. G. (2001) Toward a truly international psychology: Beyond English only. *American Psychologist, 11*, 1019-30.
- Draguns, J. G. (2004). From speculation through description toward investigation: A prospective glimpse at cultural research in psychotherapy. In Gielen, U. P., Fish, J. M., & Draguns, J. G. (Eds.), *Handbook of culture, therapy, and healing* (pp. 369-388). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Draguns, J. G. (2013). Counseling and psychotherapy around the world: Current state and future prospects. In R. Moodley, U. P. Gielen, & R. Wu (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy in an international context* (pp. 417-427). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Doughty, E. A. (2009). Investigating adaptive grieving styles: A Delphi study. *Death Studies, 33*, 462-480.
- England, K. V. L. (1994). Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research. *The Professional Geographer, 46*, 80-89.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Walker, E., & Chen, R. (2013). The American faculty in an age of globalization: Predictors of internationalization of research content and professional networks. *Higher Education, 66*, 325-340.
- Fouad, N. A., Gerstein, L. H., Toporek, R. L. (2006). Social justice and counseling psychology in context. In R. L. Toporek, L. H. Gerstein, N. A. Fouad, G. Roysircar, & T. Israel (Eds.), *Handbook for social justice in counseling psychology: Leadership, vision, and action* (pp. 1-16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Gallardo, M. E. (Ed.). (2013). *Developing cultural humility: Embracing race, privilege and power*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Gerstein, L. H., & Ægisdóttir, S. (2007). Training international social change agents: Transcending a U. S. counseling paradigm, *Counselor Education and Supervision, 47*, 123–140.
- Gerstein, L. H., Heppner, P. P., Ægisdóttir, S., Leung, S. A., & Norsworthy, K. L. (2009). Cross-cultural counseling: History, challenges, and rationale. In L. H. Gerstein, P. P. Heppner, S. Ægisdóttir, S. A. Leung, & K. L. Norsworthy (Eds.), *International handbook of cross-cultural counseling: Cultural assumptions and practices worldwide* (pp. 3-32). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Goh, M., Wahl, K. H., McDonald, J. K., Brissett, A. A., & Yoon, E. (2007). Working with immigrant students in schools: The role of school counselors in building cross-cultural bridges. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35*, 66-79.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today, 24*, 105-112.
- Green, M. F., et al. (2012). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses* (2012 ed.). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hasan, N. T., Fouad, N. A., & Williams-Nickelson, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Studying psychology in the United States: Expert guidance for international students*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Herlihy, B., & Dufrene, R. L. (2011). Current and emerging ethical issues in counseling: A Delphi study of expert opinions. *Counseling and Values, 56*, 10-24.
- Hinkle, J. S. (2014). Population-based mental health facilitation (MHF): A grassroots strategy that works. *The Professional Counselor, 4*, 1-18.
- Hohenshil, T. H., & Amundson, N. E. (2011). Publishing international counseling articles. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 89*, 313-317.
- Hohenshil, T. H., Amunson, N. E., & Niles, S. G. (Eds.). (2013). *Counseling around the world: An international handbook*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

- Hurley, E. J., Gerstein, L. H., & Ægisdóttir, S. (2013). Examining internationalization in U.S. counseling psychology training programs. *The Counseling Psychologist, 41*, 724-749.
- Institute of International Education. (2015). (Graph illustration of international students in the U.S.). *Open Doors Fast Facts 2015*. Retrieved from: <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Fast-Facts>
- Jamieson, A. (2012, August 15). Indigenous, Aboriginal or Aborigine? It's not black and white. *Crikey*. Retrieved from: <http://www.crikey.com.au/2012/08/15/indigenous-aboriginal-or-aborigine-its-not-black-and-white/>
- Jones, P. (2000). Globalization and internationalism: Democratic prospects for world education, in Stromquist, N. and Monkman, K. (ed.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 27–42). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kenney, K. R., & Kenney, M. E. (2014). Counseling multiracial individuals and families. In M. J. Ratts & P. B. Pederson (Eds.), *Counseling for multiculturalism and social justice: Integration, theory, and application* (pp. 193-209). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Kenny, M. C., Aluede, O., & McEachern, A. (2009). A comparison of counselling students' needs in the United States and Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 19*, 41-55.
- Killian, K. D. (2001). Differences making a difference: Cross-cultural interactions in supervisor relationships. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 12*, 61–103.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*, 2-31.
- Knight, J., & de Wit., H. (Eds.). (1997). *Internationalization of higher education in Asia Pacific countries*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Kpanake, L., & Ndoeye, O. (2013). Counseling and psychotherapy in francophone West Africa (focus on Senegal): Creating a future vision. In R. Moodley, U. P. Gielen, & R. Wu (Eds.), *Handbook of Counseling and Psychotherapy in an International Context* (pp. 30-39). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kreber, C. (2009). Different perspectives on internationalization in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 118*, 1–14.

- Krippendorff, K. (2013). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, *33*, 159-174.
- Larson, L. M., Ott, M., & Miles, J. M. (2010). International cultural immersion: En vivo reflections in cultural competence. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, *17*, 44-50.
- Lau, J., & Ng, K.-M. (2012). Effectiveness and relevance of training international counseling graduates: A qualitative inquiry. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *34*, 87-105.
- Lee, C. C. (1997). The global future of professional counseling: Collaboration for international social change. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *21*, 279-285.
- Lee, C. C., & Hipolito-Delgado, C. P. (2007). Introduction: Counselors as agents of social justice. In C. C. Lee (Ed.), *Counseling for social justice* (2nd ed., pp. xii-xxviii). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Leung, S. A., Clawson, T., Norsworthy, K. L., Tena, A., Szilagy, A., & Rogers, J. (2009). Internationalization of the counseling profession: An indigenous perspective. In L. H. Gerstein, P. P. Heppner, S. Ægisdóttir, S. A. Leung, & K. L. Norsworthy (Eds.), *International handbook of cross-cultural counseling: Cultural assumptions and practices worldwide* (pp. 111-123). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2003). A proposal for internationalizing counseling psychology in the United States: Rationale, recommendations, and challenges. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*, 381-395.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Lee, S. H. (2006). A cultural accommodation model of psychotherapy: Illustrated with the case of Asian-Americans. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, and Training*, *43*, 410-423.
- Lindsey, E. W. (2005). Study abroad and values development in social work students. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *41*, 229-249.
- Lorelle, S., Byrd, R., & Crockett, S. (2012). Globalization and counseling: Professional Issues for Counselors. *The Professional Counselor: Research and Practice*, *2*, 115-123.

- Marsella, A. J. (1998). Toward a global community psychology: Meeting the needs of a changing world. *American Psychologist*, 53, 1283-1291.
- Marsella, A. J. (2011). Twelve critical issues for mental health professionals working with ethnoculturally diverse populations. *Psychology International*, October 2011. Retrieved from www.apa.org/international/pi/2011/10/critical-issues.aspx
- Marsella, A. J., & Pedersen, P. (2004). Internationalizing the counseling psychology curriculum: Toward new values, competencies, and directions. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, 17, 413-423.
- McCabe, G. H. (2007). The healing path: A culture and community-derived indigenous therapy model. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 44, 148-160.
- Mental Health Facilitator (MHF), (n.d.). Retrieved from: http://www.nbccinternational.org/What_we_do/MHF
- Mills, C. (2014). *Decolonizing Global Mental Health: The Psychiatrization of the Majority World*. London: Routledge.
- Moodley, R., Gielen, U. P., & Wu, R. (2013). Introduction. In R. Moodley, U. P. Gielen, & R. Wu (Eds.), *Handbook of Counseling and Psychotherapy in an International Context* (pp. 1-15). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Moodley, R. Lengyell, M., Wu, R., & Gielen, U. P. (2015). *International Counseling Case Studies Handbook*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Mori, S. (2000). Addressing the mental health concerns of international students. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78, 137-143.
- Nagar R., & Swarr, A. L. (2010). Introduction: Theorizing transnational feminist praxis. In R. Nagar & A. L. Swarr (Eds.), *Critical transnational feminist praxis* (pp.1-18) Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Nassar-McMillian, S. C., Moore III, J. L., Warfield, H. A., & Mayes, R. D. (2013). Global diversity issues in counseling. In T. H. Hohenshil, N. E. Amunson, & S. G. Niles (Eds.), *Counseling Around the World: An International Handbook* (pp. 3-8). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- NBCC International History. (n.d.). Retrieved from: http://www.nbccinternational.org/Who_we_are/Mission_Statement_History

- Ng, K.-N. (2012). Internationalization of the counseling profession and international counseling students: Introduction to the special issue. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 34*, 1-4.
- Ng, K.-M., Choudhuri, D. D., Noonan, B. M., & Ceballos, P. (2012). An internationalization competency checklist for American counseling training programs. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 34*, 19-38.
- Ng, K.-M., & Noonan, B. M. (2012). Internationalization of the counseling profession: Meaning, scope and concerns. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 34*, 5-18.
- Ng, K.-M., & Smith, S. D. (2009). Perception and experiences of international trainees in counseling and related programs. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 34*, 72-86.
- Ng, K.-M., & Smith, S. D. (2012). Training level, acculturation, role ambiguity, and multicultural discussions in training and supervising international counseling students in the United States. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 31*, 57-70.
- Norsworthy, K. L. Heppner, P. P., Ægisdóttir, S., Gerstein, L. H., & Pedersen, P. B. (2009a). Exportation of U.S.-based models of counseling and counseling psychology. In L. H. Gerstein, P. P. Heppner, S. Ægisdóttir, S. A. Leung, & K. L. Norsworthy (Eds.), *International handbook of cross-cultural counseling: Cultural assumptions and practices worldwide* (pp. 69-81). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Norsworthy, K. L., Leung, S. A., Heppner, P. P., & Wang, L. (2009b). Crossing borders in collaboration. In L. H. Gerstein, P. P. Heppner, S. Ægisdóttir, S. A. Leung & K. L. Norsworthy (Eds.), *International handbook of cross-cultural counseling: Counseling assumptions and practices worldwide* (pp. 125-139). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Pan African Network of People with Psychosocial Disabilities. (2011). Announcement 27 October. Retrieved from:
<http://www.globalmentalhealth.org/sites/default/files/docs/PANUSP%20Cape%20Town%20Declaration%2010.2011.pdf>
- Paredes, D. M., Choi, K. M., Dipal, M., Edwards-Joseph A. R. A. C., Ermakov, Gouveia, Jain, S., Koyama, C., Hinkle, J. S., & Benschhoff, J. M. (2008). Globalization: A brief primer for counselors. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 30*, 155-166.

- Parker, I. (1999). *Deconstructing psychotherapy*. London: Sage.
- Pernell-Arnold, A., Finley, L., Sands, R. G., Bourjolly, J., & Stanhope, V. (2012). Training mental health providers in cultural competence: A transformative learning process. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation, 15*, 334-356.
- Pieterse, A. Fang, K., & S. Evans. (2011). Examining the internationalization of counseling psychology scholarship: A content analysis of two US journals. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 33*, 280-292.
- Powell, C. (2003). The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 41*, 376-382.
- Poyrazli, S., & Thompson, C. E. (Eds.). (2013). *International Case Studies in Mental Health*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education, 1*, 248-270.
- Ratts, M. J., & Pedersen, P. B. (2014) *Counseling for multiculturalism and social justice: Integration, theory, and application* (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, J. R. (2015). *Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies*. Retrieved from: http://www.multiculturalcounseling.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=205:amcd-endorses-multicultural-and-social-justice-counseling-competencies&catid=1:latest&Itemid=123
- Remley, Jr., T. P., Bacchini, E., & Krieg, P. (2010). Counseling in Italy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*, 28-32.
- Sandhu, D. S., (2012, August). The internationalization of counseling. *Counseling Today*. Retrieved from: <http://ct.counseling.org/2012/08/the-internationalization-of-counseling/>
- Santos, S. D. (2014). A comprehensive model for developing and evaluating study abroad programs in counselor education. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 36*, 332-347.

- Schweiger, W. K., Henderson, D. A., McCaskill, K., Clawson, T. W., & Collins, D. R. (Eds.). (2013). *Counselor preparation: Programs, faculty, trends* (13th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smith-Augustine, S., Dowden, A., Wiggins, A., & Hall, L. (2014). International immersion in Belize: Fostering counseling students' cultural self-awareness. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *36*, 468-484.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak?. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Staeuble, I. (2006). Psychology in the Eurocentric order of the social sciences: colonial constitution, cultural imperialist expansion, postcolonial critique. In A. C. Brock (Ed.), *Internationalizing the history of psychology* (pp. 183-207). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Stanard, R. P. (2013). International registry of counsellor education programs: CACREP's contribution to the development of counseling as global profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *91*, 55-60.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, *53*, 81-105.
- Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K. (2014). Defining globalization and assessing its implications for knowledge and education, revisited. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization & education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 1-19). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Stone Fish, L. & Busby, D. (1996). The Delphi method. In D. H. Sprenkle & S. M. Moon (Eds.), *Research methods for family therapy* (pp.469-482). New York: Guilford Press.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Hoboken: Wiley.
- Tang, M., Conyne, R., Heppner, P. P., Horne, S., Norsworthy, K., Romano, J. L., Stockton, R., Chung, R. C.-Y., & Merchant, N. (2012). Implications of the international counseling experiences of pioneering U.S. professionals: Considered from an ecological perspective. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *34*, 242-258.

- Thompson, M. (2009). Considering the implication of variations within Delphi research. *Family Practice, 26*, 420-424.
- Tomlinson-Clarke, S. M., & Clarke, D. (2010). Culturally focused community-centered service learning: an international cultural immersion experience. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 38*, 166–175.
- Trinh T. Minh-ha. (1989). *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Turner-Essel, L., & Waehler, C. (2009). Integrating internationalization counseling psychology training programs. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*, 877-901.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2013). Contributions to internationalization to psychology: Toward a global and inclusive discipline. *American Psychologist, 68*, 761-770.
- Wang, L., & Heppner, P. P. (2009). Cross-cultural collaboration: Developing cross-cultural competencies and yuan-fen.. In L. H. Gerstein, P. P. Heppner, S. Ægisdóttir, S. A. Leung & K. L. Norsworthy (Eds.), *International handbook of cross-cultural counseling: Counseling assumptions and practices worldwide* (pp. 141-154). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Watters, E. (2010). *Crazy like us: The globalization of the American psyche*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Wester, K. L., & Borders, D. L. (2014). Research competencies in counseling: A Delphi study. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 92*, 447-458.
- Yakushko, O., Watson, M., & Thompson, S. (2008). Stress and coping in the lives of recent immigrants and refugees: Considerations for counseling. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 30*, 167-178.

APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS

Dear XXXX,

I would like to invite you to participate in a study focused on developing a consensus opinion about guidelines for counselor education faculty in their global or transnational work in the profession. You have been selected for this study because of your visible involvement and notable contributions to the counseling profession related to global topics.

The study will be comprised of a very small group of people, so your input will be highly valuable to this study and the counseling profession. It is my hope that your contributions can positively impact how U.S.-based counselor educators work around the world. I am conducting this study as a part of my IRB-approved dissertation research at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

In this research, there will be three to five rounds of data collection through an online survey tool. The first round will solicit your opinions through open-ended questions about how counselor education faculty can best engage in transnational work. In this study, transnational work refers to activities with other counseling professionals across nations for a specific reason (e.g., collaborative research, teaching, study abroad).

Results of this first round will be used to develop representative statements based on data collected from all participants. Subsequent rounds will involve your rating of each statement on a 1 to 7 Likert scale based on your level of agreement. Opportunities for altering statements or adding new statements will be allowed in the second round. The initial round should take about 30 minutes and the subsequent rounds should take about 15 minutes each. It is expected that the total time for this study should be about 1-1.5 hours.

Participants must meet the following criteria to be eligible to participate:

1. Be employed as faculty member in a counselor education program.
2. Have demonstrated sustained transnational professional work as a counselor educator within multiple professional areas, such as teaching, research, service or consultation.

If you would like to participate in this study, please click on the link below. It will direct you to an online survey tool that includes the informed consent form, a demographic questionnaire and the initial open-ended questions. Within the questionnaire, you will be asked to provide an email so that I can email you with

information about each round with your responses from each round. At the conclusion of the study, your email and demographic data will be removed from the research data.

Thank you for considering participating in this research opportunity.

Sincerely,

Paul H. Smith, MA, ACS, NCC

APPENDIX B

NOMINATION EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS

Dear, XXXX,

I would like to invite you to nominate eligible peers for participation in a study focused on developing a consensus opinion about guidelines for counselor education faculty in their global or transnational work in the profession. I am conducting this study as a part of my IRB-approved dissertation research at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

I am asking if you would be willing to nominate faculty members who you believe are experts about global issues in the counseling profession and meet the criteria of the study. *To nominate an individual, please forward this email to them directly via email.* There is no limit on the number of individuals you can nominate for this study, but nominating an individual does not guarantee their eligibility to participate. The researcher will close the study for participation once the goal number of participants has been reached. Please do not post this email on a public website, social media or listserv.

In this research, there will be three to five rounds of data collection through an online survey tool. The first round will solicit your opinions through open-ended questions about how counselor education faculty can best engage in transnational work. In this study, transnational work refers to interactions with other counseling professionals across nations for a specific reason (e.g., collaborative research, teaching, presenting).

Results of this first round will be used to develop representative statements based on data collected from all participants. Subsequent rounds will involve your rating of each statement on a 1 to 7 Likert scale based on your level of agreement. Opportunities for altering statements or adding new statements will be allowed in the second round. The initial round should take 30 minutes and the subsequent rounds should take 15 minutes each.

Participants must meet the following criteria to be eligible to participate:

1. Be employed as faculty member in a counselor education program.
2. Have demonstrated sustained transnational professional work as a counselor educator within multiple professional areas, such as teaching, research, service or consultation.

If you have been nominated by a peer and would like to participate in this study, please click on the link below. It will direct you to an online survey tool that includes the informed consent form, a demographic questionnaire and the initial open-ended questions. Within the questionnaire, you will be asked to provide an email so that I can email you with information about each round with your responses from each round. At

the conclusion of the study, your email and demographic data will be removed from the research data.

Thank you for considering participating in this research opportunity.

Sincerely,

Paul H. Smith, MA, ACS, NCC

APPENDIX C

ROUND TWO PARTICIPATION REQUEST EMAIL

Dear Participant (Study ID#XXX),

Thank you for participating in Round 1 of the study entitled “Transnational Faculty Work in Counselor Education: A Delphi Study.”

I invite you to continue your participation in Round 2 of this study (using the below link). This round involves the rating of Round 1 representative statements from the group of participants. Attached you will find your own responses to Round 1. This information is sent to you as a reminder of what you included in your responses for Round 1.

As a reminder, if you complete all rounds of this study you will be eligible to be in a drawing for ONE \$250 Delta gift card.

As this round should take only about 10-15 minutes, I encourage you to complete this round by this Saturday, March 26th.

Thank you again for your participation in this study!

Round 2 link: [Click here](#)

Sincerely,
Paul H. Smith, MA, NCC, ACS

APPENDIX D

ROUND THREE PARTICIPATION REQUEST EMAIL

Dear Participant,

Thank you for participating in Round 2 of the study entitled “Transnational Faculty Work in Counselor Education: A Delphi Study.”

I invite you to continue your participation in Round 3 of this study (using the below link). This round involves the rating of only 7 edited or added statements from Round 2 of the study.

Also, the comments in the Round 2 text boxes that were *not* directly related to the adding or editing of an item will be discussed in the results of the study but will not be included for review in this round of the study. Thank you very much for your input - even if it is not present in this round of the study.

As a reminder, if you complete all rounds of this study you will be eligible to be in a drawing for ONE \$250 Delta gift card.

As this round should take only a few minutes, I encourage you to complete this round by this Friday, April 1st.

Thank you again for your participation in this study!

Round 3 link: [Click here](#)

Sincerely,
Paul H. Smith, MA, NCC, ACS

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT THANK YOU EMAIL

Dear Participant,

I want to inform you that the data collection phase has ended for the study entitled "Transnational Faculty Work in Counselor Education: A Delphi Study."

Thank you for your participation in the study for all rounds of data collection. The random drawing for the one \$250 Delta Airlines gift card will be conducted shortly, and the researcher will contact the winner.

Your participation in this study has been greatly appreciated. The researcher plans to present and publish the results of this study to better inform transnational work in counselor education.

Thank you again for your time committed to this important study.

Sincerely,
Paul H. Smith, MA, ACS, NCC

APPENDIX F

ROUND ONE OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Transnational Involvement Questionnaire: Round One

Please respond to the open-ended questions within the provided text boxes.

When responding to these open-ended questions, please think of a U.S.-based counselor educator working with individuals outside of the U.S. for a professional reason related to counselor education. Examples of transnational professional work might include but are not limited to: collaborative research, consultation, teaching or presenting, service, or leading or participating in a study abroad experience. Transnational refers to what many often consider “international,” yet the term emphasizes the idea that people interact *across* countries, not simply *between* them.

- a. What makes a U.S.-based counselor educator well-qualified to engage in transnational professional work?
- b. What specific knowledge and skills should U.S. counselor educators have when engaging in transnational professional work?
- c. What considerations should there be when working transnationally given cultural, social and professional differences?
- d. What do you believe is lacking in transnational professional work related to counselor education?
- e. Oftentimes the U.S. is perceived as the source of counseling knowledge or expertise. How should one account for that reality when working transnationally?
- f. How should one promote equity (i.e., fairness or justice) when working transnationally?
- g. Do critical or best practice guidelines vary based on the nature of the transnational work related to counselor education (e.g., consultation, immersion/study abroad program, research, teaching)? If so, how?
- h. What do you believe is lacking within current transnational working relationships in counselor education?
- i. Do you believe differences exist for counselor educators when developing transnational working relationships within the areas of education, research and practice? If so, please describe those differences.

- j. Related to the topic of transnational working relationships in counselor education, would you like to add any additional comments or ideas that you did not include in the above responses? If so, please add your comments or ideas below.

APPENDIX G

INFORMED CONSENT

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN PARTICIPANT

(To be included at the beginning of each questionnaire)

Project Title: Transnational Faculty Work in Counselor Education: A Delphi Study

Principal Investigator and Faculty Advisors: Paul H. Smith, MA, ACS, NCC; Faculty Advisors: James M. Benshoff, Ph.D. and Laura M. Gonzalez, Ph.D.

What are some general things you should know about research studies?

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your participation in the study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, and without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help people in the future. There may not be any direct benefit to you for being in the research study. There also may be risks to participating in research studies. If you choose not to be in the study or leave the study before it is done, it will not affect your relationship with the researcher or the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Details about this study are discussed in this consent form. It is important that you understand this information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study.

You will be provided with a copy of this consent form. If you have any questions about this study at any time, please contact the researchers named in this consent form. Their contact information is provided below.

What is the study about?

This is a research project. Your participation is voluntary. The purpose of this study is to learn about how counselor education faculty can best engage in transnational work around the globe related to counselor education. In this study, transnational work refers to activities with other counseling professionals across countries for a specific reason (e.g., collaborative research, teaching).

Why are you asking me?

You are a counselor education faculty member, have been involved with international issues within your professional role, and/or were nominated as an expert on international issues in the counseling profession by one of your peers that has been involved with international issues in the counseling profession.

Participants must meet the following criteria to be eligible to participate:

1. Be employed as faculty member in the counseling profession.
2. Have demonstrated sustained transnational professional work as a counselor educator within multiple professional areas, such as teaching, research, service or consultation.

What will you ask me to do if I agree to be in the study?

You will be asked to participate in responding to 3-5 rounds of questionnaires across 4-6 weeks. The first round will take approximately 30 minutes and subsequent rounds will take approximately 15 minutes each. There is the potential of being 3 to 5 rounds based on the nature of participants' consensus. This would require you spending approximately 1-1½ hours total to complete all questionnaires in the 4-6 week time frame.

The first round will solicit your opinions through open-ended questions about how counselor education faculty can best develop transnational relationships with other counseling professionals. Results of this first round will be used to develop representative statements based on data collected from all participants. Rounds two and beyond will involve your rating of each statement on a 1 to 7 Likert scale based on your level of agreement. Opportunities for altering statements or adding new statements will be allowed throughout the rounds. All questionnaires will be sent to you via email and will be able to be completed online.

Is there any audio/video recording?

No audio or video recording will be used in this study.

What are the risks to me?

The Institutional Review Board at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro has determined that participation in this study poses minimal risk to participants.

If you have questions, want more information or have suggestions, please contact Paul H. Smith, MA, ACS, NCC who may be reached at 336-334-3423 (or phsmith2@uncg.edu) or either of the Faculty Advisors, Dr. James Benschhoff (benshoff@uncg.edu) or Dr. Laura Gonzalez (lmgonza2@uncg.edu).

If you have any concerns about your rights, how you are being treated, concerns or complaints about this project, or questions about benefits or risks associated with participating in this study, please contact the Office of Research Integrity at UNCG toll-free at (855) 251-2351.

Are there any benefits to society as a result of me taking part in this research?

Benefits to society may include clarity for counseling faculty when developing transnational relationships in the profession.

Are there any benefits to *me* for taking part in this research study?

There are no direct benefits to participants in this study.

Will I get paid for being in this study? Will it cost me anything?

There are no costs to you for participating in this study. If you complete all rounds of data collection, you will be eligible for a random drawing of one \$250 Delta Airlines gift certificate.

How will you keep my information confidential?

Your privacy will be protected by keeping all questionnaires in the online format. Questionnaire results will be converted into an Excel data file after each of the rounds in order to compile the results for the following questionnaire. Data for the final round will have no identifying information. All of the data files will be stored on the researcher's computer. The computer and the data files will be password protected. The master list of participant names connected with their respective study ID will be kept in password-

protected university cloud storage separate from the other data files.

Additionally to maintain your privacy, your responses will not be attributed to you when reporting the statements to the group of participants. The participants will not know who has edited statements or how each individual participant rated the statements. This anonymity of responding will be maintained when presenting the findings of this study. Confidentiality is not guaranteed since the information is being gathered through an online questionnaire format that must contain an identifying email so that the participant responses after each round can be reported back to the respective participant. In order to maintain confidentiality for the data gathered through the questionnaires, each set of responses will be associated with this email. Email addresses will be removed from the data set and erased from the temporary account within 30 days of the final presentation of the research. Absolute confidentiality of data provided through the Internet cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of Internet access. Please be sure to close your browser when finished so no one will be able to see what you have been doing. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

What if I want to leave the study?

You have the right to refuse to participate or to withdraw at any time, without penalty. If you do withdraw, it will not affect you in any way. If you choose to withdraw, you may request that any of your identifiable data which has been collected be destroyed. The investigators also have the right to stop your participation at any time. This could be because you have had an unexpected reaction, or have failed to follow instructions, or because the entire study has been stopped.

What about new information/changes in the study?

If significant new information relating to the study becomes available which may relate to your willingness to continue to participate, this information will be provided to you.

Voluntary Consent by Participant:

By completing this questionnaire, you are agreeing that you read and you fully understand the contents of this document and willingly consent to take part in this study. All of your questions concerning this study have been answered. Also, by completing this questionnaire, you are agreeing that you are 18 years of age or older and are agreeing to participate in this study as described above to you.

APPENDIX H

ROUND ONE DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please indicate your gender identity: _____
2. Please indicate your age: _____
3. Were you born in the U.S.? Yes or No
 - a. If not, how many years have you lived within the U.S.? _____
4. Please indicate your ethnicity: _____
5. Please indicate your race: _____
6. How many years have you worked as a Counselor Education faculty member?

7. Which of the follow describes your rank as a faculty member?
 - _____ Adjunct Professor
 - _____ Visiting Assistant Professor
 - _____ Assistant Professor
 - _____ Associate Professor
 - _____ Full Professor
 - _____ Other (please specify) _____
8. On a scale from 1-10, how important are international topics or issues to you in your work as faculty member? (1 – not important at all, 10 – extremely important)

9. Have you published a journal article in a peer-reviewed journal related to international counseling issues? Yes or No
 - a. If yes, how many articles? _____
10. Have you published a book or book chapter related to international counseling issues? Yes or No
 - a. If yes, how many book chapters? _____
 - b. If yes, how many books? _____
11. Have you held a leadership position in a counseling organization related to international counseling issues? Yes or No
 - a. If yes, for how many years total? _____
 - b. Please list the organization's name(s). _____
12. Have you traveled outside the U.S. for professional reasons related to your role as a faculty member? Yes or No
 - a. If so, how many times total? _____
 - b. If applicable, how many times primarily for research? _____

- c. If applicable, how many times primarily as a part of a study abroad, service or immersion program? _____
 - d. If applicable, how many times primarily for teaching? _____
 - e. If applicable, how many times primarily for presenting? _____
 - f. If applicable, how many times primarily for consulting? _____
13. Over the past 30 years, about how much total time (in years) have you spent time outside of the U.S. for professional reasons (i.e., related to the field of counseling)? You can use decimal points to designate partial years. For example, 1.5 indicates one and a half years. _____

Please provide your preferred email address so that the researcher can email you the results from this round of data gathering, your responses to this round, and questionnaires for the subsequent of the study.