1

Introduction to Cross-Cultural Psychology

Kenneth D. Keith

In this book we attempt to provide the reader with a wide-ranging introduction to the relation between culture and a number of core subjects in the field of psychology. This aim requires that we begin by defining culture and the intersection between culture and psychology—the discipline we know today as cross-cultural psychology. Although all psychological research takes place in a cultural context, psychological scientists have not always taken account of the influence of culture on psychological processes, or the generalizability of those processes across cultures. This chapter provides a brief overview of these ideas as an introduction to the varied topics that follow in the remainder of the book.

Culture

Many writers, including anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists, have written about culture, providing a variety of definitions and descriptions. Heine (2008) described a two-part definition of culture: (a) information (e.g., beliefs, habits, ideas), learned from others, that is capable of influencing behavior; and (b) a group of people who share context and experience. Matsumoto (2009) offered a comprehensive definition, calling culture

> a unique meaning and information system, shared by a group and transmitted across generations, that allows the group to meet basic needs of survival, by coordinating social behavior to achieve a viable existence, to transmit successful social behaviors, to pursue happiness and well-being, and to derive meaning from life. (p. 5)

Matsumoto's (2009) definition shares key characteristics with that of Triandis, Kurowski, Tecktiel, and Chan (1993), who defined culture in terms of objective and subjective characteristics that increase the odds of survival, provide satisfaction

for people sharing an environmental context, and are shared via language. Objective elements of culture, as identified by Triandis et al., are the tangible objects of culture (architecture, food, manufactured products), whereas subjective culture comprises such human elements as social, economic, political, and religious practices. It is of course the subjective human elements that are of most interest to psychologists. Recently, Cohen (2009) advocated extension of the notion of culture to a variety of constellations of human groups, including religion, socioeconomic status, and region (within a country). Finally, Berry, Poortinga, Segall, and Dasen (2002) perhaps put it most succinctly, when they called culture simply "the shared way of life of a group of people" (p. 2). Common features of virtually all definitions of culture include the notion of *a group with shared behaviors, values, and beliefs that are passed from generation to generation*. Cultures may vary in their complexity (Triandis, 1980); and some embody significant diversity (i.e., are multicultural), with many subcultures (Miller, 2008), while other cultures are much more homogenous, or "tight" (Triandis, 1977).

It is also important to note what culture is *not*. Perhaps most importantly, culture is not synonymous with nationality or race. We need look only at such diverse nations as the United States or the United Kingdom to see that a nation may include many cultural and subcultural groups—thus making almost pointless a discussion of, for example, "the" American culture. And genetic research has suggested that the biological differences among races are relatively superficial, leading to the conclusion that race is largely psychosocially constructed (Mio, Barker-Hackett, & Tumambing, 2006) and, in the words of Segall, Dasen, Berry, and Poortinga (1999) an "illusion" (p. 20). This does not mean, of course, that biology has no role to play. Behavior is a product of the complex interplay among heredity, environment, and individual skills and knowledge; and the field of evolutionary psychology has sought to explain how evolution has led to the development of the human brain and the capacity to learn, giving rise to the knowledge and values that constitute culture (Pinker, 1994). Culture evolved because it contributed to human survival and reproduction (Baumeister, 2005).

Finally, culture can be construed as a characteristic residing *within* the person, and thus related to all the psychological processes associated with the person; or culture can be viewed as *outside* the person, making it more like a research variable or manipulation (e.g., Triandis, 2000). In the following sections we will discuss the implications of these perspectives for research in the field.

Why Cross-Cultural Psychology?

Arnett (2008) asserted that the conclusions of research conducted by American psychologists "are based not on a broad cross-section of humanity but on a small corner of the human population—mainly, persons living in the United States"

(p. 602). In his analysis of six prestigious journals of the American Psychological Association, Arnett found that the large majority of authors were from American universities, and that a similar majority of the research participants were Americans—most of them European Americans (the latter state of affairs prompted Guthrie, 1998, to famously observe, in the title of a book on the role of African American psychologists, that *Even the Rat was White*). Further, in those cases in which the authors reported by Arnett were not affiliated with American institutions, they were predominantly from Western and English-speaking universities. It is not, Arnett argued, scientifically sound to believe that studies focused on 5% of the world's population can be generalized to the whole of humanity. In a follow-up to Arnett's study, Webster, Nichols, and Schember (2009) studied a different (but overlapping) group of journals; although they reported an encouraging trend over a 30-year period, they too found a majority of American researchers in the journals they studied. Similarly, Quinones-Vidal, Lopez-Garcia, Penaranda-Ortega, and Tortosa-Gil (2004) found more than 90% of the studies appearing in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* were North American.

Arnett (2008) attributed the lack of cross-cultural research in American psychology at least in part to a philosophy of science dedicated to identifying universal principles. This approach, Sue (1999) contended, has included a focus on internal validity (demonstration of causal connections) at the expense of external validity (generalizability). However, LoSchiavo and Shatz (2009) saw the problem in a different light, acknowledging the lack of cultural diversity in psychological research, but arguing that many American psychologists simply do not have convenient, affordable access to international samples. Nevertheless, North American psychology has been limited in its scope, and American psychologists have tended to treat their findings as if they were universal truths, even when researchers did not test findings in diverse cultures. Psychologists interested in culture, however, have sought to move from assumptions about universal principles to empirical testing across cultures (Heine & Norenzayan, 2006). Whatever the reasons, these concerns about the need to understand the role of culture in psychology are significant, and they extend to the challenges of teaching in psychology as well (e.g., Bronstein & Quina, 1988; Goldstein, 1995; Hill, 2002).

Teaching About Culture: How Have Our Textbooks Changed?

My first experience as a teacher came more than four decades ago when, as a beginning graduate student, I taught introductory psychology. I can still remember the excitement I felt when the department chair offered me the job, and the passion with which I undertook to prepare and present the class. I chose one of the mainstream textbooks of that time (Morgan & King, 1966) and went to work.

When I compare that textbook to those of today, there are many superficial differences. The book was printed on a kind of off-white paper, and all but three of more than 800 pages were printed in black, white, or shades of gray; the only exceptions were illustrations of the color spectrum, the function of cones, and negative afterimages. Strangely, a color wheel illustrating the complementarity of colors actually appeared in black, white, and gray, with pure red portrayed as black!

Today's introductory psychology textbooks are, of course, filled with four-color illustrations, color photographs, and a variety of colorful computer-generated images. But these are only differences of style. The important question we should ask is this: To what extent has the content of the psychology we teach changed over the years? And, more specifically, are we teaching a more inclusive psychology than that of a few decades ago, or a century or more ago? In the context of these questions, we will review some developments in the field as we have attempted to encompass the role of culture in our understanding of psychological concepts and phenomena.

My 1960s textbook (Morgan & King, 1966) had a very brief (three-paragraph) section on cultural influences on personality, and little more than a page on intelligence differences associated with culture—in this case rural vs. urban and "Negroes" vs. Whites. Today, of course, we know that race cannot be equated with culture, and to their credit, Morgan and King concluded that "We are not required to make decisions about groups; instead, the problem is to make decisions about individuals" (p. 441). Nevertheless, in the realm of personality and intelligence, culture got little attention. Elsewhere, in a chapter on social influences, Morgan and King devoted about four pages to a discussion of culture; they defined culture, similarly to today's researchers, in terms of groups sharing behaviors, attitudes, and values. Anthropology rose to the fore in their treatment of culture, with the observation that most such work had been done with cultures deemed "primitive" or "backward" (p. 567). Except for brief references to American culture, the focus was on work in cultural anthropology, including that of Margaret Mead (1935).

Despite mention of cultural differences and the potential for international conflict and communication failure as a result of differential cultural experience, Morgan and King cited few examples in accounting for such differences. The emphasis was on differences involving Native Americans, Samoans, and "primitive" cultures of New Guinea. Within the U.S., Morgan and King noted a couple of rather isolated religious sects, but did not discuss the notion of cultural diversity. Although not using the word "ethnocentrism" (see chapter 2 in this volume), Morgan and King did acknowledge the tendency for people to take for granted the stereotypes and attitudes that characterize their own culture. Nevertheless, the book's index contained only seven entries for "culture" or "cultural," all referring to the personality, intelligence, or social sections of the book. The Morgan and King treatment of culture was typical for the era, and perhaps more comprehensive

than some other textbooks of the time. It was certainly more comprehensive than earlier general psychology books. Ladd (1894), for example, made no reference to the concept of culture, and William James (1892/1961) did not mention culture in his widely used *Psychology: The briefer course*.

We might logically ask whether introductory or general psychology books of the twenty-first century are more likely to acknowledge the role of culture than these earlier authors. Happily, the answer is yes. For example, typical introductory books of today (e.g., Bernstein, Penner, Clarke-Stewart, & Roy, 2008; Myers, 2007; Weiten, 2008) may include 30 to 50 index entries dealing with culture, and the books integrate the concept of culture in such mainstream sections as abnormality, achievement motivation, alcohol, altered states, attachment, attitudes, attractiveness, attribution, cognitive development, communication, gender roles, parenting, perception, personality, prejudice, self-esteem, sleep, temperament, testing, and more. Clearly, coverage of culture in the teaching of psychology has come a long way, not only since the 1960s, but also since the 1980s, when Cole (1984) acknowledged the presence of international psychology in the American curriculum, but nevertheless lamented that "cross-cultural work is ghettoized" (p. 1000), leaving students with little knowledge of the psychological characteristics of other cultures.

Today, many student readers may know that people around the world recognize basic emotional expressions, and that cultural display rules regulate these expressions; that there is a complex interplay among genetics, culture, and intelligence; that North American methods of IQ assessment are culturally limited; or that cultural experience with two-dimensional depictions of three-dimensional objects influences recognition and interpretation of photographs or drawings. Students may also know that one person's schizophrenia may be another's vision, or that cultural sensitivity is essential to successful therapy. We are beginning to see recognition of the integral role that culture plays in the ways that psychological principles play out across cultures. But, as always in the evolution of our knowledge and our science, there is plenty of room for improvement, and the field remains haunted by the findings and views of such writers as Arnett (2008) and Sue (1999) about its cultural limitations.

Cross-Cultural Psychology: What It is and Where It Has Come From

The field of cross-cultural psychology finds itself today in somewhat the same position as the discipline of psychology soon after the turn of the twentieth century, when Hermann Ebbinghaus (1908/1973) observed that "psychology has a long past, yet its real history is short" (p. 3). Just as there was widespread interest in the subjects we now call psychology long before the field was given a name, so it

was that many writers were interested in culture and cultural relationships long before the modern concern with the connection between culture and psychology.

Some reports are ancient; thus, as early as five centuries BCE, Hecateaus of Miletus proposed division of the world into Asia and Europe, and observed that "the traditions of the Greeks seem to me many and ridiculous" (Durant, 1939, p. 140). Herodutus, at about the same time, looked down upon those who did not speak Greek or live in Greek city states (Klineberg, 1980). Other reports, often taken as the beginning point for cross-cultural psychology, date from the early twentieth century. W. H. R. Rivers (1905), for example, conducted research comparing visual perception across cultures, and W. G. Sumner (1906), in his study of various cultures, coined the term *ethnocentrism* to denote the tendency of people to elevate their own cultures and to denigrate the cultures of others. At about the same time, Wilhelm Wundt (1916) was engaged in developing his multi-volume folk psychology. Subsequently, although a variety of anecdotal reports appeared, several decades passed before an explosion of cross-cultural work appeared early in the second half of the twentieth century (Lonner, 1974). And cross-cultural psychologists have had major influence in the past two decades (Matsumoto & Juang, 2008) as cross-cultural research has proliferated. For example, a recent PsychINFO© search using "cross-cultural psychology" as the subject returned 1,823 titles published from 1915 to 2009; a similar search for "cultural psychology" produced 1,966 titles. The development of the field has not, however, always progressed smoothly and without the emergence of divergent points of view. Chief among these have been the perspectives known as *cross-cultural psychology, cultural psychology*, and *indigenous psychology*.

Cross-cultural psychology

Kagitçibaşi and Berry (1989) defined cross-cultural psychology as the "study of similarities and differences in individual psychological and social functioning in various cultures and ethnic groups" (p. 494). Cross-cultural psychologists originally set out to seek universal principles that would apply across cultures (Sinha, 2002). Thus, cross-cultural psychology traditionally involved testing Western theories in other cultures (Laungani, 2002; Yang, 2000), with the notion that culture was independent of the individual and separable from psychological activities and principles (Greenfield, 2000). Cross-cultural psychologists often collect data across multiple cultures, comparing and contrasting effects in an effort to produce knowledge about phenomena that are universal and those that are culture-specific (Triandis, 2000), and attempting to determine how different cultures influence behavior (Brislin, 2000).

Cross-cultural psychologists have conducted much of their research using the research designs and methods of mainstream Western psychology. Although this may allow for the possibility of identification of psychological universals, the

cross-cultural approach has received criticism on several fronts. For example, the use of culture as an independent variable, and the associated failure to identify specific aspects of culture that may influence dependent measures, has long been a problem (Lonner, 1974), resulting in flawed conclusions about the causal role of cultural attributes (Ratner & Hui, 2003).

Further, studies have sometimes employed research materials (e.g., tests, apparatus, stimulus arrays) that are unfamiliar or ecologically invalid for people in some cultures (Ratner & Hui, 2003), with the result that conclusions or comparisons may be meaningless. For instance, if we make assumptions about the individualistic or collectivistic (IC) nature of cultures, and then attribute other observed differences between the cultures to our assumptions about the IC dimension, we may go wrong in at least two possible ways: First, the assumptions of individualism and collectivism (if not measured in individual research participants) may be erroneous; and second, reliance on differences in this single cultural dimension as an explanation for differences in outcome measures may mask other, more precise explanatory possibilities. Malpass (1977) summarized the fundamental problem of cultural comparisons in this way:

> No matter what attribute of culture the investigator prefers to focus upon or to interpret as the causative variable, any other variable correlated with the alleged causative variable could potentially serve in an alternative explanation of a mean difference between two or more local populations. (p. 1071)

Clearly, exploring underlying psychological mechanisms in cross-cultural research will be essential to understanding the role of multiple variables (Matsumoto & Yoo, 2006).

Cultural psychology

Researchers identified as cultural psychologists are less likely than cross-cultural psychologists to be interested in traditional experimental or quasi-experimental approaches, and more likely to see culture as internal to the person (Triandis, 2000). Cultural psychology uses methods and studies problems arising from the everyday activities of particular cultures, with less emphasis on cross-cultural comparison (Greenfield, 2000). Therefore, the methods of cultural psychologists are often ethnographic in nature—meaning they involve extensive observation and rich description of a culture (Heine, 2008). The focus is on finding relationships between a culture and the psychological characteristics of people living in the culture, with the corresponding view that psychological processes derive from the interplay between the person and his or her culture (Shiraev & Levy, 2010).

Cultural psychologists tend to study cultures quite different from their own, are interested in natural (non-contrived) settings and situations, and focus on context

(i.e., they are less likely to be interested in psychological principles independent of the context in which they arise) (Triandis, 2000). According to Ratner (2006), in a discussion of cultural psychology, aspects of culture provide the foundations and predictors of psychological processes more effectively than do personal factors. Thus, some writers (e.g., Yang, 2000) have characterized cultural psychology as a hybrid of psychology and anthropology that prefers to define psychology in terms of context-bound concepts. Cultural psychology sees culture as essential to understanding all psychological processes, and is interested in principles derived from culture, rather than imposed upon it (Segall, Lonner, & Berry, 1998).

Indigenous psychologies

Arising as a reaction to so-called mainstream psychology, indigenous psychology represents the efforts of researchers in many (mainly non-Western) cultures to develop a "science that more closely reflects their own social and cultural premises" (Allwood & Berry, 2006, p. 244). Indigenous psychologies are ways of thinking psychologically that grow out of individual cultures, developing scientific perspectives consistent with the cultural realities of the particular settings (Berry et al., 2002). One consequence of the development of indigenous psychologies has been a movement from investigation of psychological universals to study of culture as a psychological system (Sinha, 2002).

The focus of indigenous psychologies, unlike the comparative focus of cross-cultural psychology and the anthropological tendencies of cultural psychology, revolves around psychological understandings built upon their own unique cultural resources (Allwood & Berry, 2006). Further, indigenous psychologists are interested in studying the particular problems and challenges (e.g., economy, poverty, religion) of their particular cultures. This emphasis on the primary role of culture leads to a specificity that results in a focus on cultural differences and unique aspects of societies, rather than cross-cultural similarities or universal principles (Poortinga, 2005). However, the question remains whether indigenous psychologies will contribute to a broader understanding of global psychology.

Is there a common ground?

Although the perspective known as cross-cultural psychology has received criticism for placing more emphasis on scientific methodology than on understanding of culture (Laungani, 2002), cross-cultural psychologists have, in recent years, become more sensitive to the need to examine both universal and culture-specific phenomena (e.g., Triandis, 1999). And all of the approaches noted above—cross-cultural, cultural, and indigenous psychologies—have made significant contributions to the so-called cultural revolution in psychology (Ng & Liu, 2000; Yang, 2000).

Despite the limitations various writers have noted in mainstream scientific psychology, it seems unlikely that cultural approaches will unseat the powerful scientific findings of traditional psychology (Ng & Liu, 2000). However, it is also true that the past several decades have seen a dramatic increase in the development of psychological research and theory placing culture in a central position (Segall et al., 1998). Researchers investigating the relationship between culture and psychology have shown the role of culture as a significant influence in many traditional fields of psychological study (e.g., perception, cognition, social behavior, development, education), leading to the conclusion that "Nothing transpires in a cultural vacuum" (Lehman, Chiu, & Schaller, 2004, p. 704).

In an effort to articulate the importance of cross-cultural research, Kim (2007) proposed four perspectives that might be found among researchers:

1   the "pre-encounter research" culture: "I'm not interested,"
2   the "initial encounter" research culture: "Culture is a nuisance,"
3   the "Captain Cook" research culture: "Let's explore and compare," and
4   the "paradigm shift" research culture: "Beyond ethnocentric paradigms" (p. 280).

Kim's point is that researchers must recognize their own worldviews and the influence of worldview on their work—and that reaching the highest level in his hierarchy requires intercultural sensitivity and a willingness to reconsider one's worldview. Such a true paradigm shift would seem to suggest the integration of traditional scientific psychology with a broadened understanding of and sensitivity to, the importance of cultural context.

In a somewhat similar, but more specific, vein, Matsumoto and Yoo (2006) posited the need for an ongoing evolution in cross-cultural research. The field has moved, they suggested, through cross-cultural comparisons, identification of meaningful cultural dimensions, and cultural studies exploring the role of psychological constructs and variables in differing cultural contexts. Now, Matsumoto and Yoo argued, the field must evolve to develop research empirically investigating specific psychological variables or characteristics and their role in producing cultural differences. This approach would move the field from the tendency to assume global-level cultural characteristics (often stereotypically) to measurement of specific influences at the level of individual research participants. One example would be the design of "unpackaging" studies—the identification and incorporation of context variables (e.g., opinions, norms, values, attitudes) to replace broader cultural notions in explanation of cultural phenomena and differences (Matsumoto & Yoo, 2006).

It seems clear that in the future, cross-cultural studies will continue to move toward better understanding of psychological processes involved in cultural differences and of the basis of psychological processes (e.g., behavior) in culture (Lehman et al., 2004). In the chapters to follow, we will review a wide variety of theory and research, representing cross-cultural, cultural, and indigenous approaches. Our effort will be not to make distinctions among these perspectives,

but to achieve a broad current understanding of key aspects of the field. We will thus use the term *cross-cultural psychology* inclusively, to denote the full range of interest in the relationship between culture and psychology.

Some Basic Principles

A few organizing assumptions may help us to conceptualize the content of coming chapters as this volume's authors present a variety of perspectives and areas of research in cross-cultural psychology. These include the following (Keith, 2008):

1 People view and evaluate other cultures from the perspective of their own.
2 Some psychological principles are universal, and some are culture-specific.
3 Several key cultural dimensions aid our understanding and study of cross-cultural phenomena.
4 Despite the many cultural differences identified by cross-cultural researchers, people in various cultures share more commonalities than differences.

Seeing other cultures in light of our own

It has been more than a century since Sumner (1906) gave a name to the phenomenon of *ethnocentrism*. Ethnocentrism is the tendency for humans to hold up their own group or culture as a standard, seeing it as superior to others (Berry et al., 2002). We may be suspicious of individuals from other groups (Price & Crapo, 2002), and ethnocentrism may lead to conflict with, and stereotyped views of, other groups (Triandis, 1994). Ethnocentrism is probably universal (LeVine & Campbell, 1972), and may be a natural result of the enculturation that children experience as they are socialized in the customs, practices, and ways of behaving that characterize their cultures.

Although ethnocentrism may well be inevitable, people can learn to become more flexible (Matsumoto & Juang, 2008). Nevertheless, ethnocentrism reflects a limited worldview that develops without individual intention or awareness.

Etics and emics

Cross-cultural researchers have long sought universal behavioral principles—psychological phenomena that are true or valid across cultures—while at the same time realizing that many psychological findings are significantly influenced or limited by their specific cultural context. Deriving from the writings of Pike (1967), the terms *etic* and *emic* have evolved from linguistic usage to describe these two

eventualities. Thus, the term *phonetic* has given rise to *etic* (a universal), in recognition of the fact that phonetics exist in all languages; *phonemics*, on the other hand, are sounds that distinguish languages from one another, leading to the use of *emic* as a term to denote a culture-limited phenomenon (Triandis, 1994). For example, nearly every culture might recognize and value intelligence (an etic), but differ widely in the specific aspects of intelligence (e.g., type or speed of problem solving; Keith, 1996) that are considered important (an emic). Or aggression may be of interest in many cultures, but may play out quite differently across different cultures.

Etic and emic can also characterize *approaches* to cultural research (Berry, 1969; Berry et al., 2002). An emic approach involves the study of a particular culture, usually from within, from the perspective of the members of the culture (i.e., indigenous psychology). Alternatively, an etic approach is likely to investigate one or more characteristics of multiple cultures, often from the outside (i.e., traditional cross-cultural psychology) and imposing external measurement (Price-Williams, 1975). Put another way, the etic approach looks for cross-cultural commonalities, while the emic approach searches for meaningful concepts within a specific culture. Although psychologists are often in search of universals, a danger of the etic approach is that researchers, as products of their own cultural experience, may be tempted to impose their own biases and expectations on other cultures and as a result lose the opportunity for meaningful comparison (Segall et al., 1999).

Dimensions of culture

As investigators have explored psychological similarities and differences occurring across cultures, they have identified a number of key dimensions that have proven useful in understanding cultural influences. The best known of these dimensions are those identified by Hofstede (1980; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004): (a) individualism-collectivism (IC); (b) power distance (PD); (c) uncertainty avoidance (UA); (d) masculinity-femininity (MA); and (e) long-term orientation (LTO).

These dimensions can be summarized in the following way: IC is the extent to which the individual feels free from group pressure, or to which the individual's goals are similar to or different from the group's; PD reflects the degree to which group members accept an unequal distribution of power, or the difference in power between more or less powerful members of the group; UA is the degree to which a group develops processes to reduce uncertainty and ambiguity, or to deal with risk and unfamiliarity in everyday life; MA is the extent to which gender roles and distinctions are traditional, and masculine (e.g., aggression) or feminine (e.g., cooperation) traits are viewed favorably; and LTO suggests the level of willingness of members of the culture to forego short-term rewards in the interest of long-term goals (Brislin, 2000; Gannon, 2001).

Although researchers have of course studied all these dimensions, investigators have most often invoked IC in the study of cultural differences and similarities, and

we will use IC here as an indicator of some of the characteristic findings and challenges that have emerged in the literature. Despite criticism that IC (as well as the other dimensions) lacks explanatory power to further our understanding of the psychology of cultures (Ratner & Hui, 2003), many studies have produced descriptions of cross-cultural similarities and differences on the IC dimension, and investigators have conducted many comparisons of cultural characteristics associated with individualism and collectivism. Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier (2002), for example, carried out meta-analyses of more than 80 studies conducted both within the U.S. and across many other cultures. Although they found general support for the widely held notion that European Americans tend to be more individualistic and less collectivistic than many other groups, Oyserman et al. criticized the common practice of researchers "to accept any cross-national difference as evidence of IND-COL processes" (p. 44). The latter observation is consistent with the earlier concern of Segall et al. (1999) that IC is an "overused dichotomy" (p. 217).

One way to attempt to avoid over-generalizations about the IC characteristics of cultures is to measure individualism and collectivism at the level of individual research participants. Triandis (1995; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988) termed the individual-level occurrence of collectivism *allocentrism* and individual-level individualism *idiocentrism*, and a number of researchers (e.g., Alavi & McCormick, 2007; Matsumoto, Weissman, Preston, Brown, & Kupperbusch, 1997) have developed procedures intended to make individual-level IC measurements. Their review of scales measuring individual IC allowed Oyserman et al. (2002) to identify psychological domains typically associated with individualism (independence, goal orientation, competition, uniqueness, privacy, self-knowledge, and directness of communication) or with collectivism (relationship to group, belonging, duty, group harmony, advice from others, importance of social context, hierarchy/status, and preference for group work). Such individual measurement of cultural dimensions allows researchers not only to avoid the tendency to stereotype whole cultures (e.g., Matsumoto, 2002), but also to attempt to account for such occurrences as the existence of idiocentric people in collectivist cultures and allocentric people in individualist cultures.

Despite the concerns about over-generalizing the role of cultural dimensions, Triandis et al. (1988) identified some key differences between collectivist and individualist cultures:

1   People in individualist cultures tend to have more in-groups.
2   Collectivist cultures encourage significant vertical relationships (e.g., parent–child, supervisor–worker), while horizontal relationships (e.g., co-workers, spouses, friends) are more important in individualist cultures.
3   People in individualist cultures may be able to easily make friends, but many may be only acquaintances; collectivist people may be less skillful in making friends, but their friendships are likely to be intimate and long-lasting.
4   In-groups in individualist cultures may provide more rights and fewer obligations, but less security and support than those of collectivist cultures.

5 Collectivist cultures enable more stable in-group relationships, while individualists are more likely to leave an in-group that makes excessive demands.
6 For collectivist cultures, cooperation levels are high within in-groups, and lower with out-groups.

These IC characteristics are consistent with the notion that individualism suggests an independent, decontextualized orientation, in contrast to the contextualized, situation-based, detail-focused orientation of collectivism (Oyserman et al., 2002).

Although the IC dimension has produced a large body of fascinating cultural research, a wide range of other cultural dimensions exists. These dimensions include not only those that Hofstede and Hofstede (2004) have identified, but numerous others as well (Matsumoto & Yoo, 2006), including level of complexity and tightness (number of rules and norms) (Triandis, 1999). Although researchers have certainly studied some of these other dimensions, additional work to increase our understanding of more cultural beliefs, attitudes, and values will no doubt expand not only the available cultural knowledge, but our ability to explain cultural differences and similarities, as well.

Cultural commonalities

Although cultures may vary widely, they all share a common need to solve similar human problems, such as those associated with health, safety, reproduction, and, ultimately, survival (Matsumoto, 2006). Further, as some writers have argued, culture is not limited only to humans; other species, including chimpanzees, may well possess culture too, with some similarities to that of humans (Kendal, 2008). However, despite commonalities, much cross-cultural research in psychology has focused on identifying and describing the differences between cultures. Many of the studies describing psychological differences have done so without clear attempts to explain potential cultural foundations or causes for the differences (Ratner & Hui, 2003). Unfortunately, even in the absence of clear cultural explanations, researchers have sometimes drawn conclusions about presumed causes of differences, often in terms of dimensions like IC, even when groups also differ in other obvious ways (e.g., Segall et al., 1999).

In fact, even when studies show differences between cultures, statistically significant differences may lack practical significance, and consideration of effect sizes (in lieu of simply reporting *p* values) may result in very different perspectives on such differences (Matsumoto, Grissom, & Dinnel, 2001). And, as world cultures continue to become more intermingled and globalized, our perceptions of the differences and similarities among them may well change (Shiraev & Levy, 2010). In the future, it will be important for researchers to bring together the idiosyncratic findings of local and regional (indigenous) psychologies and a true global (cross-cultural) psychology (Poortinga, 2005).

Conclusion

In a world with far too much conflict, anger, and violence, increased understanding of culture—our own as well as others'—is perhaps the most pressing need for psychological science. Cross-cultural psychology promises to aid understanding of our differences and clarification of our similarities; but understanding will come only on the strength of sound methodology and accurate data. In the chapters that follow, we will see a variety of approaches to development of methods and knowledge that help to develop that understanding.

Psychological knowledge of culture has improved substantially since the early work of Rivers (1905) and Sumner (1906). And we have much more to offer students than Morgan and King (1966) did when I used their introductory psychology textbook. Cross-cultural psychology is an accepted field of study, one that continues to advance toward the dual aims of meeting the rigorous standards of good science and building a level of credibility that will make it acceptable in the unique contexts of the cultures of the world. An important result will be the ability to think differently about ourselves and others.

References

Alavi, S. B., & McCormick, J. (2007). Measurement of vertical and horizontal idiocentrism and allocentrism in small groups. *Small Group Research, 38*, 556–564.

Allwood, C. M., & Berry, J. W. (2006). Origins and development of indigenous psychologies: An international analysis. *International Journal of Psychology, 41*, 243–268.

Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist, 63*, 602–614.

Baumeister, R. F. (2005). *The cultural animal: Human nature, meaning, and social life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bernstein, D. A., Penner, L. A., Clarke-Stewart, A., & Roy, E. J. (2008). *Psychology* (8th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Berry, J. W. (1969). On cross-cultural comparability. *International Journal of Psychology, 4*, 119–128.

Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (2002). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brislin, R. (2000). *Understanding culture's influence on behavior* (2nd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

Bronstein, P., & Quina, K. (Eds.) (1988). *Teaching a psychology of people: Resources for gender and sociocultural awareness*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many forms of culture. *American Psychologist, 64*, 194–204.

Cole, M. (1984). The world beyond our borders: What might our students need to know about it? *American Psychologist, 39*, 998–1005.

Durant, W. (1939). *The story of civilization: Part II. The life of Greece*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ebbinghaus, H. (1908/1973). *Psychology: An elementary text-book*. New York: Arno Press.

Gannon, M. J. (2001). *Understanding global cultures: Metaphorical journeys through 23 nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Goldstein, S. B. (1995). Cross-cultural psychology as a curriculum transformation resource. *Teaching of Psychology, 22*, 228–232.

Greenfield, P. M. (2000). Three approaches to the psychology of culture: Where do they come from? Where can they go? *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 3*, 223–240.

Guthrie, R. V. (1998). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Heine, S. J. (2008). *Cultural psychology*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2006). Toward a psychological science for a cultural species. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*, 251–269.

Hill, G. W., IV (2002). Incorporating cross-cultural perspectives into the psychology curriculum: Challenges and strategies. In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (pp. 431–443). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G.-J. (2004). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

James, W. (1892/1961). *Psychology: The briefer course*. New York: Harper & Row.

Kagitçibaşi, Ç., & Berry, J. W. (1989). Cross-cultural psychology: Current research and trends. *Annual Review of Psychology, 40*, 493–531.

Keith, K. D. (1996). Measuring quality of life across cultures: Issues and challenges. In R. L. Schalock (Ed.), *Quality of life: Vol. I. Conceptualization and measurement* (pp. 73–82). Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Retardation.

Keith, K. D. (2008). Cross-cultural psychology and research. In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *21st century psychology: A reference handbook. Vol. 2* (pp. 483–490). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Kendal, R. L. (2008). Animal "culture wars." *The Psychologist, 21*, 312–315.

Kim, M.-S. (2007). The four cultures of cultural research. *Communication Monographs, 74*, 279–285.

Klineberg, O. (1980). Historical perspectives: Cross-cultural psychology before 1960. In H. C. Triandis & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 1, Perspectives* (pp. 31–67). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Ladd, G. T. (1894). *Primer of psychology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Laungani, P. (2002). Cross-cultural psychology: A handmaiden to mainstream Western psychology. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 15*, 385–397.

Lehman, D. R., Chiu, C.-Y., & Schaller, M. (2004). Psychology and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 689–714.

Levine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior*. New York: Wiley.

Lonner, W. J. (1974, April). *The past, present, and future of cross-cultural psychology*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Western Psychological Association, San Francisco.

LoSchiavo, F. M., & Shatz, M. A. (2009). Reaching the neglected 95%. *American Psychologist, 64, 565–566.*

Malpass, R. S. (1977). Theory and method in cross-cultural psychology. *American Psychologist, 32,* 1069–1079.

Matsumoto, D. (2002). *The new Japan: Debunking seven cultural stereotypes.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Matsumoto, D. (2006, October). *Culture and psychology: Best practices and challenges in teaching international perspectives.* Paper presented at the conference on Reaching Out: Best Practices in Teaching Diversity & International Perspectives Across the Psychology Curriculum, Atlanta, GA.

Matsumoto, D. (2009). Teaching about culture. In R. A. R. Gurung & L. R. Prieto (Eds.), *Getting culture: Incorporating diversity across the curriculum* (pp. 3–10). New York: Stylus.

Matsumoto, D., Grissom, R. J., & Dinnel, D. L. (2001). Do between-culture differences really mean that people are different? A look at some measures of cultural effect size. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32,* 478–490.

Matsumoto, D., & Juang, L. (2008). *Culture and psychology* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Matsumoto, D., Weissman, M. D., Preston, K., Brown, B. R., & Kupperbusch, C. (1997). Context-specific measurement of individualism-collectivism on the individual level: The individualism-collectivism interpersonal assessment inventory. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28,* 743–767.

Matsumoto, D., & Yoo, S. H. (2006). Toward a new generation of cross-cultural research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1,* 234–250.

Mead, M. (1935). *Sex and temperament.* New York: Morrow.

Miller, R. L., (2008). Community psychology. In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *21st century psychology: A reference handbook* (pp. 395–405). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mio, J. S., Barker-Hackett, L., & Tumambing, J. (2006). *Multicultural psychology: Understanding our diverse communities.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Morgan, C. T., & King, R. A. (1966). *Introduction to psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Myers, D. G. (2007). *Psychology* (8th ed.). New York: Worth.

Ng, S. H., & Liu, J. H. (2000). Cultural revolution in psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 3,* 289–293.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128,* 3–72.

Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior* (2nd ed.). The Hague: Mouton.

Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct: How the mind creates language.* New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Poortinga, Y. H. (2005). The globalization of indigenous psychologies. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 8,* 65–74.

Price, W. F., & Crapo, R. H. (2002). *Cross-cultural perspectives in introductory psychology* (4th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth.

Price-Williams, D. R. (1975). *Explorations in cross-cultural psychology.* San Francisco: Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc.

Quinones-Vidal, E., Lopez-Garcia, J. J., Penaranda-Ortega, M., & Tortosa-Gil, F. (2004). The nature of social and personality psychology as reflected in *JPSP*, 1965–2000. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 435–452.

Ratner, C. (2006). *Cultural psychology: A perspective on psychological functioning and social reform*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ratner, C., & Hui, L. (2003). Theoretical and methodological problems in cross-cultural psychology. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 33*, 67–94.

Rivers, W. H. R. (1905). Observations on the senses of the Todas. *British Journal of Psychology, 1*, 321–396.

Segall, M. H., Dasen, P. R., Berry, J. W., & Poortinga, Y. H. (1999). *Human behavior in global perspective: An introduction to cross-cultural psychology* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Segall, M. H., Lonner, W. J., & Berry, J. W. (1998). Cross-cultural psychology as a scholarly discipline: On the flowering of culture in behavioral research. *American Psychologist, 53*, 1101–1110.

Shiraev, E. B., & Levy, D. A. (2010). *Cross-cultural psychology: Critical thinking and contemporary applications* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sinha, D. (2002). Culture and psychology: Perspective of cross-cultural psychology. *Psychology and Developing Societies, 14*, 11–25.

Sue, S. (1999). Science, ethnicity, and bias: Where have we gone wrong? *American Psychologist, 54*, 1070–1077.

Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways: A study of the sociological importance of usages, manners, customs, mores, and morals*. New York: Ginn and Company.

Triandis, H. C. (1977). Cross-cultural social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3*, 143–158.

Triandis, H. C. (1980). Introduction. In H. C. Triandis & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 1, Perspectives* (pp. 1–14). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1999). Cross-cultural psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2*, 127–143.

Triandis, H. C. (2000). Dialectics between cultural and cross-cultural psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 3*, 185–195.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self–ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 323–338.

Triandis, H., Kurowski, L., Tecktiel, A., & Chan, D. (1993). Extracting the emics of cultural diversity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 17*, 217–234.

Webster, G. D., Nichols, N. L., & Schember, T. O. (2009). American psychology *is* becoming more international. *American Psychologist, 64*, 566–568.

Weiten, W. (2008). *Psychology: Themes and variations—briefer version* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Wundt, W. (1916). *Elements of folk psychology. Outlines of a psychological history of the development of mankind* (trans. E. L. Schaub). New York: Macmillan.

Yang, K.-S. (2000). Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches: The royal road to the development of a balanced global psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 3*, 241–263.