Cross-Cultural Psychology

Ype H Poortinga, Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
This article is a revision of the previous edition article by H.C. Triandis, volume 5, pp. 2994–2999, © 2001, Elsevier Ltd.

Abstract

In this article, an inclusive approach is taken, covering the study of relationships between behavior and cultural context from three perspectives: the more classical culture-comparative school, cultural psychology, and indigenous psychologies. After a brief review of the history of cross-cultural psychology over the last half century, conceptualizations following the three perspectives are outlined. There are further sections on methodology, empirical research addressing controversial issues, and applied cross-cultural psychology in six areas (acculturation, intercultural relations, intercultural communication and training, work and organizations, health, and national development). A final section gives a brief outlook on the future.

Cross-cultural psychology (CCP) is one of several areas of scholarship that focuses on the relationship between human behavior and cultural context. One definition, formulated by Berry et al. (2011: p. 5), reads:

> Cross-cultural psychology is the study: of similarities and differences in individual psychological functioning in various cultural and ethnocultural groups; of ongoing changes in variables reflecting such functioning; and of the relationships of psychological variables with sociocultural, ecological and biological variables.

With an emphasis on similarities (i.e., cultural invariance) as well as on differences, and the explicit inclusion of ecological and biological variables this is a broad definition. CCP as defined here attempts to encompass three major orientations in the psychological study of behavior–culture relationships: culture-comparative research (the defining and initially dominant approach), cultural psychology, and indigenous psychologies. There is also overlap with entries for various fields of psychology, such as *Developmental Psychology*.

History

Themes found in contemporary thinking have a long history (Jahoda, 1992), but as a subdiscipline of psychology fitting the definition mentioned above CCP started to develop around the mid-twentieth century. In the early 1970s, the field became organized with the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (first volume in 1970) and the *International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology* (first congress in 1972). At that time, perception and cognition were major areas of study. Studies examining the susceptibility for visual illusions of rectangular buildings and streets (carpenteredness of the environment), and of open vs close vistas found variations related to characteristics of the natural environment (Segall et al., 1966). Lack of exposure to pictures (i.e., two-dimensional representations of three-dimensional objects and scenes) was shown to affect the perception of depth (see Deregowski, 1980). Such research demonstrated the relevance of external context and experience on how humans perceive the world.

Research on cognition had moved away from the racist agenda of comparing groups differing in skin color on IQ tests, a prominent, even though hotly debated, activity of (Western) psychology in the first half of the twentieth century. The new research in cognition was based on cognitively simple tasks and, at that time, recent models of information transmission. One example is the distinction between two cognitive styles, called field-independence and field-dependence; their relative prevalence was related to the mode of economic subsistence. Hunter-gatherers tended to be more field-independent (i.e., they identified more easily the target figure in embedded figures tests), than traditional agriculturists (Witkin and Berry, 1975). A second example is research conducted in Africa on recall and categorization in which the importance of local activities and modes of classification was demonstrated (Cole et al., 1971).

An important feature of projects as mentioned was that unschooled traditional farmers and even hunter-gatherers were included in the research design. More than in many recent studies, which tend to be limited to literate samples, it was recognized that a major strength of the cross-cultural method lies in extending the range of cultural variation to the maximum. Much of the early work was summarized in the first edition of the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, edited by Triandis et al. (1980).

After 1980, there have been two notable developments. First, the research agenda became predominantly social–psychological; the self-report questionnaire became the main method of data collection and differences in mean scores between cultures were interpreted in terms of broad cultural dimensions. Four major value dimensions were postulated by Hofstede (1980). One of these was further developed into the individualism–collectivism dimension of which its doyen, Triandis (1995), could rightly claim that it has become the most important syndrome of culture in the literature on CCP.

The second development had to do with a shift in cultural anthropology. In traditional ethnography, a good deal of attention was paid to culture as external context, including kinship relations and economic subsistence (i.e., the 'human-made part of the environment'). The shift was toward a greater focus on culture as internal context ('culture in the minds

of people'). Each separate culture became to be seen as constituting a set of meanings, or even a system of meanings, that should be understood in its own terms. The method of access was through 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973). This reorientation was at the basis of the development of cultural psychology, with the adage that behavior and culture makes each other up (Shweder, 1991). Such ideas were in tune with the concerns of psychologists in non-Western countries who observed that Western instruments, concepts, and theories did not fit the cultural realities of their societies. The rejection of psychological concepts originating in the West has been a major factor in the development of local indigenous psychologies, for example in India (Sinha, 1997).

In the 1990s, most students of behavior and culture belonged to one of two camps: universalism (a theoretical approach that considers basic psychological processes to be shared by all people, and cultures as influencing their manifestation and salience) and relativism (a theoretical approach emphasizing that each culture should be understood in its own terms, rather than being assessed with standards and instruments from elsewhere). In universalism, there is an emphasis on the 'psychic unity' of the human species; cross-cultural differences in manifest behavior should be explained in terms of common underlying psychological mechanisms and processes that are common to all humans. One might say that universalism builds on the assumed primacy of psychological principles. In relativism, such principles are seen as inherently cultural; the primacy of culture is assumed. In the volume on theory and method of the second edition of the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (Berry et al., 1997) the universalism–relativism distinction was the main theme of discussion. Since then, the underlying issues have not been resolved, but especially in applied research they have become less focal. There is now growing recognition that culture-common and culture-specific are the two sides of a single coin.

Theory

This growing respect for theoretical diversity hardly has led to more homogeneity in outlook. Established traditions continue to influence current ideas, and new formulations are adding to the existing variation. The following, often somewhat overlapping, approaches to behavior–culture relationships may be mentioned.

Cultural variables can be defined as *antecedents* of behavior outcomes. Such antecedents need not be deterministic causes; they can also refer to probabilistic and enabling conditions. Important antecedents are affluence (a compound variable covering income, formal education, access to media, etc.) and climate. Such external conditions are supposed to have effects that are internalized and may persist over longer historical periods. However, the resulting cross-cultural differences are interpreted largely in quantitative terms; i.e., differences in manifest behavior are explained in terms of common psychological mechanisms and processes that vary in the salience of their expression across cultures. For example, individualism tends to be conceived of as a broad value dimension with deep historical roots for which higher scores are found in Western societies than elsewhere.

Culture can also be defined as *mediating* between context and individual outcomes. This idea was expressed strongly by Vygotsky (1978) who saw the development of higher mental functions (especially abstract thinking) as a historical process at the level of societies that led to essential cross-cultural inequalities in these functions, especially between literate and illiterate societies. The influence of Vygotsky is explicit in the cultural-historical school of Cole (1996), but with one important modification: cultural context is not postulated to be operating at the level of broadly defined functions, but at the level of specific competences and skills, organized in fields of activity. Various other contemporary approaches, labeled 'sociocultural psychology' in Valsiner and Rosa (2007), such as social representation and action theories, share the basic premise that the culture of a group lies in the understanding and construction of their reality. For example, in action theories the unit of analysis in psychology is taken to be an action, which invariably is embedded in cultural and historical context, and encompasses the intentions of the actor.

The theoretical position of cultural psychology is that *psychological process and behavior content are inseparable*. At an elementary level, there is no disagreement on this; even the unequal pronunciation of the word 'table' in English and in French points to some (minute) differences in the innervations of the speech apparatus between speakers of these two languages. Controversy between schools of thought, or at least a difference in emphasis, emerges at more inclusive levels of conceptualization and explanation. The most important distinction in cultural psychology (overlapping with individualism vs collectivism) is between two modes of construal of the self: the independent and the interdependent mode (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). Methods of neuroscience have been used to find differences in brain functioning that could be characteristic of interdependent self-construal (in East Asian populations), as opposed to independent self-construal (Americans of European descent in the US).

Recent research in cultural psychology tends to postulate less overarching distinctions between cultural populations. For example, culture has been defined as *shared knowledge in a group* (Hong et al., 2000). Such knowledge, which is the outcome of cultural constructions, tends to be domain-specific and even situation-specific. This is shown by the ability of bicultural persons to switch between their two cultural frames when presented with 'primes' (e.g., icons or symbols) representing either of the two cultures. Still, in the *Handbook of Cultural Psychology* (Kitayama and Cohen, 2007) the theoretical position of inseparableness of process and behavior manifestation is largely maintained. At the same time, most empirical research is seeking to follow the experimental method of psychological science with administration of the same tasks across cultures followed by direct comparison of scores. This entails an important shift away from the initial position of cultural psychology, insofar as the use of common methods and concepts only makes sense under assumptions of universalism (see below).

A relativist position, rejecting the use of the same methods and concepts across cultures as (Western) cultural impositions and advocating *culture-specific and culture-appropriate* methods and concepts, continues to be maintained in schools

of indigenous research. Various levels can be distinguished in the evidence for culture-specific functioning. Most frequently reference is made to specific categorizations (e.g., emotion terms, color terms). Broader concepts include pathological syndromes, stages of ontogenetic development, and personality traits that are said to be unique for some culture. At the most general level, there are broad concepts of functioning that tend to be seen as incommensurable across cultures, such as *Ubuntu* in Africa, a form of social orientation that is reminiscent of collectivism (Mkhize, 2004). Evidence for cultural specificity often hinges on the absence of terms corresponding in meaning across languages (see below).

Methodology

Research in CCP has to deal with difficulties in design and measurement that are less central in other fields of psychology. First, experimental designs for causal inference are generally not available. In an ideal experiment, the experimenter has control over both the treatment conditions and the assignment of subjects to these conditions. In CCP, the treatment (i.e., some aspect of living in a certain cultural context) is often vague and imprecise, and participants' assignment to a culture is fixed by virtue of their membership of that culture. This implies that alternative explanations of a finding are difficult to rule out. The onus is on researchers to strengthen their interpretations through replication and checks on alternative explanations, but designs seeking discriminant validation of a preferred explanation continue to be rare in CCP.

Second, any grouping of humans can be referred to as a culture. Ideally, for a comparative study groups are selected that show clear between-group variance and within-group homogeneity for the domain or variable of interest (as for example, with language groups in research on psycholinguistics). The most common grouping in CCP is countries for which such homogeneity obviously is questionable; moreover, the selection of countries is often on and ad hoc basis. In studies, seeking to explore the universality of some theory or relationship between variables a random sample of all cultures would be required. Even larger studies with numerous samples tend to show a bias; as a rule illiterate groups and groups with traditional means of economic subsistence are underrepresented or even totally absent.

The third and most studied methodological issue concerns the question whether or not it makes sense to use a psychological instrument (psychometric test or questionnaire) constructed in one cultural context in some other cultural context. When cultural specificity of behavior is emphasized, virtually any cross-cultural use of instruments is ruled out. On the other hand, researchers with strong universalist views tend to assume that only minor (linguistic) adaptations are needed. The key question is whether psychological data obtained from subjects in different cultures can be considered equivalent (or comparable). For most researchers in CCP, equivalence has become an empirical issue. Over several decades, an increasingly sophisticated set of psychometric approaches has been developed to examine cultural bias (i.e., differences in scores on tests and questionnaires that do not reflect corresponding differences in the trait or concept presumably measured and distort the interpretation of the scores) (Van de Vijver and Leung, 1997). The old dichotomy of a scale being equivalent or inequivalent has been replaced by distinctions between various levels of equivalence that can be examined in a hierarchical sequence of analyses. It may be found, for example, that a cross-cultural data set does not meet psychometric conditions for full-scale equivalence, but only conditions for structural equivalence. Full-scale equivalence implies that a score of a certain value corresponds to the same standing on the trait being assessed, independent of the culture of the respondent. Structural equivalence implies that the same trait is being assessed, as demonstrated, for example, by high correspondence of factor structures. But structural equivalence does not imply that across cultures test takers with the same scores on the instrument will have the same standing on the underlying trait. Evidence of inequivalence, or cultural bias, imposes constraints on cross-cultural comparison of data. It may be noted that bias refers to systematic variance (rather than error variance) and for this reason further analysis is indicated. In such attempts, a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, called 'mixed methods' are used to trace the cultural factors in terms of which observed bias can be interpreted (Van de Vijver, 2011).

In a carefully designed culture-comparative study researchers from the various participating cultures should be involved in the design and formulation of items, optimizing translation equivalence. Post hoc analyses after collection of the data will determine whether or not conditions for psychometric equivalence have been met. Large-scale projects for international assessment of quality of education, such as PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) and TIMMS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study), follow this methodology. Such careful design is still exceptional and most studies in CCP are based on existing instruments. Even then, the local experts can help in the translation and adaptation of an instrument to a new target culture. The International Test Commission (2011) has published a set of Guidelines on Adapting Tests that is available at www.intestcom.org/guidelines.

Topics in Empirical Research

The relevance of cultural context for behavior is widely recognized and has led to a large research literature that is impossible to summarize in a brief review. Here three examples will be given of how empirical findings are advancing insights in behavior–culture relationships. The first example reflects on differences between cultures relative to individual differences within cultures. Recent estimates show that the ratio of between-culture variance and within-culture variance (i.e., individual variance) is in the order of 1:10 for self-reports of value types (e.g., Fischer et al., 2010) and 1:8 for dimensions of personality (McCrae et al., 2005). Such estimates of cross-cultural differences are much smaller than would be expected by both experts and the public at large. What are the implications? Of course, there are variables for which there is large heterogeneity between cultures and homogeneity within cultures. This is the case with many conventions (i.e., agreed upon ways how to act in certain situations, what to believe,

'default strategies' in responding, etc.). Also, substantial differences are found in mean ratings of happiness and well-being that are closely associated with the affluence and security, which societies provide for their members (Diener et al., 2010). Together such findings suggest substantial differences in manifest behavior as a function of features in the external context, while psychological mechanisms and processes underlying manifest behavior may be more invariant across cultures than thought in the past.

The second example is the extensive debate on emotions. Words for emotions are found in all cultures, but for some such words in a language there may not be translation equivalent words in some other language (usually English). In cultural anthropology and cultural psychology, it has been argued that such differences point to emotions being cultural constructions that form variable categories. In culture-comparative research emotions tend to be conceived of as biologically rooted discrete categories; here cross-cultural differences are associated with differences in the salience of a certain emotion and with display rules, which proscribe the expression of emotions in various situations (Matsumoto et al., 2008). Older evidence of culture-specificity of emotions hinging on the specificity of emotion terms has been largely refuted. At the same time, a more complex view of emotions has come from componential theory, in which cultural variation can occur in each of several distinguishable features, such as the antecedents events leading to an emotion, bodily reactions, and action tendencies. However, ratings of emotion terms on numerous emotion features across numerous countries and languages have shown limited cultural variation (Fontaine et al., 2013). In turn, a new challenge has emerged from a failure in neuroscience to identify features in the brain characteristic for various emotion categories, which is taken as evidence for constructionist (relativist) views of emotions (Lindquist et al., 2012). All in all, viewpoints appear to be less extreme than a few decades ago, but a unified perspective on culture and emotion is still far off.

Research on relationships between language and thinking, the third example, also can be characterized as gradually having moved from more extreme to more moderate positions both in universalist and in relativist approaches. Much research has been inspired by Whorf's hypothesis that the vocabulary and grammar of a language are determinants of the ideas and thoughts found with the speakers of that language. Such extensive claims by Whorf soon were shown not to stand upto empirical scrutiny and were followed by strong universalist positions, exemplified in the notion of a universal grammar and other invariant features. In turn, for various allegedly invariant properties of languages, exceptions have been found in comparative linguistics, challenging universality (Evans and Levinson, 2009). Research on spatial orientation provides an illustration how careful analysis can point the way to convergence of viewpoints. In Indo-European languages, the location of objects mostly is expressed using an ego-referenced orientation. The statement: 'the chair is to the left side of the table' will change to 'the chair is to the right side of the table' when the speaker moves to the opposite side of the table. In some other language families, there is a preference for an absolute orientation that is independent of the position of the viewer (e.g., 'the chair is to the North of the table,' or 'to the side of the rising sun'). The two frames of orientation have been associated with performance on nonlinguistic tasks and have been taken to support the argument that language has profound effects on cognition. Dasen and Mishra (2010) carried out a series of careful studies in which language was seen as one aspect of a more general web of ecological and sociocultural factors. They found that the use of a particular frame by a respondent depended not only on the dominant orientation mode of the language, but also on features of the task, such as the ease of encoding either with an ego-referenced or an absolute orientation. Their conclusion was that across languages, individuals possess the basic processes needed for either frame.

Each of the three research topics mentioned is an illustration of research in action. Theoretical controversies have not been resolved fully in either of the three, but empirical evidence is slowly shaping insights. Research designs are becoming more sophisticated and there appears to be a shift from claims about major and extensive cross-cultural differences toward more modest interpretations.

Applied Cross-Cultural Research

Most applied research in CCP has a pragmatic agenda; the main question is not how or how much peoples across cultures differ, but how differences can be best addressed and dealt with. There are various fields of applied CCP; in their textbook Berry et al. (2011) present six such areas: acculturation, intercultural relations, intercultural communication and training, work and organizations, health, and national development.

Research on acculturation is rapidly expanding in response to the increase in worldwide migration. The earlier approach to acculturation, which assumed that there would be more or less successful assimilation by migrants to the new culture, has been largely abandoned. It is now recognized that migrants can follow various acculturation strategies. They can focus on the maintenance of what they consider positive in their culture of origin (such as their religion) or on gaining access to the new culture, or on both. There need not be one uniform strategy; there can be variations across domains, such as the public domain and the private domain (with family and friends). In addition, it is recognized that acculturation does not only depend on the migrants themselves, but also on attitudes toward migrants in the larger society and the kinds of settlement policies of a country. Further diversification in research has resulted from differences in theoretical approaches that emphasize stress and coping, cultural learning or social identification (Ward, 2001).

The area of intergroup relations has an international dimension, but most psychological research deals with the relations between groups within culturally plural societies. It is widely held that the best arrangement is multiculturalism, which presupposes an overarching framework of shared values and goals in a society, and mutual tolerance and respect of ethnic and religious groups for each others' cultures and identities. Positive intergroup relations are threatened by psychological mechanisms expressed in concepts such as

stereotypes (cognitive), prejudices (evaluative), and discrimination (overt behavior). The most well-known body of work in this area, aimed at overcoming negative attitudes and discrimination, is based on Allport's contact hypothesis. This hypothesis holds that, under favorable conditions, contact and sharing among members of various groups will promote mutual acceptance. There is extensive evidence supporting Allport's conjecture (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2011) and this has opened up promising perspectives for successful social intervention programs.

Intercultural communication is addressed in a range of disciplines, including linguistics and sociolinguistics, cultural anthropology and communications research. The relevance of this area derives from growing globalization and internationalization. Presence or absence of a shared language is a key factor in communication, but misunderstandings also may follow from subtle factors, such as paralinguistic differences (e.g., pragmatics, such as turn-taking) and mismatches in conventions. In contrast, theories of intercultural communication tend to provide explanations for communication difficulties in terms of dimensions at a high level of abstraction, with individualism–collectivism as the main distinction (Gudykunst, 2005). The main field for intervention is the training of sojourners or expatriates who are preparing to live and work in another culture. There is a host of training programs; one dimension on which they vary is from culture-general (promoting a deeper understanding of both self and cultural others) to culture-specific (information about rules and customs in a society). Unfortunately, for most interventions it is difficult to estimate their effectiveness. Positive reactions of participants form the main evidence for success; few programs have been validated with less impressionistic data.

Cross-cultural research on work and organizations is a large and active area with research ranging from structural characteristics of organizations as they are found in various societies to individual work-related psychological variables. One persistent question is whether across countries the structure of organizations is converging in line with technological demands or whether cultural characteristics prevent such convergence. The largest volume of research is on work-related values across countries, following Hofstede's (1980) formulation of four value dimensions. Despite increasing criticisms this set of dimensions still provides an explanatory framework for a host of differences between countries not only in psychology, but also in other disciplines, such as economics and management research. Another major focus is leadership behavior with topics such as decision making and leadership styles. In the latter domain, the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavioral Effectiveness (GLOBE) project (House et al., 2004) has been a major effort. Studies of work-related individual psychological variables include motivation, job attitudes, organizational commitment, etc. (e.g., Smith et al., 2008).

Applied cross-cultural research on health is the most diversified of the six areas mentioned here. Perhaps more than in other areas the whole range of conceptual and methodological issues is present, including conceptual discussions on the nature of culture, cultural specificity of illnesses and interventions, and (in)equivalence of diagnostic procedures and assessment scales. The area as a whole has been moving from illness as a pathological state to health as a state of well-being with a simultaneous extension from treatment to prevention. Classical topics are the universality of the major mental disorders, schizophrenia and depression, and the place of (non-Western) culture-bound syndromes in Western psychiatric classifications. Another topic, challenging dominant conceptions of psychotherapy, is the study of indigenous approaches to mental healing, with religious principles being emphasized in Muslim countries, the spiritual principle of ancestors in Africa, and retribution and punishment in some Japanese schools of psychotherapy. Prevention research and interventions address severe real-life problems, including malnutrition and transmission of HIV and other sexual diseases. In the more recently developed approach of positive mental health, there are applications on quality-of-life, stress and posttraumatic stress, and on a host of intervention programs seeking to enhance empowerment and well-being of poor and marginalized groups, especially children and women.

CCP and national development is the smallest of the six areas of applied research mentioned here. For a long time, national development was mostly owned by economists and only since it has become evident that financial and technical support are not sufficient to bring about lasting change, has there been more interest in the cultural and psychological side. Still, most of the contributions to the understanding of development come from developmental economists, such as Sen (1999) who views expansion of 'freedoms' (psychologists might say the 'capability of making choices') as the principal route of development. This suggests that intervention programs seeking to enhance empowerment and autonomy might include economic as well as health-related behaviors (Pick and Sirkin, 2010).

Future Outlook

An array of achievements can be listed showing how over the last half century CCP has contributed to insights in the relationships between behavior and culture, but is this reason for satisfaction? *Eminence grise* Gustav Jahoda (2011) recently argued that CCP has become unduly narrow and inward looking. At the same time, he is positive about the potential of CCP, outlining a promising future with theory-driven experimental research, the inclusion of samples from nonliterate societies, and the use of methods that require more direct contacts with participants than the frequently used questionnaire.

A more outward looking CCP will have to incorporate biological and evolutionary thinking. Traditionally, the concept of culture has been closely associated with differences in behavior between groups. Despite theoretical disagreements, outlined earlier, there continues to be broad consensus between researchers of various schools that the interest of research on culture and behavior mainly lies in on how, or how much, cultural populations differ from each other. There is evidence that researchers are biased toward finding and interpreting differences while ignoring evidence of cross-cultural invariance. A further bias is toward interpretations in terms of broad and inclusive concepts. In the history of CCP, it has happened time and again that initially far-reaching

generalizations of cross-cultural differences came to be seen as overgeneralizations in the light of subsequent more precise data (Poortinga, 2003).

The future relevance of CCP may well lie in conceptualizing culture as a common human propensity and understanding cross-cultural variance on psychological variables as variations on common themes. If so, CCP will have to complement its legacy from cultural anthropology with approaches rooted in biology. In that way, the field is well placed to contribute to and counterbalance the biological revolution in psychology. Cross-cultural research brings a much needed range of variation, which can help to put into question too easy invocations of genetic determinants and phylogenetic processes as long as the complexities of environmental influences on gene expression and epigenesis are poorly understood.

This does not mean that CCP should adopt the methods of current biology. Various alternatives are imaginable, one of which would be to follow an integrative approach as envisaged for ethology by Tinbergen (1963) at a time when in that discipline direct observation was the major method. Tinbergen argued that four questions have to be answered in the analysis of any behavior pattern: (1) the mechanisms or causes of the behavior, (2) its evolutionary history, (3) its ontogenetic development, and (4) the function it supposedly serves. There has been debate on the specific questions raised by Tinbergen and in CCP a question about the historical origin of a behavior pattern might have to be added. The point is that in an integrative approach, more questions have to be answered simultaneously and that this urges researchers to consider multiple perspectives.

Whatever vision one may hold on the future of CCP there remains a need to clarify basic issues. In a recent chapter Van de Vijver et al. (2011) formulated four such questions: (1) how 'deep' or profound are cross-cultural differences in psychological functioning; (2) what are the main methodological challenges to the field; (3) how does culture become engrained in human development; and (4) what is the relationship between individual and culture. It is unlikely that agreement will be reached on these questions anytime soon, but that does not rule out further convergence to at least partly shared views.

See also: Acculturation; Collectivism and Individualism: Cultural and Psychological Concerns; Cross-Cultural Research Methods in Sociology; Cross-Cultural Study of Education; Cultural Influences on Interpersonal Relationships; Cultural Psychology; Culture and Emotion; Culture and the Self: Implications for Psychological Theory; Immigration: Social Psychological Aspects; Indigenous Psychology; Intergroup Relations; Quantitative Cross-national Research Methods; Representations, Social Psychology of; Research Ethics, Cross-Cultural Dimensions of; Translating Sociology into Japanese, Chinese and Korean Languages.

Bibliography

Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., Breugelmans, S.M., Chasiotis, A., Sam, D.L., 2011. Cross-Cultural Psychology: Research and Applications, third ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., Pandey, J., Dasen, P.R., Saraswathi, T.S., Segall, M.H., Kagitcibasi, C. (Eds.), 1997. Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, second ed., vols. I–III. Allyn & Bacon, Boston.

Cole, M., 1996. Cultural Psychology: A Once and Future Discipline. Belknap, Cambridge, Mass.

Cole, M., Gay, J., Glick, J., Sharp, D., 1971. The Cultural Context of Learning and Thinking. Basic Books, New York.

Dasen, P.R., Mishra, R.C., 2010. Development of Geocentric Spatial Language and Cognition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Deregowski, J.B., 1980. Illusions, Patterns and Pictures: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Academic Press, London.

Diener, E., Ng, W., Harter, J., Arora, R., 2010. Wealth and happiness across the world: material prosperity predicts life evaluation, whereas psychosocial prosperity predicts positive feeling. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 99, 52–61.

Evans, N., Levinson, S.C., 2009. The myth of language universals: language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. Behavioral and Brain Sciences 32, 429–448.

Fischer, R., Vauclair, C.M., Fontaine, J.R.J., Schwartz, S.H., 2010. Are individual-level and country-level value structures different? Testing Hofstede's legacy with the Schwartz Value Survey. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 41, 135–151.

Fontaine, J.R.J., Scherer, K.R., Soriano, C. (Eds.), 2013. Components of Emotional Meaning: A Sourcebook. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Geertz, C., 1973. The Interpretation of Cultures. Basic Books, New York.

Gudykunst, W.B. (Ed.), 2005. Theorizing about Intercultural Communication. Sage, Thousand Oaks, Calif.

Hofstede, G., 1980. Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Sage, Beverly Hills.

Hong, Y., Morris, M., Chiu, C., Benet-Martínez, V., 2000. Multicultural minds: a dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. American Psychologist 55, 709–720.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., Gupta, V., 2004. Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. Sage, Thousand Oaks, Calif.

International Test Commission, 2011. International Test Commission Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests. http://www.intestcom.org.

Jahoda, G., 1992. Crossroads between Culture and Mind. Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.

Jahoda, G., 2011. Past and present of cross-cultural psychology. In: Van de Vijver, F.J.R., Chasiotis, A., Breugelmans, S.M. (Eds.), Fundamental Questions in Cross-Cultural Psychology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Mass, pp. 37–63.

Kitayama, S., Cohen, D. (Eds.), 2007. Handbook of Cultural Psychology. Guildford Press, New York.

Lindquist, K.A., Wager, T.D., Kober, H., Bliss-Moreau, E., Feldman Barrett, L., 2012. The brain basis of emotion: a meta-analytic review. Behavioral and Brain Sciences 35, 121–202.

Markus, H.R., Kitayama, S., 1991. Culture and the self: implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. Psychological Review 98, 244–253.

Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S.H., Fontaine, J., et al., 2008. Mapping expressive differences around the world: the relationship between emotional display rules and individualism v. collectivism. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 39, 55–74.

McCrae, R.R., Terracciano, A., 79 Members of the Personality Profiles of Cultures Project, 2005. Personality profiles of cultures: aggregate personality traits. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 89, 407–425.

Mkhize, N., 2004. Psychology: an African perspective. In: Ratele, K., Duncan, N., Hook, D., Mkhize, N., Kiguwa, P., Collins, A. (Eds.), Self, Community and Psychology. UCT Press, Cape Town, pp. 1–29.

Pettigrew, T., Tropp, L., 2011. When Groups Meet. Psychology Press, London.

Pick, S., Sirkin, J., 2010. Breaking the Cycle of Poverty: The Human Basis for Sustainable Development. Oxford University Press, New York.

Poortinga, Y.H., 2003. Coherence of culture and generalizability of data: two questionable assumptions in cross-cultural psychology. In: Berman, J., Berman, J. (Eds.), Cross-Cultural Differences in Perspectives on the Self, Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, vol. 49. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebr, pp. 257–305.

Segall, M.H., Campbell, D.T., Herskovits, K.J., 1966. The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception. Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis.

Sen, A., 1999. Development as Freedom. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Shweder, R.A., 1991. Thinking through Cultures: Expeditions in Cultural Psychology. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Sinha, D., 1997. Indigenizing psychology. In: Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., Pandey, J. (Eds.), Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Theory and Method, second ed., vol. I. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, pp. 129–169.

Smith, P.B., Peterson, M.F., Thomas, D.C., 2008. The Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management Research. Sage, Los Angeles.

Tinbergen, N., 1963. On aims and methods of ethology. Zeitschrift fuer Tierpsychologie 20, 410–433.
Triandis, H.C., 1995. Individualism and Collectivism. Westview, Boulder, Colo.
Triandis, H.C., et al. (Eds.), 1980. Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, vols. 1–6. Allyn & Bacon, Boston.
Valsiner, J., Rosa, A. (Eds.), 2007. The Cambridge Handbook of Sociocultural Psychology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Van de Vijver, F.J.R., 2011. Bias and real differences in cross-cultural differences: neither friends nor foes. In: Van de Vijver, F.J.R., Chasiotis, A., Breugelmans, S.M. (Eds.), Fundamental Questions in Cross-Cultural Psychology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 235–257.
Van de Vijver, F.J.R., Chasiotis, A., Breugelmans, S.M. (Eds.), 2011. Fundamental Questions of Cross-Cultural Psychology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 9–34.
Van de Vijver, F.J.R., Leung, K., 1997. Methods and Data Analysis for Cross-Cultural Research. Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
Vygotsky, L.S., 1978. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
Ward, C., 2001. The A, B, Cs of acculturation. In: Matsumoto, D. (Ed.), The Handbook of Culture and Psychology. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 411–445.
Witkin, H., Berry, J.W., 1975. Psychological differentiation in cross-cultural perspective. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 6, 4–87.