

ical Assessment, International Academy for Intercultural Research, and the International Test Commission.

Selected Bibliography

- Arends-Tóth, J., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2003). Multiculturalism and acculturation: Views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 249–266. doi:10.1002/ejsp.143
- Celenk, O., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2011). Assessment of acculturation: Issues and overview of measures. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 8*(1). Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol8/iss1/10>
- Cheung, F. M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leong, F. T. L. (2011). Toward a new approach to the assessment of personality in culture. *American Psychologist, 66*, 593–603. doi:10.1037/a0022389
- Malda, M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Temane, M. Q. (2010). Rugby versus soccer in South Africa: Content familiarity explains most cross-cultural differences in cognitive test scores. *Intelligence, 38*, 582–595. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2010.07.004
- Valchev, V. H., van de Vijver, F. J. R., Nel, J. A., Rothmann, S., & Meiring, D. (2013). The use of traits and contextual information in free personality descriptions of ethnocultural groups in South Africa. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 1077–1091. doi:10.1037/a0032276
- van de Vijver, F. J. R. (1997). Meta-analysis of cross-cultural comparisons of cognitive test performance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28*, 678–709. doi:10.1177/0022022197286003
- van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2002). Cross-cultural assessment: Value for money? *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*, 545–566. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00107
- van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2002). Inductive reasoning in Zambia, Turkey, and the Netherlands: Establishing cross-cultural equivalence. *Intelligence, 30*, 313–351. doi:10.1016/S0160-2896(02)00084-3
- van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2003). Bias and equivalence: Cross-cultural perspectives. In J. A. Harkness, F. J. R. van de Vijver, & P. Ph. Mohler (Eds.), *Cross-cultural survey methods* (pp. 143–155). New York, NY: Wiley.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Hambleton, R. K. (1996). Translating tests: Some practical guidelines. *European Psychologist, 1*, 89–99. doi:10.1027/1016-9040.1.2.89
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (2000). Methodological issues in psychological research on culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*, 33–51. doi:10.1177/0022022100031001004
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (2011). Equivalence and bias: A review of concepts, models, and data analytic procedures. In D. Matsumoto & F. J. R. van de Vijver (Eds.), *Cross-cultural research methods in psychology* (pp. 17–45). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Poortinga, Y. H. (2002). Structural equivalence in multilevel research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*, 141–156. doi:10.1177/0022022102033002002
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Poortinga, Y. H. (2005). Conceptual and methodological issues in adapting tests. In R. K. Hambleton, P. F. Merenda, & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Adapting educational tests and psychological tests for cross-cultural assessment* (pp. 39–64). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Tanzer, N. K. (2004). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment: An overview. *European Review of Applied Psychology, 54*, 119–135. doi:10.1016/j.erap.2003.12.004
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., Breugelmans, S. M., & Schalk-Soekar, S. R. G. (2008). Multiculturalism: Construct validity and stability. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32*, 93–104. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.11.001
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., Chasiotis, A., & Breugelmans, S. M. (Eds.) (2011). *Fundamental questions in cross-cultural psychology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Phalet, K. (2004). Assessment in multicultural groups: The role of acculturation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53*, 215–236. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00169.x
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., Van Hemert, D. A., & Poortinga, Y. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Multilevel analysis of individuals and cultures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Contributions of Internationalization to Psychology: Toward a Global and Inclusive Discipline

Fons J. R. van de Vijver
Tilburg University, the Netherlands; North-West University, South Africa; and University of Queensland, Australia

DOI: 10.1037/a0033762

In this article I define and describe the current state of internationalization in psychology. Internationalization refers here to the approach in which existing or new psychological theories, methods, procedures, or data across cultures are synthesized so as to create a more culture-informed, inclusive, and globally applicable science and profession. This approach is essential to advance psychology beyond its Euro-American context of development and to achieve a more global applicability of its theories and professional procedures. Internationalization already has led to a better integration of cultural aspects in various psychological theories, to more insight into how to deal with methodological aspects of intact group comparisons (such as bias and equivalence), and to the development of guidelines in areas such as test development, test adaptations, ethics codes, and Internet testing. I review systemic and scientific climate factors in psychology that thwart the progress of internationalization, and conclude by suggesting methods of enhancing internationalization, which is essential for developing a truly universal psychology.

Keywords: internationalization, cross-cultural, emic, etic

In the last 40 years, psychology has become more international. This development is a consequence of external dynamics, notably, globalization (Arnett, 2002) and international migration (Rogler, 1994). This development is also due to the internal dynamics of psychology, such as the increase in the number of international conferences and the number of countries from which the conference attendees come (Adair, Coêlho, & Luna, 2002; Adair, Unik, & Huynh, 2010; Pawlik & d'Ydewalle, 1996) and the increased interest in cross-cultural comparisons. Both the number and proportion of cross-cultural studies have increased considerably (cf. van de Vijver, 2006). For example, since 1970, the number of publications included in the PsycINFO database has increased sevenfold, but the number of cross-cultural studies included has increased fifteenfold.

In the context of this article, *internationalization* refers to a broad set of approaches in which existing or new psychological theories, methods, procedures, or data are synthesized across cultures so as to create a more culture-informed,

inclusive, and globally applicable psychology. This definition involves activities in branches of psychology in which internationalization is a core activity, such as cross-cultural psychology, and specific professional associations, such as the International Association for Intercultural Research (www.intercultural-academy.net) and the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (www.iaccp.org). The definition also covers activities in other branches of psychology and organizations in which cross-ethnic or international issues are addressed.

My thesis is that internationalization is here to stay, is irreversible, and should be further developed to make psychology more inclusive and universally applicable. We need to move beyond the current state in which many psychological constructs are either taken to be completely invariant across cultures or are considered culture-specific and incomparable across cultures. Internationalization is important in order to overcome this dichotomy, to adequately deal with culture in our theories and models, and to better accommodate cross-cultural differences and similarities in our theories (F. M. Cheung, van de Vijver, & Leong, 2011).

The first section, in which I describe internationalization, is followed by a description of internationalization's direct and indirect contributions to psychology. The third section deals with impediments to be faced in advancing internationalization. Finally, I make suggestions about how internationalization can be further developed.

The Three Imperatives of Internationalization

In my view, the internationalization approach is imperative in psychology. I distinguish three imperatives: moral, intellectual, and professional. First, internationalization is a *moral* imperative. It makes psychology more inclusive. It is important to be inclusive in psychology, to not neglect 95% of the world's population (Arnett, 2008), and to include the majority world (Kagitcibasi, 2002). If we want our models and findings to apply outside the Euro-American context in which most psychological studies are conducted, Western psychology needs to reach out beyond its comfort zone.

Second, internationalization is an *intellectual* imperative if psychology is to be inclusive. Internationalization makes better science. In 1942, Merton formulated five norms that should guide scientific research and theories, which became known as the CUDOS norms (Merton, 1942/1973): communalism (results are a common good of the entire scientific community), universalism (everyone can contribute to science), disinterestedness (scientists should work for the sake of science, not their personal profits or fame), originality (new work should expand our knowledge or data), and organized skepticism (critical scrutiny is the hallmark of good science). It is probably

telling of the zeitgeist of the 1940s that universalism was not interpreted in an additional way: Our theories should be globally applicable. Psychological theories often tacitly assume global validity and applicability. Clearly, such an assumption requires testing.

The pursuit of globally applicable theories and practices does not imply a "one size fits all" approach. Internationalization does not imply homogenization. Rather, global applicability means that cultural elements are factored into psychological theories and procedures so that these theories accommodate both cross-cultural similarities and differences. The approach is in line with Lewin's (1936) famous equation according to which behavior is a function of the person and the environment. The development of a global psychology requires that we include the environment in our theorizing. Such a development should be based on existing approaches, notably Western models (with their often tacitly assumed, yet untested, global applicability) and indigenous models. Indigenous psychologies have become the generic name for all efforts (invariably in non-Western cultures) to develop theories with maximum validity and applicability in these cultures (e.g., Allwood & Berry, 2006; Diaz-Loving, 2005). Integrating indigenous approaches (of which Western psychology is one example) in a truly universal psychology is an important intellectual challenge (Poortinga, 2005).

Finally, internationalization (or, probably better, interculturalization or multiculturalization) is a *professional* imperative, notably in polyethnic societies (Mays, Rubin, Sabourin, & Walker, 1996). Internationalization makes better practice. It is related to one of the values of the Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists (Gauthier, Pettifor, & Ferrero, 2010): maximizing benefits and minimizing potential harm to individuals, families, groups, and communities. Professional psychologists working in polyethnic groups may experience a discrepancy between what is desirable and what is available in their service delivery, tools, and therapies. Professional requirements to optimize service delivery may imply that tools need to be adapted (van de Vijver & Phaet, 2004).

Editor's note. Fons J. R. van de Vijver received the Award for Distinguished Contributions to the International Advancement of Psychology. Award winners are invited to deliver an award address at the APA's annual convention. This article is based on the award address presented at the 121st annual meeting, held July 31–August 4, 2013, in Honolulu, Hawaii. Articles based on award addresses are reviewed, but they differ from unsolicited articles in that they are expressions of the winners' reflections on their work and their views of the field.

Author's note. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Fons J. R. van de Vijver, Department of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands. E-mail: fons.vandevijver@uvt.nl

The Goals of Cross-Cultural Psychology as Stages in Internationalization

The putative three stages in the development of cross-cultural psychology (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 2002; F. M. Cheung, 2012) can be interpreted as the stages of internationalization. The first stage aims *to transport and test* hypotheses and findings obtained in Western cultures to other cultures. For example, can the Beck Depression Inventory be used to measure depression in Iran? If so, what can be concluded about depression levels among Iranian and Western clinical and nonclinical samples? Most cross-cultural studies were, are, and will probably continue to be of this nature (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). The second stage takes stock of these studies by documenting psychological differences and similarities *to explore other cultures in order to discover psychological variation*. For example, what can be concluded about the prevalence of depression if we compare scores on the Beck Depression Inventory from all the studies that have been reported (van Hemert, van de Vijver, & Poortinga, 2002)? Are these country differences related to economic or social indicators? Such studies tend to employ meta-analyses (e.g., van Hemert et al.) or large-scale surveys (Diener, Ng, Harter, & Arora, 2010). With the advent of multilevel models, there are interesting new opportunities to address both individual- and country-level variation in a single analysis (M. W. L. Cheung & Au, 2005; Fischer & Boer, 2011). In the third stage, the goal is *to integrate findings in order to generate a more universal psychology*. The findings of the first two stages are used to augment existing theories and models so as to accommodate the patterning of cross-cultural differences and similarities that have been found. For example, a theory of well-being that meets the requirements of the third stage would both specify cross-cultural similarities and differences and make predictions about individual- and country-level differences. A truly international psychology should develop theories of this kind. If this approach was fully implemented in psychology, there would be no reason for further internationalization. Branches of psychology that have internationalization at their core, such as cross-cultural psychology, could then cease to exist (Segall, Lonner, & Berry, 1998).

Contributions of Internationalization to Psychology

Internationalization of psychology has made various contributions; I focus here on how internationalization has helped to achieve the third goal, which is the development of a truly international psychology. I describe three types of contributions: theoretical advances, methodological advances, and guidelines for research and practice.

Theoretical Contributions

The internationalization approach is probably most associated with a number of social-psychological studies that have reported differences in attitudes, norms, and values in large-scale international studies. The best-known examples are Hofstede's (2001) study of work-related values, the conceptually related GLOBE study (House et al., 2004), and Schwartz's (1992) study of values. Notably, Hofstede's work has received much attention. The country value dimensions he reported (individualism–collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity–femininity, and long-term orientation) have been widely applied. Individualism–collectivism, going back to Tönnies (1887/1963), has become the most frequently studied dimension in cross-cultural studies (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1994). Most studies of differences between East Asians and Americans, the most common comparison in cross-cultural psychology (Brouwers, van Hemert, Breugelmans, & van de Vijver, 2004), use these concepts as their theoretical background.

However, internationalization is much broader and richer than the study of norms, values, and attitudes. It has permeated all branches of psychology, although the level of advancement with regard to internationalization differs across branches. Rather than trying to be exhaustive, I describe here examples of fields with a special standing regarding internationalization. In developmental science, conceptual frameworks have been developed and tested that explain the interrelationships between cultural and psychological phenomena. Examples include models of child–environment interactions (e.g., Bronfenbrenner's, 1979, ecological model), parenting (LeVine, 1980), and parental ethnotheories (Super & Harkness, 1986). Work by Kagitcibasi (2007) and Keller (2007), which is based on theories of independence and interdependence, shows that cross-cultural differences in parenting have a functional background. Parental socialization strategies match the relationship patterns that prevail in a society (interdependent or autonomous) to ensure that children are socialized to become adults who are well prepared to function in that society.

The field of personality shows a less advanced picture vis-à-vis internationalization. The dominant paradigm in the field, the five-factor personality model, has shown impressive cross-cultural invariance (e.g., McCrae et al., 2005). There is much evidence that when the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992) or a similar instrument is administered, the five factors that were originally found in U.S. American samples are found in many other countries. The only factor that does not always replicate is Openness (De Raad, 1998). However, the reasons for not finding the fifth factor are elusive and do not seem to involve specific types of cultures. The evidence for the universality of the five-factor model makes it very unlikely that there are basic cross-cultural differences in personality structure.

The cross-cultural studies that have compared factor structures across countries have focused on confirming the Western structure and not on identifying culture-specific structures. In other words, cross-cultural studies tested the applicability of the five factors, assuming that the Western theory and instrument provide an adequate rendering of personality in all the countries studied. However, there are strong indications from non-Western studies that set out to combine etic and emic approaches that the five-factor model may not be comprehensive. Psycholexical studies, which start from an analysis of a language's lexicon of personality-related terms or interviews with local informants to build up a database of such terms, do not always find the invariance of the five factors. Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness are consistently found, whereas Openness and Emotional Stability have not been found in all languages in which psycholexical studies have been conducted (De Raad & Peabody, 2005). In addition, there are psycholexical studies in non-Western countries, such as China (F. M. Cheung et al., 2001), the Philippines (Church, 1987), and South Africa (Nel et al., 2012), that have tried to strike a balance between etic (universal) and emic (culture-specific) constructs (F. M. Cheung et al., 2011). These studies have found that the social domain of personality is insufficiently covered by the Agreeableness factor of the five-factor model. For example, in a qualitative South African study it was found that relationship harmony (covered by facets such as approachability, conflict seeking, and interpersonal relatedness) and softheartedness (e.g., active support, amiability, and egoism) were the personality terms that were most frequently mentioned by participants from the 11 official language groups of the country (Nel et al., 2012). Similarly, interpersonal relatedness, measuring various aspects of interdependence, was found in a psycholexical study in China (F. M. Cheung et al., 2011). These studies suggest that the five-factor model is universal yet incomplete in at least some non-Western cultures in its representation of social aspects of personality. There may be a functional reason for the more complex structure of social aspects in these cultures. Individuals living in (collectivistic) cultural contexts where personal relationships with ingroup members are more salient show a richer structure in these characteristics than do persons living in individualistic cultural contexts (where the five-factor model originated).

The field of intelligence shows a less advanced picture in terms of internationalization than does the field of personality. The prevailing theory on the structure of intelligence nowadays is the CHC model, named after its originators, Cattell, Horn, and Carroll (Carroll, 1993). Like most models in intelligence, the CHC model has an assumed global applicability. The available, admittedly scant, cross-cultural evidence has supported this model (e.g., Malda, van de Vijver, Srinivasan, Transler, & Sukumar, 2010). Interestingly, there is another influential model in the cognitive domain, related to the field of social cognition, that adopts a more culture-

specific approach: Nisbett's model of thought (e.g., Nisbett, Peng, Choi, & Norenzayan, 2001). According to this model, East Asians think in a more holistic manner, attend more to the entire context, and use dialectical reasoning more. Westerners, on the other hand, are more analytic, attend more to detail, and employ more causal reasoning. There is no work on the link between these two seemingly conflicting traditions. From the perspective of internationalization, the (etic) skill conceptions of the CHC model should be combined with the (emic) style conceptions of Nisbett's model to develop a more integrated, culture-informed perspective on cognition.

A final domain mentioned here is clinical psychology (Helman, 2007), which has the same dualism between etic and emic approaches as the personality domain. On the one hand, the field has a strong etic orientation (focusing on the study of universals), notably in its nosology of disorders, such as the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (published by the American Psychiatric Association) and the *International Classification of Diseases* (published by the World Health Organization). On the other hand, there is work with a strong emic orientation (focused on the study of culture-specific syndromes). The latter is best represented in the study of culture-bound syndromes (Kleinman, Eisenberg, & Good, 1978). In addition, there is an emic orientation in the adjustment of therapies to specific ethnic groups (Cuéllar, 1998; L. A. Suzuki & Ponterotto, 2008). The current level of internationalization of the field, which is hampered by the relative independence of the emic and etic traditions, can be illustrated by the following example. *Taijin Kyofusho* is a type of social anxiety in Japan in which a patient avoids social contacts, not because of a self-perceived inadequacy in establishing contacts but in order to avoid harming others. Symptoms can be fear of blushing, eye contact, and emitting a foul body odor (Takahashi, 1989). It is no surprise to find claims that *Taijin Kyofusho* can also be found in other cultures (e.g., K. Suzuki, Takei, Kawai, Minabe, & Mori, 2003). Social anxieties (and their culture-specific forms) are more likely to develop in societies with very strict norms regarding social contacts, such as in Japan. Social anxieties are probably universal, but cultures may well influence their expression. Clinical psychology will advance by integrating etic and emic perspectives on social anxiety.

It can be concluded from these examples that the development of internationalization is rather uneven across branches of psychology; it is fairly common to see that universal (etic) and more culture-specific (emic) topics are independently pursued without attempts to integrate both approaches. The global perspective, characteristic of internationalization, can help to overcome the dichotomy.

Methodological Contributions

The methodological contributions undergirding internationalization have been developed (and applied) in statistics, psychometrics, cross-cultural psychology, education, and

cross-cultural survey research. The contributions comprise procedures that are based partly on new statistical developments and partly on more experience with small and large cross-cultural studies. These procedures specify recommendations on how to conduct comparative studies. I first describe a taxonomy of bias, followed by a taxonomy of equivalence.

The major methodological threat to valid inferences in comparative studies is *bias* (He & van de Vijver, 2012; van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). Bias occurs when score differences on indicators of a particular construct do not correspond to differences in the underlying trait or ability (van de Vijver & Tanzer, 2004). For example, a response in one culture represents a target construct (say, conscientiousness), whereas responses in another country may be due to other constructs (e.g., social desirability) or additional constructs (a combination of conscientiousness and social desirability). Bias can arise from three sources: the construct under study, methodological aspects of an instrument or sample, and specific items.

Construct bias indicates that the construct measured is not identical across cultures. It can occur when there is only a partial overlap in definition of the construct across cultures or when not all relevant behaviors associated with the construct are present and properly sampled in each culture (van de Vijver & Poortinga, 1997). For example, it was found that Chinese depressed outpatients mentioned somatic symptoms as their major complaints, whereas their Australian counterparts more often stressed depressed mood and cognitive anxiety symptoms (Parker, Cheah, & Roy, 2001; see also Marsella, 1980).

Method bias refers to all sources of systematic cross-cultural differences that are due to instrument or administration features. Three sources of method-related factors can be distinguished: sample, instrument, and administration bias (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). Sample bias results from incomparability of samples due to cross-cultural variation in sample characteristics. For example, cross-national comparisons of intelligence test scores can be compromised by differences in the quality of education in the countries involved. Instrument bias involves problems deriving from instrument characteristics, such as stimulus familiarity (in cognitive and educational tests) and response styles (in personality and attitude inventories) that differ across populations. Teacher self-efficacy was studied among 73,100 teachers in 23 countries with the Teaching and Learning International Survey. Extremity scoring was measured as the proportion of responses in the two extreme response categories (*strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*) on other scales of the survey. This response tendency was one of the best predictors of cross-national differences in teacher self-efficacy scores (Vieluf, Kuenther, & van de Vijver, 2013). The last type of method bias, administration bias, can come from administration conditions (e.g., data collection modes and

class size), ambiguous instructions, the interaction between the administrator and respondents (e.g., halo effects), and communication problems (e.g., language differences and taboo topics).

Finally, bias can be due to specific items. An item is biased when its psychological meaning differs across cultures. More precisely, an item of a scale (e.g., measuring anxiety) is said to be biased if persons with the same standing on the trait but coming from different cultures are not equally likely to endorse the item (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). Item bias (or differential item functioning) can arise from various sources. Examples are poor translation, inapplicability of item contents in some cultures, or items that trigger additional traits or use words or expressions with ambiguous connotations. A good example is the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale item "I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car." The item presupposes ownership of a car, which limits its applicability in cross-cultural research. Of all the bias types distinguished, differential item functioning has been the most extensively studied (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997; Zumbo, 2007).

Bias has implications for the *equivalence* (or comparability) of scores. Statistical and linguistic equivalence are of particular relevance here (the latter is dealt with in the next section). In the last 15 years, various taxonomies of statistical equivalence have been proposed. The currently most popular ones are based on structural equation modeling (e.g., Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). There are four basic types recurring in the numerous taxonomies that have been proposed. The first occurs when there is construct bias and there is no basis for comparing constructs across groups ("comparing apples and oranges"), which is the case when factor structures of constructs differ across groups. The second is called configural invariance, which means that the same indicators (items or subtests) load on the same factors in all groups studied. The third, called measurement weights or metric invariance, is found when the indicators show the same factor loadings in all groups. The fourth type, called score invariance or scalar invariance (or equivalence), is found when the regression of the latent factors on the observed indicators has the same intercept in each group.

Bias and equivalence are concepts that provide a framework for design and analysis aimed at enhancing research quality. The underlying questions are not unique for internationalization and are also relevant for comparisons of ages, genders, or patient groups and for the comparison of work organizations and classes. Issues of comparability are relevant in all these groups. Employing current procedures to study equivalence and differential item functioning would enhance the research quality in such studies.

Guidelines for Research and Practice

In the last decade, various groups and associations have established guidelines that are relevant for promoting inter-

nationally coordinated ways of dealing with common problems in internationalization. Using the Internet as its principal means of dissemination, the International Test Commission has published guidelines on test use (International Test Commission, 2000), on computer-based and Internet testing (International Test Commission, 2005), and on adaptations across languages and cultures (International Test Commission, 2010). Guidelines have also been developed in the domains of quality of life research (e.g., Guillemin, Bombardier, & Beaton, 1993) and cross-cultural survey research (Harkness, van de Vijver, & Mohler, 2003). Guidelines are sometimes formulated as recommendations and best practices. For example, the Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI) Guidelines are aiming to “to develop and promote internationally recognized guidelines that highlight best practice for the conduct of comparative survey research across cultures and countries” (Survey Research Center, 2010, p. 1). These Guidelines describe the general goals of guidelines for survey questions as “to maximize the comparability of survey questions across cultures and languages and reduce measurement error related to question design” (p. VI-3). The statement of this principle is then followed by procedural steps, which provide detailed recommendations about how items can be formulated to increase their cross-cultural suitability. The International Test Commission’s (2010) guidelines on test adaptations follow a similar format. For example, the first test adaptation guideline defines the general context of multilingual studies: “Effects of cultural differences which are not relevant or important to the main purposes of the study should be minimized to the extent possible” (p. 2). These guidelines are couched in terms of recommendable practices rather than inflexible norms that should be obeyed. Such norms can be perceived as unnecessary and counterproductive impositions as they cannot deal with all possible contingencies in field conditions.

These sets of guidelines accommodate both universal and culture-specific aspects of assessments. The above requirement in the International Test Commission guideline to minimize the impact of irrelevant cultural differences is meant to be a globally applicable principle. However, the operationalization of this principle in a specific context requires a profound knowledge of the construct studied, of the psychological meaning of the construct in the target cultural context, and of the specific measurement operations that could be used to assess the construct. It should be noted that this current intellectual climate of developing instruments for use in multiple cultures is an improvement over the zeitgeist in which there was an almost exclusive emphasis on linguistic aspects and translation accuracy in international projects. It is in line with this change that the term *translation* seems to have gradually been replaced by the term *adaptation*. In PsycINFO, the term *adaptation* is now more common than the term *translation* in the context of cross-cultural studies.

The domain of ethics has also seen an important internationalization movement. A 2010 special issue of *Ethics & Behavior* illustrates the combination of universal and country-specific aspects, which is the common denominator of all internationalization efforts, in the domain of psychological ethics. Leach and Leong (2010) wrote in their introduction to the special issue that “the idea of an eventual common ethics code is probably not feasible or even appropriate given cultural nuances that comprise national ethics codes. However, as the discipline of psychology becomes more formalized in increasing numbers of countries, some common standards and principles are likely to follow” (p. 175). The work on international guidelines is useful for striking a balance between the common and the unique (in line with the goals of internationalization). On the one hand, the work illustrates how we can escape from a simple Euro-American dominance in psychology and include the neglected 95% of the world’s population (Arnett, 2008). On the other hand, the work also illustrates that guidelines that are assumed to be globally applicable are typically not very dissimilar from Western recommended practices. However, they differ in an essential aspect from Western standards: They are based on experiences and insights obtained in various cultures and explicitly leave room for culturally unique aspects.

It can be concluded that there is a remarkable overlap in issues in the internationalization of psychology in theoretical advances, methodological developments, and the formulation of guidelines. Internationalization in each of these domains is based on broad universal features (constructs or procedures), complemented by culture-specific aspects. In each of the three, there are many more universal than culture-specific features; still, the accommodation of these specifics is essential to make models, techniques, and recommendations globally applicable.

Impediments to Progress

There are two kinds of obstructions to further internationalization in psychology. The first kind is due to two systemic properties of psychology as a discipline. One of these is the dominant presence of Euro-American psychology. The discipline was not set up to deal with great ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity in the profession or the participants we study. Not surprisingly, there are problems in dealing with this diversity. A good example is the dominance of English as the scientific lingua franca (Draguns, 2001). Technical tools for routine translation of scientific articles do not yet provide adequate quality. This language issue is particularly pressing in countries with a strong monolingual, non-English tradition, such as where the Romance languages are spoken. The language barriers have contributed to the development of separate language-wise organized disciplines with their own dynamics, with much mutual ignorance and neglect, despite the overlap in topics studied. For example, acculturation studies in the Anglophone and Francophone worlds are remarkably

different in theories and methods; cross-referencing is rare. Such mutual isolation impedes progress in both worlds. A second systemic problem is the absence in many countries of good tutoring systems to coach young scientists who want to submit manuscripts to international journals. I have met young colleagues from various countries who have to publish in these journals to be promoted, but because of a lack of relevant experience, their teachers and supervisors cannot be role models. It is not surprising that there is much copycatting of Western research in this young generation.

The prevailing scientific climate in psychology lacks openness, which thwarts progress in internationalization. A first example involves the numerous tacit conventions in reporting psychological studies that are not mentioned in submission guidelines or in the *American Psychological Association's (2009) Publication Manual* (Bem, 2003). Journal editors and reviewers often have very detailed opinions and expectations about what should be mentioned where in a manuscript, which statistical analyses should be used, and which theories are popular or no longer popular. Authors who are not fully aware of these expectations may find that their manuscripts are rejected because they do not fit well in the scientific climate of that field. There is a striking analogy with how Wober (1969) once described the application of Western cognitive tests to non-Western participants: "How well can they do our tricks?" (p. 488). In the fierce competition for journal space, unorthodox ways of presenting a study can be construed as incompetence.

The same lack of openness plagues the internationalization approach in other ways as well. Individualism–collectivism (Hofstede, 2001; Triandis, 1994) and independence–interdependence (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) are very popular explanations of cross-cultural differences. Critical evaluations of these concepts (e.g., Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002; Schwartz, 1994) have fallen on deaf ears. The concepts are overused. For example, Chiao and Blizinsky (2010) reported a significant correlation between 5-HTTLPR, a serotonin transporter gene that is related to negative affect, and individualism–collectivism at the country level. The correlation was presented as evidence in favor of culture–gene coevolutionary theory. More specifically, it was argued that "cultural values and frequency of S allele carriers negatively predicted global prevalence of anxiety and mood disorder. Mediation analyses further indicate that increased frequency of S allele carriers predicted decreased anxiety and mood disorder prevalence due to increased collectivistic cultural values" (Chiao & Bebko, 2011, p. 23). A main problem with this reasoning is that individualism–collectivism is just one of the country-level variables that could be associated with 5-HTTLPR. I correlated 5-HTTLPR country scores with various other country-level scores and found stronger correlations for indicators of countries' politeness, kindness, and humaneness (e.g., *Chinese Culture*

Connection, 1987). As a consequence, kindness may be a more powerful mediator (with an interpretation quite different from collectivism).

The third example of a lack of openness involves the strong tendency to focus on cross-cultural differences and to disregard cross-cultural similarities. Brouwers et al. (2004) conducted an overview of studies published in the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* between 1970 and 2004. They found that more than 40% of the studies in which cross-cultural differences were expected did not find all the differences expected, whereas there was almost no study in which expected similarities were not found. The cross-cultural field is difference driven. Such an orientation was helpful in the initial stages of the discipline when the field had to justify its existence. However, this orientation has quickly become counterproductive now that the initial stages are past.

It has often been argued that the closure that is associated with dominant paradigms in science is counterproductive and that individuals and groups with a vested interest in these paradigms can block progress (e.g., Willmott, 1993). The same problem threatens internationalization, which requires that we "break the paradigm mentality," to use Willmott's (1993, p. 681) words, and foster a basic openness to accommodate diversity.

Conclusion and Implications

Internationalization comprises different approaches in different fields. I have described approaches in theories, design and analysis, and guidelines on how to conduct studies in multicultural and multilingual settings. Even if approaches in these fields have been developed rather independently, they have much in common. These approaches share the need to overcome the dualism between etic and emic approaches. They also share the aim to accommodate both universal and culture-specific aspects in constructs or measures. In sum, they are crucial for the further development of psychology as a science and a profession.

Internationalization has come a long way. It has led to the development of various new practices. Internationalization gave rise to the development of models and training procedures in intercultural communication, improved our understanding of cultural factors in psychotherapy, has provided guidelines about how to design educational tests in polyethnic societies, and has informed policies on multiculturalism. Internationalization has expanded our theoretical knowledge in social psychology (e.g., cross-cultural similarities and differences in values) and developmental psychology (e.g., developmental tasks as preparations for both universal and culture-specific ways of demonstrating adulthood). In addition, our methodological tools to analyze quasi-experimental designs and to develop culture-informed instruments have been greatly expanded in the last decades. Also, topics in polyethnic societies have been investigated extensively, such as acculturation, which has been studied in psychology

(Berry, 1997; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001) and sociology (Portes & Zhou, 1993). However, internationalization of the discipline is still far from complete. Various branches of psychology have yet to overcome the emic-etic dichotomy, such as personality and clinical psychology. In addition, there are aspects of internationalization that have hardly been touched on, such as the psychology of globalization (Gelfand, Lyons, & Lun, 2011).

There are in my view three promising ways to further advance internationalization in psychology. The first is the *further development of international collaboration*. The nature of such cooperation is a crucial factor in how much a study can contribute to the internationalization of psychology. Studies of international collaboration have shown that the power differential is often uneven; researchers from Western countries are often the dominant party, as they usually have an advantage in terms of language, experience, and resources (Adair et al., 2010). Obviously, the development of a truly international psychology requires the intellectual input of all parties.

As a second important way of advancing the internationalization of the field, we should try to *become less driven by implicit agendas (such as the overuse of individualism-collectivism) in the study of cross-cultural differences and explore new perspectives on cross-cultural differences*. A good example is the study by Schaller and Murray (2008) on the relation between disease prevalence and personality. There are few theoretical models of cross-cultural differences. It is, therefore, more productive in the long run to explore new models than to replicate or refine existing models, as is currently done in the area of individualism-collectivism. This plea involves the research agenda of the field of internationalization but also editorial policies. It would help the field if journal editors and reviewers better appreciated that the few models of cross-cultural differences that are available are still fairly crude and in need of amendments and that we need a balanced view of similarities and differences.

Finally, internationalization has an important applied component involving, among other things, assessment in multicultural groups (L. A. Suzuki & Ponterotto, 2008), adjusting therapies for groups of immigrants (Gaw, 1993), and intercultural communication training (Deardorff, 2009). Numerous interesting approaches have been developed in each of these areas. However, these areas of inquiry lack integration and a systematic study of what is (not) effective. *A stronger orientation toward the development of evidence-based practices* in these areas would be helpful to advance the field as it will help to identify critical factors.

When the globalization movement gained momentum, it was not uncommon to hear that humankind was moving toward a homogeneous culture. In such a homogeneous world, the study of cross-cultural differences would become a nonissue. With the further development of globalization, it is becoming clear that if there is some homogenization of

humankind, it will be probably be restricted to a small elite with a strong international outlook and experience, such as sojourners working for multinational companies. It is much more likely that internationalization will further advance against a backdrop of prevailing cultural differences. Interesting challenges lie ahead of us if we want to advance the psychological basis of this development and want to reach a state in which we routinely incorporate culture in our theorizing.

REFERENCES

- Adair, J. G., Coêlho, A. E. L., & Luna, J. R. (2002). How international is psychology? *International Journal of Psychology, 37*, 160–170. doi:10.1080/00207590143000351
- Adair, J. G., Unik, L. M., & Huynh, C. L. (2010). Psychology through international congresses: Differences between regions, countries, and congresses. *International Journal of Psychology, 45*, 155–162. doi:10.1080/00207590903157221
- Allwood, C. M., & Berry, J. W. (2006). Origins and development of indigenous psychologies. *International Journal of Psychology, 41*, 243–268. doi:10.1080/00207590544000013
- American Psychological Association. (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Arnett, J. J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist, 57*, 774–783. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.57.10.774
- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist, 63*, 602–614. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602
- Bem, D. (2003). *Writing the empirical journal article*. Retrieved from <http://dbem.ws/WritingArticle.pdf>
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46*, 5–34. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (2002). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brouwers, S. A., van Hemert, D. A., Breugelmans, S. M., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2004). A historical analysis of empirical studies published in the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 1970–2004. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*, 251–262. doi:10.1177/0022022104264121
- Carroll, J. B. (1993). *Human cognitive abilities: A survey of factor analytic studies*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511571312
- Cheung, F. M. (2012). Mainstreaming culture in psychology. *American Psychologist, 67*, 721–730. doi:10.1037/a0029876
- Cheung, F. M., Leung, K., Zhang, J. X., Sun, H. F., Gan, Y. G., Song, W. Z., & Xie, D. (2001). Indigenous Chinese personality constructs: Is the Five-Factor Model complete? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*, 407–433. doi:10.1177/0022022101032004003
- Cheung, F. M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leong, F. T. L. (2011). Toward a new approach to the assessment of personality in culture. *American Psychologist, 66*, 593–603. doi:10.1037/a0022389
- Cheung, M. W. L., & Au, K. (2005). Applications of multilevel structural equation modeling to cross-cultural research. *Structural Equation Modeling, 12*, 598–619. doi:10.1207/s15328007sem1204_5
- Chiao, J. Y., & Beblo, G. M. (2011). Cultural neuroscience of social cognition. In S. Han & E. Pöppel (Eds.), *Culture and neural frames of cognition and communication* (On Thinking Series, Vol. 3, pp. 19–39). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15423-2_2
- Chiao, J. Y., & Blizinsky, K. D. (2010). Culture–gene coevolution of individualism–collectivism and the serotonin transporter gene. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 277*, 529–537. doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.1650

- Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*, 143–164. doi:10.1177/0022002187018002002
- Church, A. T. (1987). Personality research in a non-Western culture: The Philippines. *Psychological Bulletin, 102*, 272–292. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.102.2.272
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO FFI)*. Professional manual. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Cuellar, I. (1998). Cross-cultural clinical psychological assessment of Hispanic Americans. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 70*, 71–86. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa7001_5
- Deardorff, D. (Ed.). (2009). *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- De Raad, B. (1998). Five big, Big Five issues: Rationale, content, structure, status, and cross-cultural assessment. *European Psychologist, 3*, 113–124. doi:10.1027/1016-9040.3.2.113
- De Raad, B., & Peabody, D. (2005). Cross-culturally recurrent personality factors: Analyses of three factors. *European Journal of Personality, 19*, 451–474. doi:10.1002/per.550
- Diaz-Loving, R. (2005). Emergence and contributions of a Latin American indigenous social psychology. *International Journal of Psychology, 40*, 213–227. doi:10.1080/00207590444000168
- 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. doi:10.1037/a0018066
- Draguns, J. G. (2001). Toward a truly international psychology: Beyond English only. *American Psychologist, 56*, 1019–1030. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.11.1019
- Fischer, R., & Boer, D. (2011). What is more important for national well-being: Money or autonomy? A meta-analysis of well-being, burnout, and anxiety across 63 societies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 164–184. doi:10.1037/a0023663
- Gauthier, J., Pettifor, J., & Ferrero, A. (2010). The universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists: A culture-sensitive model for creating and reviewing a code of ethics. *Ethics & Behavior, 20*, 179–196. doi:10.1080/10508421003798885
- Gaw, A. (Ed.). (1993). *Culture, ethnicity, and mental illness*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Press.
- Gelfand, M. J., Lyons, S. L., & Lun, J. (2011). Toward a psychological science of globalization. *Journal of Social Issues, 67*, 841–853. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01731.x
- Guillemin, F., Bombardier, C., & Beaton, D. (1993). Cross-cultural adaptation of health-related quality of life measures: Literature review and proposed guidelines. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 46*, 1417–1432. doi:10.1016/0895-4356(93)90142-N
- Harkness, J. A., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Mohler, P. Ph. (Eds.). (2003). *Cross-cultural survey methods*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- He, J., & van de Vijver, F. (2012). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural research. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(2). doi:10.9707/2307-0919.1111. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol2/iss2/8>
- Helman, C. G. (2007). *Culture, health and illness* (5th ed.). London, United Kingdom: Arnold, Hodder Headline Group.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Leadership, culture and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- International Test Commission. (2000). *International guidelines for test use*. Retrieved from <http://www.intestcom.org/upload/sitefiles/41.pdf>
- International Test Commission. (2005). *International guidelines on computer-based and internet delivered testing*. Retrieved from <http://www.intestcom.org/Downloads/ITC%20Guidelines%20on%20Computer%20-%20version%202005%20approved.pdf>
- International Test Commission. (2010). *International Test Commission guidelines for translating and adapting tests*. Retrieved from <http://www.intestcom.org/upload/sitefiles/40.pdf>
- Kagitcibasi, C. (2002). A model of family change in cultural context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 6*(3). doi:10.9707/2307-0919.1059. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol6/iss3/1>
- Kagitcibasi, C. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theories and applications* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Keller, H. (2007). *Cultures of infancy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kleinman, A., Eisenberg, L., & Good, B. (1978). Culture, illness, and care: Clinical lessons from anthropologic and cross-cultural research. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 88*, 251–258. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-88-2-251
- Leach, M. M., & Leong, F. T. L. (2010). Introduction to the special issue: International dimensions of psychological ethics. *Ethics & Behavior, 20*, 175–178. doi:10.1080/10508421003798851
- LeVine, R. A. (1980). A cross-cultural perspective on parenting. In M. D. Fantini & R. Cárdenas (Eds.), *Parenting in a multicultural society* (pp. 17–26). New York, NY: Longman.
- Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. doi:10.1037/10019-000
- Malda, M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., Srinivasan, K., Transler, C., & Sukumar, P. (2010). Traveling with cognitive tests: Testing the validity of a KABC-II adaptation in India. *Assessment, 17*, 107–115. doi:10.1177/1073191109341445
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224–253. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224
- Marsella, A. J. (1980). Depressive experience and disorder across cultures. In H. C. Triandis & J. G. Draguns (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 237–289). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mays, V., Rubin, J., Sabourin, M., & Walker, L. (1996). Moving toward a global psychology: Changing theories and practices to meet the needs of a changing world. *American Psychologist, 51*, 485–487. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.51.5.485
- 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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.407
- Merton, R. K. (1973). *Sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1942)
- Nel, J. A., Valchev, V. H., Rothmann, S., van de Vijver, F. J. R., Meiring, D., & de Bruin, G. (2012). Exploring the personality structure in the 11 languages of South Africa. *Journal of Personality, 80*, 915–948. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00751.x
- Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: Holistic versus analytic cognition. *Psychological Review, 108*, 291–310. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.108.2.291
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kimmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 3–72. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.3
- Parker, G., Cheah, Y. C., & Roy, K. (2001). Do the Chinese somatize depression? A cross-cultural study. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 36*, 287–293. doi:10.1007/s001270170046
- Pawlik, K., & d'Ydewalle, G. (1996). Psychology and the global commons: Perspectives of international psychology. *American Psychologist, 51*, 488–495. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.51.5.488
- Poortinga, Y. H. (2005). The globalization of indigenous psychologies. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 8*, 65–74. doi:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2005.00157.x
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 530*, 74–96. doi:10.1177/0002716293530001006
- Rogler, L. H. (1994). International migrations: A framework for directing research. *American Psychologist, 49*, 701–708. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.49.8.701
- Schaller, M., & Murray, D. R. (2008). Pathogens, personality, and culture: Disease prevalence predicts worldwide variability in sociosexuality, extraversion, and openness to experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 212–221. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.212
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York, NY: Academic Press.

- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. E. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 85–119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.53.10.1101
- Super, C., & Harkness, S. (1986). The developmental niche: A conceptualization at the interface of child and culture. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *9*, 545–569. doi:10.1177/016502548600900409
- Survey Research Center. (2010). *Guidelines for best practice in cross-cultural surveys*. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Retrieved from <http://ccsg.isr.umich.edu/pdf/00FullGuidelines3.pdf>
- Suzuki, K., Takei, N., Kawai, M., Minabe, Y., & Mori, N. (2003). Is Taijin Kyofusho a culture-bound syndrome? *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *160*, 1358. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.160.7.1358
- Suzuki, L. A., & Ponterotto, J. G. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of multicultural assessment: Clinical, psychological, and educational applications*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Takahashi, T. (1989). Social phobia syndrome in Japan. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *30*, 45–52. doi:10.1016/0010-440X(89)90117-X
- Tönnies, F. (1963). *Community and society* (C. P. Loomis, Ed. and Trans.). New York, NY: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1887)
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *3*, 4–70. doi:10.1177/109442810031002
- van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2006). Culture and psychology: A SWOT analysis of cross-cultural psychology. In Q. Jing, H. Zhang, & K. Zhang (Eds.), *Psychological science around the world* (Vol. 2, pp. 279–298). London, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Phalet, K. (2004). Assessment in multicultural groups: The role of acculturation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *53*, 215–236. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00169.x
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Poortinga, Y. H. (1997). Towards an integrated analysis of bias in cross-cultural assessment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *13*, 29–37. doi:10.1027/1015-5759.13.1.29
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Tanzer, N. K. (2004). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment: An overview. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, *54*, 119–135. doi:10.1016/j.erap.2003.12.004
- van Hemert, D. A., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Poortinga, Y. H. (2002). The Beck Depression Inventory as a measure of subjective well-being: A cross-national study. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*, 257–286. doi:10.1023/A:1020601806080
- Vieluf, S., Kuenther, M., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2013). Teacher self-efficacy in cross-cultural perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *35*, 95–103. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2013.05.006
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Willmott, H. (1993). Breaking the paradigm mentality. *Organization Studies*, *14*, 681–719. doi:10.1177/017084069301400504
- Wober, M. (1969). Distinguishing centri-cultural from cross-cultural tests and research. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *28*, 488. doi:10.2466/pms.1969.28.2.488
- Zumbo, B. D. (2007). Three generations of DIF analyses: Considering where it has been, where it is now, and where it is going. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *4*, 223–233. doi:10.1080/15434300701375832