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The term "culture" is everywhere today as people strive to make sense of their increasingly diverse and divided worlds. To say "it's cultural," or "it's a culture clash," or "We need a culture change" is becoming idiomatic, and lay cultural theories and hypotheses abound. In this chapter, we review how the psychological science of culture has advanced in the past decade and how psychologists are providing insights to today's most pressing issues. In the first section, we explain some foundational ideas of the science of cultural psychology, introduce the culture cycle, and summarize how different culture cycles shape different ways of being a person. In the second section, we describe several crosscutting generalizations about people and about culture that have become more fully theorized and empirically grounded since the first edition of this volume was published. In the third section, we review some key empirical insights from the field that have emerged over the past decade. And finally, we consider how to apply some of the insights of cultural psychology to understand contemporary culture clashes and divides, as well as envision psychologically grounded approaches to culture change.
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e.g., values, beliefs, meanings, assumptions) and practices (e.g., ways of doing, making, and being) that organize people’s experiences and behavior.

We begin the chapter with a selection of recent findings to highlight the fact that culture matters in every domain of life, and that the cultures under study in the field are an increasingly diverse set, as are the researchers who are studying them. These findings show how culture is at work in our world in ways sometimes in predictable or understandable ways, and sometimes in surprising or unseen ways. Figure 1.1 highlights recent examples of how cultures influence everyday experience—in school, at work, in the marketplace, on our streets, in our communities, and across borders.

This chapter is organized into four sections: (1) cultural psychology: what is it? (2) what cultural psychologists know about persons and cultures; (3) recent empirical insights and advances; and (4) looking ahead: from culture to culture to culture change. In the first section, we explain some foundational ideas of the science of cultural psychology, introduce the culture cycle, and summarize how different culture cycles shape different ways of being a person. In the second section, we describe some crosscutting generalizations about people and about culture that have become more fully theorized and empirically grounded over the past decade. In the third section, we review some key empirical insights from the field since the first edition of this volume was published. And finally, we consider how to apply some of the insights of cultural psychology to understand contemporary culture clashes and divides, and envision psychologically grounded approaches to culture change.

CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY: WHAT IS IT?

Mutual Constitution: The Psychological Is Cultural and the Cultural Is Psychological

The studies sketched in Figure 1.1 compare people across a wide range of sociocultural distinctions and divides. Studies like these, and thousands of others, provide robust evidence for the basic social-psychological insight that the situation is powerful. People who experience different social circumstances and situations, what we call here “sociocultural contexts,” as a consequence of nation, social class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, generation, profession, and more, are likely to respond to different norms and incentives. They are also likely to understand the world using different interpretive frameworks (also called “constructs,” “schemas,” “perspectives,” “mindsets,” “mentalities,” or “meanings”).

Some of psychology’s earliest theorizing reflects a commitment to the ways in which psychological processes are made up of, or are made by, the social elements of a person’s many interacting contexts (although the term culture was not explicitly invoked until later). Wundt, a founding figure in modern psychology, believed that no thought, judgment, or evaluation could be methodologically isolated from its sociocultural base (Graumann, 1886). More explicitly, Lewin (1948, one of social psychology’s intellectual founders, wrote:

The perception of social space and the experimental and conceptual investigation of the dynamics and laws of the processes in social space are of fundamental and theoretical and practical importance. . . . The social climate in which a child lives is the world for the child as important as the air it breathes. The group to which the child belongs is the ground on which he stands. (p. 82)

As Lewin (1946/1951) also proposed “the person (P) and his environment (e) have to be viewed as variables which are mutually dependent upon each other.” In other words, to understand or predict behavior the person and the environment have to be considered as one constellation of interdependent factors” (pp. 239–240; emphasis added).

Although social psychology is one of the foundational disciplines for cultural psychology, many social-psychological studies examine the behavior of strangers—often college students—in laboratory-generated situations. This constrained, lab-based analog of the social environment is designed for the purpose of controlling the situation and specifying which aspects of situations cause behavior change. Cultural psychology research includes comparisons across a wider range of social circumstances, and encompasses more within the scope of “the situation” than has been typical in social psy-

Children in Cameroon are better able to delay gratification and resist a tempting marshmallow than children in Germany (Lammi et al., 2017).

Learners in the United States are more likely to complete an online course when they focus on how to achieve their personal goals than learners in China and India (Kulcsar & Cohen, 2017).

Latino college students perform better when their family (vs. individual) values are affirmed compared to white college students (Covarrubias, Herrmann, & Fryberg, 2016).

Chinese are more likely to seek the advice of others when making career decisions than Americans (Guan et al., 2015).

To be well regarded by their bosses, Latin American workers are more likely to act warmly (vs. competently) than U.S. American workers (Treuil, Leslie, Stizner, & Puente, 2014).

Americans contribute more personal opinions and recommendations in online reviews than do Chinese reviewers (Lai, He, Chou, & Zhou, 2013).

Indian consumers are less likely to make product purchases based on their personal preferences than are American consumers (Riener, Shavitt, Koo, & Markus, 2014; Savani, Markus, & Conner, 2008).

Upper-middle-class drivers in the U.S. are more likely to brake the law while driving than lower-class drivers (Pfau, Stancato, C04, Mendez-Denton, & Kellner, 2012).

Police officers in the United States use less respectful language when they stop African American drivers versus white drivers (Voigt et al., 2017).

Asian Americans respond better to calm versus excited doctors than European Americans (Sims et al., 2018).

Negative feelings are better predictors of poor health in the United States than in Japan (Curhan et al., 2014a; Kitayama & Park, 2017; Miyamoto et al., 2013).

Compared to West Coast cities, headlines and homepages in East Coast cities promote status and tradition (vs. freedom and innovation) (Pfeut, Markus, Treadway, & Fa, 2012).

For immigrants, fill in the culture depends more on experience than attitudes (De Leersey, Mesquita, & Kim, 2011).

People living in the Global North feel more negative emotions and report less meaning in life than people living in the Global South (Oishi & Diener, 2014;AY, Morrison, & Diener, 2014).

FIGURE 1.1. Culture at work in the world: A sample of recent findings.
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chology. From the wide-angle perspective of cultural psychology, cultures are powerful situations—albeit situations that are larger, longer-term, more complex, and messier than those typically explored in traditional social-psychological studies. One goal of cultural psychology is to specify the multiple intertwining micro, meso, and macro mechanisms through which situations wield their power.

The number of definitions of “culture” varies. Different cultures view the concept of culture in different historical and social contexts, but it is often interpreted as a system of ideas, practices, and social institutions that enable coordination of behavior in a population. (p. 632) Some theorists (Adams & Markus, 2004; Shwed, 1991, 2003) have returned to the insights of Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952), who highlight the ongoing cultural constitution of cultures and psychologist.

Culture consists of explicit and implicit patterns of historically derived and selected ideas and their embodiment in institutions, practices, and artifacts; cultural patterns may, on one hand, be considered as products of action, and on the other as conditioning elements of further action. (as summarized by Adams & Markus, 2004, p. 241; emphasis in original)

This definition conceptualizes culture as a system or as a cycle—a recurring sequence of interrelated activities that reflect and reinforce each other. The embodiment of the cycle is the people, cultural shaped shapers.

Throughout the chapter, we use the terms “culture” and “cultural” for simplicity’s sake. Yet the term “cultural” is probably preferable for communicating the full scope of cultural psychology (Markus, & Hamedani, 2007). A “cultural analysis” as we define it includes both the conceptual and the material aspects of culture. It includes both meanings—ideas, images, representations, attitudes, values, mindsets, schemas, and stereotypes—and what is often treated separately: structural and the material—cultural products, interpersonal interactions, and formal and informal institutional practices, norms, and rules of all types. Likewise, we often use the phrase “sociocultural context” in place of the term “culture.” The term “culture” is sometimes used to convey something more fixed, monolithic, or bounded than intended here. A “sociocultural context” meant to convey a system with some patterns and organization, but with more dimensionality, more openness, more malleability, more variation, and less coherence.

Cultural patterns condition people’s food and festivals, but significantly, for psychologists, they also condition people’s thoughts, feelings, and actions. As such, the psychological is cultural. Humans require multiple intersecting cultures to become people. Cultural transmission is more than just a matter of exposure, earning, and norm-following. Cultural formation is a bidirectional offer invitations for how to live and how to inhabit the world. Institutional structures and their products have intellectual history and shared theories and beliefs built right into them. And, in turn, these sociocultural contexts afford future psychological activity. Humans are Homo sapiens, those who make sense or meaning, and are also Homo faber, those who make or create. Indeed, the fact that humans make the cultures that influence them is a major evolutionary advantage (Henrich, 2015; Mesoudi, 2009; Richerson & Boyd, 2005). Culture thus exists both “in the head” and “in the world,” which means that culture interacts not only with the psychological via the “heads” of people engaging in a particular context, but also via the material “worlds” that people inhabit (Short, 1996).

A brief answer to the question “Cultural psychology: what is it?” is “research that examines the ways in which cultures and psychological make each other up in an ongoing dynamic of mutual constitution” (Adams & Markus, 2004; A. Fiske, Kitayama, Markus, & Nisbett, 1998; Gefand & Kashima, 2016; Kashima, 2000, 2016; Markus & Kitayama, 2010; Shwed, 1991, 2003; Wertsch & Sammarco, 1985). In the next section, we discuss how to represent and map this cycle of mutual constitution using a schematic or tool that we call “the culture cycle.”

Mapping Mutual Constitution: The Culture Cycle

Figure 1.1 represents culture as a system of four interacting layers that fit together into a dynamic called “the culture cycle” (A. Fiske et al., 1998; Markus & Conner, 2014; Markus & Kitayama, 2010; Markus, 2017b). Culture includes the ideas, institutions, and interactions that guide individuals’ thoughts, feelings, and actions. This graphic inscribes many of the overlapping ideas of psychology and social psychology’s earliest theorists (e.g., Asch, 1952; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Bruner, 1990; James, 1890; Lewin, 1948; Mead, 1934; Moscovici, 1988; Wundt, 1916), as well as cultural psychology’s early pioneers (e.g., Azuma, 1984; Choi, Nisbett, & Norenzayan, 1999; M. Cole, 1996; Cross & Madson, 1997; A. Fiske et al., 1998; Gefand, Triandis, & Chen, 1996; Greenfield & Cocking, 1994; Heine & Lehman, 1997; Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999; Hong, Morris, Chui, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Kashima et al., 1995; Luria, 1981; Miller, 1984; Matsu- nomoto, 1950; Mesquita & Frijda, 1992; Miller, 1995; Morris & Peng, 1994; Nisbett, 2003; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Oyserman & Markus, 1993; Oyserman, Kemmelmeier, Fryberg, Brosh, & Hart-Johnson, 2003; Rogoff, 1991; Shwed, 1991, 2003; Shwed & LeVine, 1984; Smith & Bond, 1998; Triandis, 1989; Vygotsky, 1978). For example, the depiction of the individual as an embodied part of the culture cycle heeds Bruner’s (1990) admonition that it is impossible to “construct a human psychology on the basis of the individual.” It also incorporates Gefand and Kashima’s (2016) claim that “culture is central to human sociality” (p. iv). Most significantly, with the depiction of interacting layers that influence each other, the cycle reflects the metaphor of Shwed’s (1991) view of the mutual constitution of culture and psyche that “culture and psyche make each other up” (p. 24).

Anecdotally, the culture cycle starts from either the let-hand or the right-hand side. From the left, the ideas, institutions, and interactions of an individual’s mix of cultures shapes the “I,” so that a person thinks, feels, and acts in ways that reflect and perpetuate these cultures. From the right side, i.e., individuals, selves, minds create (i.e., reinforce, resist, change) cultures to which other people adapt. The “individuals level” is the usual focus of psychologists and includes thoughts, beliefs, attitudes, feelings, emotions, biases, motives, goals, identities, and self-concepts.

The “interactional level” is the part of the culture cycle in which people live their lives. As people interact with other people and with human-made products (artifacts), their ways of life manifest in everyday situations that follow seldom-spoken norms
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**FIGURE 1.2**. The culture cycle. Adapted from Fiske, Kitayama, Markus, and Nisbett (1998), Markus and Conner (2014), and Markus and Kitayama (2010).

about the right ways to behave at home, school, work, worship, and play (Gelfand et al., 2011; Kashima, 2014, 2016; Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997; Rogoff, 2016). Guiding these practices are the everyday cultural products—stories, songs, advertisements, social media, tools (e.g., physical, technological, architectural, and so forth)—that make some ways to think, feel, and act easier, more fluid, or better supported by the world a person inhabits than others.

The next layer of culture is made up of the “institutions level,” within which everyday interactions take place. Institutions spell out and formalize the roles for a society and include government, religious, legal, economic, educational, and scientific institutions. As an example, economic institutions (e.g., capitalism, socialism), and their associated structures and policies about the distribution of material resources, are particularly significant. For the most part, people are unaware of all the laws and policies at play currently or historically in their cultures. Yet institutions exert a formidable force by providing incentives that foster certain practices and inhibit others (Markus & Conner, 2014; Tankard & Paluck, 2017; Yamagishi & Hashimoto, 2016).

The last and most abstract layer of the culture cycle is the “ideas level,” and it is made up of the pervasive, often invisible, historically derived and collectively held ideologies, beliefs, and values about what is good, right, moral, natural, powerful, real, and necessary that inform institutions, interactions, and, ultimately, the self. Because of them, cultures can appear to have overarching themes or patterns that persist, to some extent, across time. To be sure, cultures harbor multiple exceptions to their own foundational rules and values. But they also contain general patterns that can be detected, studied, and, even changed (Markus & Conner, 2014).

Several features of the culture cycle approach are especially relevant to its application: (1) The individual is a part of culture rather than an entity separate from it; (2) all four levels are important in shaping behavior, and none is assumed to be more important or theoretically prior to the others; (3) cultures are always dynamic, never static; all levels continually influence each other, and a change at any one level can produce changes in other levels; (4) the culture cycle includes structures and structural dynamics within the cycle and does not separate the cultural from the structural, and structures go hand in hand with meaning systems that animate them and help them exert their influence; (5) the four layers of the culture cycle may be in alignment and support one another or they may be misaligned and in tension; (6) within individuals, depicted here by a head with a gear, are multiple interlocking physiological and genetic systems; and (7) culture cycles are embedded in ecological systems, and all of the systems—within the individual and without—are coevolving.

**1. People Are Culturally Shaped Shapers**

**Being a Person Is a Cultural Project**

The *Me* in the Middle

What is a psychologist to do with culture cycles? Quadrupling the size of the field—adding interactions, institutions, and ideas to the already overly complex terrain of individuals—can seem daunting at best. The invitation here is not for psychologists also to become sociologists, anthropologists, economists, political scientists, historians, and biologists (although we are not discouraging that). The goal for psychologists, regardless of their particular process or dependent variable of interest, is to widen their analytical angle as they work to conceptualize, theorize, explain, predict, or change people’s behavior.

For the most part, psychologists seek the sources of behavior inside the brain and body of the person. A sociocultural perspective encourages looking at a much wider arc of influences on the individual (e.g., Luria, 1981). As the definitions of culture discussed previously reveal, complex and continually evolving cultural patterns of all types provide frameworks for agency for or individuals’ thinking, feeling, and acting. The anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) wrote that an important starting point in understanding behavior is “to figure out what the devil [people] think they are up to” (p. 29). This is the question of agency. Everyone is agentic, but just what they understand themselves to be doing and what motivates them to act can vary dramatically by context (Markus, 2016).

From the perspective of psychology, one of the most important functions of cultures is to provide guidance for what the individual should be doing and how to be a person. As shown in Figure 1.2, what it means to be an individual or a self—that is, how people in different cultures tend to answer life’s essential “Who am I?” and “What am I doing? Should I be doing?” questions—are among the big ideas that animate culture cycles. A self is the “me” and the “I” at the center of a person’s experiences and is the referent for agency. This self mediates and regulates behavior by coordinating and integrating cognitive, affective, and motivational activity (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Markus & Wurf, 1987; Oyserman, 2007, 2015; Oyserman & Markus, 1993). The self also provides a coordinating framework for brain functioning (Han & Humphreys, 2016; Ma et al., 2012; Varnum, Shu, Chen, Qui, & Han, 2014; Zhu, Zhang, Fan, & Han, 2007; see also Kitayama, Varnum, & Salvador, Chapter 3, this volume). Grounded in culture-specific ideas about how to be a normatively appropriate person, the self directs and lends coherence to attention, perceptions, feelings, memories, hopes, fears, expectations, and goals. A self is a repository or system of many selves (also called “identities”), some of which are more chronically active and others of which are cued and activated by the situation. Considering the potential meanings and relevance of any stimulus or task to the “me” is a useful starting point when making sense of individuals’ behavior, or for conceptualizing how to redirect or change behavior (Wilson, 2011).

Recent studies provide strong support for the powerful impact of how people construe themselves and their actions (i.e., their implicit theories, mindsets, schemas) on their motivation, performance, and physiology. People who construe their abilities as mal- leable and capable of cultivation (i.e., who have a growth mindset), for example, perform better than those who construe their abilities as stable and something that they
are born with (i.e., who have a fixed mindset; Dweck, 2006; Yeager et al., 2016). Students who are the first in their families to attend college, and who learn how to construe their working-class backgrounds as a resource for negotiating the world, perform better than those without this lay theory (Stephens, Hamedani, & Destin, 2014). And people who construe their stress as an opportunity for growth outperform, and show more optimal physiological responding, than those who view their stress as deleterious to their health (Crum, Ainokina, Martin, & Fath, 2017; Crum, Salovey, & Achor, 2013).

When self-construals are widely shared and inscribed—that is, reflected and promoted across the ideas, institutions, and interactions of various culture cycles—they can be called intersubjective schemas, cultural models, or social orientations (D'Andrade, 1984; Holland & Quinn, 1987; Lamont, Adler, Park, & Xiang, 2017). These collective mindsets play a significant role in how people understand themselves and one another, and how they coordinate their behavior. They function by providing blueprints for how to think, feel, and act in the world, and often result in different ways of living and being a person, also called "selfways," "folkways," or "life-ways" in the literature (Markus, Mullally, & Kitayama, 1997; Rogoff, 2016; Sumner, 1906; Adams, Escura-Villalta & Ordóñez, 2018).

**FIGURE 1.3.** Interdependent and independent selves. Adapted from Heine (2013), Markus and Conner (2014), and Markus and Kitayama (1991, 2010).

**TABLE 1.3.** Two Normative Ways of Being a Self: My Way and the Right Way

Among the many different ways people can construe themselves, cultural psychological research provides consistent evidence for at least two shared, influential, and widely practiced types of self-construals or social orientations. In a given situation across situations, people can perceive and understand themselves to be separate from and independent from others or they can perceive and understand themselves as connected to and interdependent with others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 20 0; see Figure 1.3). How these two construals are realized, and the relative balance between the two in a given culture, can vary dramatically depending on a wide range of contextual factors, including the ecology, historical period, economic system, philosophical and religious orientation, and rate of social change (in this volume, see Keller, Chapter 15: Talhelm & Oishi, Chapter 4; Cohen & Neuberg, Chapter 2). An independent model of the self is more prominent and normative in the West, whereas an interdependent model of the self is more prominent and normative in non-Western cultures that characterize the majority of the world (Adams, 2305; Gelfand & Kashi- ma, 2016; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010; Kitayama & Cohen, 2007; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 2003, 2010; Kitayama, Duffy, & Uchida, 2007; see Figure 1.3).

In many Eastern cultural contexts, for example, national and regional culture cycles contain a confluence of multiple historically developed ideas, philosophies, religious institutions, and daily practices that promote a different set of national and regional culture cycles that promote a way of being and construal of the self as a way of being and construal of the self as an interdependent individual—as interdependent. In many Western cultural contexts, in contrast, a different set of national and regional culture cycles promote a way of being and construal of the self as separate, being and construal of the self as a separate, autonomous individual—as independent. Engaging in culture cycles is the basic, active, and constitutive process of human life and forms the biological being into an individual.

With an independent self comes an independent style of agency or acting in the world (i.e., "my way" agency). The emphasis is on being a unique, separate individual, expressing the self and influencing others and the world, being free from constraints and free to choose, and being equal to others—represented by the shaded area in the independent self in Figure 1.3 (Heine, 2015; Markus & Conner, 2014; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 1997). When an independent self is guiding behavior, personal preferences, feelings, attitudes, mindsets, individual goals, and feelings about the self (e.g., a sense of control, self-esteem, self-confidence) influence one's decisions and drive behavior. These internal characteristics have behavioral force; they are the source of agency. For example, in cultural contexts that emphasize independence, a person's attitudes, feelings, and preferences guide behavior (Riener et al., 2014). Attitudes toward the environment predict ecologically conscious behaviors (Eisen, Kim, Sherman, & Ishi, 2016), negative feelings predict poor physical and mental health (Curhan, Sims, et al., 2014b; Kitayama et al., 2015; Kitayama, Norenzayan, & DeScioli, 2013, this volume; Miyamoto et al., 2013; Miyamoto, You, & Wilken, Chapter 1, this volume), and personal preferences motivate which spouses, jobs, and products people choose (Chen, Austin, Miller, & Price, 2015; Guan et al., 2015; Savani, Markus, & Conner, 2008; Savani, Morris, & Naidu, 2012; Shavitt, Cho, & Barnes, Chapter 25, this volume). In these contexts, affirming the independent self improves performance (Coavarrubias, Hermann, & Fryberg, 2016), and commitment to individual goals maintains motivation (Kizilcec & Cohen, 2017). Fou-
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Kwan, & Nisbett, 2018; Uchida, Townsend, & Markus, 2009; marriage and employment decisions depend on important others (Chen et al., 2015; Guan et al., 2015; Savani, Markus, Naidoo, Kumar, & Berila, 2010); peer influences predict product choices (Savani et al., 2008; Sta & et al., 2009); and close and important others motivate behavior (Covarrubias et al., 2016; Lam & et al., 2017; Sims et al., 2018; Stephens, Fryberg, Markus, Johnson, & Covarrubias, 2012; Torelli, Leslie, Stoner & Puente, 2014; Tripathi, Cervone, & Savani, 2018). Furthermore, people accommodate requests, exhibit more patience, and treat others with less concern for reciprocity (Miller et al., 2014; Perlow & Weeks, 2002; Savani, Morris, Naidoo, Kumar, & Berila, 2011); they have more socially oriented memories (Q. Wang, 2016); attend more to the social context in judging emotions (Masuda et al., 2008, Masuda, Russel, Li, & Lee, Chapter 8, this volume) and give more Facebook likes and fewer status updates (S. Hong & Na, 2017). Further, among people who hold a more interdependent model of self, cross-situational inconsistency is often more predictive of well-being (Church, 2014; Cross, Gorn, & Morris, 2013; Diener & Suh, 2002), behavior that is inconsistent with personal preferences is more common (Savani, Markus, & Conner, 2008) and does not arouse as much cognitive dissonance (Heine & Lehman, 1997; Hoshino-Browne et al., 2005; Kitayama et al., 2004), and failing to practice what one preaches receives less moral condemnation (Effron, Markus, Jackman, Maramoto, & Muluk, 2018).

The source of agency from an interdependent perspective is experienced as coming from outside the individual (Phut & Markus, 2005; Markus, 2016), and good or normative behavior is very often other-regulated behavior that is responsive to expectations and obligations in these contexts, "connectivity," or how: person is related to and linked with others is the primary driver of behavior. Another type of evidence supporting interdependent agency or the significance of others in shaping behavior comes from recent research demonstrating how cultural norms—what other people think, feel, or do in a given context—explains and powers behavior in multiple domains and circumstances (Gelfand et al., 2011; Har-}

universal existential theme (Keller & Kärnner, 1984) and many others have (Memon & Bourne, 1981; Shweder & Bourne, 1984) and many agree that people have some experience with both of these styles of agency.

The evidence for these conclusions is robust and growing. Most of it is from comparisons between Western contexts (North American and European cultural contexts) in which an independent style of agency is familiar and practiced, and Eastern contexts (East and South Asian cultural contexts) in which an interdependent style of agency is familiar and practiced. Researchers have also looked at interdependent agency in Middle Eastern and African contexts (Dziko, 2013; Uksol, Cross, Glinow, & Gull, Chapter 30, this volume; Uksol, Kiyawaya, & Nisbett, 2008). Recently studies have also examined agency in U.S. working-class and Latinx, Native American, and African American contexts, in which an interdependent style of agency is practiced and familiar (sometimes right alongside an independent style of agency; Brannon, Markus, & Taylor, 2015; Fryberg, Covarrubias, & Burack, 2013; Hallway, Bell, & Klee, 2009; Kraus, Caplan, & Ondish, Chapter 27, this volume; Ramirez-Esparza, Chung, Sierra-Otero, & Pennebaker, 2012; Stephens, Marku, & Townsend, 2007). Together, these studies are beginning to reveal with more detail and precision some of the sources and mechanisms of interdependent agency. At least three crosscutting understandings emerge from research on culture and agency. First, interdependent agency does not involve a grudging attention to others, role prescriptions, or norms. Instead, people actively seek and so as to be part of develop internal goals (Kraus et al., Self-1997) and, in fact, most people in the U.S. are not, or are at least not often, the normative and other-regulation; the difference is that the norm is "to follow the norm" and to do things "my way." One consequence of this is that the role of independent agency, for laypeople and scientists alike, is that the role of sociocultural norms becomes hard to track and often seems to disappear altogether. Third, given psychology's near exclusive emphasis on independent agency, many everyday forms of interdependent agency have yet to be examined as sources of agency themselves. With the exception of research on honor (i.e., one's reputation in the eyes of others) (Cross et al., 2014; Leung, 2011; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Uksol et al., Chapter 30, this volume), they include loyalty, solidarity, obligation, duty, sacrifice, hierarchy (vs. equality), roles, responsibilities, other-regulation (vs. self-regulation), and normative- or authority-driven behavior (Markus, 2016).

WHAT CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGISTS KNOW ABOUT PERSONS AND CULTURES

In the decade since the publication of the first Handbook of Cultural Psychology (Kitayama & Cohea, 2007), thousands of studies in all areas of psychology have examined the ways in which culture shapes behavior. Across these studies, in multiple cultural contexts with an array of methods, several crosscutting, high-level generalizations are emerging: people and about cultures. Before choosing a selection of recent finding and theories in more detail, we describe five of these generalizations in the following sections: (1) people are different—some are WEIRD, others are not; (2) culture matters; (3) culture is not overlays or lenses; (4) cultural differences are more equal than others—how difference becomes inequality; and (5) it's cultural—of fits and clashes.

People Are Different—Some Are WEIRD, but Most Are Not

One of the field's major achievements has been to raise awareness among psychologists that most existing scholarship is based on studies of middle-class people in the West, carried out by middle-class researchers in the West. Arnett (2008) argued that we have focused far too narrowly on U.S. American populations, who are only common about 5% of the world's population, and that have neglected the other 95%. Given this research bias, he asks whether psychology can truly consider itself to be a science of human behavior. He notes that most people in the world live in strenuous, under-resourced circumstances, and that the main social unit in these contexts is large, multigenerational families that pro-
more interdependence, obligation, and mutual support. As a consequence, many psychological findings and generalizations from the middle-class West are likely to be a poor fit at best for most of the world's people (see also Brady, Fryberg, & Shoda, 2018; Greenfield, 2017; Greenfield et al., 2006; Miller, 1999; Rogoff, 2003).

The economist-social psychologist team of Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan ratcheted up the discussion of this problem with the observation that the 15% of the world's population that psychology understands best, is, in fact, WEIRD: an acronym that stands for Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (Henrich et al., 2010). Moreover, WEIRD is not just an acronym. The West is actually historically, economically, and geographically odd compared to much of the world's population. This means that the relatively well-resourced culture cycles of the middle-class West that shape people with independent selves and an independent style of agency operate with very different ideas, institutions, and interactions.

These WEIRD culture cycles are saturated with ideas about the natural rights of free and equal individuals, institutions like the legal system support and formalize these ideas, and interactions are organized by social networks built around single-generation families with few children. In these WEIRD culture cycles, people spend more time alone and are encouraged to focus on themselves, making choices based on their preferences, expressing their emotions and opinions, following their own unique paths, and charting their futures. These are the so-called "basic" humans that psychologists know best. Perhaps the most significant contribution of cultural psychology's comparative approach in the last decade has been to shine a bright light on middle-class, Western cultural contexts and to see them as particular ways of living that give rise to particular ways of being. Many phenomena and processes long considered to be the result of the unfolding of universal human nature may now be examined for the ways in which they are actually culturally constructed and maintained.

Qi Yang (2016) advises that incorporating cultural psychology into research programs is feasible and necessary, and that all psychologists should be cultural psychologists.

**Cultures “R” Us, Not Overlays or Lenses**

More than two decades ago, Shweder and colleagues (1997) in a chapter with the subtitle “One Mind, Many Mentalities,” wrote “that the wagers of cultural psychology is that relatively few components of the human mental equipment are so inherent, hard wired, fundamental that their developmental pathway is fixed in advance and cannot be altered through cultural participation” (p. 867). That wager has paid off. Participating in communities and engaging with particular sets of ideas, frames, schemes, or mindsets can alter how and what people see, desire, feel, think, and act; how they learn and how they perform; and even how they respond psychologically (Kitayama et al., 1997, Chapter 3, this volume). Revealing when, why, how, and to what extent it happens is now the charge of cultural psychology.

The empirical examples in Figure 1.1 shine a bright light on what a careful consideration and interrogation of cultural ideas and practices can contribute to our understanding of human psychological functioning, as well as the many challenges and research opportunities that are ahead for a socioculturally grounded psychology. In Lamm and colleagues’ (2017) study, children are given Walter Mischel's alternative sweet in the “marshmallow test,” in which an adult tells a child that if she does not eat the marshmallow in front of the adult right now, she may have a second one if she waits until an adult comes back into the room. Many Western lay observers and psychologists alike assume that 4-year-olds facing the prospect of a delicious treat (a marshmallow) in the Global North or an equally appealing alternative sweet in the Global South will “naturally” struggle to fight their desire and the temptation of consuming it immediately.

In reality, an independent model of agency underlies the assumption that people are driven to express their individual needs and preferences and can suffer negative consequences constrained from doing so. Waiting is the opposite of freely exercising one’s own preferences—thus, the struggle of whether to eat the marshmallow immediately or wait and postpone gratification to obtain a second treat. Some German children manage to resist. To distract themselves, they move, twist, whine, hum, and make desperate, unhappy faces. Nearly twice as many Nso children in Cameroon, on the other hand, resist for the second treat. As these children supposedly “test” the temptation to eat the first marshmallow, they do not manifest the same signs of “struggle” as the German children. One Cameroon and German culture cycles provide insights into why these children behave differently. In Cameroon, one prevalent cultural idea is that an individual is a part of an encompassing social whole, and part of the overarching goal that guides a person’s behavior is to figure out how to fit within this whole and adjust to it. As interdependent agents with interdependent selves, people live in intergenerational extended families and are used to adjusting to others. At the interactions level of the culture cycle, parenting practices emphasize awareness of one’s place in the social hierarchy and respecting elders. In contrast, German culture cycles foster independent agency and an independent self. Parenting practices instead stress personal independence and expressing individual preferences and emotions. When one compares these two culture cycles and their underlying models of agency, one can see that the appeal of a sweet may be universal, but the behavioral course and outcome of this appeal is quite different.

This fascinating study opens the door to many lines of inquiry. Will the children who can delay gratification do show more achievement in later life as they do in the United States (Mischel, 2014)? Do children in Germany and Cameroon experience the situation similarly? If not, what do they experience and why? How do parents structure interactions to foster these different styles of regulation and associated ways of being? Is it the case that the Nso children reveal no negative affect, or do they learn effective strategies of down-regulation? For example, analyzing East Asian contexts, Tsai and colleagues propose that calm affect is highly functional, in that it allows people to attend to others, to be interdependent, and to respond to others, which is useful for interdependent selves and agents (Tsai, 2017; Tsai, Knutson, & Fung, 2006). How are such differences in arousal socialized and maintained (Tsai & Gobert, Chapter 11, this volume)? What does variability in arousal or other aspects of emotional expression (e.g., degree of embodiment, emotional practices) mean for the conceptualization of “basic” human emotions (Mesquita & Barret, 2017)? What are productive and innovative methods for answering these types of questions?

Psychology is the science of the minds, brains, and behavior of individuals, but what the evidence now underscores is that these minds, brains, and behavior are always in situations and cultures, and are responsive to them. The strong implication is that minds, brains, people, and their situations are best conceptualized and theorized together, and that minds, brains, and people are more malleable and flexible than psychologists have previously realized. Patterns of activity that are observed in behavior and in the brain are made up of, and are made up by, the sociocultural. The sociocultural, then, is not an overlay on the basic that can be peeled back to reveal the underlying “real.”

Psychology’s focus on people in WEIRD cultural contexts has led to an essentialist perspective that focuses on people’s internality, locates the sources of action inside the person, and conceptualizes psychological functioning as basic and discrete psychological processes (e.g., attention, perception, cognition, emotion, motivation). A cultural perspective may eventually lead to a psychology instead focuses more on shared and contextualized human activities (Rozin, 2001), including eating (Rozin, Ruby, & Cohen, Chapter 17, this volume), attachment (Keller, 2016; Keller, Chapter 15, this volume), learning (Rogoff, 2006), working (Levine, Harrington, & Ullmann, Chapter 23, this volume), relating (Kim & Lawrie, Chapter 10, this volume), communicating (Keller, Chapter 15, this volume), consuming (Shavitt, Cho, & Barnes, Chapter 25, this volume), being well (Miyamoto, Yoo, & Wilken, Chapter 12, this volume), fitting in and acculturating (Mesquita, De Leersnyder, & Jasni, Chapter 19, and Morris,Fischer, S. & Savani, Chapter 18, this volume), and more, most of which have connecting or relating to others and the social world as key features (Adams, Estrada-Vallés, & Kurr, 2018).
Everyone Is Multicultural—and Intersectional—it’s Complicated

Navigating the norms and demands of two or more nations, regions, cultures, or ethnic groups—many of them at odds with one another—is a formidable challenge for people across the globe (Benet-Martinez & Hong, 2014; Leung & Koh, Chapter 21, and Messa, et al., Chapter 19, this volume). As people encounter each other in bedrooms, classrooms, courthouses, and boardrooms, it is important that they recognize and reject what Morris and colleagues call cultural rationalism: “a categorical conception in which individuals are shaped by one primary culture and the world’s cultural traditions are separate and independent” (Morris et al., 2015a, p. 533). As popular and scientific attention focuses on culture beyond nations or regions, and the scope of cultural analysis expands to consider the many cultures of people’s lives, it may become easier to forget rationalism and the fact that people are all multicultural in one way or another. All people participate in many culture cycles simultaneously, and all lives contain a variety of cultural intersections (A. Cohen, 2009; A. Cohen & Varnum, 2016; Markus & Conner, 2014). As a sociocultural perspective grows in prominence, it may become more obvious and possibly easier to reject color blindness, an ideology that claims that culture, race, ethnicity, as well as gender and other markers of social distinctions, should not be major factors that shape the experiences and outcomes of people’s lives. Currently, color blindness is still a powerful ideology in places such as the United States, bringing with it a neglect or denial of the fact that social categorizations fundamentally organize society and have life-altering consequences (e.g., Markus & Moya, 2010; Omi & Winant, 1986/2015; Pilut, 2010).

From a cultural psychological perspective, people can be characterized as nodes in multiple intersecting, open, and constantly shifting culture cycles. As an example, many people in U.S. national contexts are often goal-directed, focused on self-promotion and expressiveness, and have a sense of self that is highly independent compared to people in East Asian national contexts. Yet, as U.S. national culture cycles intersect with U.S. social class culture cycles, the character-

ization of U.S. psychological tendencies may change markedly. In contexts characterized by fewer economic resources, less status, and lower societal rank, people react to depend on, rely on, and fit in with others who can help buffer the constraints of riskier worlds (S. Fiske & Markus, 2012; Markus & Stephens, 2014; Cialdigh, 2017). As they enter into the cultural intersecting and their interrelated individual psychological tendencies (Markus, 2017). In contrast, middle- and upper-class U.S. individuals have the often unexamined advantage of having access to more material and social resources to realize prevalent cultural mandates like those reflected in the American Dream.

As Japanese national culture cycles intersect with Japanese social class culture cycles, the outcomes are both similar and different than the U.S. case. Miyamoto and colleagues (2018) found that in Japan, higher SES is associated with higher self-orientated psychological traits and socialization values, as they are in the United States. Yet, interestingly, this self-orientation does not come at the expense of other orientation. Higher SES is also associated with higher other-orientated psychological traits and socialization values. In Japan, it is to be noted that this SEL context in which the multifaceted task of pursuing their own goals while also fulfilling the social responsibilities that are foundational to competent personhood in Japan is somewhat analogous to the East Asian and other East Asian cultural cycles. One of the obvious challenges of multicultural, intersectional selves is that of concomitantly complexity. Theoretically, all significant social categories are meaningful and can powerfully shape psychological experience, but what is one to do in the ana-
dritic moment? Addressing this “All of us are in the same boat” inquiry, Markus and Conner multicategorical–points (Markus, 2014) analyzed eight cultural divides that have been reasonably well studied in the social sciences, and that have been shown to be consequential for people’s answers to the question of “Who am I/who are we” questions of identity and belonging: East versus West, Global North versus Global South, men versus women, rich versus poor, whites versus people of color, businesses versus governmental and non-profit, liberal versus conservative religious groups, and coasts versus heartlands. They show that one set of culture cycles (i.e., those of the West, the Global North, men, the rich or middle-class, whites, businesses, liberal religious groups, and the coasts), tend to promote independence, while the culture cycles of the less well-resourced and less powerful sides of these divides tend to promote interdependence. Markus and Conner propose that any given person’s social orientation toward independence or interdependence will depend on the person’s mix of these culture cycles and on which ones are salient at a given time or situation. Given the hegemony of independence in American ideas and institutions, along with the historical dominance of color blindness, the interdependent tendencies that arise from intersections of national culture with social class, race and ethnicity are generally unrecognized and are often misunderstood and stigmatized.

The most well-developed theorizing on intersectionality focuses on the interplay of race and gender identities. It proposes that the many facets that contribute to one’s identity should not be considered separately, but instead, simultaneously and as interacting to influence one’s privilege and treatment in society (E. Cole, 2009; Cremins, 1995; Goff & Kahn, 2013; E. Hall, Galinsky, & Phillips, 2015; Settles & Buchanan, 2014). These researchers have been most concerned with the power and social justice implications of intersectionality, especially in law, the workplace, and education. Researchers studying multiculturalism in cultural psychology have instead focused primarily on the psychological experience of having multiple identities and their behavioral consequences (Benet-Martinez & Hong, 2014). These two literatures are highly relevant for each other but have yet to intersect.

Some Cultures Are More Equal Than Others—How Difference Becomes Inferiority

In the course of expanding the scope of cultural comparison and revealing different and previously unexamined ways of living and ways of being call cultures more the same. Some cultures are more equal than others. There is a clear power hierarchy among cultures. One project of cultural psychology is to compare cultures’ different ways of living and being, and to test the hypothesis that there is more than one good and viable way of living and being (e.g., what looks like conformity and a failure to express oneself from a Western perspective is adjusting in the service of group harmony from an Eastern perspective; Kim & Markus, 1999). This task is challenging enough. Yet dramatically complicating the cultural comparison project is the fact that cultural divides, the cultures being compared should not be arrayed horizontally, side by side, but rather vertically, because one has more material resources, power, and status than the other (e.g., the Global North vs. the Global South, the middle class vs. the working class, men vs. women, whites vs. African Americans).

It is easy to fall into the trap of culturalism (Morris et al., 2015a) and assume that the cultures on either side of a divide are separate from each other, and that their cultural patterns reflect only their own value, self-esteem, individualism, and practices. This way of conceptualizing culture ignores the fact that the observed cultural patterns of the less powerful group are, in some significant part, a function of contending with the implications of the more powerful culture’s ideas and practices (Markus, 2008). When what the less powerful group does is shown to be less efficient, competent, or healthy (often according to the metrics and measurement instruments devised by the more powerful group), the assumption may be that the less powerful group is different because its members’ ways of living and being are somehow inferior or faulty (Moya & Markus, 2010).
Further, these power and resource differences among cultures have real and significant consequences, and serve to maintain the dominance of the more powerful group. As such, cultural differences come to be constructed not simply as differences, but as indications of the "inferiority" of the small—in which group (Adams & Estrada-Villalta, 2017, Crozier, 2012)

The task for cultural psychologists, then, is to consider not only the maturational constitution of culture and psyche, but also what is more properly called "downward constitution": the experience of being in a setting in which "one is exposed to a potentially limiting and devaluing concert of representations, historical narratives, possible judgments, treatments, interactions, expectations, and affective reactions" (Thomas, 1992, as paraphrased in Markus, Steele, & Steele, 2000, p. 235). Some of the observed practices and tendencies of a given sociocultural context under study are claimed and valued by participants in that context, while others may be imposed and unclaimed and thus resisted and challenged. Observed psychological tendencies can reflect adaptation to one, both, or a blend of incorporation or resistance. The analysis of how cultures and psyches make each other up also requires an understanding and an explanation of downward social constitution within its cycles (see Figure 1.4 for an example of the downward constitution of African Americans in the U.S.).

A cultural analysis that incorporates downward constitution should include an awareness of (1) historically derived ideas about group differences (e.g., black = criminal, Latino = illegal); (2) the role of current or past institutions in how policies and structures formalize or devalue groups, as well as inscribe and maintain a particular social ordering (e.g., slavery, immigration policy); (3) the role of interactions in perpetuating norms that guide behavior (e.g., who plays with whom, who dates whom), the actions of other people (e.g., being followed in a department store, being handcuffed without cause during a traffic stop by the police), and the expectations of others (e.g., employers and teachers' views about who is smart and capable or who is likely to be a troublemaker in the classroom or on the street); and (4) at the level of individuals, people's experiences of difference (e.g., stereotype threat, invisibility).

Attending to the dynamics of downward constitution in a cultural analysis importantly directs our attention to the negative, essentializing, and deficiency-focused ideas and actions that powerful groups in society impose on a less powerful groups. Higher ranking groups, compared to lower ranking groups, often adopt more fixed or essentializing beliefs about the sources of identity and behavior of other groups as a way of maintaining their status (Mahalingam, 2003; Moya & Henrich, 2016). A sociocultural approach offers psychologists a view to the historically derived and context-specific processes by which difference becomes inferiority—a view that is hidden by a focus on the individual level alone (Markus & Moya, 2010; for specific examples, see Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Ordóñez (2018) for a discussion of how the colonial Global North downwardly constitutes the formerly colonized Global South with various forms of so-called cultural "pathologies"; see Shafir (2017) for a discussion of how people in high SES contexts are disdainful of people in low SES contexts and downwardly constitute them through attributions of inferiority, and Goudreau and Crozier (2017) for a discussion of how certain classroom practices such as hand raising advantage middle-class students compared to their working-class students and often go unseen).

It's Cultural—of Fits and Clashes
As societies and the social sciences have grown more diverse in recent years, there has been a growing interest in the volume of research on culture clashes or divides. These clashes occur when a person's understanding or way of being in the situation does not match up with the ways and practices that are prevalent in that situation. This can happen when, for instance, a student or employee feels like they are met with a constrict of ideas and practices like age and small—in which case is invisible or rendered as potentially inferior (Brann et al. 2015; Fryberg & Townsend, 2008; Lewis & Sekaquaptewa, 2016; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008; C. Steele, 2010; Walton, Murphy, & Ryan, 2015). One example is when a Latinx lawyer, in the midst of a firm reception or party, is asked, "Where are the drinks?" by a colleague who mistakes her for a server. It can also happen when a familiar and well-practiced way of being (e.g., interdependent agency) meets a set of inter- nalized patterns or institutional polices that have been set up with another way of being in mind (e.g., independent agency; Bencar et al. 2018; Markus & Conner, 2014; Stephens, Hamedani, Markus, Bergskei, & Elo, 2009; Stephens, Townsend, Markus, & Phillips, 2012). One example is when an East Asian middle manager, during performance review time, is told that he does not have the executive presence to move to the C-suite.

The result in both instances is a culture clash or a lack of fit and a sense of dis-ease, difficulty, or discomfort in the person in the clashing or ill-fitting situation. This experience often manifests as a drag on trust, motivation, performance, social interactions, well-being, and even physical health (Fryberg & Martinez, 2014; C. Steele, 2010).

Recent examples of the effects of culture clashes include underrepresented or minoritized students in colleges or universities (Yeager et al., 2016), first-generation college students entering institutions of higher education (Harackiewicz et al., 2014; Goudreau & Crozier, 2017; Stephens, Townsend, et al., 2012), immigrants from collectivist societies entering more individualist ones (Cheung, Chudek, & Heine, 2011; LeClere & Lueth, 2011; Sam & Berry, 2011).

**Figure 1.4. Downward constitution.**
Going Deep: Genetics and the Brain

Culture shapes not only psychological processes themselves but also the genetic and neural processes that can underlie what we think of as "psychological." Culture is not just the ubiquitous term that is used; it also operates under the skin, interacting with our genes and brains at the biological level. As Kitayama and Uskul (2011) importantly underscore, due to the ways the biological and social sciences were used and abused in the past to justify so-called "scientific" racism, it was considered taboo for some time even to breach the topic of cultural differences mapping onto the physical body in any way. As the science behind gene-environment interaction has grown more sophisticated in recent years, however, the data simply do not show that there is any kind of biologically deterministic relationship between genes and cultures. Instead, what scientists have observed is an intricate and flexible process in which social and environmental interaction and adaptation that does not affect the genetic code itself, but instead affects how some genes are expressed under certain conditions. Cultures, therefore, may influence genetics in a subtle way (in this volume, see Kim & Lawrie, Chapter 10; Kitayama et al., Chapter 3) — it does not change the basic design of the mind or body itself, but rather specific aspects of psychological or behavioral adaptation to particular environmental factors (Kitayama & Uskul, 2011).

How does this take place? Genes and cultures can influence one another both at the macro-level, through what is called gene-culture coevolution, and at the micro-level, through what is called gene-culture interactions (Henrich, 2015; Kim & Sasaki, 2014; Moya & Henrich, 2016; see also Mesoudi, Chapter 5, this volume). Gene-culture coevolution means that cultural ideas, values, and practices have evolved over time and are adaptive, influence the social and physical environments in which people live, and happen in tandem with the genetic natural selection process. As such, certain genotypes may correspond to particular cultural tendencies or reflect different tendencies in different cultural environments. Gene-culture interactions, on the other hand, mean that cultural and genetic culture interactions may interact with people's genetic predispositions to influence how they think, feel, or act, or influence how sensitive particular people are to certain kinds of cultural or environmental experiences (Kim & Sasaki, 2014; Kitayama, King, Hsu, Liberson, & Yoon, 2016). What do these interactive processes actually look like? Kitayama and colleagues (2016) recently proposed that for example, that some people may be more genetically sensitive to cultural norms than others, which could help account for individual differences in psychological tendencies within cultural groups. For example, in one of this theory, they found that people who carried dopamine receptor gene (DRD4) polymorphisms linked to increased dopamine signaling (7- or 2-repeat alleles) were more likely to exhibit culturally dominant social orientations (Kitayama et al., 2014). That is, American-born European Americans with this gene expression were likely to be more independent than their counterparts without the gene expression. Similarly, Asian-born Asians with the same gene expression were likely to be more interdependent than their fellow Asians without the gene expression. This evidence suggests that the DRD4 could play an important role in cultural learning, accounting for at least some variation in how people acquire and develop specific social norms. It may help explain, for example, why some of us might seem more like prototypes typical members of our cultures, while others may be more likely to seem like eccentrics or rebels who more often go against the grain.

Culture also shapes the mind through how people's brains work, both functionally and structurally (Chiao, 2009; Kim & Sasaki, 2014; Kitayama & Uskul, 2011; see also Kitayama et al., Chapter 3, this volume). Early studies in cultural neuroscience, using brain imaging methods such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and event-related potential (ERP), indicated that there are neural correlates to cultural differences typically captured through self-report and behavioral measures. For example, both Chinese and North American college students showed greater MPFC (medial prefrontal cortex) activation when making judgments about themselves compared to others, consistent with prior behavioral research showing differences between East Asians and North Americans in self-other judgments (Zhu et al., 2007). However, only Chinese participants also showed activation in the MPPC when thinking about their mothers, a close other role independent of the self. Indeed, as numerous studies have shown, self-construct has been found to be a consistent mediator of cultural differences in brain activity in explaining differences across both national and religious cultures (Han & Humphreys, 2016; Sasaki & Kim, 2011).

Other researchers have examined the effects of cultural priming on brain activity and have studied the neural correlates of cultural differences in cognitive styles, emotion regulation, and social cognition (in this volume, see Masuda, Russell, Li, & Lee, Chapter 8; Tsai & Cobbert, Chapter 11). Using fMRI to study cultural differences in holistic versus analytic processing styles, for instance, showed that East Asians and European Americans had to control their attention more when they were asked to adopt the "culturally opposite" processing style when making visual judgments. East Asians exerted greater mental effort (i.e., showed greater frontal and parietal activation) when asked to ignore the context (which contrasts with a holistic processing style), while European Americans showed greater mental effort when asked to pay attention to the context (which contrasts with an analytic processing style; Hedden, Kato, Aron, Markus, & Gabrieli, 2008). In a study using functional near-infrared spectroscopy, Muata, Park, Kovelman, Hu, and Kitayama (2015) found similar results using a different method to look at brain activity. As for brain structures itself, early research using MRI has shown that some meaningful cultural differences may also develop in the brain's anatomy, possibly due to the acquisition of different cognitive styles, languages, or self-regulation processes (Sasaki & Kim, 2011; Kitayama et al., 2015). Taken together, this work suggests that the brain is plastic and flexible, responsive to a diversity of cultural inputs and variation.

Spanning Basic Processes: Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation

As showcased in Figure 1.1, culture in all forms shapes the: basic psychological pro-
cesses of cognition, emotion, and motivation. Culture facilitates different styles of thinking, feeling, and acting that guide how people understand themselves and others, as well as how they perceive and navigate the world around them.

Cognition

In addition to continuing to document the effects of analytic-holistic cognitive styles and independent-interdependent social orientations on perception, attention, categorization, and reasoning (see Masuda et al., Chapter 8, this volume), researchers are now analyzing how these cultural differences in cognition originate and develop. Some have hypothesized that adapting to different environmental ecologies, in particular, can lead to cultural variation in cognition (see also Talhelm & Oishi, Chapter 4, this volume). As an example, to test whether environments that call for greater social interdependence lead to a more holistic cognitive style, Uskul and colleagues (2008) studied three communities in Turkey’s Black Sea region that have different ecological environments and local economies. These Turkish communities share a common nationality, language, ethnicity, and geographic region, but differ in how socially interdependent they are. This variation in social interdependence, Uskul and colleagues (2008) proposed, is due to the fact that these communities have been historically dependent on different kinds of occupations: farming, fishing, or herding. Farming and fishing, on the one hand, require high levels of social cohesion, group collaboration, and staying in one place (i.e., a lot of social interdependence). Herding, on the other hand, requires high levels of autonomy, individual decision making, and moving around to multiple places (i.e., a lot of social independence). They found that farmers and fishers, communities with greater social interdependence, thought more holistically, while herders, a community with greater social independence, thought more analytically. Talhelm and colleagues (2014) found complementary results when contrasting the effects of rice versus wheat agricultural legacies in China, with rice farming requiring much more social cohesion than wheat farming. In support of this hypothesis, they found that people from rice-growing, Southern provinces in China were more likely to be interdependent, holistic thinkers than people from wheat-growing, Northern provinces.

Psychologists have also started to take a more detailed look at how cultural differences in cognition emerge developmentally (see Masuda et al., Chapter 8, and Keller, Chapter 15, this volume). In one study that examined children’s artwork, Sensaki, Masuda, and Nand (2014) found that Japanese and Canadian children produced similar landscape drawings (i.e., a drawing of a house and its surrounding environment) and understood the concept of a “horizon” in grade 1. However, by grade 2, cultural differences began to emerge. Japanese children in grade 2 drew the horizon significantly higher up in their pictures, and drew more objects in them overall, than Canadian children of the same age, mimicking a more holistic versus analytic style of visual representational prevalent in Japanese culture and aesthetics. In another study, researchers found that Japanese children’s tendency to pay attention to the context of the environment, a feature of a holistic cognitive style, called “context sensitivity”—increased by age, emerging at ages around 5 years of age and reaching adult levels by 8–9 years of age (Imada, Carlson, & Ikakura, 2013).

Emotion

Turning from cognition to emotion, researchers are continuing to study how people do emotion differently in multiple cultural contexts, and are now also looking at how emotional norms and biases play out in institutional contexts such as doctors’ offices, schools, and workplaces. Over the past decade, scholars have also been expanding their work beyond East-West cultural comparisons, studying other kinds of cultural contexts, as well as identity intersections within national contexts (Mesquita, Boiger, & De Leersnyder, 2016); in this volume, see also Tsai & Colber, Chapter 11; Mesquita, De Leersnyder, & Jasim, Chapter 19).

Culture and emotion researchers, for example, have weighed in on the long-standing assumption that suppressing one’s emotions is intrinsically and can lead to negative mental and physical health outcomes. For example, Sato, Perez, Kong, and Minnick (2011) asked whether this should be the case in East Asian cultural contexts, in which showing emotional restraint is valued over freely expressing one’s emotions. By comparing U.S., Japanese, and Chinese students’ use of emotional suppression, life satisfaction, and mood, they found that suppression was related to negative psychological functioning (i.e., lower life satisfaction and depressed mood) for U.S. European American students but not for Hong Kong Chinese students. Since expressing one’s emotions is part of being true to oneself in individualistic, independent U.S. culture, it follows that going against this emotional norm by regulating or suppressing one’s emotions is experienced negatively by Americans. Since this emotional logic is not the norm in East Asian contexts, regulating or suppressing emotion is far less likely to result in this kind of negative experience. One study conducted in the Philippines showed that negative feelings are an expected part of life, and control over emotional expressions that could disrupt important relations is highly valued (Guritan, Sims, et al., 2014). It is likely that the practice of emotional suppression, especially in ideal affect in each culture: U.S. culture values excitement and high-arousal, positive emotions, while Chinese culture values calm and low-arousal, positive emotions (Tsai et al., 2006). These cultural differences in ideal affect may also contribute to bias when cultural mismatches arise. For example, Asian Americans in the United States are often stereotyped as being “too passive” by the strong leaders or “too quiet” to be the smartest students—cultural clashes or misunderstandings that can be attributed, in part, to divergent emotional norms.

Motivation

Turning to motivation, researchers have continued to explore how agency takes different forms across diverse cultural contexts, and they are now exploring how cultural goals shape choice and decision making as well as impact health and education behaviors (see Kim & Leana, Chapter 10, this volume). The idea that agency can come from “the outside”—from attunement to close others.
and by following social norms and expectations—instead of “the inside”—from one’s internal preferences and by following one’s own personal attitudes and values—remains a challenging idea for many psychological scientists and people in the West in general (e.g., Fiske et al., 2007; Markus, 2014; Riemer, Shavit, Koo, & Markus, 2014; Stephens et al., 2009). Given the power of the Western, neoliberal narrative of choice and freedom embedded in the U.S. and among elites around the world, expanding theories of agency and motivation is an uphill battle that involves bucking a deeply inscribed social and political construction. Increasingly, sociocultural analyses reveal that agency does not equal independence; in fact, in many parts of the world and among diverse groups within the United States itself, agency instead equals interdependence (Markus, 2017).

Studies have demonstrated the real-world significance of independent versus interdependent styles of agency and motivating behavior (Riemer et al., 2014). Eom and colleagues (2016), for example, challenged the prevailing assumption that increasing people’s personal concerns about the environment is the best path to promoting proenvironmental behavior. In a study analyzing World Values Survey data from 42 nations, they found that people’s proenvironmental behaviors were more likely to predict their support for proenvironmental action in countries that are high in individualism, which suggests that the link between belief and action is higher in countries where “the inside” matters most. In countries that are high in collectivism, such as Japan, where “the outside” matters most, they found that perceived proenvironmental social norms were instead more predictive of people’s proenvironmental decisions.

Along similar lines, Ramach and Gelfand (2010) examined job turnover in India and the United States, two of the world’s most influential economies. While it is important to employ both India and the United States to feel like they “fit” with their respective companies or organizations, different aspects of fit actually predict job turnover (Kamen & Gelfand, 2010). In the United States, a country high in individualism, with a culture that values “the inside,” employees are more likely to leave their jobs when they feel that their roles do not fit them personally. In India, a country high in collectivism, with a culture that values “the outside,” employees are more likely to leave their jobs when they feel that their tasks do not fit them personally. In India, a country high in collectivism, with a culture that values “the outside,” employees are more likely to leave their jobs when they feel that their tasks do not fit them personally. In India, a country high in collectivism, with a culture that values “the outside,” employees are more likely to leave their jobs when they feel that their tasks do not fit them personally.

Growing Up: Psycho-social Development:

Given that the cultural and the psychological make each other up, it follows that culture should play a powerful role in psychological development. Researchers who study culture and development have been making theoretical and empirical strides over the past decade, proposing models of cultural variation in development and producing compelling empirical demonstrations of how culture intersects with a variety of developmental processes (see Keller, Chapter 15, this volume).

The last decade of research reveals multiple pathways for healthy human development that are informed by diverse cultural and ecological models of the self, childhood, and familial relationships (e.g., Keller, 2013; Keller & Kärtner, 2013; Schröder, Kärter, Keller, & Chaudhary, 2012; Q. Wang, Q. Wang, & Gelfand, 2011; 2012; P. Wang, 2013; 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; 2018; 2019; 2020). Different ways of conceptualizing how children learn to participate in cultural ways of life (e.g., Chaudhary, 2015; Rogoff, 2014; & Corelli & Chaudhary, 2015; R. Gelfand, 2015; Haehn & Karasawa, 2009) and changing norms around development as societies evolve and respond to global trends such as globalization and technology (e.g., Greenfeld, 2005; Manago, 2013; Park, 2014; Twenge, & Greenfeld, 2014).

As an example of this research, Kärter, Keller, and Chaudhary (2011) asked how culture can foster different pathways to the same developmental milestones. Specifically, they examined emerging prosocial behavior among German and Indian toddlers. In the West, where developing an autonomous and independent self is the norm, developmental scientists have theorized and found empirical support for the idea that having empathy or showing concern for others necessitates being able to distinguish oneself from another person. This is called “self-other differentiation.” Comparing children from middle-class families in Germany and India, a cultural context where developing a relational and interdependent self is instead the norm, Kärter and colleagues found that while self-other differentiation was associated with increased prosociality among German toddlers, it was not among Indian toddlers. The researchers concluded that there might be another kind of developmental “tension” in Indian culture, one that does not rely on separating the self from others. Building on the idea that psychological scientists need to question their assumptions about so-called “universal” developmental processes, research shows that even a number of studies examining the role of “tension” in Western parents—such as “Beware of stranger danger” or “Don’t play with knives”—are grounded in cultural norms and assumptions about healthy development that do not hold up in other places around the world (e.g., Lancy, 2016; Marey-Sarwane, Keller, & Otto, 2016).

Externalizing the Psycho: Norms and Morality:

We are also learning more about how norms operate across a variety of different cultures, transmitting shared knowledge and guiding moral decision making and behavior. In psychology, “norms” are typically defined as unwritten social rules that guide the kinds of behaviors that people find acceptable versus frowned upon. Norms and moral help people answer the “big questions” in a given society, orienting them toward what is good, right, and true. In the face of bad, wrong, and false (Shwed, 1991).

Social and cultural psychologists, as we have noted, ground their scholarship in the theoretical and empirical study of the myriad powerful ways the social context influences people’s behavior. The science of cultural norms takes this work even further by analyzing how social norms both perpetuate culture and in turn are culturally change, and by examining how norms work at both the individual (micro) and collective (macro) levels. Studies over the past decade have focused on what shapes the content and strength of cultural norms, when people adhere to rather than deviate from cultural norms, and how social norms can be leveraged to change cultures (Gelfand, 2012; Gelfand & Jackson, 2015; Gelfand & Jackson, 2015b). While scholars across fields often distinguish between what are called “injunctive” norms (i.e., what people do) and “descriptive” norms (i.e., what people actually do), researchers have found that this distinction is often blurred among everyday social actors (Erickson, Strimling, & Coutias, 2015) or that both kinds of norms often function together as culture operates as shared common sense or as intersubjective perspective (Gelfand & Jackson, 2016; Chi, Gelfand, Yamagishi, Sheyberg, & Wan, 2010; Zou et al., 2009).

Looking at the relative strength of cultural norms across societies, Gelfand and colleagues compared the antecedents and consequences of so-called “tight” versus “loose” cultures (e.g., Gelfand et al., 2011; Harrington & Gelfand, 2014; Mu, Kitayama, Han, & Gelfand, 2013; Roos, Gelfand, Nau, & Lun, 2015). “Tight” cultures are defined as those that have strong norms and a low tolerance for norm deviance (e.g., Singapore, South Korea), while “loose” cultures are defined as those that have weaker norms and a higher tolerance for norm deviance (e.g., the Netherlands, Israel). In a multilevel analysis of 33 national cultures, they found that nations with a history of ecological
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uncertainty and threat were more likely to have tight (vs. loose) cultures, which could be explained by a historical need to coherently organize or coordinate socially important interaction to respond to and survive those threats (Gelfand et al., 2011; Roos et al., 2015; for an overview of the neurobiology of tightness-looseness, see Mura et al., 2015; for a complementary set of within-nation findings, see Harrington & Gelfand, 2014).

In addition to identifying cross-cultural variation in individuals and social judgments, researchers are now focusing on the role of moral behavior in everyday practice and cultural conflicts, as well as investigating differences among subgroups within national cultures (e.g., Buchtel et al., 2015; A. Cohen, 2009; Graham, Meindl, Beall, Johnson, & Zhang, 2016; Oishi, 2010; Piff, Stancato, Côte, Mendoza-Denton, & Keltner, 2012; Ral & Fiske, 2011; see also Miller, Woot, & Goyal, Chapter 16, this volume). Haidt and Graham’s moral foundations theory has been particularly influential, organizing moral differences along six dimensions: harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, liberty/oppression, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity (Graham et al., 2012; Haidt & Graham, 2007). This framework has been useful for explaining differences in liberal and conservative political ideologies that fuel the American “cultural wars” (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009). Wide-scale conservatives, for example, tend to value the six dimensions equally, and crafts value harm/care and fairness/reciprocity above the others (Graham et al., 2009).

Materializing the Psyche: Cultural Products

“Because cultural psychology is the study of both person-shaped cultural contexts and culturally shaped persons,” Lamoreaux & Morling urged in 2012, “the field should include measures of cultural difference at both of these levels” (p. 299). Over the past decade, cultural psychologists have heeded this call, learning more about how to measure cultural patterns and tendencies outside of the head by analyzing a wide variety of cultural products.

Cultural products are artifacts or tangible objects—such as computers, phones, books or texts, artwork and songs, consumer ad-vertisements and products, or media—that reflect and reproduce psychological tendencies in a given culture (D. Cohen & Leung, 2009; Lamoreaux & Morling, 2012; Morling, 2016; Morling & Lamoreaux, 2000). As such, cultural products both represent and transmit cultural patterns in ideas and values; they also reflect and transmit aspects of both cultural stability and change. In a meta-analysis of 51 studies of cultural products (i.e., books and texts, Internet and e-mail content, magazine and TV ads, press coverage), Morling and Lamoreaux (2008) found that Western cultural products were more individualistic and less collectivistic than East Asian and Mexican cultural products. In a follow-up study, they also found that cultural products reflected a number of other dimensions of cultural difference beyond individualism and collectivism (Lamoreaux & Morling, 2012). Japanese cultural products, for instance, scored lower than U.S. products on positivity and hedonism, mirroring cultural variation in self-concept and ideal affect.

In recent years, researchers have catalogued cultural differences in self-concept, ideal affect, cognitive style, equality, and power by analyzing children’s books (e.g., Imada, 2012; Dehghani et al., 2013; Tsi, Loi, & O’Hara, 2005), greeting cards (e.g., Choi & Ross, 2011; Koopmann-Holm & Tsai, 2014), religious texts (e.g., Tsi, Miao, & Seppala, 2007b), artwork (e.g., Murawa et al., 2008; Nand, Musada, Senzaki, & Ishii, 2014), advertising appeals (e.g., Shavitt, Johnson, & Zhang, 2011), and even academic presentations (H. Wang, Musada, Ito, & Rashid, 2012). In addition to showing how material products reflect enduring cultural differences, they have also found evidence of how cultural products can be used to study cultural change (Morling, 2016). DeWitt, Pond, Campbell, and Twenge (2011), for example, found that popular American song lyrics have become more self-involved over time. To do so, they looked at word use in the most popular American songs recorded in 1980 and 2007, and found that heightened self-focus and decreased social connection—two common trends in the U.S. during that time period—were reflected in lyrics that increasingly communicated anger and antisocial behavior.

Multiple Cultures: Multiculturalism and Cultural Learning

Psychologists are also learning more about how to theorize and empirically demonstrate the ways that multiple cultures interact, and combine to shape people’s psychological processes. In today’s globalized world, interacting with multiple, intersecting cultures at a rapid rate is increasingly normal for most people, not just immigrants, so understanding those processes is more pressing than ever. Moreover, many countries, such as the United States, are also experiencing significant demographic shifts within their borders. Analyzing the impact of these social forces requires more dynamic, interactive, and complex ways to describe and study how the cultural influences the psychological.

In the past decade, research on multicultural identity, cultural priming or frame switching between multiple cultures, multiculturalism’s influence on creativity and innovation, and people’s acculturation and adjustment experiences as they transition to new places have continued to thrive (e.g., Benet-Martinez & Hong, 2014; Chiu & Cheng, 2007; Chiu & Kwan, 2016; Y. Hong, Zhan, Morris, & Benet-Martinez, 2009; Morris et al., 2013). See also Leung & Koh, Chapter 21; Mesquita et al., Chapter 19, and Chiu & Hong, Chapter 26, this volume. Other research on this topic has looked at how people who are multicultural in various ways think about race and experience discrimination and exclusion, as well as how different kinds of ideologies about diversity and multiculturalism affect people’s behavior, as well as organizational and social policies (e.g., Chao, Hong, & Chiu, 2013; Chao, Morris, Slepian, & Tadmor, 2017; Rosenthal & Levy, 2012; Sanchez-Hudes & Davis, 2010; Tadmor, Chao, Hong, & Polzer, 2013). Researchers have also examined the psychological processes and outcomes of cultural learning, or how people acquire culture-related knowledge (see Leung & Koh, Chapter 21; and Morris, Fincher, & Savani, Chapter 10). Taking a look at recent research on cultural learning, Ang and colleagues, for example, have studied what they call “cultural intelligence” or “CQ,” the capacity to “adapt effectively to situations of cultural diversity” (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 3). Building on this work, Leung and colleagues have also identified “cultural metaknowledge” or “knowledge of people’s knowledge in a certain culture” (Leung, Lec, & Chiu, 2013, p. 993). Mor, Morris, and Joo (2013) found that knowledge of cultural metaknowledge, “cultural perspective taking,” or considering how another’s cultural background shapes one’s behavior in a particular situation, can promote cooperation with people from other cultures.

This work takes the idea of cultural competence into the psychological domain, moving beyond a more traditional skills-based framework to unpack the underlying psychological processes involved in learning about culture and cultural differences.

To capture more fully how intercultural contact is an essential part of being human, Morris et al. (2015) propose that psychological scientists adopt a “polycultural” perspective on culture, which is “a network conception of culture in which cultural influence on individuals is partial and plural, and cultural traditions interact and change each other” (p. 634). While most scholars in the field would certainly agree with this perspective, Morris et al. urge cultural psychologists to recognize that some current theoretical models and empirical paradigms still communicate a categorical and stable view of culture, even if this is not their intent, and that this can have detrimental consequences for the field. Researchers have also started to study how thinking about culture as “polycultural” influences laypeople’s attitudes and behaviors. For instance, Chao and colleagues (2017) found that priming a “polycultural mindset”—or the belief that cultures interact with one another, change, and evolve—can encourage people to prefer consumer products that promote cultural fusion (e.g., English tea blended with Chinese herbs).

Spanning these recent empirical advances and bodies of work, it is clear that research on multiculturalism and diversity is a rapidly evolving field. The field is gaining traction, but much more remains to be done to understand the processes and mechanisms (Q. Wang, 2016; see D. Cohen, Chapter 6, this volume). They are also diver-
Looking ahead from culture clashes to culture change

Looking back at the research examples we highlight in Figure 1.1, as well as throughout this chapter, it is hard to deny the myriad compelling ways that culture is at work in the world and in our psychology. As cultural psychology has matured, it has thrived as a field over the past decade, both deepening and broadening our understanding of how our cultures and our psyches make us the people we are (Adams, 2012). It is the purpose of this book to make the theoretical and empirical advances in this field accessible to those who are interested in learning more about how culture shapes us and what culture means for all of us. We hope that many will find their interest piqued by the rich, diverse, and fascinating perspectives presented in this volume.

The literature on culture is vast and varied, and this chapter is designed to provide a broad overview of some of the key ideas and concepts that are central to the study of cultural psychology. We begin with a brief introduction to the field of cultural psychology, followed by a discussion of some of the key findings and trends that have emerged in recent years. We then turn to a consideration of the ways in which cultural psychology has been applied to real-world problems, such as education, health, and politics. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of some of the limitations of cultural psychology and the challenges that lie ahead for the field.

In addition to providing an overview of the field, this chapter is intended to serve as a guide to the rest of the book. Each chapter is designed to build on the ideas presented in the previous one, and readers who are interested in learning more about a particular topic can use this chapter as a starting point for further exploration.

As you read through this chapter, you will find that cultural psychology is a dynamic and ever-evolving field. New ideas and findings are being published every day, and it is our hope that this chapter will help you to keep up with the latest developments in the field. We encourage you to read the other chapters in this book and to engage with the research and ideas that they present. We believe that cultural psychology has the potential to make a significant contribution to our understanding of the world and to our own lives. We hope that this chapter will help you to see the exciting possibilities that lie ahead for this field.
1. People Are Culturally Shaped Shapers

which can lead them to question whether they fit or belong (Covarrubias & Fryberg, 2015; Ostrove & Long, 2007; Walton & Cohen, 2007). Students from low-income or working-class backgrounds may also be unfamiliar with the "rules of the game" that are needed to succeed in higher education, which can undermine their sense of empowerment and efficacy (Housel & Harvey, 2009; Ostrove & Long, 2007; Reay, Crozier, & Clayton, 2009). As such, typical college environments can systematically disadvantage first-generation students, contributing to an achievement gap with their continuing-generation peers (i.e., students who have at least one parent with a 4-year degree; Astin & Oseguera, 2004; Bowen, Kurzweil, & Tobin, 2005; Crozier & Millet, 2011; Goudeau & Crozier, 2017; Sirin, 2003; Stephens et al., 2012). These kinds of psychological challenges work alongside disparities in resources and precollege preparation to fuel the social class achievement gap.

Where in a college or university's culture might we intervene to make its values, policies, and practices more inclusive of and equitable for first-generation students? Research in social and cultural psychology shows that educating students about how their social class backgrounds can shape their college experiences is one way to help students understand how social differences can be an asset, and changing college norms to be more interdependent and collectivist (vs. independent and individualistic) can be effective intervention strategies that foster academic and social success for first-generation students (Dittmann & Stephens, 2017; Stephens, Brannon, Markus, & Nelson, 2015; Stephens, Fryberg, et al., 2012; Stephens, and Hamedani, et al., 2014). In particular, these strategies center around helping first-generation students adopt a new lay theory of social difference and experience their backgrounds and perspectives as part of, rather than separate from, the mainstream college environment.

To apply these strategies to change college cultures, we might ask how colleges and universities might address the following at each level of the culture cycle. For example, to help first-generation students feel empowered at the individual level, schools could assign first-generation students "big sibs" or mentors that are first-generation graduate students or faculty to help advise them and act as role models (integration level); institute an intergroup dialogue class or counter storytelling workshop requirement for all incoming first-year students that highlights how people's different social class backgrounds can be resources (institutions level); or elevate and normalize interdependent or collectivistic values and academic motivations in college or university promotional materials such as "giving back to your community" (ideas level). Ideally, to have the biggest impact, culture change is more likely to occur when there is change at each level and these changes work to support and reinforce one another over time.

Culture clash 2: Police–community relations in communities of color. The second culture clash has a long, fraught history in the United States: police–community relations in communities of color, especially in African American communities. The tense relationship between law enforcement and communities of color is one of the most contentious culture clashes in the U.S. today, with officer-involved shootings of unarmed black male civilians being one of the major catalysts of the modern racial justice movement. Since the rise of Black Lives Matter in response to the shootings of unarmed black boys and men such as Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, and Akai Gurley, police–community relations are seriously fractured, which has led many Americans, especially those in lower-income communities of color, to distrust the police or believe that law enforcement exists to keep them safe (La Vigne, Fontaine, & Dweivedi, 2017; Morin, Parker, Stepler, & Mercer, 2017; Pegues, 2017). In this climate, there have been numerous calls for police departments around the country to reexamine and change their cultures, which have been called toxic, violent, disrespectful, and macho (Armacost, 2016; A. Hall, Hall, & Perry, 2016). At the same time, many officers across the country think that the public does not understand the nature of their jobs and the risks that they face (Morin et al., 2017; Pegues, 2017). As such, politicians, law enforcement professionals, and community activists have been grappling with how...
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To bridge the so-called “black and blue” divide from the effects of implicit racial bias to the tension between so-called guardians versus warrior mindsets, to the use of new technologies such as body-worn cameras, to the implementation of procedural justice and community policing practices, police and community members alike are struggling with how to work together effectively and come up with solutions that address concerns on both sides of the divide (e.g., Eberhardt, 2016; A. Hall et al., 2016; Hetey & Eberhardt, 2014; Lyons-Padilla, Hamedani, Markus, & Eberhardt, 2018; President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015; Trinkler, Tyler, & Goff, 2016; Tyler, Goff, & MacCoun, 2015; Voigt et al., 2017).

Where in a police department’s culture cycle might we intervene to increase trust and cooperation among police and community members? On the policing side, law enforcement professionals and researchers alike have proposed the following evidence-based solutions to help police departments evaluate and improve their practices: Develop officers’ procedural justice and community-based policing skills, educate officers about implicit bias, diversify the police force, increase cross-race experience and dialogue, leverage technology to identify disparities and evaluate training initiatives, attend to officers’ social and emotional needs, increase departmental accountability and transparency, and improve internal procedural justice (Eberhardt, 2016; Gilmartin, 2002; A. Hall et al., 2016; Lyons-Padilla, Hamedani, Markus, & Eberhardt, 2018; Pleguez, 2017; President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015; Tyler et al., 2015; Voigt et al., 2017). In particular, a number of these strategies shift officers away from a warrior mindset that casts black males, in particular, as “enemies” or “others,” to a guardian mindset that is more relational or other-focused and motivated by why many officers joined the police force to begin with—to help people.

To apply these strategies to change the culture of police departments, we might ask how law enforcement agencies can address the following at each level of the culture cycle. For example, to help police officers adopt a guardian mindset (individual level), law enforcement agencies could provide more positive opportunities for sworn staff to learn about and interact with the local community, they serve but sometimes not live (interactions level); reward procedural justice or community-based policing behaviors when considering raises and promotions (institutional level); and integrate procedural justice and community-based policing values into departmental strategic plans, missions, and visions (ideas level). Ideally, to ensure the strongest impact, cultural change happens in concert and not independently. When police agencies work on their legitimacy issues with the communities they serve by being transparent and involving community stakeholders in their culture change efforts.

Culture change is difficult work and may have unintended consequences. Culture changers need to keep in mind how the interconnecting, shifting dynamics that make up the culture cycle afford certain ways of being, while constraining or downgrading other possibilities. Some people use that phrase as a way to say a problem is systemic, but they often use it to deflect responsibility and say that a problem is not really “our” problem. The good news is that, as highlighted by the work of Goodman (1994), psychologists can help people think about the meaning and nature of the social difference (e.g., Markus, 2008; Markus & Moya, 2010).

Conclusions: Culture is Trending

People are culturally shaped shapers. In demonstrating this point, we have ranged from the biological to the societal, reviewing research on genes and also on police-community divides. Across domains, at every level of being, people invoke culture as they struggle to make sense of themselves and their worlds. In brief, it is an excellent time to be a cultural scientist, a cultural psychologist, or to add sociocultural analysis techniques to one’s “making sense of behavior” toolkit. The pay variable is the work is unlimited and infinitely challenging. And the possibility to make a positive difference in scientific understanding and in the applications of these understandings is real. The innovative and groundbreaking research reviewed here gives rise to more questions than answers, but the questions are now somewhat different: in nature than in earlier decades. Cultural psychological research has the potential to be a vital part of something larger. The psychological study of culture is as cultural and is psychological culture. Culture exists both in the head and in the world; it is made up of both conceptual and material elements; and its influence on people’s reactions and responses, but also through analyses of products, practices, and policies that reflect and promote pervasive cultural ideas. While cultural psychologists have been laboring to refine the field, it has become clear that the world outside of the ivory tower needs their insights and solutions now more than ever. The phrase “It’s cultural” often reveals people’s frustration that a problem is messy and intractable, too big and complex to parse and solve. Sometimes people use that phrase as a way to say a problem is systemic, but they often use it to deflect responsibility and say that a problem is not really “our” problem. The good news is that, as highlighted by the work of Goodman (1994), psychologists are now equipped with the theories, methods, techniques, and applications to make it our problem. We think that cultural psychologists are more than ready to take up this challenge.
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Cultural psychology as embodied in the current edition of the Handbook of Cultural Psychology is an intellectual movement located in cultural psychology as an intellectual tradition whose historical roots may be found in the Enlightenment and Romantic schools of thought, and their contemporaries of the 18th- and 19th-century Western Europe. The chapter traces their influence in the history of psychology as an academic discipline in the form of natural scientific versus cultural scientific models of psychological investigation — emergence, entrenchment, and ebbing of this structure — interaction with global history, and describes the historical context in which contemporary cultural psychology appeared as an approach that regards humans as meaning-making beings. The chapter then observes an emerging conception of the person that challenges the Enlightenment-Romantic assumptions separating culture from nature, and notes its reflection in cultural psychology’s recent push to naturalize culture in the early 21st century against the backdrop of the global challenges to humanity, including climate change and intergroup conflict. The chapter concludes with a call for new conceptions of the person that regard culture in nature, which can help orient cultural psychology for the future.

Cultural psychology has two senses. In one sense, it is an intellectual movement that came into prominence in the late 20th century; in the other sense, it is a primarily Western European intellectual tradition that has continued since the 19th century. The publication of Cultural Psychology: Essays on Comparative Human Development (Stieger, Shweder, & Herder, 1990) marked the start of the former with Richard Shweder’s (1990) essay, “Cultural Psychology—What Is It?” The first edition of the Handbook of Cultural Psychology (Kitayama & Cohen, 2007) was very much a product of this movement. However, it finds its inspiration in the early writings of the Romantics of the 19th century. To wit, Shweder’s (1984a) essay, “Anthropology’s Romantic Rebellion against the Enlightenment, or There’s More to Thinking Than Reason and Evidence,” links Shweder’s thinking on psychological anthropology to the Romantic intellectual tradition, from which cultural psychology as a tradition draws.

In many ways, these two senses of cultural psychology—movement and tradition—are