

Global psychology

John W Berry

Abstract

The study of psychology has been largely developed in Europe and the United States. It thus has close ties to the cultural traditions of those particular societies. As a result, the discipline and practice of psychology are largely *culture-bound*, limited in its origins, concepts, and empirical findings to only this small portion of the world. The discipline is also *culture-blind*, largely ignoring the influence of the role of culture in shaping the development and display of human behaviour. The result has been the dominating position of a Western Academic Scientific Psychology in relation to other cultural perspectives. Challenges to, and some possible solutions for, these problems have come from some recent regional and national conferences. In particular, the Nassau Declaration from the Caribbean Regional Conference of Psychology in 2011 and the Capetown Declaration from the International Congress of Psychology in 2012 have highlighted widespread concern for this continuing imbalance in international psychology. This article draws on concepts and strategies in psychology (particularly cross-cultural and intercultural psychology) to propose some remedies to these problems. It is based on a universalist vision for the discipline; this view asserts that basic psychological processes are common to our human species, while their development and expression are culturally shaped. The eventual goal is to achieve a global psychology that incorporates concepts and findings from societies and cultures from all parts of the world.

Keywords

Acculturation strategies, culture-blind, culture-bound, dominance, global psychology, indigenous psychology, prevention, universalism

The discipline and practice of psychology have long histories in only a few countries of the world. Initially developed in Europe, then further in the United States, it has close ties to the cultural traditions of those particular societies. Although more and more taught, studied, and practised in other parts of the world, psychology remains largely *culture-bound* (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 1992; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010), being limited in its origins, concepts, and empirical findings to only a small portion of the world. Although the concept of culture has been recognized

Queen's University, Canada

Corresponding author:

John W Berry, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada K7L 3N6.
Email: elderberrys@gmail.com

as a core variable in psychology in a book that documents the origin and development of 15 key psychological concepts (Berry & Triandis, 2006), the discipline has remained *culture-blind*, largely ignoring the influence of the role of culture in shaping the development and display of human behaviour.

As a result of these limitations, missing from the international scene are the insights, and the knowledge of psychology from the largest, most complex, and in many ways, the earliest developed societies of the world. In particular, the psychological contributions from China, India, and the Arab world are largely unknown to Western psychology. Similarly, missing are those from societies in Africa, the Caribbean, and the indigenous peoples in North and South America, and the Pacific region.

If human beings are all one people, belonging to one species, how can a discipline that thinks of itself as 'the science of human behavior' not be based on all human experience and knowledge? Answers to this rhetorical question serve a basis for my approach to the development of a global psychology. In this article, I argue that the discipline and the profession of psychology are overwhelmingly rooted in, and practised in, Western Euro-American societies. The rest of the world has often assumed the roles of 'consumers' or 'subjects'; psychology is 'sold to' or 'tried out on' other people. The evidence for this state of affairs has been clearly presented by Allwood and Berry (2006) and Cole (2006). Cole (2006) noted that the leadership of international psychology, particularly the International Union of Psychological Science has '... remained firmly in Euro-American hands. These countries have dominated participation and management of the congress to this day, despite the fact that psychologists from approximately 100 countries currently participate' (p. 905). However, recently, this situation has begun to change as evidenced by the election of Saths Cooper of South Africa as President of IUPsyS.

There has also been a move towards having equal representation of all member societies in the Union. These changes came about as a result of dissatisfaction among members with the unequal distribution of power and decision-making in the Union, as well as very active campaigning by some members. At the meeting of the General Assembly in 2008, Saths Cooper and I noted that some member countries had multiple votes (as many as six) in the General Assembly, while others had only one vote, with most members falling in between. We moved a motion that all member societies should have an equal number of votes (two). The rationale was that IUPsyS is a Union, and in most unions, all members have an equal say. We also argued that in General Assemblies (such as the United Nations), all member countries have an equal vote. To our surprise and delight, at the next meeting, the executive announced that they accepted this proposal, and the General Assembly voted in favour of the change (with one country voting against).

Another recent development has been the promotion of two declarations by regional groups of psychologists. The first was the Nassau Declaration. The Caribbean Regional Conference of Psychology (CRCP2011) held in the Bahamas on 15–18 November 2011 was hosted by the Bahamas Psychological Association (BPA), and supported by the IUPsyS, the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP), and the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP). The conference addressed issues of paramount importance to the Caribbean community of psychologists as they strive to attend to local needs, and at the same time to connect with the global community of psychologists. The theme of the conference was 'Psychological science and well-being: building bridges for tomorrow'. The conference was attended by over 350 persons, from 37 countries, of which 20 nations/territories were in the Caribbean.

At the end of the conference, delegates signed the *Nassau Declaration*, in which they made a commitment to form a Caribbean Psychology Organization to promote the national and regional development of psychology as a science and practice. The organization will significantly enhance

the capacity of psychologists in the region to use psychological science to improve the well-being of the Caribbean people.

The Nassau Declaration 2011 CRCP reads,

Recognizing the potential for psychology to serve as a critical instrument for building bridges across cultures, time, disciplines, regions, research, areas, and communities.

Recognizing the critical role of psychology in policy development, advocacy, education, publication and teaching

Recognizing the strength of psychology as an agent for change, development and empowerment of individuals and communities

Recognizing the value of collaborative regional organizations to work toward these goals

Therefore: We the undersigned, having attended the Caribbean Regional Conference of Psychology 2011 in Nassau, Bahamas, November 2011, agree in principle to establish a Caribbean Psychology Organization to promote the development of psychology as a science and practice.

In 2013, delegates at the meetings of the Caribbean Studies Association in Grenada formed The Caribbean Alliance of National Psychological Associations (CANPA) (<http://www.canpanet.org>). The next conference of CANPA will be held in Paramaribo, Suriname, 11–14 November 2014.

The second declaration was advanced at the International Congress of Psychology in Cape Town in 2012. This declaration was motivated by the energy created by delegates from many parts of Africa meeting each other at the congress, and was inspired by the Nassau Declaration. The 'Cape Town Declaration: The Establishment of a Pan-African Psychology Union' has recently been published in its entirety in the *South African Journal of Psychology* (2013).

While these recent developments have improved the situation somewhat, I argue that in order to deal with these limitations, human behavioural diversity needs to be fully sampled and examined in all its variety, as a basis for discerning what may be common to all human behaviour. This strategy would follow the examples of cultural anthropology, where centuries of studying the diversity of human expression has led to the claim that there are cultural universals that underlie the surface variations in customs. From this enterprise, it has been well established that all cultures share numerous basic attributes (such as social structures, norms, and ways of dealing with their habitat); similarly, all languages share core features (such as semantics and syntax). In both these examples, the discovery of these underlying similarities was only possible after substantial study of variations across cultures and languages.

The core question is why has psychology lagged so far behind these other human and social sciences in seeking the development of a global science? Why do we not have a global science that permits the understanding of human behaviour and the practice of psychology that is truly pan-human?

Over the years, I have been pondering, researching, and teaching about many aspects of this question. My own approach has been through a psychological specialty, often referred to as *cross-cultural psychology*. This approach combines ethnographic research (rooted in the discipline of anthropology) with the concepts and tools of psychology, and employs the comparative method to discover relationships between cultural context and the development and display of human behaviour. Cross-cultural psychology was born in the late 1960s and early 1970s, with the coming together of psychologists from many countries who shared these concerns. The result was the formation of an association (the IACCP) and a journal (the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*).

The origin and early developments of the field can be examined in the *Online Readings in Culture and Psychology* (2010).

To be sure, there were psychologists who had earlier considered these issues in their research and teaching. Such pioneers as Simon Biesheuvel, Leonard Doob, Gustav Jahoda, Otto Klineberg, Wally Lambert, Gardner Murphy, Marshall Segall, and Harry Triandis (to mention just a few) provided some of the foundations for the study of human behaviour in all its cultural contexts. However, it was the critical mass of psychologists who came together at that time that provided the impetus, social support, and legitimacy for asking these questions. These psychologists recognized that only when a wide variety of cultural contexts are studied and taken into account in psychological research can a truly global science be developed.

As for many social movements, the creation of a group was essential for the development of a scientific identity and for a source of social support. In many departments, we were not only alone in our interests in how culture shaped human behaviour, but we were often considered to be outsiders and even a threat to the established, and presumably already-universal psychological knowledge. Our challenge to our colleagues was that if psychological findings and interpretations are based on only a small sample of the human population, how can one be sure that it is valid knowledge and useful for all human beings? To put it more bluntly, we asserted that 'You do not know what you think you know about human behaviour until you have sampled it more widely, and taken cultural variation into account'. To illustrate this perspective, I once asked a colleague who employed university undergraduates to study social behaviour, 'Given the increasing cultural diversity of the students you use in your studies, how do you take this diversity into account when interpreting your results?' His answer was 'to me, culture is just noise'. To which I replied, 'to me, culture is music!'

The goal

The very possibility of achieving a global psychology must be based on some vision of what we all share as members of humanity. This vision has emerged over the years, accompanying a gradual shift in interest in cross-cultural and intercultural psychology that has moved away from what is *different* between cultural groups and the behaviour of their individual members to what is *similar* among them. While the interest has remained on what differentiates individuals and groups from each other across cultures, there is now a much greater interest in what we share as members of one human community. This shift can be portrayed by comparing one of the first texts in the field (*Human Behavior in Global Perspective*; Segall, Dasen, Berry, & Poortinga, 1990) and the third edition of a related textbook (*Cross-Cultural Psychology: Research and Applications*; Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis, & Sam, 2011). Somewhat paradoxically, this search for what is common to human behaviour around the world requires the examination of behavioural diversity. It also requires the introduction of the concept of cultural and psychological *universals*. These universals are cultural and psychological features of human life that are found in all cultural populations, even though they may be expressed in very different ways. Concretely, the search for these universals requires ethnographic and psychological research in many societies, and then the use of the comparative method to assemble them into meaningful patterns.

The concept of universals is linked to the distinctions among three core features of psychological life: *process*, *competence*, and *performance*. Psychological processes are posited to be shared features of all human beings. Competence is the outcome of psychological development rooted in these shared processes in interaction with environmental (including cultural) experience; it is posited to be variable across individuals and cultures. Performance is the expression of these

competencies in appropriate social and cultural contexts and settings; it is also posited to be variable across individuals and cultures.

To illustrate, processes are those psychological features of individuals that are the fundamental ways in which people deal with their day-to-day experiences, such as perception, learning, and categorization. Competencies are those features of individuals that develop with cultural experience, such as abilities, attitudes, and values. They are developed on the basis of the interaction between the basic underlying processes and peoples' encounters with the outside world. Performances are those activities of individuals that are expressed as behaviour, such as skilled work, carrying out projects, or engaging in social or political action. Performances are those expressions of competencies that are appropriate to, or are triggered by, the need to act in a suitable way in a particular social context. The actual performance will depend, not only on the competence but also on a host of situational factors. For example, all individuals have the basic processes required to learn a language (or multiple languages). Which language(s) will be learned (competencies) depends on the cultural context in which the individual develops. And in a situation where there is a choice of language, the performance will depend on the language of the interlocutor, and the requirement to speak a particular language in any specific social situation (such as at work, or in one's cultural community).

Understanding these three psychological phenomena is a prerequisite for interpreting the theoretical position of universalism. We can only observe actual performances, in all their variety, and in all their cultural and intercultural contexts. Competencies can only be inferred from patterns of regularities in these performances (whether exhibited in naturalistic settings or under controlled test conditions). And, most removed from observable human behaviours are the underlying processes; these also require the making of inferences from these patterns.

As noted above, the universalist vision for psychology is supported by the existence of universals in other disciplines, such as in biology (e.g., basic needs such as sustenance and reproduction), in anthropology (e.g., family and norms), and in linguistics (e.g., syntax and semantics). To illustrate the existence of universals in one area of psychology, it was possible to develop the Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists (<http://www.am.org/iupsys/resources/ethics/univdecl2008.html>) only after extensive examination and consultation by Janel Gauthier and his international team with psychologists concerned with ethics in many societies. In these examples from biology, anthropology, linguistics, and ethics, the discovery of these underlying commonalities was only possible after a wide-ranging study of variations across cultures and languages; the global achievement could only have followed the inclusion of a substantial number of local phenomena. In my view, only with this universalist perspective can psychology move towards the goal of achieving a global psychology.

The problem

As noted at the outset, the basic problem is that psychology at present is largely culture-bound and culture-blind. An earlier examination of these problems was the subject of my talk when I received the Interamerican Prize for Contributions to Psychology in the Americas from the *Sociedad Interamericana de Psicología* (SIP) entitled 'Interamerican or Unteramerican: Trafficking in International Psychology'. My title was intended to startle and to provoke discussion on the imbalance in the supply and demand of psychology internationally. Of course, it was a play on words. *Inter* implies that relationships between communities of psychologists take place among equal-status parties, involving two-way communication, sharing, and cooperation. *Unter* implies relationships among unequal parties, involving dominance and subservience. Similarly, *American* has

two possible meanings. First, it can refer to all the peoples of the Americas (which is the use of the term in SIP). But it can also refer to the people of one country, which often refers to itself simply as 'America' (the United States).

The subtitle refers to trade in commodities (such as consumer goods and illicit drugs). There are two implications to the concept of trafficking. The first is to the notion of *dumping*, in which a commodity that is in great supply in one country is dumped into other societies, thereby overwhelming the other societies; it may also be delivered at a lower cost than in the original society. The second reference is to the *transfer* to other countries of commodities where the product may not be of any value, or may even be harmful to people in other societies. The commodity being referred to is, of course, psychology, including concepts, empirical findings, journals, and textbooks. Specifically, the reference is to psychology that is produced in the Western world (particularly in the United States), and that is made available to psychologists in other countries in large quantities and relatively cheaply.

This supply side is well documented: overwhelmingly, psychology is produced in Western societies and distributed to others (Danziger, 1990). The demand side is equally problematic for the attainment of a global psychology. When so many psychologists in other countries take Western psychology as their reference group, key psychological issues of local concern may be missed or even misrepresented both conceptually and empirically. In addition, the growth and sharing of a locally relevant psychology, both as a discipline and as practice, may be retarded by such easy access to Western psychology.

The way forward

How can we move from the present state of affairs towards our goal of achieving a global psychology? There are a number of options to be considered, all of them using established approaches, concepts, and methods in psychology.

Prevention strategies

Borrowing concepts from the field of health, there are three forms of prevention that may be used to reduce the demand. First is primary prevention. For members of non-dominant cultural communities, the strategy is simply not to expose oneself to the dominant Western psychology: do not subscribe to or read the material on offer. And it also means not submitting research work carried out in, or of primary relevance to one's own society to the national journals of another society. All this means turning away from, and not using the dominant psychology as one's reference group. Instead, it involves deliberately avoiding the external source, and turning to the examination of issues in one's own society, using local concepts and methods. For the dominant psychology community (as noted above), primary prevention means not dumping psychology onto non-dominant psychological communities.

Secondary prevention for non-dominant psychologists is to limit the impact of the external influence once exposure has already occurred. If the materials are readily available (e.g., in journals and textbooks in the library, or serving as the basis for discussions with colleagues), ignore them, and do not use them in teaching or research. For the dominant Western psychology, any reduction of the impact is difficult to achieve; once, it is made widely available, it is difficult to take it back. Hence, primary prevention is of utmost importance.

The third prevention strategy for non-dominant psychology is to counteract the influence of Western psychology by criticizing it and providing alternative materials (such as locally relevant

research concepts, empirical findings, and teaching materials) that will be more useful in the local society. These strategies have given rise to the development of *indigenous psychologies* (to be discussed below). For the dominant Western psychology, tertiary prevention may take the form of not dismissing or negating the development of indigenous approaches, but being open to such alternative conceptions of human behaviour. These three prevention strategies may help in dealing with the demand side of the problem; however, the supply side will remain a problem as long as the dominant psychology continues to be disseminated (even dumped) into the world psychology market.

Acculturation strategies

In the field of intercultural psychology, the concept of *acculturation* has been examined for decades. This process involves the cultural and behavioural changes that result from contact between groups and individuals who have different cultural backgrounds. Understanding the process of acculturation is relevant here because we may consider the impact of Western psychology on other societies as a form of *scientific assimilation*. As part of this research, the concept of *acculturation strategies* has been advanced (Berry, 1974). This concept refers to the various ways that groups and individuals seek to engage the acculturation process. Knowledge of these variations has increased substantially in recent years (Sam & Berry, 2006), challenging the widespread assumption that everyone would assimilate and become absorbed into the dominant group.

The search for a global psychology naturally brings to mind the concept of *globalization*. I have argued previously (Berry, 2008) that globalization does not lead inevitably to a linear change from being engaged in one's heritage culture to losing it and accepting the more dominant one. If this is so, then multidimensional conceptions are required. One way to examine these various possible outcomes of intercultural contact in plural societies is to consider the intercultural strategies framework that I developed (Berry, 1980), which had three dimensions. The first is the relative preference for maintaining one's culture and identity. The second is the relative preference for having intercultural contact with, and participating in, the larger society along with other ethnocultural groups. The third is the role played by the larger society (its policies and institutions) in allowing or constraining these first two preferences.

These issues can be responded to on attitudinal dimensions, ranging from generally positive or negative orientations to these issues; their intersection defines eight strategies. There are four orientations from the point of view of non-dominant ethnocultural peoples (both individuals and groups), and four views (public policies and attitudes) held by the dominant larger society. It has now been well demonstrated that these dimensions are empirically, as well as conceptually, independent from each other (e.g., Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000; Sabatier & Berry, 2008).

For non-dominant ethnocultural groups, orientations to these issues intersect to define the four acculturation strategies of *assimilation*, *separation*, *integration*, and *marginalization*. When individuals do not wish to maintain their cultural identity and seek daily interaction with other cultures, the assimilation strategy is defined. In contrast, when individuals place a value on holding on to their original culture, and at the same time wish to avoid interaction with others, then the separation alternative is defined. When there is little possibility or interest in cultural maintenance (often for reasons of enforced cultural loss), and little interest in having relations with others (often for reasons of exclusion or discrimination), then marginalization is defined finally, when there is an interest in both maintaining one's culture, while in daily interactions with other groups, the integration strategy is defined. In this case, there is some degree of cultural *integrity* maintained, while seeking, as a member of an ethnocultural group, there is a desire to participate as an *integral* part of the

larger society. Note that *integration* has a very specific meaning within this framework: it is clearly different from assimilation (because there is substantial cultural maintenance with integration), and it is not a generic term referring to just any kind of long-term presence, or involvement, of an immigrant group in a society of settlement.

The original anthropological definition clearly established that *both* groups in contact would change during the acculturation process. Hence, there is a need to conceptualize the views of the dominant group in influencing the way in which mutual acculturation would take place. Assimilation when sought by the dominant group is termed the *melting pot*. When separation is forced by the dominant group, it is *segregation*. Marginalization, when imposed by the dominant group, is *exclusion*. Finally, with respect to integration, when diversity is a widely accepted and valued feature of the society as a whole, including all the various ethnocultural groups, it is called *Multiculturalism*.

I argue that the dominance of Western psychology has resulted in a form of scientific assimilation. It has influenced the development of international psychology (how it is conceived, researched, and practised) in the rest of the world. It has also influenced the development of a psychology that is rooted in local societal issues. This has resulted not only in scientific assimilation of the discipline, it has also led to the personal and social assimilation of psychologists, when they turn away from networks in their own society, and orient themselves to the national organizations in other countries. For example, when a national psychological society accepts a foreign national psychological association to meet within their national borders, or to provide accreditation for their graduate programmes (usually with the acceptance of foreign criteria), the local national society engages in the acceptance of such scientific assimilation. As a result, it is possible that national psychological communities may become marginal to the needs and concerns of their own society.

Indigenous approaches

By indigenous psychologies is meant

a set of approaches to understanding human behavior within the cultural contexts in which they have developed and are currently displayed. They can also be seen as attempts to root psychological research in the conceptual systems that are indigenous to a culture, including the philosophical, theological, and scientific ideas that are part of the historical and contemporary lives of people and their institutions. (Allwood & Berry, 2006, p. 241; see also Kim & Berry, 1993)

The indigenous approach may be seen as a reaction to the dominance of Western psychology around the world. This dominance is problematic, since there may be a serious mismatch between what is available from Western psychology and what is needed in other societies (Moghaddam, Erneling, Montero, & Lee, 2007). Allwood (1998) and Danziger (2006) have argued that Western psychology is actually an indigenous psychology, which is rooted in one particular time and place. That is, the psychology that most of us know and practice (and which is sometimes thought to be universal) is actually just an indigenous psychology of the West.

Part of the answer to the problem of the dominance of Western psychology is the development of a psychology that is both sensitive to cultural variation in all societies, and is thus potentially global in scope. One might take the emergence of cross-cultural psychology as an important move in the right direction. While this is partly true, it is also the case that cross-cultural psychology has been guilty of using the majority world as a kind of natural laboratory, exploiting its human resources, and simply extracting information out of a cultural group for its own purposes (Moghaddam & Lee, 2006).

An international survey of indigenous psychologists which examined the current state of indigenous psychologies was carried out by Allwood and Berry (2006). Analysis of respondents' views noted some core features to the approach, including the widespread recognition of the importance of the historical and philosophical notions in their cultures, and the contemporary characteristics of their societies, in achieving a relevant indigenous psychology. The view was widely shared that indigenous psychologies could advance psychology in two ways: they serve to create a more valid and useful local psychology, and they serve as contributions in the pursuit of a global psychology, through the use of the comparative 'cross-indigenous' method. They also noted some other qualities of indigenous psychologies. They are seen as a postcolonial reaction to the dominance of concepts, methods, and findings of Western psychology. It is also considered that these imported psychologies could not usually be applied to the development needs of their societies. Many respondents also reported that there was reaction against their work on indigenous psychology by some of their local colleagues; their work was viewed as undermining their academic careers, as well as the status of psychology in their departments.

An important issue found in the survey was the contrasting views that may be described as 'indigenous versus indigenizing'. Is the starting point in developing indigenous psychologies to be rooted exclusively in one's own history, society, and culture; or is it in the importation followed by the modification of Western psychology? This issue was raised by Sinha (1997), who saw these paths as complementary, rather than contradictory. The process of indigenization was the route; this could be by way of the examination of local cultural themes, and by drawing on Western psychology. The product was the attainment of indigenous psychologies and eventually, through the use of the comparative method, the achievement of a global psychology.

Sinha (1997) has presented a systematic account of this process in many parts of the Majority World. His main position is composed of two complementary assertions: first is the need to embed every psychology in a specific cultural context and second is the need to establish the universality of the empirical basis and principles of psychology. In his view, 'indigenization is considered to be a vital step towards a universal psychology' (Sinha, 1997, p. 131). This view is shared by Yang (2000), and corresponds to the goal of achieving a global psychology.

My view is that a balance has to be found (Berry, 2000). On the one hand, it does not make sense to ignore the achievements of Western psychology, and to reinvent the psychological wheel in each culture. On the other hand, the ethnocentrism of Western psychology makes it necessary to take other cultural viewpoints on human behaviour into account if we are ever to achieve a global psychology. As argued elsewhere (Berry et al., 2011), one of the goals of cross-cultural psychology is the eventual development of a universal psychology that incorporates all indigenous (including Western) psychologies. We will never know whether all diverse psychological data and cultural points of view have been incorporated into the eventual universal psychology, if we continue to use only Western concepts and tools. Eddington (1939) noted that we can only catch fish that are able to be caught with the type of net that we use. In keeping with this metaphor, we should at least cast our net as widely as possible, and with culturally appropriate concepts and tools, in order to gather all the relevant psychological information that is available around the world.

Conclusion

In this article, I have presented some criticisms of the dominant Western psychology (WASP), and proposed that the achievement of a more global psychology may be within reach if we use some concepts and methods now available in psychology from both the dominant Western sources and from those working in the rest of the world. A global psychology would be based on a sampling of

behaviours in many cultures, using indigenous concepts and methods, and then examining them for their commonalities. The perspectives to be employed include using the distinction among process, competence, and performance; prevention strategies to avoid domination by Western psychology; the intercultural strategies of separation and integration (while avoiding assimilation and marginalization); and the development of indigenous psychologies around the world, followed by comparisons among them.

It is a truism that all forms of domination eventually come to an end. Whether they are empires or scientific paradigms, nothing lasts forever. In my view, the time is ripe to question the presumed universality of Western psychology, to challenge its dominance, and to develop alternative psychologies through the use of more indigenous approaches. Whether these various psychologies will eventuate in the emergence of a global psychology remains an open question. However, in my view, there is now sufficient evidence available to form the basis to develop a global psychology, one that is rooted in common shared psychological processes. This view is sustained because no cross-cultural research has yet established the presence of a basic psychological process in one culture that is absent in another culture. Despite the obvious fact that behaviour is developed and displayed in culturally variable ways, there appears to be no conceptual or methodological impediment to searching for their underlying commonalities.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Allwood, C. M. (1998). The creation and nature of indigenized psychologies from the perspective of the anthropology of knowledge. *Knowledge and Society*, 11, 153–172.
- Allwood, C. M., & Berry, J. W. (2006). Origins and development of indigenous psychologies: An international analysis [Special Issue]. *International Journal of Psychology*, 41, 243–268.
- Berry, J. W. (1974). Psychological aspects of cultural pluralism. *Topics in Culture Learning*, 2, 17–22.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Berry, J. W. (2000). Cross-cultural psychology: A symbiosis of cultural and comparative approaches. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 197–205.
- Berry, J. W. (2008). Globalisation and acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32, 328–336.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Breugelmans, S. M., Chasiotis, A., & Sam, D. L. (2011). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (1st ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Berry, J. W., & Triandis, H. C. (2006). Culture. In K. Pawlik & G. d'Ydewalle (Eds.), *Psychological concepts: An international historical perspective* (pp. 47–62). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Cole, M. (2006). Internationalism in psychology: We need it now more than ever. *American Psychologist*, 61, 904–917.
- Danziger, K. (1990). *Constructing the subject: Historical origins of psychological research*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Danziger, K. (2006). Universalism and indigenization in the history of modern psychology. In A. Brock (Ed.), *Internationalizing the history of psychology* (pp. 208–225). New York: New York University Press.
- Eddington, A. (1939). *Philosophy of science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61–83.

- International Union of Psychological Science. (IUPsyS). (2008). *Universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: IUPsyS.
- Kim, U. & Berry, J. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Moghaddam, F., Erneling, C., Montero, M., & Lee, N. (2007). Toward a conceptual foundation for a global psychology. In M. Stevens & U. Gielen (Eds.), *Toward a global psychology: Theory, research and pedagogy* (pp. 179–206). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Moghaddam, F., & Lee, N. (2006). Double reification: The process of universalizing psychology in the three worlds. In A. Brock (Ed.), *Internationalizing the history of psychology* (pp. 163–182). New York: New York University Press.
- Online Readings in Culture and Psychology. (2010). Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/contents.html>
- Ryder, A., Alden, L., & Paulhus, D. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 49–65.
- Sabatier, C., & Berry, J. W. (2008). The role of family acculturation, parental style, and perceived discrimination in the adaptation of second-generation immigrant youth in France and Canada. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 5, 159–185.
- Sam, D. L. & Berry, J. W. (Eds.). (2006). *Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Segall, M. H., Dasen, P. R., Berry, J. W., & Poortinga, Y. H. (1990). *Human Behaviour in Global Perspective: An Introduction to Cross-Cultural Psychology*. New York: Pergamon.
- Sinha, D. (1997). Indigenizing psychology. In J. W. Berry, Y. H. Poortinga, & J. Pandey (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, Vol. 1. Theory and method* (2nd ed., pp. 129–169). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- South African Journal of Psychology*. (2013). The Cape Town declaration. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 43, 156. doi:10.1177/0081246313489413.
- Yang, K.-S. (2000). Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 241–263.