

Ethnic Psychology in the United States

Jonathan S. Kaplan & Stanley Sue

Throughout history, human beings have had to deal with individual and group differences on many dimensions. Two of the most important dimensions are ethnicity and race. Ethnic and racial groups often mirror the fears, prejudices, and hostilities, as well as the curiosity, benevolence, and understanding, of one group of people toward another. The history of the United States is strongly embedded in ethnicity and ethnic relations. When the founding fathers sought freedom and democracy and the establishment of a new country in the Americas, the seeds were laid for conflict with the indigenous people—the Native Americans—and for the introduction of African slavery. Years of ethnic and racial strife, including a civil war, the civil rights movement, and the controversies over affirmative action, immigration, and racial genetic differences in intelligence have bedeviled the history of the United States. Yet, in many ways, tremendous progress over time has been made in race and ethnic relations.

In this chapter, our goal is to describe developments in ethnic psychology—namely, the study of psychology and ethnic relations in the United States. We shall see how the field of psychology has attempted to study and explain ethnic differences and relationships. We conclude by indicating the implications of the research on ethnicity.

Ethnic psychology has been defined as the examination of psychological variables within an ethnic group in order to discover the relationships between characteristics of that ethnic group, other groups with which it is in contact, and the corresponding intergroup interactions (Berry, 1994). Put another way,

ethnic psychology strives to explain psychological differences and similarities between ethnic groups based on the qualities of each ethnic group. Thus, the field is concerned with diverse issues, such as ethnic differences in academic achievement, intelligence, psychopathology, prejudice, communication, and personal relationships.

For purposes of this chapter, we discuss ethnic groups at a broad, macrolevel, limited to the nonwhite ethnic groups of African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans. (In the earlier part of this century, however, ethnic psychology often focused on white ethnic groups, such as the Irish, Italians, and Jews—e.g., Giordano & Levine, 1975.) In the United States, the recent growth rate of these minority ethnic groups is considerably higher than white European Americans. From 1980 to 1990, whites underwent a 6 percent growth in population. In contrast, African Americans grew by 13.2 percent, Hispanics by 53 percent, and Asian Americans by 95 percent (LEAP Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute, 1993). Together with Native Americans, these ethnic groups constituted approximately 25 percent of the total U.S. population in 1990 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1990). Within the next century, ethnic minorities will outnumber the white population in some states (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989). Therefore, the United States has become increasingly multieethnic—indeed, it is one of the most multieethnic countries in the world—and it is instructive to examine the issues and problems that arise from the interaction of different ethnic Americans.

In this chapter, our specific goal is to present a broad overview of the past, present, and future of ethnic psychology. Our discussion covers the following four areas:

1. We define *ethnicity* and outline related issues in order to provide an appropriate framework for discussion.
2. We present a very brief overview of the historical experiences of different ethnic groups in the United States as a background to facilitate understanding of ethnic relations in this country. Both racism (negative attitudes and beliefs about nonwhite groups) and discrimination (the corresponding poor treatment of nonwhite ethnic groups) characterize the historical relationships between white Americans and nonwhite ethnic groups.
3. We describe the past and present psychological models that attempt to explain ethnic differences. The evolution of these different perspectives demonstrates advances in scientific thinking, along with progress in the public consideration of ethnic issues.
4. Our final section outlines the challenges that face ethnic researchers in psychology.

Definition and Discussion of Ethnicity

The term “ethnicity” was originally derived from the Greek word for nation, *ethnos*. Herein, an ethnic group is defined as “a group socially distinguished or set apart, by others or by itself, primarily on the basis of cultural or nationality

characteristics" (Feagin, 1989, p. 9). It is important to note that this is a social definition, not a biological one. However, outward physical similarities may also exist within certain ethnic groups.

Berry (1994) noted that ethnic groups have both objective and subjective components. They are united with a common lineage and culture that can be observed objectively from outside the group. In addition, an ethnic group subjectively defines its own sense of identity and group membership. When conducting research on different ethnic groups, it is therefore essential to determine beforehand what component(s) of ethnicity may explain the results.

In addition to the subjective and objective components, there are many different "levels" of ethnicity based on the specificity of the group under examination. Within each broad ethnic category (e.g., Asian American), there is a considerable amount of heterogeneity in terms of cultural values and historical experiences in the United States (Sue, Zane, & Young, 1994; Uehara, Takeuchi, & Smukler, 1994). As one provides more detail about the specific ethnic subgroup under study, one moves to a different level of analysis. For example, among Asian Americans, individuals may have originally descended from China, Korea, Japan, India, Taiwan, the Philippines, Southeast Asia, or even countries in South America. At the level of these more specific subgroups, systematic ethnic differences may appear (e.g., between Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans). Further subdivisions may also be possible: Chinese Americans who originally emigrated from mainland China may differ from immigrants who came from Taiwan or Hong Kong. Thus, research on Asian Americans may not be truly representative of Chinese Americans; research on Chinese immigrants from Taiwan may differ from findings with Chinese Americans born in the United States.

To create a visual example of ethnicity as a categorical variable, picture it as a pyramid: the broad, macrolevel descriptions (e.g., Asian American or Hispanic American), which include many different subgroups, appear at the bottom. More detailed group designations cause one to move up to higher levels of the pyramid until the apex of a highly specified group (e.g., third-generation, middle-class Chinese American college students) is reached. If one is comparing different levels within a pyramid, one is doing intraethnic research. Comparisons of different pyramids can be likened to interethnic research.

This ethnicity pyramid will help one determine whether or not cross-ethnic studies are conducting comparisons at the same level of ethnicity. For example, in a study of Mexican Americans, are they being compared—on a similar level of specificity—to Chinese Americans? Or are they being contrasted to Asian Americans in general, who represent a broader ethnic level? Naturally, either comparison may be empirically or theoretically justified depending on the nature of the experiment. In summary, when studying different ethnic groups, one should delineate the appropriate level of discourse, or ethnic (sub)group, to be clear about exactly who is being compared. Naturally, when conducting an experiment and interpreting its results, it is important to stay within those boundaries unless one is testing the generalizability of findings across different levels of ethnicity.

In psychological research, as well as everyday society, ethnicity is often confused with race and culture (Belancourt & Lopez, 1993). Essentially, culture is a collection of subjective norms that could apply to any kind of group, not only different ethnicities. So a common culture exists in the United States, in the workplace, in opera audiences, and so on. Race, on the other hand, is typically defined in terms of shared physical characteristics, such as skin color, hair type, and facial structure, that evolved from geographically isolated in-group breeding (Zuckerman, 1990). The traditional anthropological distinctions consist of Mongoloid, Negroid, and Caucasoid. However, as we discuss later, these categories have not withstood criticisms from modern-day research in genetics.

The Major Ethnic Minority Groups

African Americans

In 1619, the first Africans arrived in the United States as indentured servants. During the 17th and 18th centuries, the period of their servitude gradually extended to a life of slavery as a result of state laws, court precedents, and systematic maltreatment at the hands of the white slave owners (Burkey, 1978). Typically, African slaves were forced to work on plantations and small farms as field workers. As the interests of the white farm owners expanded in tobacco and cotton, their need for African labor also increased.

The ubiquitous oppression of the African slaves was often justified by both biblical and "scientific" sources (Guthrie, 1976; Thomas & Sillen, 1972). Some white Americans believed that, owing to their dark skin, the Africans were the cursed descendants of Noah's son Ham, as described in the Book of Genesis (Guthrie, 1976). Others argued that Africans were created before man and, accordingly, were not even human (Smith, 1993). Physicians of the time also described the Africans as having smaller, primitive brains and psychologies well suited for servitude (Thomas & Sillen, 1972). As a result, the slaves were denied basic human rights and subjected to beatings, psychological traumas, and squalid living conditions. Family members were often separated from each other. Laws concerning slavery were designed to safeguard the property rights of the slave owner and protect the safety of the white public (Hornsby, 1991).

The egalitarian principles embodied in the American Revolution started a series of manumissions in which black slaves were set free by their owners. The invention of the seed-separating cotton gin effectively reversed this trend, however. Cotton became a highly profitable crop, but it required large amounts of manual labor for cultivation and harvesting. As a result, the U.S. demand for slave labor increased from 500,000 in 1776 to 4 million in 1861 (Burkey, 1978; Hornsby, 1991).

In 1865, following a bloody civil war, the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution officially abolished slavery. In the following years, African Americans technically were granted the same rights as other citizens, including the

right to vote. However, racism, discrimination, and hatred directed against African Americans became more firmly entrenched in American life, thus preventing African Americans from attaining a better standard of living. In 1896, the U.S. Supreme Court case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* stated that "separate but equal" facilities could be established for blacks and whites. Consequently, African Americans were segregated within society and given inferior treatment, owing to the omnipresence of white racism. Public areas such as water fountains, bathrooms, and buses were divided into "colored" and "white" sections. In the South, Jim Crow laws essentially denied African Americans the right to vote through the imposition of barriers at the polls, such as literacy tests and poll taxes.

In 1954, the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* declared that segregated school facilities were unequal and therefore unconstitutional. In the following decade, five civil rights acts were passed that established inviolable voting rights for African Americans and prohibited discriminatory practices in public areas and government programs.

In the 1960s, the civil rights movement demanded equal rights for African Americans and other minority groups. African Americans began to establish a positive self-consciousness on a national level. Black leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, and Stokely Carmichael provided energy and determination for the movement toward equal rights for African Americans. During this time, the government-sponsored program of affirmative action was designed to facilitate minority access to better employment positions and educational programs.

In recent years, African Americans have reached a higher level of prominence in American society. They occupy more prestigious political, social, and economic positions than ever before. However, there are still many threats to African Americans in this country. Poor socioeconomic conditions, high rates of drug use and criminality, and the persistence of American racism represent just a few of the serious obstacles facing African Americans today.

Hispanic Americans

Hispanic Americans are a very diverse group, composed of people from Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Central and South America. Because Mexican Americans represent the vast majority of Hispanics in the United States (Martinez, 1986), their history will be documented here.

The original people of Mexico were conquered by Spain around 1522. Merging with the native population, the Spanish settlement grew northward from 1530 to 1800 into the present-day states of Texas, California, and New Mexico (Novas, 1994). While some people were direct descendants of the Spanish colonists, most inhabitants were of mixed ancestry between the Spanish and the indigenous people of Mexico.

White American traders had their first contact with Mexicans along the Santa Fe Trail in the late 1700s and 1800s. In addition to business relationships, some traders formed matrimonial ties with the local population and settled down in

the Mexican territories. As the fledgling nation of the United States expanded westward in the 18th and 19th centuries, Mexicans fell into areas that were controlled by the American government. The increase of white settlers in the Southwest relegated the Mexican inhabitants to a minority, second-class status.

Fearing overcrowding on the East Coast, the country soon embarked on a popular journey of aggressive nationalism in the 19th century. Coined in 1845, the phrase "Manifest Destiny" proclaimed that Americans had the God-given right to rule the continent from coast to coast (Samora & Simon, 1993). As more settlers moved westward, conflicts slowly emerged between whites and Mexicans and between both groups against the Mexican government (Moore & Pachon, 1970; Samora & Simon, 1993).

The United States was at war with Mexico from 1846 to 1847. After early Mexican victories, the U.S. government prioritized the war effort, which produced a quick American victory. Through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the United States gained control of vast areas of Mexican territory, including Texas, California, New Mexico, and Arizona. Eighty thousand Mexicans thus became de facto citizens of the United States (Meier & Ribera, 1993).

The development of large farming interests, together with the railroad and mining industries, forced many Mexican ranchers and farmers out of business. Mexican Americans reluctantly assumed the subservient role of laborers or tenants in these businesses in order to support themselves and their families (Meier & Ribera, 1993; Moore & Pachon, 1970). Living in poor health and housing conditions, these workers characteristically earned low wages and moved often to follow the seasonal demands of different industries (Moore & Pachon, 1970).

Owing to the anti-Asian immigration acts of the 1880s and 1900s, Mexico provided a large number of laborers to work in American business ventures. The 1924 Immigration Act did not place any restrictions on immigration within the Western Hemisphere, so Mexican workers flocked across the border to fill the high demand for cheap labor (Novas, 1994).

When the Great Depression of 1930-1933 devastated American business, many Mexican workers were left jobless and dependent on government-sponsored programs. A movement within the United States called for the deportation of Mexican workers; 500,000 were sent back to Mexico during the 1930s (Novas, 1994). Later, in the 1940s, Mexican laborers were again welcomed into the country in the face of an agricultural crisis and the wartime demand for manufactured goods.

In the 1960s and 1970s, an increased ethnic consciousness developed among Mexican Americans. During this time, Cesar Chavez formed the first successful farm workers' union, which achieved better rights and a higher minimum wage from Californian grape growers. In addition, more militant, separatist movements led by Reis Tijerina and Rodolfo Gonzalez called for the return of federal properties unlawfully seized from Mexican property owners to their original heirs (Novas, 1994).

Today, Mexican Americans and other Hispanics report high levels of physical problems and psychological distress relative to the white population (Fabrega,

1995, Roberts, 1980). The discrimination against this minority group continues as well. Most recently, the state of California passed a resolution (Proposition 187) to deny social services to illegal immigrants. This law is targeted at undocumented Mexicans living in the country, but it undoubtedly affects Mexican Americans whose rightful citizenship will be questioned.

Asian Americans

Often considered as a single ethnic group, Asian Americans actually include over 25 distinct ethnic groups, each with its own unique history in the United States (Uba, 1994). Owing to space limitations, we present a very brief description of the experiences of Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, and Southeast Asians in this country.

Japanese Americans Seeking work as farm laborers, Japanese immigrants started coming to the United States during the 1880s. In 1906, Executive Order 589 and, in 1907, the Gentlemen's Agreement restricted Japanese immigration. In response, many male Japanese who had settled here quickly arranged marriages with Japanese women overseas (known as "picture brides") in order to start families in the United States. So, by the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, which totally restricted Japanese immigration, about 130,000 to 150,000 Japanese were living in this country (Uba, 1994).

The most significant event affecting Japanese Americans was Executive Order 9066, issued by President Franklin Roosevelt during World War II. Because the United States was at war with Japan, people of Japanese ancestry were considered to be possible conspirators against the American war effort (Hatanaka, 1993). Consequently, in a wave of severe persecution and paranoia, the federal government removed Japanese Americans from their homes and incarcerated them in poorly accommodated internment camps, where they remained for the duration of the war. This presidential order deprived Japanese Americans of their rights to due process and equal protection under the law in flagrant violation of the U.S. Constitution: two-thirds of the 120,000 internees were American citizens by birth, and thus their civil liberties should have been protected and inviolable (Daniels, 1971; Irons, 1983, as cited in Takaki, 1989). As a result of the internment, many Japanese Americans lost their jobs, homes, and possessions. This victimization psychologically traumatized the internees and their children (Nagata, 1991).

Chinese Americans The history of Chinese immigration in the United States has significantly affected the size and characteristics of Chinese American families over time (Glenn, 1983; Wong, 1985). Chinese Americans first started coming to the United States during the mid-19th century in order to find employment as farmhands, miners, or railroad workers (Chan, 1991). Emigration from China was severely curtailed by the 1882 Exclusion Act and totally cut off by the 1924 Immigration Act (Hing, 1993). During this time period, many laws were directed

against the Chinese, including special taxes and restrictions in housing and employment (Daniels, 1988; Glenn, 1983). A Supreme Court decision classified Chinese women as laborers, thus subjecting them to immigration law restrictions. The Chinese American population was correspondingly limited, as Chinese men were unable to meet potential wives and start families in the United States (Hing, 1993).

During World War II, the United States began accepting a small quota of Chinese immigrants. Later, after the Communist victory in China, the United States encouraged Nationalist scientists and professionals to settle here (Uba, 1994). Today, Chinese arrive under the auspices of the 1965 Immigration Act (and its 1990 extension), which allows the immigration of individuals with special skills or people whose families reside in the United States (Hing, 1993). Because immigration quotas are no longer based on race, the number of Chinese immigrants has risen as individuals arrive from China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong (Uba, 1994). At present, only 37 percent of Chinese Americans are born in the United States; the rest are foreign-born immigrants (Sue, Zane, & Young, 1994).

Southeast Asians The various groups of Southeast Asians suffered many different traumas associated with their migration to the United States. The Vietnamese, for example, first started coming after the victory of North Vietnam in 1975 (Uba, 1994). Most of these immigrants paid great sums of money in order to escape on overcrowded, dilapidated boats. Once at sea, they suffered from starvation, disease, and attacks by pirates who robbed, raped, and killed many of the refugees (Niemi, 1989). Similar atrocities befell the citizens of Laos and Cambodia (Uba, 1994). In 1975, the Pathet Lao seized power in Laos. This regime soon embarked on a campaign of extermination directed at its opponents, including the hill tribes of Hmong and Mien, who helped the CIA during the Vietnam War. Also in that year, Pol Pot, leader of the Khmer Rouge, took over in Cambodia. He forced millions of people into harsh labor camps, splitting up families in the process. Deemed a threat to society, intellectuals were targeted for annihilation.

The traumatic experiences of Southeast Asian refugees do not end once they arrive in the United States. Many problems arise here as well, including unemployment (Belser, Johnson, & Turner, 1993), language difficulties (Niemi, 1989), and disruptions in family life and traditions (Abe, Zane, & Chun, 1994).

Today, there is a popular belief that Asian Americans constitute a well-adjusted, "model minority" based on their high rates of academic achievement and presumably low rates of psychopathology and social deviance (Sue & Morishima, 1983; Sue, 1994; Sue, Nakamura, Chung, & Yee-Bradbury, 1994). Consequently, some people use Asian Americans as a yardstick to measure other ethnic groups, in effect saying, "Asians Americans have done well in this country, so if you find yourself in a disadvantaged position, the fault lies in you, not American society."

The arguments against this position are fourfold. First, as we have outlined earlier, the discriminatory experiences of each ethnic group are unique and

widely varied (Fairchild, 1991); thus, their relative positions in present-day society are not indicative of progress along similar paths. Second, while some Asian Americans are doing well, many (e.g., recent immigrants) still experience significant hardships (Sue, 1994). A third contention is that Asian Americans still have to work harder than whites in order to reach similar levels of success. Finally, Asian Americans have been able to better themselves through the use of education to overcome restrictions in upward mobility (Sue & Okazaki, 1990). Even so, an environment persists that allows Asian Americans only to go so far. For example, a prevailing stereotype is that Asian Americans make good workers, not good leaders. Thus, the "model minority" myth is replete with criticisms.

Native Americans

Estimates of the number of Native American tribes that existed prior to the arrival of English colonists range between 200 (Burkey, 1978) and 400 (Churchill, 1993). These tribes centered on kin groups involved in a symbiotic relationship with their natural surroundings. Initially, Native Americans had good relations with the European traders, who depended upon them for furs and pelts. The situation soon soured, however. Economic opportunities spawned greed in some native tribes, which promoted the abandonment of traditional means of subsistence. Whole animal species were wiped out as a result of excessive hunting. The introduction of alcohol as a way to take advantage of Native Americans during trade negotiations promoted alcoholism. All of these factors, combined with the westward movement of the fur trade, sunk the eastern tribes into a state of poverty and misery (Joseph, 1994).

In addition to the disruptions caused by trading, the native population declined drastically owing to disease and warfare following the arrival of the Europeans (Thornton, 1987). Epidemic diseases, such as smallpox, cholera, and whooping cough, almost devastated whole tribes of Native Americans (Oswalt, 1978). Severe hardship ensued as a result of the loss of tribal leaders, the lack of faith in native shamans, and holes in the cooperative fabric of tribal living (Walker & LaDuc, 1986). The native population fell from over 5 million people in 1492 to only 600,000 in 1800 (Thornton, 1987).

The present-day Bureau of Indian Affairs traces its roots to 1824, when management of Native Americans was assigned to the secretary of war (Trimble, 1988). Evidently, the colonists did not foresee peaceful coexistence with the native population. Soon thereafter, in 1830, the Indian Removal Act forced eastern tribes, including the Creeks, Cherokee, and Choctaw, to relocate to isolated areas in the Midwest. The expulsion of the Cherokee from Georgia, known as the Trail of Tears, typified a pattern in which Native Americans were relocated to less desirable pieces of land until the United States, succumbing to its economic or expansionist needs, violated existing treaties and forced them to move again (Burkey, 1978). The federal government repeatedly ignored the boundary restrictions contained in its treaties with different tribes (Jackson, 1881), often resorting to coercive purchases or outright annexation (Foreman, 1932).

In 1854, the Kansas-Nebraska Act confined Native Americans to remote reservations in order to remove them as a barrier to westward migration. The lands set aside for reservations dwindled in size as the number of settlers and land speculators increased in those areas. In addition, the 1887 Dawes Act broke up reservations into small plots assigned to individuals; the 48 million remaining unassigned acres were gradually sold to white settlers and businesses (Joseph, 1994).

The U.S. oppression of Native Americans was not a peaceful process. Many armed battles arose between whites and various native tribes whenever settlers infringed on tribal lands. For example, approximately 70,000 Native Americans perished from war or disease in the decade following the 1849 discovery of gold in California (Burkey, 1978).

In the 20th century, the federal government began efforts to assimilate Native Americans into mainstream society. Full citizenship was granted to Native Americans in 1924. The establishment of voting rights varied from state to state, with some states (New Mexico and Arizona) withholding such privileges until 1948 (Trimble, 1988). The 1934 Indian Reorganization Bill gave them the right to self-government on the reservations through governmentally appointed tribal councils (Churchill, 1992). However, during the Great Depression, the life of Native Americans was again disrupted as government-sponsored public works projects infringed on tribal land and destroyed the local ecosystems upon which many tribes depended for subsistence (Walker & LaDuc, 1986).

In the 1950s, the government tried to relocate Native Americans to urban centers in order to provide them with job training and employment opportunities. This effort helped some Native Americans achieve a higher socioeconomic status, but many were unable to make the transition. Thornton (1987) predicts that the urbanization movement will produce three notable changes in the Native American population: a decline in the growth rate, an increased number of interethnic marriages, and a loss of tribal affiliations.

In 1975, the Indian Self-Determination Act and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act finally allowed tribal input in the planning of social service programs on reservations. Today, Native American communities are plagued with problems of alcoholism, violence, suicide, and depression (Mail & Johnson, 1993; May & Ditzmann, 1974; Walker & LaDuc, 1986).

Explanatory Models in Ethnic Psychology

Psychological research has uncovered ethnic differences in many different areas, including the following: academic achievement (Whang & Hancock, 1994); emotional expressions (Matsumoto, 1993); child rearing (Kelley & Tseng, 1992; Levine & Bartz, 1979; Reis, 1993); cognitive styles (Huang & Sisco, 1994; Shade, 1986); marital interactions and attitudes (Cromwell & Cromwell, 1978; Farber, 1990; Oiggins, Veroff, & Leber, 1993; Oiggins, Leber, & Veroff, 1993; Uzzell, 1986); and rates of psychopathology (Robins & Regier, 1991). In the United States, these

research findings have been viewed from a variety of perspectives. Many psychological models have been proposed to explain both categorical (e.g., psychiatric symptomatology) and dimensional (e.g., intelligence test scores) differences between ethnic groups. These models represent not only advances in scientific thinking about ethnic differences but also reflections of public opinions characteristic of the time period in which the model was proposed. For example, the focus on innate biological characteristics as the fundamental source of differences between people was originally derived from the writings of Charles Darwin and Gregor Mendel. However, the popularized version of this perspective—which touted the genetic inferiority of ethnic minorities—aptly demonstrated the blatant racism endemic in the United States during the 19th and early 20th centuries.

At the time of writing, there have been five major explanatory models in ethnic psychology. Sue, Ito, and Bradshaw (1982) and Sue (1983) described the first three models as focusing on genetic inferiority, environmentally caused deficits, and cultural pluralism. In the past decade, the two competing theories of symbolic racism and social dominance have emerged as a fourth model to explain white racism in political matters. In vogue today, the final model has ethnic psychology subsumed within the larger arena of human diversity. In the following section, the models are presented in roughly chronological order in terms of their emergence and popularity. For illustrative purposes, an empirical example is also interpreted within the context of each model.

Inferiority Model

Because of centuries of religious, racial, and colonial persecution, it is not surprising that the first paradigm used to explain ethnic differences was based on racist thinking. Innate biological characteristics, as described by Charles Darwin and Gregor Mendel, were considered to be responsible for a minority ethnic group's failure to thrive. This "natural inferiority" of different ethnic groups provided justification for the continuation of discrimination and oppression. The argument proceeds as follows: if a group is inherently incapable of attaining a better position in society, then there is no point in adjusting the existing environment to provide preferential or equal opportunities. Nonwhite ethnic group members were considered to be misfits in a "civilized" world and thus suitable only for menial jobs and disdainful treatment. The notion of genetic inferiority characterized the discriminatory and persecutory practices inflicted against African Americans in the United States (Klineberg, 1935). This doctrine also provided the scientific justification for slavery, which originated from the religious and ethnocentric prejudices of Western Europe. The disadvantaged position of African Americans, and other minorities, in this country was seen to result from inherent biological factors, not years of oppression and exclusion (Thomas & Sillen, 1972; Kovel, 1970).

Biological explanations for racial and ethnic differences are not supported by research in human genetics, however. Although racial categories are based

on similar phenotypes, the underlying genetics within each racial group are remarkably dissimilar. Indeed, research has discovered more genetic differences intraracially than interracially (Jackson, 1992; Zuckerman, 1996; Nei & Roychoudhury, 1974). Recent findings in the Human Genome Project at Stanford University also show that true genetic differences between people have almost no relationship to traditional racial distinctions (Begley, 1995). Thus, some researchers (Fairchild, Yee, Wyatt, & Weizmann, 1995; Sun, 1995; Yee, Fairchild, Weizmann, & Wyatt, 1993) have concluded that the concept of race includes a notable social component.

The inferiority model is perhaps most associated with the controversy surrounding racial differences in intelligence and intelligence test scores. Guthrie (1976) noted that the first intelligence testing of African Americans was done by Josiah Morse and Alice Strong in 1912. Not surprisingly, they concluded that African American children were mentally younger than white children. Based on his study in 1915, W. H. Pyle later declared that African Americans had only two-thirds of the mental capacity of whites (Guthrie, 1976). Intelligence testing of army recruits in World War I also testified to the intellectual inferiority of African Americans.

Since that time, a number of additional authors have reported lower IQ scores among African Americans than among white European Americans (Monte & Fagan, 1988; Reynolds, Chastain, Kaufman, & McLean, 1987; Seligman, 1992; Jensen, 1969; Jensen & Reynolds, 1982; Rushion, 1994). Some researchers proclaim these lower results to be caused by genetic deficiencies (Jensen, 1969; Jensen, 1976; Rushion, 1994; Rushion, 1995). Support for this argument is gathered from studies that show intelligence to be a highly heritable trait (e.g., Boomsma, 1993; Chipuer, Rovine, & Plomin, 1990; Jensen, 1976; Plomin, 1989).

The position that genetically mediated racial differences exist in intelligence has been criticized from many angles, however. For example, Crane (1994) argues that the environmental factors—not genetics—play a significant role in racial IQ differences. As a direct refutation of J. P. Rushion's work, which finds racial differences in cranial capacity (Rushion, 1994), Cernovsky (1993) states that head size is not related to intelligence or race. Furthermore, Grubb (1987) reasoned that if African Americans are truly genetically inferior in intelligence, then the occurrence rate for severe mental retardation among blacks would be higher than among whites; he found no such differences, however. Numerous researchers have also challenged the heritability estimates of intelligence (e.g., Erdle, 1990; Mackenzie, 1984; Schonemann, 1989; Wahlsten, 1994).

In addition, there are many criticisms of the intelligence tests themselves and their application to nonwhite populations. For example, in his book *The Mismeasure of Man* (1981), Gould criticizes the very notion of having a single numerical measure of intelligence, as well as its corresponding ranking system. After all, Frenchman Alfred Binet developed the first intelligence test to distinguish between normal and mentally retarded schoolchildren, not as a continuous scale of intelligence (Kamin, 1974). Other authors have argued against the use of intelligence tests for ethnic minorities in particular. For example, Lopez

and Taussig (1991) showed that a difference in language introduces a test bias when assessing Hispanic Americans. Furthermore, variables that systematically covary with ethnicity, such as educational achievement and socioeconomic status, may cause ethnic and racial differences to appear in test results (Ehrlich & Feldman, 1977). A Western cultural bias may also exist in the test items and components used to define intelligence (Ehrlich & Feldman, 1977; Guy, 1977). Despite the overwhelming and varied evidence against the application of the inferiority model to ethnic differences in intelligence, the controversy continues, as evidenced by the recent publication of *The Bell Curve* (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994), which argues for the genetic-intellectual inferiority of African Americans.

Deficit Model

As a reaction to the proposition that genetics—or “nature”—explains ethnic differences in psychological research, the deficit hypothesis developed. Based on Gordon Allport's landmark book *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954) and fueled by the civil rights movement in the 1960s, this model proposed the opposite extreme: the locus of ethnic differences lies in the environment—or “nurture”—not in the individual.

In his book, Allport (1954) stated that prejudice is composed of erroneous generalizations and hostility. Both of these ingredients are “natural and common capacities of the human mind” (p. 17). Prejudice is subsequently applied in the rejection of out-groups who do not share the same well-regarded characteristics of one's in-group; the formal distinctions between in-groups and out-groups are derived from normal psychological processes.

The deficit model built upon these premises by stating that the consequences of prejudice (i.e., verbal rejection, discrimination, and physical attack [Allport, 1954]) create stress for minority groups that greatly hinders their ability to thrive (Sue, 1983). Kramer, Rosen, and Willis (1973) took the position that “racist practices undoubtedly are key factors—perhaps the most important ones—in producing mental disorders in Blacks and other underprivileged groups” (p. 355). Racial discrimination and segregation in housing, education, and employment restrict the opportunities available to ethnic minorities. Furthermore, severe persecution can lead to self-hatred and a loss of self-respect in oppressed ethnic groups (Baldwin, 1979; Saenger, 1953).

The deficit model has been applied to ethnic differences in mental health. For example, several studies have reported higher rates of schizophrenia (Steinberg, Paredes, Bjork, & Sporty, 1977) and some anxiety disorders (Blazer, Hughes, George, Swartz, & Boyer, 1991; Eaton, Dryman, & Weissman, 1991; Neal & Turner, 1991) in African Americans, accompanied by more severe symptomatology (Adeboye, Chu, Klein, & Lange, 1982; Kleiner, Tuckman, & Lovell, 1960). The deficit model, therefore, proposes that white racism produces these higher rates of mental distress in African Americans (Carter, 1994). Gary (1981)

suggested that the oppression characteristic of institutionalized racism produces self-destructive psychological coping mechanisms, such as substance use and suicide, in African American men. The fear of racism may also cause African Americans to act paranoid or secretive in therapy situations (Ridley, 1984) and thus prevent the establishment of a trusting therapeutic relationship (Hankins-McNary, 1979). Perhaps institutionalized racism affects the admission rates or quality of care in psychiatric facilities (Flaherty & Meagher, 1980; Wade, 1993). Evidence also suggests that racism is responsible for the poor physical health of some nonwhite ethnic groups (Krieger, Rowley, Herman, Avery, & Phillips, 1993).

The deficit model has both advantages and disadvantages in terms of explaining ethnic differences (Sue, 1983; Sue et al., 1982). On the one hand, its focused attention on the environment provides a closer examination of racial discrimination and the poor social and living conditions of some minorities, which may hinder their ability to thrive. In 1954, psychological research into the harmful effects of segregation formed the basis of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* to end the separation of black and white schoolchildren (Sue, 1983; Yee et al., 1993). On the other hand, the deficit model still cast minorities as inferior (Thomas & Sillen, 1972). By only looking at the weaknesses of a specific ethnic group relative to white Americans, it neglected areas of good or superior functioning in the nonwhite group. Klineberg (1981) described this problem as the replacement of nature by nurture in explaining the inferiority of African Americans.

Cultural Pluralism

Originally proposed by Horace Kallen in 1915, cultural pluralism arose as an idealized description of ethnic group relations to counteract the coercive efforts of assimilation and Americanization directed against ethnic minorities. Kallen (1924) rejected the popular idea of the melting pot, which proffered that American ethnic groups were combining with the dominant Anglo-Saxon culture to produce a new, universal American identity. Instead, he proposed that ethnic groups should remain distinct cultural entities while promoting universal American values. For example, groups would promote democratic principles through voting and political participation. Kallen used the phrase “unity in diversity” to represent the ethnic groups’ acceptance of common American values and traditions, combined with the groups’ preservation of their own unique culture (Krug, 1976).

Gordon (1964) identified three themes that punctuated Kallen's writings on cultural pluralism. First, Kallen believed that, in contrast to all other groups to which an individual may belong (e.g., political party or religious group), ethnic group membership is an involuntary process that fosters personality development. Because an individual is not able to change his ethnicity, he must come to terms with it. Second, cultural pluralism embodies the ideals of democracy

because it does not force minorities to conform to the dominant American culture. Thus, one is free to embrace the values of his ethnic group and/or American society to any degree he desires. And finally, the United States benefits from the interactions of diverse ethnic groups within its boundaries. Individual ethnic groups are able to contribute parts of their cultural heritage to the national culture directly, as well as indirectly, thereby promoting positive relationships with other ethnic groups.

Cultural pluralism may operate at several different levels in society (Gordon, 1978). At the most basic level, each ethnic group maintains all intimate and family relationships within itself. Contact with other ethnic groups is formal, impersonal, and characterized by tolerance. The more advanced stage of "good group relations" includes primary personal relationships that cross ethnic boundaries. At this level, public institutions are well integrated with different ethnic groups. The point at which ethnicity is no longer a salient feature in personal relationships is dubbed the "community integration" level. People of diverse ethnic backgrounds interact within a common, intimate social structure. In keeping with the central tenets of cultural pluralism, the cultural and ethnic identities of individuals are well respected and valued but are also combined with an appreciation of the commonalities of all people. Because cultural pluralism places a high emphasis on allowing ethnic groups to decide their own levels of identification and integration in American society, a mixed level also exists. Herein, individuals could live primarily within their own ethnic group (i.e., at the tolerance or "good group relations" level) or participate in a larger communal brotherhood (i.e., at the community integration level). These latter individuals would likely have only a marginal affiliation with their own ethnic group.

Unlike the premises of the inferiority and deficit models, cultural pluralism is not a theory or a description of real-life circumstances (Sue, Moore, Iacone, & Nagata, 1984). Rather, it is an ideology that sets the stage for social interventions. Sue et al. (1984) outlined the following three values contained in a culturally pluralistic perspective: (1) a mutual respect for the presence of cultural differences; (2) an awareness of the strengths inherent in those differences; and (3) active support of the rights of different ethnic groups to retain their cultural heritage. The application of these principles to interethnic relations would presumably lead to a better understanding and camaraderie between ethnic groups. The influence of cultural pluralism in psychology can be seen in research on ethnic identity. Like cultural pluralism, the concept of ethnic identity received increased attention during the ethnic-consciousness movements of the 1960s (Phinney, 1990). Essentially, ethnic identity seeks to discern an individual's relationship to his own ethnic group and to the larger, dominant white society. In most ethnic identity paradigms, the individual progresses from a state of unawareness of his own ethnic identity, through an ethnocentric fixation upon it, to a stage in which he has integrated his ethnic self together with his relationship to the white culture. These latter two levels are similar to the first and second stages of cultural pluralism as posited by Gordon (1978).

Symbolic Racism

Following the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision and the civil rights movement, politics tried to provide equal opportunities in education and employment for nonwhite ethnic groups, together with the desegregation of public facilities. While white Americans were supportive of egalitarianism (Taylor, Sheatsley, & Greeley, 1978), they also opposed specific policies designed to facilitate equality and desegregation, such as affirmative action and the busing of schoolchildren to provide diversified learning environments (Pettigrew, 1979). Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo (1985) found that whites were more positive to egalitarian attitudes than to egalitarian policies. Bobo (1988) described this discrepancy as "a gap between principles and implementation."

In order to explain the voting behavior of white Americans who opposed desegregation and affirmative action, the theories of symbolic racism and social dominance have been recently proposed. Whites were voting against black political candidates and policies of desegregation and affirmative action (e.g., busing), even when such issues did not significantly affect their self-interests. Flagrant, "traditional" racism was unable to explain the observed voting behavior, so a more subtle form of prejudice was conjectured.

The theory of symbolic racism states that white opposition to certain racial policies is caused by an adherence to traditional American values of individualism and meritocracy combined with antiblack affect (Kinder & Sears, 1981). In 1988, Sears outlined the three central propositions of the model. First, symbolic racism significantly affects racial policy preferences and voting decisions in elections in which race is an issue. Second, symbolic racism has a greater impact on political issues than "traditional" racism. And third, symbolic racism is a more salient feature of whites' political responses than personally relevant racial threats. This final tenet highlights the fact that symbolic racism deals with abstract concepts and symbols rather than concrete interests of the self or group. Research on symbolic racism has shown it to be a better predictor of white opposition to busing (Sears & Kinder, 1985) and African American candidates (Kinder & Sears, 1981) than simply self-interest or traditional racism.

In contrast to symbolic racism, social dominance theory proposes that anti-egalitarian attitudes fuel racist voting decisions. As a hegemonic in-group, whites adopt a social dominance orientation by favorably comparing themselves to African Americans, who represent a negative reference out-group. This social dominance orientation not only fuels discrimination against African Americans but also supports socially accepted attitudes that justify an unequal distribution of societal resources. These attitudes and beliefs are known as legitimizing myths. Social dominance theory also assumes that most conflicts between groups occur as a result of the unequal social hierarchy, which provides an evolutionarily adaptive function in reconciling intragroup conflict and better organizing groups to compete for scarce resources (Sidanius, 1993).

A recent study of symbolic racism and social dominance theory (Sidanius, Devereux, & Pratto, 1991) found more support for the latter theory than the former one. While symbolic racism was related to white resistance to racial policies of equal opportunity and preferential treatment for minorities, it was not significantly related to feelings of meritocracy, one of the theory's central tenets. In contrast, the test of social dominance theory showed that anti-egalitarianism was related to legitimizing myths (including symbolic racism) and resistance to equal opportunities for minorities. Thus, there is some evidence that social dominance may better explain the rationale behind white racist voting behavior than symbolic racism.

Human Diversity

The newly emerging model in ethnic psychology is simply known as human diversity (e.g., Trickett, Watts, & Birman, 1993, 1994; Chin, De La Cancela, & Jenkins, 1993). Basically, this new area seeks to broaden the scope of research beyond racial, ethnic, or cultural issues to include other groups that have unique differences, strengths, needs, histories, and discriminatory experiences. This research will include ethnic groups and other populations that historically have been victims of discrimination, such as women, gays and lesbians, and individuals with disabilities. Members of the dominant culture (i.e., white male heterosexuals) are included as well. Thus, one of the central premises is that everyone in society has a unique culture, both independently and in relationship to a larger society.

Watts (1994) outlined the following four paradigms to conducting research within the framework of human diversity: population-specific psychology, cross-cultural psychology, sociopolitical psychology, and intergroup theory. Population-specific psychology posits that by understanding an oppressed population's worldview and its environmental circumstances, one is able to identify patterns distinctly applicable to that population. These patterns become the basis for theories that then can be applied to research or interventions within that specific population. Cross-cultural psychology looks for both universal and unique cultural attributes between two or more cultural groups. Instead of examining one group exclusively, cross-cultural psychologists gain understanding of populations through explicit comparisons to each other. This perspective allows for the influence of culture into our psychological theories of affect, behavior, and cognition. Sociopolitical psychology examines the oppression against nondominant groups by an elite group, both as a process and as an outcome. By focusing on the present ideology of oppression and injustice, one strives to ultimately change or replace the current sociopolitical system. Finally, intergroup theory examines group processes at the most general level by incorporating cultural, societal, and other factors that impinge upon the formation, structure, identity, and dynamics of all groups.

As an example of population-specific psychology, research has recently started to examine the concept of "loss of face" in Asians and Asian Americans

(e.g., Ja & Aoki, 1993; Kuo & Kavanaugh, 1994; Leong, Wagner, & Kim, 1995). Based on cultural phenomena, this construct posits that Asians are concerned with the maintenance of harmony in interpersonal relationships; behavior will be circumscribed in order to prevent oneself and others from losing respect in the eyes of the group. Loss of face may be examined in many different contexts, including school environments, business meetings, and psychotherapy sessions. For example, the tendency of Asian Americans to underutilize mental health services relative to the white population may reflect concerns about saving face. Applications such as this one will provide better understanding of Asians and Asian Americans.

Future Challenges in Ethnic Psychology

The future of ethnic psychology will likely encounter the following five major challenges: (1) the limitations of ethnicity as an explanatory variable; (2) the difficulty of investigating individuals who have a mixed ethnic background; (3) the refinement of handling ethnicity in research; (4) the development of culturally valid assessment measures; and (5) the cyclical nature of beliefs.

First, we, as researchers, need to move beyond ethnicity as a way of explaining differences (Betancourt & Lopez, 1993). As traditionally employed, ethnicity is essentially a categorical variable, not an explanatory one. It is also entangled with differences in social class (Adler et al., 1994; Ehrlich & Feldman, 1977). Rather than providing an additive stress, differences in socioeconomic status interact with ethnicity, so it is not possible simply to remove the effects of income and education (Adler et al., 1994; Kessler & Neighbors, 1986; Ulbrich, Warheit, & Zimmerman, 1989). In other words, being poor and African American is fundamentally different from being poor and white. As a result, we need to ask more specific questions, like "What is it about being Asian American or African American or Hispanic American that makes one different?" In order to uncover the causal mechanisms that lie beneath ethnic differences, we must find constructs that are capable of providing better explanations than simply ethnicity.

These new variables may be explicitly related to notions of race, ethnicity, or culture. Racial identity, ethnic identity, acculturation, and cultural competence are all promising examples used to explain differences both between and within ethnic groups. In addition, variables may be applied that cut across ethnic lines. These variables may possess better predictive validity than simple ethnic group membership. For example, the theory of interdependent and independent self-construals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) may provide better indicators of behavior and cognitions than ethnicity. That is, two independently oriented individuals from disparate ethnic backgrounds may act more similarly than two people who share the same ethnicity but different self-construals. Individualism/collectivism (see Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990) is an example of a construct that has been previously applied to explain the similarities between seemingly

disparate societies, as well as the differences between presumably similar societies. It is also possible that variables that have traditionally examined individual and group differences in personality psychology and social psychology (e.g., introversion and extraversion) may be adapted for use with cultural and ethnic groups.

A second issue confronting ethnic researchers is how to conceptualize individuals with a diverse ethnic background. For example, how should a child whose parents are African American and Asian American be treated in research? Would the child be considered as belonging specifically to either ethnic group? Both? Neither? As the number of different ethnic groups increases in our society, so will the number of mixed ethnic pairings and their offspring. These individuals may represent a new challenge to existing research strategies, but they also provide interesting insights into many research areas, such as prejudice and self-identity.

A third problem confronting researchers is how to appropriately treat ethnicity in research. If we agree that ethnicity is socially defined and has both objective and subjective components as defined by Berry (1994), then how do we define our research subjects? Do we rely on the subject's self-report as belonging to a specific ethnic group? Do we assign subjects to multiethnic conditions based on their outward physical appearance? Our answers to these questions necessarily limit our investigations and conclusions. Zuckerman (1990), for example, points out that conclusions of genetic differences in intelligence between racial groups are invalid if the racial group of the subjects is simply based on self-report. Because little is known about the cultural and genetic makeup of the subjects, any conclusions about the origin of group differences are premature.

In recent years, psychological studies have been forced to include a diverse sample across ethnic and gender lines. This movement provides a welcome opportunity to expand the applicability of research findings beyond white male undergraduates who major in psychology. Unfortunately, an unintended result is that many researchers simply lose in a few minority subjects with little consideration of how they contribute to the overall research design beyond a simple categorical designation. This neglect of the possible effects of ethnicity is simply bad science. Even if the dependent variables under investigation do not seem amenable to ethnic effects, there is the possibility that ethnicity may confound results owing to the very nature of how and where research is conducted. Given the complexity of cross-racial and cross-ethnic interactions, the ethnicity of the experimenter(s) may influence the behaviors or reports of the subjects (Sue et al., 1982).

The fourth challenge to ethnic psychology is the development of culturally valid assessment measures. Many psychological tests have been designed by white male researchers and standardized on white subjects. Should test items selected by whites, coupled with profiles based on white subjects, be used with nonwhite ethnic groups? Maybe so, maybe not. Some tests may indeed be valid and reliable for use with different ethnic groups. However, because research has found biases in the application of some tests to nonwhite ethnic groups, one should

be careful in the interpretation of a subject's performance by considering the bases of the test results. For example, if a subject or patient is not a native English speaker, the psychologist may give less weight in his overall assessment of tests conducted in English. In the future, psychological research should strive to cross-validate assessment tests and widen standardization samples.

The final challenge revolves around the cyclical nature of racial and ethnic beliefs. It seems that some arguments never die. For example, the notion that African Americans are genetically inferior in intelligence was popularly held until the civil rights movement. It is now being revived by publications such as the book *The Bell Curve*. The cyclic nature of sentiments can also be seen in political attitudes toward immigrants and multiculturalism. The United States has experienced periods when immigrants have been unwelcome and have been victims of great hostility. At other times, immigrants have been viewed as adding to the strength and vitality of the country. Currently, there is an unfortunate rise in anti-immigrant sentiments and a tendency toward ethnocentrism. To progress as a discipline and society, we need to recognize our common future and work toward better relations between ethnic groups. A rebash of moot findings in the absence of new evidence is both fruitless and counterproductive. As a society, we need to recognize the benefits of improved interethnic relations and build upon the unique strengths of each ethnic group. In doing so, we must try to reduce ethnic conflicts, not provoke them.

Summary

Incorporating American history and empirical research, we have outlined the field of ethnic psychology in the United States. Our presentation of the historical experiences of nonwhite ethnic groups demonstrated how ethnic relations in this country have been tainted with racism and discrimination. We also discussed the theoretical models that have been applied to explain findings of ethnic differences. The development of these models and their application to particular research findings shows the progression of thinking about ethnic differences in both psychology and public opinion. In other words, the unfolding history of ethnic relations in the United States has been mirrored by changes in popular and scientific thinking about ethnic differences. In the 19th and first half of the 20th century, the early model of inferiority highlighted the low functioning of nonwhite ethnic groups and tried to explain their failure to thrive in terms of genetic differences between ethnic groups. In the 1950s, the deficit model emerged as an effort to explain ethnic differences in terms of environmental pressures; research began to study the effects of discrimination and prejudice. However, the underlying message was that nonwhite ethnic groups still performed more poorly than whites. In the hope of promoting mutual respect and harmony, cultural pluralism gained popularity in the 1980s and has tried to emphasize the interconnectedness of different ethnic groups. Unfortunately, as the theories of symbolic racism and social dominance demonstrate, racism and

discrimination still exist, though in a more camouflaged form. Finally, the human diversity model seeks to acknowledge discrimination as a common factor that applies to all disadvantaged groups in society. In summary, the effects of discrimination and racism have been progressively more recognized in American society. As a result, their influence on the explanatory models of differences between ethnic groups has also increased.

Now and in the future it will be useful to compare and contrast ethnic psychologies from different societies. Are the processes underlying ethnic prejudice and discrimination similar in different countries? Why do ethnic conflicts in some countries result in violence? To what extent can the solutions for ethnic strife found in one country be used in another? These are the important and interesting questions that need to be addressed. By comparing the approaches to ethnic psychology in different societies, as is being done in this book, we may be able to put an end to ethnically motivated conflicts and work toward improving the status of different ethnic groups and the quality of interethnic relationships.

References

- Abel, J., Zane, N., & Chun, K. (1994). Differential responses to trauma: Migration-related discriminants of posttraumatic stress disorder among Southeast Asian refugees. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 121-135.
- Adebimpe, V. R. (1981). Overview: White norms and the psychiatric diagnosis of black patients. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 138(3), 279-285.
- Adebimpe, V. R., Chu, C.-C., Klein, H. E., & Lange, M. H. (1982). Racial and geographic differences in the psychopathology of schizophrenia. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 139(7), 888-891.
- Adler, N. E., Boyce, T., Chesney, M. A., Cohen, S., Folkman, S., Kahn, R. L., & Syme, S. L. (1994). Socioeconomic status and health: The challenge of the gradient. *American Psychologist*, 49(1), 15-24.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Baldwin, J. A. (1979). Theory and research concerning the notion of black self-hatred: A review and reinterpretation. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 5(2), 51-77.
- Begley, S. (1995). There is not enough: Surprising new lessons from the controversial science of race. *Newsweek*, 13 February, pp. 67-69.
- Belsky, M., Johnson, P., & Turner, R. (1993). Unemployment, underemployment, and depressive affect among Southeast Asian refugees. *Psychological Medicine*, 23, 731-743.
- Berry, J. W. (1994). An ecological perspective on cultural and ethnic psychology. In E. Triandis, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 115-141). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Belancourt, H., & Lopez, S. R. (1993). The study of culture, ethnicity, and race in American psychology. *American Psychologist*, 48(6), 629-637.
- Blazer, D. G., Hughes, D., George, L. K., Swartz, M., & Boyer, R. (1991). Generalized anxiety disorder. In L. N. Robins & D. A. Regier (eds.), *Psychiatric disorders in America: The epidemiologic catchment area* (pp. 180-203). New York: Free Press.
- Bobo, L. (1988). Group conflict, prejudice, and the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes. In P. Katz & D. Taylor (eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum.
- Boomsma, D. I. (1993). Current status and future prospects of twin studies in the development of cognitive abilities: Infancy to old age. In T. J. Bouvard Jr. & P. Propping (eds.), *Twins as a tool of behavioral genetics* (pp. 67-82). Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Burkey, R. M. (1978). Ethnic and racial groups: The dynamics of dominance. Menlo Park, Calif.: Cummings.
- Carter, J. H. (1994). Racism's impact on mental health. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 86(7), 543-547.
- Cernovsky, Z. Z. (1993). J. P. Rushton's aggregational errors in racial psychology. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 19(3), 282-289.
- Chan, S. (1991). *Asian Americans: An interpretive history*. New York: Twayne.
- Chen, J., De La Caneda, V., & Jenkins, Y. (1993). *Diversity in psychotherapy: The politics of race, ethnicity, and gender*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Chipuer, H. M., Rovine, M. J., & Plomin, R. (1990). LISREL modeling: Genetic and environmental influences on IQ revisited. *Intelligence*, 14(1), 11-29.
- Churchill, W. (1992). Preface: The open veins of native North America. In M. A. James (ed.), *Fantasies of the master race: Literature, cinema, and the colonization of American Indians*. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press.
- Churchill, W. (1993). *Struggle for the land: Indigenous resistance to genocide, exocide, and expropriation in contemporary North America*. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press.
- Crane, J. (1994). Exploding the myth of scientific support for the theory of black intellectual inferiority. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 20(2), 189-209.
- Cromwell, V. L., & Cromwell, R. E. (1978). Perceived dominance in decision-making and conflict resolution among Anglo, black, and Chicano couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 40(4), 749-759.
- Cross, T., Bazron, B., Dennis, K., & Isaacs, M. (1989). *Towards a culturally competent system of care: A monograph on effective services for minority children who are severely emotionally disturbed*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Mental Health, Child and Adolescent Service System Program.
- Daniels, R. (1997). *Concentration camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II*. New York: Rinehart & Winston.
- Daniels, R. (1988). *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Eaton, W. M., Dryman, A., & Weissman, M. M. (1991). Panic and phobia. In L. N. Robins & D. A. Regier (eds.), *Psychiatric disorders in America: The epidemiologic catchment area* (pp. 155-179). New York: Free Press.
- Ehrlich, P. R., & Feldman, S. S. (1977). *The race bomb: Skin color, prejudice, and intelligence*. New York: Quadrangle.
- Erdle, S. (1990). Limitations of the heritability coefficient as an index of genetic and environmental influences on human behavior. *American Psychologist*, 45(4), 553-554.
- Fabrega, H., Jr. (1995). Hispanic mental health research: A case for cultural psychiatry. In A. M. Padilla (ed.), *Hispanic psychology: Critical issues in theory and research* (pp. 107-130). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

- Fairchild, H. (1991). Scientific racism: The cloak of objectivity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47(3), 101-115.
- Fairchild, H. H., Yee, A. H., Wyatt, G. L., & Weitzmann, F. M. (1995). Rethinking psychology's problems with race. *American Psychologist*, 50(1), 46-47.
- Farber, N. (1990). The significance of race and class in marital decisions among unmarried adolescent mothers. *Social Problems*, 37(1), 51-63.
- Feagin, J. R. (1989). *Racial and ethnic relations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Flaherty, J. A., & Meagher, R. (1980). Measuring racial bias in inpatient treatment. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 137(6), 679-682.
- Foreman, G. (1932). *Indian removal: The emigration of the five civilized tribes*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Gary, L. E. (ed.) (1981). *Black men*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Giordano, J., & Levine, M. (1975). Mental health and middle America. *Mental Health*, 59(4), 26-31.
- Glen, E. N. (1983). Split household, small producer, and dual wage earner: An analysis of Chinese-American family strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45(1), 35-46.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gordon, M. M. (1978). *Human nature, class, and ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Grubb, H. J. (1987). Intelligence at the low end of the curve: Where are the racial differences? *Journal of Black Psychology*, 14(1), 25-34.
- Guthrie, R. V. (1976). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Guy, D. P. (1977). Issues in the unbiased assessment of intelligence. *School Psychology Review*, 6(3), 14-23.
- Haller, J. S., Jr. (1971). *Outcasts from evolution: Scientific attitudes of racial inferiority, 1859-1900*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hankins-McNary, L. D. (1979). The effect of institutional racism on the therapeutic relationship. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 17(1), 25-30.
- Hatamiya, L. T. (1993). *Righting a wrong: Japanese Americans and the passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: Free Press.
- Hing, B. O. (1993). *Making and remaking Asian America through immigration policy, 1850-1990*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Hornsbey, A., Jr. (1991). *Chronology of African-American history: Significant events and people from 1619 to the present*. Detroit: Gale Research.
- Huang, J., & Sisco, B. R. (1994). Thinking styles of Chinese and American adult students in higher education: A comparative study. *Psychological Reports*, 74(2), 475-480.
- Irons, P. H. (1983). *Justice at war: The story of Japanese American internment cases*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ja, D. Y., & Aoki, B. (1993). Substance abuse and treatment: Cultural barriers in the Asian-American community. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 25(1), 61-71.
- Jackson, F. L. C. (1992). Race and ethnicity as biological constructs. *Race and Ethnicity*, 2, 120-125.
- Jackson, H. (1881). *A century of dishonor: A sketch of the United States government's dealings with some of the Indian tribes*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 39(1), 1-123.
- Jensen, A. R. (1976). Race and the genetics of intelligence: A reply to Lewontin. In N. J. Block & G. Dworkin (eds.), *The I.Q. controversy: Critical readings* (pp. 93-106). New York: Pantheon.
- Jensen, A. R., & Reynolds, C. R. (1982). Race, social class, and ability patterns on the WISC-R. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 3(4), 423-438.
- Joseph, A. M., Jr. (1994). *500 nations: An illustrated history of North American Indians*. New York: Knopf.
- Kallen, H. M. (1924). *Culture and democracy in the United States*. New York: Boni & Liveright.
- Kanin, L. J. (1974). *The science and politics of I.Q.* Potomac, Md.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kelly, M. L., & Tseng, H.-M. (1992). Cultural differences in child rearing: A comparison of immigrant Chinese and Caucasian American mothers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23(4), 444-455.
- Kessler, R. C., & Neighbors, H. W. (1986). A new perspective on the relationships among race, social class, and psychological distress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 27(6), 107-115.
- Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40(3), 414-431.
- Kleiner, R., Tuckman, J., & Lovell, M. (1960). Mental disorder and status based on race. *Psychiatry*, 23, 271-274.
- Klineberg, O. (1935). *Race differences*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Klineberg, O. (1981). International educational exchange: The problem of evaluation. *American Psychologist*, 36, 192-199.
- Kovel, J. (1970). *White racism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Kramer, M., Rosen, B. M., & Willis, E. M. (1973). Definitions and distributions of mental disorders in a racist society. In C. V. Willie, B. M. Kramer, & B. S. Brown (eds.), *Racism and mental health*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Krieger, N., Rowley, D. L., Herman, A. A., Avery, B., & Phillips, M. T. (1993). Racism, sexism, and social class: Implications for studies of health, disease, and well-being. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, Supplement, 9(6), 82-122.
- Krug, M. (1976). *The melting of the ethnics: Education of the immigrants, 1880-1914*. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Kuo, C.-L., & Kavanagh, K. H. (1994). Chinese perspectives on culture and mental health. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 15(6), 557-567.
- LEAP Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute (1993). *The state of Asian Pacific America: Policy issues to the year 2020, a public policy report, executive summary*. Los Angeles: LEAP and UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
- Leong, F. T. L., Wagner, N. S., & Kim, H. H. (1995). Group counseling expectations among Asian American students: The role of culture-specific factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42(2), 217-222.
- Levine, E. S., & Bartz, K. W. (1979). Comparative child-rearing attitudes among Chicano, Anglo, and black parents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 1(2), 165-178.
- Lopez, S. R., & Taussig, I. M. (1991). Cognitive-intellectual functioning of Spanish-speaking impaired and nonimpaired elderly: Implications for culturally sensitive assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, 3(3), 448-454.

- Loring, M., & Powell, B. (1988). Gender, race, and DSM-III: A study of the objectivity of psychiatric diagnostic behavior. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 29, 1-22.
- Mackenzie, B. (1984). Explaining race differences in IQ: The logic, the methodology, and the evidence. *American Psychologist*, 39(11), 1214-1233.
- Mall, P. D., & Johnson, S. (1993). Booze, snuff, and tobacco: An overview of the past, present, and future of substance use by American Indians. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research*, 5(2), 1-33.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253.
- Martinez, C. J. (1986). Hispanics: Psychiatric issues. In Charles B. Wilkinson (ed.), *Ethnic psychiatry*. New York: Plenum.
- Matsumoto, D. (1993). Ethnic differences in affect intensity, emotion judgments, display rule attitudes, and self-reported emotional expression in an American sample. *Motivation and Emotion*, 17(2), 107-123.
- May, P. A., & Ditzman, L. H. (1974). Suicide and the American Indian. *Psychiatric Annals*, 4(1), 22-28.
- Meier, M. S., & Ribera, R. (1993). *Mexican Americans/American Mexicans: From conquistadors to Chicanos*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Monte, J. E., & Fagan, J. F. (1988). Racial differences in IQ: Item analysis of the Stanford-Binet at 3 years. *Intelligence*, 12(3), 315-332.
- Moore, J. W., & Pachon, H. (1970). *Mexican Americans* (2d ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Nagata, D. K. (1991). Transgenerational impact of the Japanese-American internment: Critical issues in working with the children of former internees. *Psychotherapy*, 28(1), 121-128.
- Neal, A. M., & Turner, S. M. (1991). Anxiety disorders research with African Americans: Current status. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109(3), 400-410.
- Nei, M., & Roychoudhury, A. (1974). Genetic variation within and between the three major races of man, Caucasoids, Negroids, and Mongoloids. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 26, 421-443.
- Niem, T. T. (1989). Treating Oriental patients with Western psychiatry: A 12-year experience with Vietnamese refugee psychiatric patients. *Psychiatric Annals*, 19(12), 648-652.
- Novas, H. (1994). *Everything you need to know about Latino history*. New York: Plume Books.
- Ogginis, J., Leber, D., & Veroff, J. (1993). Race and gender differences in black and white newlyweds' perceptions of sexual and marital relations. *Journal of Sex Research*, 30(2), 152-160.
- Ogginis, J., Veroff, J., & Leber, D. (1993). Perceptions of marital interaction among black and white newlyweds. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(3), 494-511.
- Oswalt, W. H. (1978). *This land was theirs: A study of North American Indians* (3d ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). Racial change and social policy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 441, 114-131.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 499-514.
- Plomin, R. (1989). Environment and genes: Determinants of behavior. *American Psychologist*, 44(2), 105-111.
- Reis, J. (1993). Black and white adolescent mothers' child-rearing beliefs and behaviors. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 14(3), 223-233.
- Reynolds, C. R., Chastain, R. L., Kaufman, A. S., & McLean, J. E. (1987). Demographic characteristics and IQ among adults: Analysis of the WAIS-R standardization sample as a function of stratification variables. *Journal of School Psychology*, 25(4), 323-342.
- Ridley, C. R. (1984). Clinical treatment of the nondiscussing black client: A therapeutic paradox. *American Psychologist*, 39(11), 1234-1244.
- Roberts, R. E. (1980). Prevalence of psychological distress among Mexican Americans. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 21(2), 134-145.
- Roberts, R. E. (1990). Prevalence and psychological distress among Mexican Americans. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 21(2), 134-145.
- Robins, L. N., & Regier, D. A. (eds.) (1991). *Psychiatric disorders in America: The epidemiologic catchment area study*. New York: Free Press.
- Rushon, J. P. (1994). The egalitarian dogma revisited. *Intelligence*, 19(3), 263-280.
- Rushon, J. P. (1995). *Race, evolution, and behavior: A life history perspective*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Saenger, G. (1993). *The social psychology of prejudice: Achieving intercultural understanding and cooperation in a democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Samora, J., & Simon, P. V. (1993). *A history of the Mexican American people*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Schoneemann, P. H. (1989). New questions about old heritability estimates. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 27(2), 175-178.
- Schuman, H., Steeh, C., & Bobo, L. (1985). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Sears, D. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. Katz & D. Taylor (eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum.
- Sears, D. O., & Kinder, D. R. (1985). Whites' opposition to busing: On conceptualizing and operationalizing group conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(5), 1148-1161.
- Selgman, D. (1992). *A question of intelligence: The I.Q. debate in America*. New York: Birch Lane Press.
- Shade, B. J. (1986). Is there an Afro-American cognitive style? An exploratory study. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 13(1), 13-16.
- Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In S. Iyengar & W. J. McGuire (eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 183-224). Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Devereux, E., & Pratto, F. (1991). A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 132(3), 377-395.
- Smith, J. D. (1993). Introduction. In J. D. Smith (ed.), *Anti-black thought, 1863-1925*, vol. 6, *The biblical and "scientific" defense of slavery: Religion and "the Negro problem"* (part 2, pp. xxv-xxix). New York: Garland.
- Steinberg, M. D., Pades, H., Bjork, D., & Sporty, L. (1977). Demographic and clinical characteristics of black psychiatric patients in a private general hospital. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, 28(2), 128-132.
- Sue, S. (1983). Ethnic minority issues in psychology: A reexamination. *American Psychologist*, 38(5), 583-592.

- Sue, S. (1994). Mental health. In N. Zane, D. T. Takeuchi, & K. Young (eds.), *Confronting critical health issues of Asian and Pacific Islander Americans* (pp. 266-288). Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Sue, S., Ito, J., & Bradshaw, C. (1982). Ethnic minority research: Trends and directions. In E. E. Jones & S. J. Korchin (eds.), *Minority mental health*. New York: Praeger.
- Sue, S., Moore, T., Joo, J., & Negata, D. (1984). Ethnic minority groups in community psychology. In S. Sue and T. Moore (eds.), *The pluralistic society: A community mental health perspective*. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Sue, S., & Morishima, J. (1982). *The mental health of Asian Americans*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sue, S., Nakamura, C. Y., Chung, R., & Yee-Bradbury, C. (1994). Mental health research on Asian Americans. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 22(2), 61-67.
- Sue, S., & Okazaki, S. (1990). Asian-American educational achievements: A phenomenon in search of an explanation. *American Psychologist*, 45(8), 913-920.
- Sue, S., Zane, N., & Young, K. (1994). Research on psychotherapy with culturally diverse populations. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (4th ed., pp. 783-807). New York: Wiley.
- Sun, K. (1993). The definition of race. *American Psychologist*, 50(1), 43-44.
- Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Taylor, D. G., Shearsley, P. B., & Greeley, A. M. (1978). Attitudes towards racial integration. *Scientific American*, 238, 42-49.
- Thomas, A., & Sillen, S. (1972). *Racism and psychiatry*. Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel.
- Thornhill, R. (1987). *American Indian holocaust and survival: A population history since 1492*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 1006-1020.
- Trickett, E. J., Watts, R. J., & Birman, D. (1993). Human diversity and community psychology: Still hazy after all these years. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 21(4), 264-279.
- Trickett, E. J., Watts, R. J., & Birman, D. (1994). Towards an overarching framework for diversity. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 7-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Trimble, J. E. (1988). Stereotypical images, American Indians, and prejudice. In P. Katz & D. Taylor (eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 181-202). New York: Plenum.
- Uba, L. (1994). *Asian Americans: Personality patterns, identity, and mental health*. New York: Guilford.
- Uehara, E., Takeuchi, D., & Smukler, M. (1994). Effects of combining disparate groups in the analysis of ethnic differences: Variations among Asian American mental health service consumers in level of community functioning. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 22(1), 83-99.
- Ulrich, P. M., Warheit, G. J., & Zimmerman, R. S. (1989). Race, socioeconomic status, and psychological distress: An examination of differential vulnerability. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 30, 131-146.
- United States Bureau of Census (1990). *Census of population and housing: Summary of social, economic, and housing characteristics*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics, and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census.
- Uzzell, O. (1986). Racial and gender perceptions of marriage roles at a predominantly black university. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 16(4), 167-171.
- Wade, J. C. (1993). Institutional racism: An analysis of the mental health system. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 63(4), 536-544.
- Walshstein, D. (1994). The intelligence of heritability. *Canadian Psychology*, 35(3), 244-260.
- Walker, R. D., & LaDue, R. (1986). An integrative approach to American Indian mental health. In C. B. Wilkinson (ed.), *Ethnic psychiatry* (pp. 143-194). New York: Plenum.
- Watts, R. J. (1994). Paradigms of diversity. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 49-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Whang, P. A., & Hancock, G. R. (1994). Motivation and mathematics achievement: Comparisons between Asian-American and non-Asian students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 19(3), 302-322.
- Wong, B. (1985). Family, kinship, and ethnic identity of the Chinese in New York City, with comparative remarks on the Chinese in Lima, Peru, and Manila, Philippines. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 16(2), 231-254.
- Yee, A. H., Fatchild, H. H., Weitzmann, F., & Wyatt, G. E. (1993). Addressing psychology's problems with race. *American Psychologist*, 48(11), 1132-1140.
- Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory on racial differences: Scientific, social, and ethical issues. *American Psychologist*, 45(12), 1297-1303.

Oxford University Press

Oxford New York

Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogota Bombay Buenos Aires
Calcutta Cape Town Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong
Istanbul Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madras Madrid Melbourne
Mexico City Nairobi Paris Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto

and associated companies in

Berlin Brasilia

Copyright © 1997 by Oxford University Press, Inc.

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.

198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Oxford University Press.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

States of mind : American and post-Soviet perspectives on contemporary issues in psychology / edited by Diane F. Halpern and Alexander E. Voiskounsky.

1. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-19-51030-5 (cloth)

ISBN 0-19-51030-3 (paper)

1. Psychology—United States. 2. Psychology—Former Soviet republics. I. Halpern, Diane F. II. Voiskounsky, Alexander E.

BF71.S826 1997

150'.947—dc20

96-21639

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

Preface

The idea for this book grew from several months of discussions between the editors when Halpern, the American editor, was teaching psychology classes at Moscow State University where Voiskounsky, the Russian editor, had worked as a student and then as a professor for most of his adult life. It seemed obvious to us that we could learn a great deal about psychology if we could trade places and view contemporary issues with each other's eyes and against a backdrop of political thought that was diametrically opposed to the one we had each known. We were immediately struck by the differences in how we thought about contemporary issues in psychology and the way we made sense of thoughts, actions, and feelings. Unwittingly, we became participants in the process we wanted to observe.

Even as we planned this book, the differences in how we thought about topics in psychology and in the world came into focus. These differences became apparent as we selected topics that we believed to be important at the present time and into the future and the way we decided to organize the topics. For example, it was obvious to Halpern, the American, that politics, persuasion, and lying belonged together as a conceptual unit. For Voiskounsky, the Russian, it was equally obvious that politics, prejudice, and ethnic psychology were the most logically connected topics. As we discussed the differences in our thinking, we became aware of the way sociopolitical experiences had differentially shaped the organization and boundaries of these concepts for each of us. In the Soviet Union, the major political issues were the repeated attempts of ethnically dis-