
Beyond Indigenization: International Dissemination of Research by Majority-World Psychologists

John G. Adair, *University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada*,
adair@ms.umanitoba.ca

Yoshi Kashima, *University of Melbourne, Australia*,
y Kashima@unimelb.edu.au

Maria Regina Maluf, *Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil*,
regina@mrmaluf.com.br

Janak Pandey, *University of Allahabad, India*, janakpandey@usa.net

Analyses of the affiliations of authors of articles published in targeted samples of North American and international journals revealed trends toward increasing international publication by psychologists from countries outside the U.S., i.e., from countries in the rest of the world (ROW). Relatively few of these ROW publications came from psychologists from developing countries. Because developing countries are most numerous and represent the majority of the people in the world, their contribution to the world of psychology is important. Following a summary presentation of data for each journal for psychologists from East Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and South Asia (primarily India), the factors differentially deterring or promoting international publication within each region are discussed.¹ Consideration of the extent to which research contributions are differentially influenced by the national economy, national language, and the state of discipline development raise questions and provide insights into the international dissemination of majority-world research.

Although psychological science has been dominated for many years by research and researchers from the United States, psychology aspires to become a world-wide discipline. For this to occur psychological science must take root in many countries with each contributing to the knowledge base. This is a difficult challenge. The majority of the countries in the world are comprised of what have been called low-income or developing countries, which in turn represent the majority of the people in the world. Each of these “majority-world” countries has their own culture and traditions, often quite different from those found in the cultures of the US and Western Europe where psychology originated. Yet, if psychological science is to become truly international, it is important for the discipline to be culturally adapted or indigenized, and for psychologists from each country to make their research known and to contribute to the broader world of psychology. This chapter examines the data for the international dissemination of psychological research particularly from majority-world countries, and the factors facilitating and impeding its progress.

According to the conceptual model guiding this research (Adair, 2004; 2006) global publication emanating from each country is seen to be a consequence of the development of

¹ This is a collaboratively written chapter based on the papers presented in the symposium Beyond Indigenization: International Dissemination of Research by Majority-World Psychologists, J. G. Adair (Chair), at the International Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece, July, 2006. Although sections of this article were based on the paper presentations by each of the co-authors, the complete final text was reviewed and agreed upon by all authors.

The senior author acknowledges the support for his research on the internationalization of psychology by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

individual researchers and of the national discipline of psychology. The process begins with the developmental experiences of individual researchers. Individuals proceed from supervised research training to thesis work, followed by independent research produced on their first academic appointment, and ultimately to research accomplishments as mature investigators. The stepwise accumulation of a critical mass of such researchers within a country shapes the national development of the discipline which cumulatively leads to the spread of psychology around the world.

Discipline development. The discipline of psychology within a country also follows a developmental pathway, typically beginning with (a) someone trained abroad who returns with the imported discipline that (b) becomes implanted as an academic department within universities. As the imported discipline is (c) transformed to make it culturally appropriate, the process called indigenization, the discipline is also (d) shaped into a self-sustaining autochthonous or independent discipline. This developmental process is described in detail and illustrated within representative countries in Adair (2006). As psychology has spread around the world proponents for its indigenization have emerged within each country: most notably in Mexico (Diaz-Guerrero, 1975); India, (Sinha, 1986); the Philippines (Enriquez, 1977); and Taiwan (Yang, 1997). These psychologists and most disciplines in majority-world countries have focused on the processes and goals of indigenization, and to some extent on its autochthonization.

Internationalization. Motivated by research and publishing accomplishments within their country individual researchers seek to advance their work by publishing at the next level, that is, in prestigious English-language journals outside their country. These dynamics move the researcher and the discipline through three further stages of activity and development, a process Adair (2004) calls internationalization. (1) **International presence and visibility:** Publications in journals of the global psychology community and presentations at international congresses make the researcher known and bring the local discipline international visibility as a place where psychology has a presence. By identifying the countries in which psychology has an international presence Adair, Coêlho, and Luna (2002) have provided an answer to the question: "How international is psychology"? (2) **International participation and collaboration:** International presentations and publications bring recognition to the researcher as a representative of his/her country and their further participation in international research. International research activity, especially for newer and smaller national communities, will be driven by international collaborative research support of colleagues from other countries. (3) **International research contributors:** Frequent publications abroad lead to the recognition of the national discipline as a contributor to the development of psychology as a truly international discipline. Contributions especially within APA/premier journals additionally influence the shape and direction of the discipline.

The ultimate goal of internationalization is a research discipline that is no longer geographically imbalanced by a disproportionate weighting of U.S. psychology compared to the rest of the world. Its attainment concludes the developmental path begun with the imported discipline and new psychologists learning how to conduct psychological research. The seemingly marginal participant in the new discipline over time becomes a substantive contributor to an increasing international knowledge base. In this chapter we assess and consider the internationalization of psychology, with primary attention to its progress in majority-world countries.

Method

To assess the internationalization of psychology, Adair (2006) developed a database of authorship affiliations by country for all articles published in journals purposely selected to broadly represent the discipline. A selection of 16 Premier/APA journals that are among those most widely cited within four broad specialty areas were initially surveyed (Adair, 2004). As

expected authors from rest of the world (ROW, i.e., all countries except for the USA) publishing in these 16 journals primarily came from developed-world countries, with only an occasional “majority-world” publication.

To provide an opportunity for authorship from a broader range of countries, five journals published by international associations or intended for an international audience, and four less-frequently cited or low-impact journals were also sampled. Presumably these latter journals are more receptive to research that is different from that typically accepted by APA journals.

Data for each of the journals over the first three years within each of the past three decades: 1980s, 1990s, 2000s (3 years was used as a more stable measure for each decade) showed decided trends toward increasing publication by psychologists from around the world (ROW) compared to previous substantial proportions of US authorship in these journals (Adair, 2004). Indeed, the percentages of ROW authors in some APA journals increased so substantially (50% to 100% increases over the 1990s), that it was decided to collect an additional 3 years of data (2003-2005) for a current assessment of the internationalization of journal publication. The focus of this chapter is on the current data for the 25 journals listed below.

Premier/APA Journals

Journal of Experimental Psychology (JEP): General*
 JEP: Human Perception and Performance*
 JEP: Animal Behavior*
 JEP: Learning, Memory, & Cognition
 Developmental Psychology
 Child Development
 Psychology and Aging
 Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*
 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
 Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
 Journal of Personality
 Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*
 Journal of Abnormal Psychology
 Health Psychology
 Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology
 Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology

International Journals

International Journal of Psychology*
 International Journal of Behavior Development*
 Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*
 Applied Psychology*
 Behavior Research and Therapy*

Low-Impact Journals

Perceptual and Motor Skills*
 Social Behavior and Personality*
 Journal of Social Psychology*
 Psychological Reports

(Note: * indicates journals with more current articles by ROW authors than by US authors).

Results

The distribution of the authorship of publications of each journal type indicated a substantial shift toward a more international psychology. Although U.S. psychologists continued to dominate first-authorships within APA/premier journals (65.9%), they first-authored less than half (46.5%) of the publications in Low-impact journals, and proportionally fewer (35.3%) in International journals. Indeed, Western European psychologists (36.7%) had a greater percentage of first-authored articles in international journals than U.S. psychologists. Majority-world psychologists rarely published in APA/Premier journals (0.85%), and first-authored an only slightly increased share of publications in Low-impact (8.35%) and International journals (13.40%)

Increased internationalization was confirmed by a greater percentage of ROW than US first-authored articles in 12 of the 25 journals surveyed (those asterisked among the sampled journals). Although the distribution of ROW-authored articles were greatest, as expected, within international and low-impact journals, ROW first-authorships were greater than for US authors in five of the APA/Premier journals. A quick scan of these journals revealed a tendency for greater ROW publication to emerge in journals publishing research using the experimental

paradigm, thus suggesting that ROW authors having mastered US psychology, rather than in Low-impact journals where they might be seen as bringing something entirely different to US journals.

Rest of the world's publications came primarily from Western Europe (52%), especially from the UK, Germany and Netherlands. Next in frequency were publications from Canada (15%), with substantial percentages from Australia and New Zealand (8%), East Asia (11%), and the Middle East (8%), primarily Israel. Within Low-Impact journals, majority-world countries contributed 13% of the articles, with an additional 1% from authors based in Eastern European countries. These latter data suggest the need to reconsider the international publication and possibly some of the factors influencing national development of the discipline in many Eastern European countries as more comparable to that of majority-world countries than to their Western European neighbors.

International collaborations. The conceptual model proposed that internationalization would be advanced through collaborations with psychologists from other countries especially in countries where the discipline is new. Within larger countries or those in which the discipline is well-established there would be much less need for and hence fewer international collaborations. The extent of international collaborations, assessed by multiple-authored publications in which the authors for each article were from two or more countries, are reported in Table 1 by country and region. As predicted, international collaborations first-authored by psychologists from Western Europe were most frequent across all types of journals. Psychologists from the USA on the other hand, were less inclined to pursue international collaboration in all types of journals and in Low-impact journals their data (23.30) were even surpassed by the data for Majority-World psychologists (23.10), when the latter were combined with those of East European authors (0.50).

Table 1. International collaborations by country and region

Region/Country	APA/Premier	International	Low Impact
Western Europe	38.74	37.37	30.10
U. S. A.	36.30	25.79	23.30
Canada	11.51	11.58	6.80
Other Dlpd Wld*	10.43	11.58	10.68
Majority-Wld**	2.59	11.58	23.10
Eastern Europe	0.32	1.05	0.50

*Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and Israel

** Remainder of East Asia & Middle East, South and Southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America

In the remainder of this chapter we focus on the publication and international collaboration rates followed by interpretations and explanations of data trends for countries from three specific regions that were represented within the symposium (East Asia; South Asia, and Latin America/Caribbean).

East Asia. Most of the research published by East Asian psychologists (Table 2) appeared in Low-impact journals: especially Japan (87.5%), Taiwan (82%) and Korea (67%). Only Hong Kong published evenly (37.5%) in both international and low-impact journals. The other striking observation from these data was that Japan (other than its prolific publications in low-impact journals) was not an outlier, i.e., comparable to the other countries in the region in publication rates for international and APA/Premier journals. East Asian countries, especially China, Hong Kong, and Japan, were engaged in the largest number of international collaborations (see Table 4) mostly led by North American psychologists, but a number also led

by the host country and by psychologists from other countries. Unlike Latin America and the Caribbean, there was some intra-regional collaboration among East Asian psychologists.

Explanation of East Asian data. According to Kashima (July, 2006), the production of psychological knowledge in a country is a function of its *collective capacity* (human and tangible infrastructure) to generate research questions, answers, and publications and its *collective motivation* to initiate research and collaborate with other researchers. He conceptualized the surge of publications by East Asian psychologists to arise through what he calls a “Political Economy of Knowledge.” The demand for knowledge is partly determined by political and economic processes. When the political economical demand is great for a certain type of knowledge, in the long run a greater collective capacity and motivation is likely to ensue.

Table 2. Frequencies of First Authors and Co-Authors in Sampled Journals: East Asia and South Asia 2003-2005

Countries	APA/Premier		International		Low-Impact		Total	
	1 st -Au	Co-Au	1 st -Au	Co-Au	1 st -Au	Co-Au	1 st -Au	Co-Au
East Asia								
China	7	32	8	23	15	22	30	77
Hong Kong	13	23	19	33	19	32	51	88
Japan	15	41	8	28	164	237	187	306
Korea	3	8	6	10	18	24	27	42
Taiwan	3	5	4	3	34	36	41	44
Total	41	109	45	97	250	351	336	557
South Asia								
Bangladesh				1	1		1	1
India			2		6	6	8	6
Nepal				1		2		3
Pakistan						1		1
Total			2	2	7	9	9	11

These conditions explain the psychological research developments in East Asian (EA) countries, each of which are relatively stable political entities with sizable and rapidly expanding economies. This reasoning applies to Japan and the Asian tiger economies of South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, and to China (PRC) which has one of the fastest growing economies. Each of these countries has a relatively established collective capacity for research.

Collective motivation for research in East Asia comes from several sources. Much is reactive to Western-led research prompted by their political economic demands for cross-cultural knowledge about East Asia as a market and by East Asians who are seen as potential political and economic competitors, and also seen as suppliers of raw material. But a comparable source comes from within Asian countries' political economic demands for psychological knowledge and for *cross-cultural knowledge about the West and other regions*.

This reasoning leads to expectations that are confirmed by the data: relatively greater proportion of North American and Western European international collaborations involving an EA country, a smaller proportion of international collaborations first authored by its own country's authors, and a relatively greater proportion of own country first-authored publications in Low-impact journals. Examining the data for first-authored publications, we find that China, Hong Kong, Japan, and Korea reflect the expected pattern: greater other than own first-authored publications. Taiwan, as a smaller market is seen as less of a threat or competitor, and therefore has less demand for cross-cultural knowledge. As well it has a stronger cultural identity expression and hence stronger presence of indigenous psychology. Hong Kong, a former British colony, may also be seen to be an exception through its difference in language and history of international

collaboration.

Forecasting the future, there are several potential consequences of the rich East Asian political economy. Some are opportunities that result from further economic expansion and from being relatively shielded from global conflict. Specifically, these may come in the form of cultural identity politics and possibility of unique, non-Western contributions to psychological science, such as may be found in the Asian Association of Social Psychology and Asian Journal of Social Psychology. On the other hand, unresolved problems from WW II and cold war international politics may lead to a regional conflict in East Asia, and also an inward turning away from international psychological science. Although the inward looking trend is not visible at present, the recent North Korean nuclear activities may threaten to destabilize the international relations of the region.

Latin America and the Caribbean. Publications in the sampled journals by Latin-Americans (Table 3) were considerably less than those by East Asian psychologists. There were only two first-authored publications in APA/Premier journals (Chile and Dominican Republic), whereas in international journals there were six by Mexican psychologists, and one or two each by an assortment of other countries. Argentina, Brazil and Mexico (especially Brazil) were internationally visible through publications in low-impact journals.

Table 3. Frequencies of First Authors and Co-Authors in Sampled Journals: Latin America 2003-2005

Countries	APA/Premier		International		Low-Impact		Total	
	1 st -Au	Co-Au	1 st -Au	Co-Au	1 st -Au	Co-Au	1 st -Au	Co-Au
Argentina		1			6	12	6	13
Brazil		2	1	3	18	46	19	51
Chile	1	3		5	1	2	2	10
Colombia		3			1	1	1	4
Costa Rica		2		3			0	5
Cuba			2	2			2	2
Dom. Rep.	1	1	1				2	1
Jamaica			3	1			3	1
México		6	6	16	5	10	11	32
Perú						2	0	2
Puerto Rico					1	2	1	2
Venezuela				5	1	4	1	9
Total	2	18	13	35	33	79	48	132

Latin American international collaborations were fewer in number, with most psychologists from Brazil, Mexico, and Chile; the majority of the collaborations were led by US psychologists and none involved collaborations with other Latin American countries (Table 4).

Language of science vs. language of instruction. Language can be seen as one of the most important factors determining international dissemination of research by Latin American psychologists. Throughout all of Latin America (including Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, and South America), Brazil is the only country where the spoken language is Portuguese. In the other countries, formal schooling is carried out in Spanish, except where the native/indigenous language is taught for basic education. This is quite different from what takes place in some other countries, such as those in Asia, where English may be the language of higher learning or the academic language.

In Latin America, English used to be learned as a second language by the minority who reached the highest level of education. In Brazil the second language frequently may be French or Spanish, rather than English. A large percentage of researchers typically learn to read and understand the second language, yet only a small number reach oral and written fluency.

Brazilian research articles are primarily written in Portuguese, although in some exceptional cases and fields they may be directly written and published in English. To translate one's research report into English is hard work and sometimes costly.

Other discipline differences and trends. In Brazil, training courses/programs for researchers are a recent activity compared to those in countries in Western Europe and North America, although they are relatively mature if compared to other South American countries. A national system of advanced courses for Masters and Doctoral training started at the end of the 1960s. In early years, concerns about the social relevance of research generating knowledge for the real needs of society were paramount. In the 1980s, methodological concerns, i.e., how to rigorously conduct psychological research, became the primary concern and focus of the discipline in Brazil. During the 1990s, the psychological community in Brazil has concluded that both methodological rigor and social relevance are important. Brazilian psychologists are interested in local or regional rather than global questions, as well as in the generalization of research contributions.

Table 4. Frequencies of International Collaborations in East Asia and Latin America: 2003-2005

Country	First Author				
	Total	North America	Home Country	Region	Other Country
East Asia					
China	51	26	17	6	2
Hong Kong	48	23	19	1	5
Japan	49	18	20	2	9
Korea	20	7	8	3	2
Taiwan	11	4	6		1
Totals	179	78	70	12	19
Latin America					
Argentina	1	1			
Brazil	13	6	6		1
Chile	7	6	1		
Colombia	2	1			1
Costa Rica	5				5
Cuba	2		2		
Mexico	9	6	2		1
Peru	2	1			1
Venezuela	5	1	1		3
Totals	46	22	12		12

Presently, many strategies take place and help to advance the discipline toward indigenization and internationalization in Latin American countries (Maluf, July, 2006). These include partnerships for research promoting cooperation between researchers from different countries and more agreements between countries for psychology teaching programs.

In the last few years scientific journals in Brazil have made significant advances in adopting international evaluative criteria and in inserting Brazilian journals into international databases. There are several reference sites where Brazilian and Latin American full-text articles may be found (e.g., see www.scielo.br; www.bvs-psi.org.br). The Interamerican Society of Psychology (SIP) has recently entered into an agreement with Psychology Press for the inclusion in the IUPsyS Global Resource CD-ROM of all abstracts from the 2007 Interamerican congress that was held in Mexico City in July of 2007, in both English and the language of the presentation (Portuguese, Spanish or French). This presents a unique opportunity for Latin American research to be translated into English and made globally available.

Finally, open access to and use of scientific information is of utmost importance for all, but especially for majority-world countries. Historically, their access to scientific information

has been prevented or made difficult by economic barriers, government policies, language and other issues. Much effort is required to overcome these obstacles. We need to recognize that scientific communication is a crucial part of research for all countries. Universal access to scientific information will make possible effective participation by all in the process of generating and disseminating knowledge. This will do much to promote the integration of Latin-American psychology into the worldwide body of psychological knowledge.

South Asia. There were few publications by South Asian psychologists over the three-year period 2003-2005 (see Table 2). Almost all of these were by Indian researchers; none were in APA/Premier journals, two were in International Journals, and six in Low-Impact journals (see Table 2). The paucity of first-authored Indian research was surprising compared to its substantial visibility in the 1980s. Longitudinal data (Adair, 2007) for comparable three-year periods revealed a steady decline from 31 publications in the first three years of the 1980s to levels of only 6 for the current decade.

According to Pandey (July, 2006), a number of factors could account for this dramatic shift in global publication by Indian psychologists. These are presented here not as apologies for the Indian context, but are offered for reflection on the dynamics of research publication important to discipline development. One reason for the decline is likely the aging professoriate and retirement of several high profile active researchers from earlier years, who are no longer around to carry the banner of Indian psychology internationally. Durganand Sinha was just one of many scholars who was trained abroad and published actively over this period. Indian researchers at that time were mostly trained in the USA, Canada or the UK and had mentors and models for publication submission to English-language and international journals. The transition in India to national research graduate training programs likely pose other models and targets for research publication.

In earlier years it was the practice in most universities in India to encourage, monitor, and promote a few highly selected faculty, who received special recognition for their publications, especially for international articles. Such practices changed in the mid-eighties with a shift in policy of the University Grants Commission of India. Responsible for recruitment and promotion policies of universities and colleges in India, the Commission introduced time-bound career advancement up to the highest level and over time research quality could not be maintained as a stringent criterion for promotion.

Graduate programs in psychology competing with other disciplines for new students have been forced to enroll poorer quality students, thereby negatively affecting the overall quality of the discipline. Similar to other majority-world countries, engineering, physical and biological sciences in India are greatly preferred as careers and considered to be more economically appropriate choices, thus leaving lesser-talented students to enroll in psychology. In the last two decades, admission to business schools with greater financial incentive has also become highly attractive. As a related aside, some of psychology's most talented newly-granted PhDs have joined business management schools as faculty, expecting that quality research will not be demanded in these appointments.

Although it may sound heretical and contradictory to even suggest it, the indigenization movement of the discipline in India also may have contributed to its current levels of publication globally. The movement toward the indigenization of psychological research that swept across India, over the previous two decades, shifted the attention of many researchers away from methodological mastery that was the focus or goal for researchers, toward identifying and researching topics and concepts of local relevance and applicability to the Indian context. Several scholars of India and other countries with great enthusiasm have contributed some good examples of indigenous research but they and their students may have failed to sustain it to the level of international publication. A period of time may also be required for the maturing of the indigenization movement to result in substantive publications for international publication. Another problem is that there may not be international outlets

receptive to the publication of indigenous research. Adair (2006) has suggested the need for an *International Journal of Indigenous Research* to fill that void and to provide a forum for assessing the international quality of the research and how truly indigenous are the local findings.

Conclusions

The foregoing data and discussion have highlighted substantial differences between the three regions of largely majority-world countries: East Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and South Asia. In spite of substantial differences from the West in language and culture, East Asian psychology appears to have a greater global presence than the discipline in either Latin America or South Asia. East Asian countries have had considerable success in publishing their research globally, largely due to their economic wealth, the US- and Western European-led demand for psychological knowledge about the East Asian economic markets and competitors, the support for research that is perceived to be useful to their government and society, and their desire to command written English and to compete directly with US psychology.

The other two regions have substantially less global publication for quite different reasons. Economies that are not as rich and lesser command of written English among students and graduates seriously handicap the participation of Latin American scholars in the world psychological community. India, on the other hand, had considerable publication success and international visibility in the 1980s, yet contrary to other developmental trends has experienced declining global publication in recent years. Retirements, changes in higher education practices, and the declining attractiveness of psychology as a career choice have all contributed to this trend.

Nonetheless, it is encouraging that the data from this research has confirmed the global trend toward increasing internationalization, resulting in more comparable levels of publications by psychologists from the USA and ROW countries. Although the pattern of journals with ROW authorships suggests that psychologists from the ROW at the moment are mastering US psychology, rather than contributing something entirely new, it is anticipated that this broader mixture of contributing countries will ultimately result in an enrichment of the discipline.

The pattern of the data also suggested the need to reconsider the stage of development and status of certain countries: On the one hand, the limited global-visibility of publications of psychological research from most Eastern European countries (and likely the stage of discipline development) seems to be more comparable to the rates found in majority-world countries than to their Western European neighbors. On the other hand, Japan, aside from its prolific publication rates in low-impact journals, did not appear to be an outlier when compared to other East Asian countries on publications in APA/Premier or international journals. Indeed, the publication of Japanese psychological research in Low-impact journals was comparable to the publication practices for internationally-visible research published by psychologists from the Majority-World. Empirically monitoring the authorship affiliations of contributors to the psychological research literature provides a more objective means for assessing the progressive spread of the discipline around the world and contributes to our understanding of the dynamics of its development.

References

- Adair, J.G. (2004). On the indigenization and autochthonization of psychology. In B. N. Setiadi, A. Supratiknya, W.J. Lonner, & Y.H. Poortinga (Eds.) *Ongoing themes in psychology and culture* (pp. 115-129). Yogyakarta, Indonesia: International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.
- Adair, J.G. (2006). Creating indigenous psychologies: Insights from empirical social studies of the science of psychology. In U. Kim, K.S. Yang, & K.K. Hwang (Eds.). *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology: Understanding people in context* (pp. 467-485). New York: Springer.
- Adair, J.G. (July, 2006). Psychology's Development As An International Science In Majority-World

- Countries. Paper presented in the symposium J.G. Adair (Chair). Beyond Indigenization: International Dissemination of Research by Majority-World Psychologists, at the International Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece, July, 2006.
- Adair, J.G. (2007). Beyond indigenization: Asian psychology's contribution to the world of psychology. In G. Zheng, K. Leung, & J. G. Adair (Eds.) *Perspectives and progress in contemporary cross-cultural psychology* (17-23). Beijing: China Light Industry Press.
- Adair, J.G., Coêlho, A., & Luna, J.R. (2002). How International is International Psychology? *International Journal of Psychology*, 37, 160–170.
- Diaz-Guerrero, R. (1975). *Psychology of the Mexican: Culture and personality*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Enriquez, V.G. (1977). Filipino psychology in the third world. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 10, 3-18.
- Kashima, Y. (July, 2006). East Asia: Political Economy of Psychological Knowledge. Paper presented in the symposium J.G. Adair (Chair). Beyond Indigenization: International Dissemination of Research by Majority-World Psychologists, at the International Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece, July, 2006.
- Maluf, M.R. (July, 2006). Dissemination of Research by Latin-American Psychologists: What is known, what is changing. Paper presented in the symposium J.G. Adair (Chair). Beyond Indigenization: International Dissemination of Research by Majority-World Psychologists, at the International Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece, July, 2006.
- Pandey, J. (July, 2006). India's contributions to Development of Psychology as an International Science. Paper presented in the symposium J.G. Adair (Chair). Beyond Indigenization: International Dissemination of Research by Majority-World Psychologists, at the International Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece, July, 2006.
- Sinha, D. (1986). *Psychology in a Third World country: The Indian experience*. New York: Sage.
- Yang, K.S. (1997). Indigenizing westernised Chinese psychology. In M.H. Bond (Ed.) *Working at the interface of cultures*. (pp. 62-76). New York: Routledge.