

Grand Valley State University

ScholarWorks@GVSU

Papers from the International Association for
Cross-Cultural Psychology Conferences

IACCP

2009

YouTube, the Internet and IACCP: Opportunities and Challenges for Cross-Cultural Psychology

William K. Gabrenya Jr.

Florida Institute of Technology, Gabrenya@fit.edu

Nathalie van Meurs

Middlesex University, N.Van-Meurs@mdx.ac.uk

Ronald Fischer

Victoria University Wellington, ronald.fischer@vuw.ac.nz

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/iaccp_papers



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

ScholarWorks Citation

Gabrenya Jr., W. K., van Meurs, N., & Fischer, R. (2009). YouTube, the internet and IACCP: Opportunities and challenges for cross-cultural psychology. In G. Aikaterini & K. Mylonas (Eds.), *Quod Erat Demonstrandum: From Herodotus' ethnographic journeys to cross-cultural research: Proceedings from the 18th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology*. https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/iaccp_papers/58/

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the IACCP at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Papers from the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology Conferences by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

YouTube, the Internet and IACCP: Opportunities and Challenges for Cross-Cultural Psychology

William K. Gabrenya Jr., *Florida Institute of Technology, USA*,
Gabrenya@fit.edu

Nathalie van Meurs, *Middlesex University, UK*, N.Van-Meurs@mdx.ac.uk

Ronald Fischer, *Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand*,
Ronald.Fischer@vuw.ac.nz

We culturalists are an unusual lot! Dispersed geographically and divided socially by potential and real political conflict, economic competition, religious disagreement and vast disparities in wealth and resources, we struggle with the dilemma of studying diversities that can only be understood adequately through effective communication and collaboration. The International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology was conceptualized by psychologists who recognized and participated in this dialectical context. The Founders set out to create an organization that would provide *communication* venues in order to facilitate the development of a *community* of psychologists who would *collaborate* on cultural research. Communication, indeed, was the starting point of IACCP, in face-to-face interactions at international conferences in the 1960s and through a project begun in 1969 by Harry Triandis, the *Cross-Cultural Social Psychology Newsletter*. These two types of communication were precursors to the founding of the Association in Hong Kong in 1972.

We will refer to these three goals –communication, collaboration and community– as the 3C Goals. This chapter reviews the status of these goals, admittedly without quantitative data on which to base some of our assertions, and discusses how new technologies could affect –hopefully enhance– our accomplishment of these goals looking forward. Many of the ideas presented here were discussed at the workshop, “Using the Internet to enhance scholarly communication in the IACCP,” hosted by the Communication and Publications Committee at the XVIII Congress of the IACCP in Spetses, Greece. The workshop focused on a fourth goal as well, support for teaching of cross-cultural psychology.

First Impressions on 3C Goals: Have We Met Them?

We believe IACCP has largely succeeded in accomplishing its 3C Goals, although much can still be done. Communication among culturalists has been supported through the evolution of Harry Triandis’ newsletter to the present *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*; Congresses and conferences grow larger and more frequent; and the very pace of communication has approached the speed of light with the development of Internet tools such as email and the IACCP discussion lists.

Collaboration has followed in step, evidenced by a long history of joint international research projects, many of which have been reported in our *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. IACCP Congresses and conferences provide two venues: the official or manifest venue of paper sessions and social events; and the latent (and rather informal) venue of research teams sequestered at restaurants and bars plotting their joint efforts.

The sense of community in IACCP has developed and endures, even as the Association has grown. IACCP’s social structure has always been characterized by multiple core groups of collaborating researchers, often formed through mentor-student relationships, and a larger corpus of members with varying degrees of ties to these core groups and to each other. Thus, the “community” fostered by IACCP is not homogeneous, but nonetheless evidences an unusually high degree of cohesion considering the dispersed and divided character of the field.

Many cross-culturalists currently working in Western and non-Western societies alike were graduate students of the small number of original founders of IACCP. This pattern has engendered a certain degree of continuity, but also presents challenges. Informally, one hears two kinds of comments from IACCP Congress participants: they are highly impressed with the community atmosphere that they encounter; and they are keenly aware of the power of the core groups whose research attracts the most attention and whose members are overrepresented in the Association's governance structure.

It seems that issues of power distance and collectivism that are the main staple (and focus) of our research also seem to permeate how the organization is run. As Greenfield (2000) noted, collectivism is not only the object of our study, but also influences how we do science. Criticizing, power sharing or initiating change might not feel right for researchers who have been trained to obey elders in collectivist or high power distance societies.

3C Goals: Taking a Second Look

It has become almost trite to talk about the effects of technological innovations on interpersonal communication and the "information revolution." Nonetheless, these historically unprecedented developments provide opportunities as well as challenges from all around. We evaluate the Association's progress in accomplishing its 3C Goals in the broad context of their historical development in IACCP and we propose new opportunities and directions for the Association.

Communication

In the 1960s and 1970s, scholarly communication focused on the informal interaction between scholars that was facilitated by newsletters and conferences, and on formal peer-reviewed publications. Walt Lonner's *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* was the first journal dedicated specifically to providing the latter type of communication, and became associated with IACCP when IACCP was founded in 1972.

The communication goal of the Founders was primarily to enhance the ability of cross-culturalists to interact effectively despite their considerable geographic dispersal. They did not anticipate email and discussion lists, of course. Email became widely available by the late 1980s, sooner in wealthier nations than in others, and in preparation for IACCP's first online election in 2002, we determined that most IACCP members had email addresses. The first cross-cultural discussion list, "XCUL," was inaugurated in the early 1990s by Roy Malpass, then superseded in 2000 by the IACCP Online Discussion List (about 300 members currently). Perhaps the Founders would have been dismayed back then had they been able to anticipate how much time we now spend on email rather than on thinking and direct social interaction. Nonetheless, the Internet has been a boon for cross-cultural psychology; indeed, we would argue that it has transformed the field.

The Internet is gradually supplanting print publication. Much of the communication function of the original *Cross-Cultural Social Psychology Newsletter* is no longer necessary; the modern *Bulletin* does not print items like "I will be in Hong Kong in December, if anyone would like to meet me," or long bibliographies of recently published cross-cultural articles. By 2003, the *Bulletin* had discontinued its traditional section on Association news. Some of this communication was replaced by email and the discussion list, and still more by the appearance in 1995 of the IACCP web site, on which the *Bulletin* itself is now published electronically in parallel with its print edition. Gabrenya (1995) mused that he would be the last editor of a print version of the *Bulletin*, but by 2009 the technology has not yet progressed sufficiently to facilitate an electronic magazine providing all of the advantages of a print publication. Gabrenya (2006) suggested that

...the future of IACCP communication will involve a hybrid online <<fill in technogeek noun>> that will incorporate the relative permanence of published

articles, such as the current *Bulletin* content, with short-lived material that we now see in email announcements, online discussions, and news articles. Simply converting the *Bulletin* to an emailed or online PDF publication is not sufficient; nor is a blog, chat room, forum, etc. (p. 3).

Conferences were the primary interpersonal communication venue, besides newsletters and correspondence by post, in the era of the inception of IACCP and they remain the focal point of the Association. The Spetses Congress was the largest conference in Association history. The previous Congress (Xi'an, China, 2004) was the second-largest. The unique culture of IACCP allows us to put on unique, compelling conferences that are well attended and foster our 3C Goals.

However, IACCP conferences (like any other face-to-face conference of an international community) have enormous carbon footprints, they are expensive for international travelers, and they compete in an increasingly crowded conferences "market." While fostering communication and collaboration effectively within psychology, the Association has not attempted to extend its 3C Goals across disciplines even though many research programs in our field require extensive interdisciplinary knowledge (Gabrenya, 1989). In the marketplace of conferences, most cross-cultural psychologists do not have the luxury of attending additional conferences outside of psychology, for example in anthropology and sociology. The compartmentalization of psychological research also means that a less diverse group of researchers will attend a Congress now than 20 years ago. Cultural and indigenous psychologists have attended fewer meetings of IACCP in recent years and the sessions have become dominated by imposed-etic, universalistic, culture-comparative approaches (of admittedly high quality).

Online conferences offer a recent innovation that can address some of these drawbacks. Such conferences foster scholarly discussion by turning the focus of interaction on the content of presenters' work while reducing peripheral influences such as the presenters' style or other social and sightseeing distractions. These conferences can also increase communication across ideological or academic boundaries since they are more widely accessible. Nathalie van Meurs (van Meurs, 2004) has organized several online conferences using specialized conferencing software. The success of these conferences has led government organizations such as the Commission for Racial Equality (now Equality and Human Rights Commission) to emulate the concept and make them a regular feature additional to face-to-face conferences (www.dialogin.com). Online conferences are primarily text based at this time (papers are posted; written comments are posted in response in a forum format), but as the availability of Internet2 connectivity increases, synchronous (two-way, simultaneously) audio and video communication will be feasible (see www.internet2.edu). Because participation in online conferences is more efficient with respect to time, this venue allows practitioners (time-is-money) to interact with academics, and academics to potentially conserve travel funds in order to attend a broader array of conferences. Of course, a conference without a dance party is out of step for IACCP (but see www.secondlife.com for the possibility of "virtual dancing"). Online conferences are particularly attractive for young scholars and students who are familiar and comfortable with online communities (e.g., *Facebook*) and tools (e.g., *YouTube*). IACCP must keep up with these developments if it wants to grow and evolve as a modern organization. The appeal to undergraduate and postgraduate students is also enormous. Online communication has a status leveling effect that can offer many benefits for student participants who are too shy to ask questions otherwise. It also has the advantage that students can interact with leading scholars directly (rather than only reading their often dry academic prose), which enhances their learning and motivation.

The appearance of the Web has broadened and complicated scholarly communication by providing vastly more, and arguably less reliable, information in a consummately public

medium. Google and Google Scholar provide mixed blessings. The business plan for information has been altered (perhaps warped) so that opportunities and expectations for “free” information have increased. IACCP has taken advantage of the availability of inexpensive Web distribution to provide high quality “free” information by publishing its Congress proceedings volumes online (see ebooks.iaccp.org). The Center for Cross-Cultural Research at Western Washington University, under the leadership of Walt Lonner, created a large set of “free” textual resources, *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture and Psychology*, that are now under the aegis of IACCP (ORPC; see orpc.iaccp.org). In the spirit of the Open Access Initiative (see www.soros.org/openaccess), the Association provides this edited scholarly content “free” of charge.

The aforementioned Spetses workshop discussed another exciting opportunity for providing “free” open access information: a cultural wiki, perhaps “*Wikicultura*.” A wiki is a web-based information system that facilitates collaborative knowledge diffusion, the most famous of which is the online encyclopedia, *Wikipedia*. The IACCP Executive Council approved in principle the creation of a wiki-like web site in 2000, before the appearance of *Wikipedia* or the term “wiki” was in common use (Gabrenya, 2001). This project did not find traction, but the conceptually related ORPC appeared several years later. In *Wikicultura*, “authorized experts” in the field would collaboratively create an encyclopedic resource of knowledge in cross-cultural psychology. The two challenges to *Wikicultura* (and especially *Wikipedia*) are problems familiar to sociology of science, *authority* and *consensus* (Cole, 1992): the establishment of who has the credentials to make statements of fact and the extent to which such facts are agreed upon within the academic community. However, this medium would also open the possibility for open discussion and less reliance on established hierarchy structures. Furthermore, debates on the use of the internet within academia are indicating that *Wikipedia* may be a source for coursework in the future and that students may be allowed to cite it as it is a “peer reviewed” source.

Open access materials are of course not at all *free*, hence our placement of quotation marks around that word in this section. Altogether, IACCP spends thousands of dollars each year, in direct payments and donated labor, to maintain its infrastructure of open access documents, excluding the costs to develop the original ORPC at Western Washington. As technologies that facilitate opportunities for providing open access materials appear in tandem with rising expectations, the Association gradually finds itself in a knowledge dissemination business that the Founders did not envision. We strongly believe that open access and web-based opportunities allow us to reduce exclusivity, but providing these materials alters somewhat the mission of the Association.

Collaboration

Most culture-comparative research in the field is collaborative, if for no other reason than the need to obtain suitable samples. The first commercial flight of the Boeing 747 took place just two months before the cover date of the first issue of JCCP, two auspicious events for the progress of cross-cultural research. Travel to distant locales was greatly improved, leading to complaints about cross-cultural research as “research by 747,” meaning multi-nation research by psychologists who would *swoop in*, pass around some questionnaires, enjoy the hotel bar, then *swoop out* with data but absolutely no understanding of the culture being sampled (Doob, 1980). Of course Doob exaggerates; research by 747 does not necessarily entail drinking at an overpriced bar. But now we can cease our *swooping*; we have the Internet. The Web makes it even easier to harvest data with no real understanding of cultural processes. It is now possible to spend a few hours in front of one’s computer to set up yet another online survey or experiment that may have no local relevance or input from cultural informants.

The Internet’s facilitation of communication in the broad sense has facilitated research collaboration in a narrow sense, enhancing the scope of research and greatly increasing the size

of datasets, both in number of samples and in sample sizes. The early, huge cross-national dataset analyzed by Geert Hofstede was available because it was collected by a large multinational, IBM. Subsequent large-scale dimensional studies, such as those of Shalom Schwartz (1994), the Chinese Culture Connection (Michael Bond et al., 1987), the Social Axioms Project (Kwok Leung, Michael Bond, and many collaborators, 2004), the International Sexuality Description Project (David Schmitt et al., 2004), GLOBE (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004), and others, were facilitated by the Internet.

As cross-cultural psychologists are obsessively opportunistic in seeking datasets, we have seen a shift toward methodologies that are conducive to the large research designs that Internet-abetted collaboration makes possible: self-report methods. Compare John Berry slogging through New Guinea carrying devices to assess field dependence or Marshall Segall sweating bullets in Uganda to a questionnaire on Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com). Gabrenya (2004a) found that 65% of JCCP articles involving Chinese participants used self-report methods in the period 1979-1984, but 81% used self-report methods from 1995 to 2004 (peak period: 93% in 1990-1994).

The enhanced opportunities to collect self-report data afforded by the Internet have in turn altered our research expectations in arguably unfortunate ways. Researchers face pressures to collect data in more and more locations without evaluating cultural appropriateness, theoretical relevance or central issues of equivalence or bias. Our students (and we as supervisors, too) are keen and excited to see whether a new academic toy (say, questionnaire or experiment) works as well somewhere else. Wielding the interchangeable labels of individualism-collectivism (or more recently, thinking styles), it is easy to derive trivial hypotheses that are publishable and can form the material for numerous student projects. Theory and method influence each other in a positive feedback loop (Gabrenya, 2004b), so the data harvesting opportunities afforded by the Internet may have deeper effects on the course of the discipline. A methodological arms race—the pressure to apply increasingly sophisticated statistical techniques quite independently of theoretical advances—exacerbates this problem.

Communication and collaboration technologies continue to develop, for example, the appearance of free synchronous audio through VOIP (voice over IP; internet telephony) applications such as *Skype* and moderately expensive multimodal Web collaboration tools such as *Adobe Connect* or *WebX*. Free international conference calls among research collaborators are now possible, if a little buggy, and should improve as bandwidth increases. Some government-run networks (such as BRCSS [Building Research Capacities in the Social Sciences] in New Zealand) use grid-like structures for virtual meetings of researchers and students. Fischer has worked on a project in which academics from several institutions interacted without meeting face-to-face. Such grids are also used for lectures broadcast simultaneously across multiple campuses, with opportunities for participants to interact in real time.

Long-distance observational research and field-like studies of intercultural virtual teams are conceivable using asynchronous video over the Web and synchronous Web collaboration tools, so at some point we might expect the trend toward self-report studies to reverse. The Centre of Applied Cross-Cultural Research in New Zealand has a real-time lab for experiments that is linked to other labs in Taiwan, mainland China and Japan. Students at the various universities have successfully interacted online as part of experiments on intergroup conflict and stereotyping (organized by James Liu and others). Gradually, *being there* takes on a different meaning, but some problems inherent in research by 747 remain, as cultural psychologists are wont to remind us.

A proposal was made at a symposium on the future of IACCP at the Spetses Congress that datasets be placed online to be shared among researchers. To some extent this is already taking place, for example, the Inglehart World Values Survey can be downloaded and even analyzed interactively on the WVS Web site. Other researchers make their datasets available

with permission. IACCP should address the question of creating a repository of datasets, although many difficult problems would need to be solved before doing so. Arguably, the current academic climate is more competitive than that of the trading floor in a stock market, and is not conducive to sharing datasets. But perhaps we need to press the academic reset button and become aware that this competitive element is an imposed ethic from government funding bodies. By sharing datasets once we have published the main results we are actually doing what we are supposed to: advancing knowledge through (collaborative) scientific exploration.

Community

The primary challenges to maintaining and enhancing the sense of community in IACCP are the ever-present problems of dispersion and division and the newer problems of size and mission. The feeling of community present at the founding of the Association was achieved despite dispersion and division due to the small size of the initial membership and the cohesion wrought by a compelling sense among the Founders that they were pioneers doing something new and important. Thirty-five years later, dispersion is still intrinsic to our nature; division continues to wax and wane with the international political scene, recently quite grim. (For example, members from some countries can no longer pay their membership dues as a result of international monetary embargoes.) The size of the IACCP membership has been stable for most of the decade, but its composition has been increasingly unstable as more people join but do not renew their memberships. One reason for this trend may be a lack of community. IACCP certainly benefits from the general increase in interest in things cultural but many new members may fail to find what they want in the Association and leave more quickly.

Any discussion of maintaining or enhancing community must take into account some structural characteristics of the Association that are a legacy of the Founders. The establishment of IACCP by a small number of pioneers who went on to educate several generations of students seems to have propagated a culture of rather homogeneous cliques that can be hard for outsiders to penetrate. The recurring roster of keynote speakers at regional and international IACCP conferences certainly creates an impression of an inward looking, hierarchical (and to a certain extent patriarchal) organization. This situation might be a reflection of the current state of academia internationally, but it is not altogether compatible with the mission of IACCP. It is encouraging to see the establishment of the Walt Lonner Distinguished Lecture series and some explicit recognition of this problem in the leadership looking to future conferences. The underrepresentation of women and non-English speaking (or non-Commonwealth) senior figures should also be a concern. As discussed in a previous section, innovations such as Internet-based conferences can contribute to penetrating our cliques and leveling our hierarchy.

The status of IACCP within the broader, rapidly growing field of culture-psychology studies is problematic, even precarious. Can IACCP be justified? As a well-known and distinguished IACCP member recently commented, the future of academic cultural research seems to be in just two labs in North America. Research categorized nominally as “cultural psychology” has become very fashionable and is rapidly spreading into mainstream journals. Although this interest is welcome and to be encouraged (indeed one of the missions of the founders of IACCP), it is curious to note that there are only very tenuous links between the centers of this activity in North America and IACCP. So, to our frustration and to the detriment of science, little cross-referencing of academic work takes place and research paradigms are again being transmitted in one direction, from the U.S. to the rest of the world. Researchers working in these newly formed traditions miss the opportunity to take advantage of many of the lessons learned by members of this Association, often published in non-US journals. It is ironic that the rise of cultural research in the U.S. could lead to further domination and monopolization of (cultural) research by U.S.-based researchers, quite contrary to founding ethos of the IACCP.

To answer the question, *whither IACCP?*, it is the international psychology community enabled by IACCP that may be its greatest asset. Given its diverse membership base, IACCP should take up the challenge by creating a truly global cross-cultural psychology community.

The Internet presents some prospects for fostering community. Several types of Internet applications have facilitated the creation of virtual communities whose interests are narrowly focused and whose mere existence is essentially invisible to nonmembers. These communities are founded on themes such as hobbies, religion, politics and sex. Social networking sites, such as *Facebook* globally and *MySpace* in the USA, present venues for a complex set of interconnected, variably cohesive communities. Social commentators have criticized the societal “Balkanization” engendered by these voluntary communities as mass media is replaced by Web sites (Galston, 1999). Nonetheless, virtual communities may serve as model for promoting community in IACCP.

How so? We offer six reasons for embracing virtual communities.

First, readers of a certain age will not understand the extent to which “communication styles” have shifted in the generation that completed High School after the late 1990s, unless they have had close contact with members of said generation. The professional and social impact of *Facebook*, for example, is enormous. A case in point is the necessity for HSBC bank to re-evaluate its HRM practices after a community of complaining individuals was set up in *Facebook*. Members can join any community, be it alumni, professional (e.g., IBM), or social. In fact, the Academy of Management has its own entry on *Facebook*, with 100 members as this chapter is being written. Even local groups may benefit from such initiatives: the Australasian Social Psychology group attracted 56 new members within a few weeks through online appeals, a considerable membership in light of the small number of Social Psychologists in that part of the world. Government funding agencies in New Zealand and Australia now establish similar initiatives to tie together their larger communities of research providers and research users. These interactions might also suit communication styles globally, as suggested by the enormous success of early social networking sites such as Google’s *Orkut* in Brazil and Asia, even before *Facebook* took the world by storm. Fischer was taken by surprise during his sabbatical in Brazil when he discovered that seemingly everyone had given up email, instead leaving “scraps” (messages) on other people’s scrapboards (message boards or “walls” in *Facebook* terminology). This practice allows everyone who is interested to see what is happening with everyone in the community. In the UK, an application called *Twitter* allows people to update their *Facebook* status on via their mobile phone. Online, an individual’s status will say “Nathalie van Meurs is twittering: she can be found in a café by London School of Economics.” It also allows her to be updated on the status (whereabouts) of her “friends” on a continuous basis. Perhaps this will be the future of IACCP conferences –at a push of a button we will know who is sitting by the pool and who went to that workshop on IACCP and the Internet.

Second, virtual communities solve the dispersion problem in two ways: obviously, they are virtual (you don’t need a plane ticket); and they are not delimited by the frequency and length of conferences. In other words, interaction can be frequent and ongoing rather than jarringly episodic. IACCP members have commented over the years about the disconcerting cognitive distance between normal life at home and the four days of a Congress. Through virtual communities, contact and collaboration is maintained even as the glow of the Congress experience wears off.

Third, they solve the division problem. So far (and this could very well change), political conflict between nations does not appear to hinder communication on the Internet, except when it involves countries that are willing to expend considerable resources to build firewalls (e.g., China), can readily disconnect (e.g., Myanmar), or routinely eavesdrop on their citizens using data mining technologies (the U.S.).

Fourth, they are scalable and focused. Large or small communities can self-select on broad or narrow interests. We see this currently in the development of online discussion lists.

The danger of Balkanization, however, persists. IACCP has occasionally debated whether or not to create divisions, as in the larger psychology organizations such as the International Association for Applied Psychology, but the leadership has felt that the Association is too small for this sort of potentially divisive structure. In practice, such divisions have formed through the initiatives of members who felt their interests were not served adequately by IACCP, a case in point being the recent creation of the Asian Association for Social Psychology. Virtual communities in IACCP would be layered on the broader community that is maintained through face-to-face conferences. Indeed, the Academy of Management allows its members to select to receive emails from special interest groups. Establishing special interest groups or special interest group communication media (e.g., discussion lists) within the Association may help create communities within IACCP that are more active than the single general purpose IACCP discussion list.

Fifth, they are cheap. Until recently, air travel was becoming less and less expensive relative to disposable income and inflation in most nations. But at the time of this writing, oil has reached USD100 per barrel and ticket prices have skyrocketed. Meanwhile, the costs of computer technology continue to fall. So, virtual communities that meet in online conferences and other forms of Internet communications are available to a wide range of psychologists who have limited travel funds. Size of travel budget or personal wealth would no longer sort members into two classes, members who have multiple opportunities to travel and take leadership positions, and the rest.

Sixth, virtual communities might facilitate the creation of virtual research teams that would in previous years have formed around leaders of the core groups described previously. While there is little question that the core groups in IACCP produce high quality, high profile research, the potential of others is often not recognized or facilitated.

How would IACCP foster the development of virtual communities? Technical and social engineering would be required. Technical engineering would involve the creation of Web services, presumably attached to the IACCP Web site, through which these communities would form and conceivably communicate. Social engineering would be a catalyst: individuals would be charged with recruiting and promoting the initial development of these communities. The specific technical and social steps through which this fete would be accomplished remain to be developed by interested parties.

Teaching: Adding a "T"

We doubt that teaching was on the minds of the psychologists who conceptualized IACCP in the 1960s. Nonetheless, at the end of the day, few cross-cultural psychologists in any country would be able to pursue their research interests were they not employed primarily, or substantially, to teach. Those of us lucky enough to teach in our field must often grapple with a second reality: the flavor and texture of cross-cultural psychology is difficult to communicate to students in the setting of a psychology classroom. Although we have only anecdotal evidence for support, we might go further to assert that few of us would have chosen this field based solely on reading a cross-cultural textbook or (even) taking a cross-cultural class. Instead, most culturalists entered the field after an experience such as living overseas, emigrating, marrying out of the home culture, or encountering a particularly compelling or charismatic mentor. The challenge to teachers is to pass on their enthusiasm for the field to their students, who may or may not be future researchers but will surely need to function in a globalized world.

The fact of the matter is that it is unlikely that young professionals entering the job market will find work that does not require some level of "cultural intelligence" (Earley & Ang, 2003). Business schools in particular have jumped on the cross-cultural bandwagon and offer intercultural, cross-cultural, or international management courses that lean heavily on psychology due to their focus on human interaction. What is more, these courses are sometimes "franchised" to universities outside the country of residence of the researcher, such as Hong

Kong and Dubai (e.g., Middlesex University Business School). As these courses are taught by others, universally relevant teaching materials are needed, additional to small adaptations for the local audience (e.g., anecdotes and examples) that can be improved by collaborative sharing of knowledge. Coursework is increasingly delivered via the Internet by using university student systems and portals that can be accessed from anywhere. These portals also contain announcements, reading lists, lecture slides, weblinks (of *YouTube* videos and news websites), podcasts, and quizzes. Regardless of the manner in which cultural courses are developed or the medium through which they are taught, teachers require and actively seek compelling instructional materials.

The Internet has tremendous potential for providing online resources to help instructors communicate the flavor and texture of cross-cultural psychology. IACCP could assume responsibility for providing these resources, given that the textbook market in the field has not grown to the point where expensive ancillaries can be developed by commercial publishers. In the Spetses workshop and in many conversations over the years, we have brainstormed the resources that could be provided. Audio-visual aids include a video library of the works of the most prominent members of the field or carefully edited short documentary-style clips designed to illustrate theoretical principles and research findings. Annotated still photography could accomplish some of the same goals more simply. The Association could sponsor a documentary film of the history and dominant models of the field, an idea discussed in several meetings at the Spetses Congress. PowerPoint shows could be posted that would help new instructors get started. We can generate a database of internet videos, links, multiple choice questions, e-books, etc. The need for the inclusion of modern technology is poignantly illustrated in the video *Did you know* (www.youtube.com/watch?v=jpEnFwiqdx8), which van Meurs used in her introductory lecture on cross cultural management. These resources could be collected in a digital repository, or IACCP could participate in a such a repository (e.g., see www.theorangegrove.com or www.scivee.tv).

Finally, the potential of Web-based synchronous communication for research collaboration also exists for teaching. Collaborative teaching, guest lectures, seminars mixing students in distant universities, class projects composed of virtual teams across campuses are all possible and become increasingly easier as this technology matures. Gabrenya tried two experiments using Web-based communication tools. An active cross-cultural scholar, Zeynep Aycan of Koc University, Turkey, presented a colloquium in mid-2007 to Industrial/Organizational graduate students in the U.S. from her university office in Turkey using *Adobe Connect* technology. The experiment was successful in providing much of the experience of a classroom lecture, albeit hampered by low bandwidth (some dropped audio, for example). In a second experiment, Wenhua Yan of East China Normal University, Shanghai, China and Gabrenya collaborated to pair students in her undergraduate cross-cultural psychology class with students in his undergraduate social psychology class. Students completed a series of projects by communicating in English using *Skype*. As a pilot project, much was learned in this experiment, in particular the difficulties of real-time communication when students are separated by a 12-hour time difference as well as deeper cultural differences in the social settings of American and Chinese classrooms. Teaching styles must accommodate intercultural experiences such as this one so that the experience is integrated into the course rather than simply added on top of it.

Fischer participated in a teaching and assessment project initiated by Miriam Erez in which students at various institutions had to interact, develop a short training tool together and then had to present the final team product in their respective classes for assessment. This project required minimal resources (some networked computers with email or MSN), but students found this exercise to be highly rewarding and learned a lot.

Conclusion: $iaccp=f(3c+t)^1$

Those who follow the development of information technology informally, as we do, or formally, such as professional university IT administrators, are familiar with the pie-in-the-sky predictions of the technology pundits (e.g., Robert Cringely, David Pogue, and John Dvorak in the U.S.). The present chapter –so speculative– is stylistically consistent with the musings of these commentators. How does technology develop and shape social institutions, and how valid can predictions and recommendations such as those presented here actually be?

Some predict email to be obsolete in a matter of few years. Really?

In the 1960s, U.S. educators were certain that the introduction of videotape players to secondary school classrooms would change everything. Really?

Or was it the introduction of classroom personal computer in the 1980s that solved all of the problems in education? Really?

These questions are fascinating in their own right and the subject of several specialties in anthropology and sociology. In other words... we would not hazard a guess as to how the Internet will affect cross-cultural psychology in the future. Nonetheless, we can call on psychology's most clever and consistently correct analytical tool to lay out a broad prediction of what must come to be: the past and present goals of IACCP, communication, collaboration, and community, and the fourth goal, teaching, will continue to frame the activities of the Association, and development of Internet technologies will continue to shape the manner in which these goals are met.

In this chapter we have tried to highlight some challenges posed by emerging technologies and some intriguing opportunities. We have proposed some potential solutions for helping IACCP grow and achieve these goals, dispersed and divided as we are, by engaging such technologies. But history will not end and solutions are surely as fluid and unpredictable as Chuck Hill on the dance floor. So: please *set aside some time now* to read van Meurs and Fischer (2018) for an update of this chapter and a prospective analysis of the following 10 years of IACCP's technological engagement.

So, yes, we culturalists *are* an unusual lot.

References

- Chinese Culture Connection (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18, 143-164.
- Cole, S. (1992). *Making science: Between nature and society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Doob, L. W. (1980). The inconclusive struggles of cross-cultural psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 11, 59-73.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA: University Press.
- Gabrenya, W. K., Jr. (1989). Social science and social psychology: The cross-cultural link. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The Cross-cultural challenge to social psychology*, (pp. 48-66). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gabrenya, W. K., Jr. (1995). Welcome to the new Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin. *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 2-7.
- Gabrenya, W. K. Jr. (2001, July). OpenText: A proposal for a collaborative new technology textbook. In W. J. Lonner (Convenor), *Psychology meets culture: What should our students know about human thought and behavior beyond their own borders and how do we propose to help them learn effectively?* Symposium conducted at the Fifth European Regional Congress of the IACCP, Winchester, UK
- Gabrenya, W. K. Jr. (2004a, August). Cross-cultural psychology and the Chinese: A song from a barbarian reed pipe. In W. K. Gabrenya (Convener), *Asian psychologies: Development, progress, and challenge*. Symposium organized for the XVII Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Xi'an, China.
- Gabrenya, W. K., Jr. (2004b). A sociology of science approach to understanding indigenous psychologies. In B. N. Setiadi, A. Supratiknya, W. J. Lonner, & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *Ongoing Themes in Psychology and Culture* (pp. 131-149). Jakarta: International Association for Cross-Cultural

Psychology.

- Gabrenya, W. K., Jr. (2006). Publications news and the instantiation of "funky." *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*, 40, 2-4.
- Galston, W. (1999). (How) does the Internet affect community? Some speculations in search of evidence. In E. C. Kamarck, & J. S. Nye, Jr., *Democracy.com? Governance in a networked world* (pp. 45-62). NH: Hollis Publishing.
- Greenfield, P. M. (2000). Three approaches to the psychology of culture: Where do they come from? Where can they go? *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 223-240.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (2004). Social axioms: A model for social beliefs in multicultural perspective. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 36, pp. 119-197). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Schmitt, D. P., Alcalay, L., Allensworth, M., Allik, J., Ault, L., Austers, I., et al. (2004). Patterns and universals of adult romantic attachment across 62 cultural regions: Are models of self and of other pancultural constructs? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 367-402.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Mapping and interpreting cultural differences around the world. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, and P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures: Dimensions of culture in a comparative perspectives* (pp. 43-73). Leiden, NL: Brill
- Van Meurs, N. (2004). A review of the eConference "Building Bridges: Organisational Conflict and Interaction between Cultures." *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*, 38, (1-2), 35-39.
- Van Meurs, N., & Fischer, R. (2018). The Internet and IACCP: Meeting the technology opportunities and challenges of cross-cultural psychology 10 years later. In M. Gelfand & J. Adamopoulos (Eds.), *Unusual research in cultural psychology: Proceedings of the 2016 Congress of the IACCP*. Shanghai: IACCP. (accessed at www.iaccp.org).

COGNITIVE PROCESSES

