Chapter 3
The Science of a Global Organizational Psychology: Differing Approaches and Assumptions

Donald M. Truxillo and Franco Fraccaroli

It is a virtual truism to say that the world is getting more interconnected and that workers now need to work more closely with colleagues from all parts of the world. At the same time, work organizations commonly employ workers from around the globe, and teams are now routinely made up of workers from multiple continents—and cultures.

These changes spring from several sources. Economic and political conditions are such that people move to countries where they perceive greater opportunities. Such migration brings with it the need for these workers to adapt to different cultures and for employers to understand these workers so as to utilize their skills. All told, workers from different cultures can have profound differences in their economic expectations and culture, such that approaches to managing these employees—from selection and training them to motivating and helping them manage stress—can be ineffective, to the extent that these approaches ignore cultural differences and ways of thinking.

Moreover, new technologies facilitate teams of people to work more remotely, without physical contact. However, this type of collaboration (teleconferences; exchanges by e-mail; working on the same project via virtual meetings, telework, computer-supported team works, etc.) also introduces a psychosocial confrontation between cultures, style of working, work habits, and social rules. Organizations and workers must also cope with new problems of coordination, evaluation, and management of workers. "The dissolution of the unity of work in time and space" (Frese 2008) is a process that obliges researchers and practitioners to think cross-culturally.

Therein lies the rub: Much of Industrial, Work, and Organizational (I-W/O) psychology research has been dominated by a very small percentage of the world population in industrialized countries, particularly North America and Europe

---

D. M. Truxillo (✉)
Department of Psychology, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207, USA
e-mail: truxillod@pdx.edu

F. Fraccaroli
Department of Psychology and Cognitive Science, University of Trento, 38122, Trento, Italy

(Tsui et al. 2007). This imbalance affects research's basic conceptualization of "work" and the relationships and psychological constructs involved. Arnett (2008), in articulating a similar concern, bemoaned the fact that much of psychology as a whole is dominated by the USA, despite comprising only about 5 % of the world population. Additional viewpoints and paradigms are needed to understand people's relationship with work and to test whether basic I-W/O assumptions, constructs, and interrelationships hold.

In this chapter, we begin to scratch the surface of these challenges in differences in I-W/O psychology science. We start by focusing on differences between our scientific assumptions in North America and Europe, noting that if such large differences are found here, disparities should only be greater with other parts of the globe that differ culturally, politically, and economically from America and Europe. From there, we briefly review the literature on cross-cultural research, making key points regarding issues that we as researchers must address to make our work relevant to more of the world's population. We next discuss differences in ways of gaining knowledge. We also make two key points that international collaborations are an important way to make headway on this issue and that practice could critically inform our research because, by necessity, our practice may be far ahead of our science in terms of acknowledging cultural differences. Finally, we discuss ways forward.

US and European Work Psychology: Differences in Focus

In general, over the last 50 years, there has been a strong process of cross-pollination between the I-W/O psychology in Europe and the USA. Scientists from both schools pursue similar research and intervention topics (i.e., training, selection, teamwork, motivation, etc.) and use many of the same research methods and approaches. However, despite this "long-term process" of coming together, some differences persist (see Truxillo and Fraccaroli 2011, for a discussion of these differences). European and US approaches to I-W/O psychology make quite different assumptions in terms of whom they serve and whose interests they serve. In short, I-W/O psychology—at least in the USA—is often a servant of management, at least in comparison to European Work Psychology, which focuses more on the interests of workers. In Europe, the name of the field, "Work and Organizational" psychology, showcases the importance of work, which can be studied without consideration of the employer. In other words, part of this difference between Europe and the USA is even found in disciplinary names. In contrast, the focus in the USA is on "Industrial and Organizational" with the goal of advancing the interests of the employing organization.

There are several examples of these differences between the USA and European I-W/O psychology (Truxillo and Fraccaroli 2011). For example, the topic of "applicant reactions" has developed over the last 20 years (e.g., Truxillo and Bauer 2011). In Europe, a broad approach to the applicant's experience of the selection

process has been evolving for quite some time, and this approach has looked at the job applicant as a complete individual who is impacted by the experience of going through a selection process (e.g., Salgado et al. 2010), with a focus on "social validity" (Schuler 1993) and treating applicants with respect. In contrast, the interest in applicant reactions in the USA has focused largely on how such reactions impact the organization, for instance, through reductions in litigation or increases in applicant attraction to the organization. In short, the European approach has acknowledged that the selection process is important not only to employers but also to individuals, not only in terms of employment outcomes but also in considering their dignity. Another example is the examination of the meaning of work (e.g., MOW; International Research Team 1987) by European scholars. By its nature, the MOW literature is more focused on the interests of the individual person rather than on that of the employer. Work values and MOW are important elements which derive from cultural and social origins of people, also connected with ideological and cultural beliefs of people (Furnham 1977) and can affect a worker's work and professional history, career choices, and level of work involvement regardless of the employer.

This attention to MOW and the psychological functions that work could fulfill for individuals can be related to the "occupational psychology" tradition—mostly European—that studies attitudes and values in relation to the positions of people in the labor market. Examples of research topics in this subfield include psychological antecedents and consequences of unemployment, job search behavior, and career and vocational choices. A similar example would be the milestone research of Jahoda (1982) on the psychological function of work. Further, these topics are also psychological aspects of work in general that are studied independently from one particular work organization and industry.

Another example is the approach to the study of work motivation. A long tradition of research and intervention in the USA has been devoted to the study of motivation in a particular job or organization, including human resource (HR) management characteristics that could improve or inhibit the motivation of workers. Examples including the Hackman and Oldham (1976) model of job design, now revisited by researchers such as Morgeson and Humphrey (2006), and the goal setting theory of Locke and Latham (1985) also focused on the viewpoint of management. In this case, motivation is analyzed as a consequence of organizational choices. In Europe, the study of work motivation processes are more connected with an action theory (Frese and Zapf 1994), which tries to understand self-regulation and self-evaluation of people in goal-oriented behavior. In this case, motivation is more related to the active role of an individual that interacts proactively with the organizational context.

Finally, we point to the area of occupational health psychology (OHP) as an example of research that attends to the individual's experience, which originated from both European and North American roots and is now growing worldwide. In contrast to the examples presented above, OHP emphasizes on both the organization and the individual. For instance, it strives to understand work experience in terms of well-being and to identify the psychological risks to individuals at work (Warr 2007) as well as examine variables of interest to the employer, the employee, and even the employee's family life (e.g., Hammer et al. 2011). In short, OHP

legitimizes the study of the whole person. OHP, in fact, includes studying how an individual with specific expectations, values, and psychological resources encounters the world of work and how this encounter can produce healthy or unhealthy outcomes. Family and friends, relationships, personal and social characteristics, individual aspirations, and future time perspectives could be variables to study in promoting a person-oriented approach.

We see OHP as an example of research in which increased collaboration between Europeans and Americans has led to important paradigmatic shifts in the field of I-W/O psychology, resulting in a more complete view of how workers contribute to organizational success and also how they experience work as part of their whole life.

In short, the internationalization of I-W/O has already begun to reduce paradigmatic differences between the USA and Europe and resulted in increased research into the worker not only to fulfill the needs of the employer but also to understand the worker as a complete, integrated person (Truxillo and Fraccaroli 2011). However, as profound as the differences and assumptions are between US and European I-W/O researchers, they are differences that are realized within some of the world's most highly industrialized societies (the USA and Europe) and within two geographic regions which are dominated by "Western" cultural values such as liberal capitalism and which have a developed economy. Thus, we note that differences with nonindustrialized countries are bound to be even more profound, and bridging these gaps will bring even a greater change to the way that we view and approach I-W/O research and eventually understand the importance of work to individual outcomes and to organizational success.

What Does "Applied" Mean for a Global I-W/O/W Psychology? What Are the Potential Settings for this Work?

The differences in I-W/O psychology with regard to focus and the intended beneficiary—the individual employee or the organization—raise the question of what is meant by "applied settings." Judging by most introductory I-W/O psychology texts, for most Western I-W/O researchers this generally means working for a corporation, consulting firm, or government entity. In reality, a number of possibilities are notably missing from this range of work settings. For example, in recent years there has been a growing interest in Humanitarian Work Psychology (e.g., Olson-Buchanan et al. 2013), recognizing that work psychology may have the potential to advance the interests not only of corporations but also of individuals and societies in need as well. Similarly, the Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology (SIOP) has recently achieved nongovernmental group (NGO) status, recognized by the United Nations (UN) as a possible instrument to benefit and support governments, societies, and countries worldwide. In keeping with this development, I-W/Os now may even support local organizations after natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina (Rizzuto 2008). Although this broadened scope of work has begun

to develop only recently in the history of I-W/O psychology, we believe that these recent strands may represent a substantial change in the way that I-W/O psychologists think of their work and whose interests it serves.

This illustrates an important point: I-W/O psychology researchers can gain important perspectives from being aware of the needs of practice. Specifically, practice issues that arise as work psychologists operate in different countries and cultures can not only help inform our field about the differing workplace problems that psychologists are asked to help solve but also identify and recognize what may be profoundly different ways of experiencing work and its relations to other aspects of life from around the world. Such work has begun in professional publications such as SIOP's The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist (*TIP*) column focusing on I-W/O psychology professional issues in different countries and practice.

Similarly, in recent years there is a growing interest of I-W/O psychology on several social issues that are beyond the corporate business interests. Consider, for instance, the attention to imbalances in the demographic distribution of the workforce (older workers and late career), issues related to the mismatch between the educational system and work opportunities (over-skilled and underemployed workers), the promotion of work as an opportunity for social integration for people with disabilities (work and organizational accommodations to promote integration into the workforce), and the challenge of reducing discrimination and inequality in workplace (the reduction of sexism and ageism and the promotion of equal opportunities independent of race, ideology, and sexual orientation). In all of these examples, it is possible to notice the interest of I-W/O psychologists in improving the quality of the relationship between the individual and the workplace, even though this improvement might not directly benefit the organizational or corporate rationale.

In addition, diversity in the makeup of our professional organizations will lead to the integration of diverse viewpoints and, as a result, diverse methods. As Tsui (2007) points out, the internationalization of the membership of the Academy of Management is a rich resource for its members. The recent establishment of the Alliance for Organizational Psychology (AOP), which at this writing includes the charter members in SIOP, European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP), and International Association for Applied Psychology (IAAP), but whose membership is set to expand, I-W/O psychology will be able to share experience in research and practice among psychologists worldwide.

A Global Science of I-W/O Psychology: Differences in Context and Individual Experience

It is sometimes difficult to consider a *global* I-W/O psychology, either for research activities or for the interventions, because of the great differences in context. The work conditions of people living in different geographical areas are in some cases incomparable in terms of the quality of physical conditions, the stability of the job position, safety, and a multitude of other issues. These differences are sometimes

amplified by the labor market characteristics in different countries: rights and contractual rules, flexibility in terms of entry and exit from a job position, level of employability for various working people, and the degree of union influence in the workplace.

One can suppose that the meaning of words such as "work" and "career" and the centrality of the job in the people's lives could be very different from one cultural setting to another. These differences could affect the way people invest energies in a job and the degree to which they consider work activities to be central in their definition of personal identity. Furthermore, the experience of work could be analyzed through different lenses such as through macro-level economic differences (for instance, advanced industrialized countries, like the USA and European Union (EU), versus developing economies, like some Asian or South American areas), or institutional differences (to study the effects of different laws, rules, or labor market characteristics), or cultural differences (cultural, ideological, and religious factors). For developing this type of comparative research, the cross-cultural organizational psychology and organizational behavior literature can play a pivotal role.

Tsui et al. (2007) define cross-cultural organizational psychology or behavior as "… the study of individual behavior or team processes in which national cultural characteristics play a major role as independent or moderating variables" (p. 428). However, the internationalization of I-W/O psychology is hampered by the difficulty in comparing different contexts and cultures. These difficulties are amplified by the fact that paradigms and cultural models in research and interventions are dominated by hegemonic points of view developed primarily in Western countries. As noted by Gelfand, Leslie, and Fehe (2008), "*[cross-cultural organizational psychology] remains a U.S. export business*" (p. 494). Gelfand et al. also help to identify some specific barriers for the development of a "truly global" organizational psychology.

First, research questions in organizational psychology prioritize a vision of the individual as an independent person. The "cultural model of the self" represents individuals as able to define their own internal attributes, to make vocational choices following their personal needs and pursuing happiness and well-being, and to be driven by personal characteristics such as attitudes, abilities, and personality. However, in this model, contextual constraints, social norms, and social interaction are mostly neglected.

Second, research questions in organizational psychology assume a post-materialistic worldview. The organizational psychology research and interventions are oriented towards values such as self-expression, subjective well-being, and quality of life. However, in the world at large, vast numbers of people at work and in organizational settings must deal with some materialist values. For instance, it is interesting to note that in much of Western I-W/O psychology, the greatest attention is devoted to job satisfaction and well-being, with less attention to the quality of working life or, until recently, of simply having *decent work* (e.g., freedom from dirty and unsafe work, unfavorable working hours, harassment, and so on; *International Labor Organization* 2012). Similarly, the concept of "retirement" (e.g., Wang 2007, 2012) may have a different (or little) meaning where there is little or minimal retirement

system, or when the cessation of work only occurs when a person is physically or mentally unable to continue.

Third, research questions in organizational psychology assume a separation between work and other life domains. The dominant model, described by Gelfand et al. (2008) as "protestant relational ideology," uses, as a starting point, a low integration between organizational life and other life domains such as family, friendship, and religion. In actuality, this hardly reflects the way many, or perhaps most, people in the world actually exist, living in small, highly integrated communities. Indeed, this lack of integration among life domains has been largely rejected in recent decades with increased recognition of the importance of nonwork domains on work, including the domains of spouses, elders, and children (e.g., Hammer et al. 2011).

Taken together, these issues suggest that some voices and cultural perspectives in the field of organizational psychology are often ignored. They should be included in the questions and in the issues managed by I-W/O psychologists. Most notably, the voices and cultural perspectives from nonindustrialized countries, or from countries where the domains of work and organizational life are more closely connected with other values (e.g., spirituality, collective meaning of achievement), may be absent from much of the current I-W/O psychology literature.

Cultural Differences: Challenges in Meaning and Measurement

As specific examples, it is possible to identify some issues related to cultural differences in the meaning and interpretation of concepts which are widespread in the I-W/O psychology literature. For example, the concept of motives, goals, feedback, job satisfaction, and job characteristics can have quite different meanings in different cultural and economic contexts. Similarly, there are serious issues in the different ways of interpreting the relationship between the individual and the organization. For instance, the meaning of commonplace concepts such as organizational commitment, psychological contract, organizational justice, and organizational citizenship behavior can have quite different meanings (e.g., Gelfand et al. 2007)—and may not even have any real meaning in certain cultural contexts.

Glazer and Beehr (2005) present a good example of differences in the culture surrounding job and organizational characteristics. They compare the effects of three role stressors on intentions to leave in four countries (the USA, UK, Italy, and Hungary). These four countries were chosen because of their different cultural values and economic structures, differences presumed to influence the workplace social context. Specifically, the authors examined a stress model that included role stressors as predictors, anxiety and organizational commitment as mediators, and turnover intentions as the outcome of the stress process. They compared the structural equivalence of this model in nurses from these four countries. On the one hand, their results supported the portability between countries of the general stress model:

Some work characteristics such as roles are stressors, which lead to a personal variable (anxiety), leading to an individual–organization link (organizational commitment) and organizational behavior (intention to leave). However, they found that culture and economic characteristics for each country partially affect the strength to which variables are related. For instance, the intention to leave the organization among US nurses is more likely a result of anxiety level than it is among the Hungarian nurses. This difference across countries in the relationship between variables could reflect the differences in availability of viable job alternatives and opportunities. In other words, the same job characteristic could have differential impacts on organizational behavior, depending on job market features in the specific context.

A second example of differences related to the individual–organization link could be drawn from the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) literature. In a study conducted in Taiwan by Farh, Earley, and Lin (1997) on the relationship between organizational justice and OCB, the authors consider that in different cultural contexts in Taiwan (traditionality versus modernity), the perception of organizational justice could play a different role in explaining OCB. In the modernity cultural context, such as that dominates Western countries, the perception of justice is a strong predictor of OCB; people who perceived high distributive and procedural justice are more likely to behave in terms of extra-role behavior, altruism, and other OCB dimensions. The emphasis on instrumental exchange is dominant in this modernity cultural model. In the traditionality model, in contrast, people's organizational behavior is more directed by prescribed roles, and the central focus is not necessarily on the equity of the exchange but on the principles of respect, authority, and an expressive relationship. The authors found partial confirmation of these hypotheses: Traditionality moderated the relationship between fairness perceptions and OCB. For tradition-oriented people, cultural values such as an expressive tie with the organization explained attachment with the organization (measured by OCB), but justice perceptions did not.

Farh et al. (1997) provide an example of another important topic in the field of cross-cultural organizational research: the methodological and epistemological aspects related to the questionnaires adopted in different linguistic and cultural contexts. The most widespread procedure for conducting cross-cultural studies begins with an established and validated measure of a concept and then translating it into the required language, using translation and back-translation (Brislin 1970), often referred to as the adoption/adaption process. This procedure clears up the primary linguistic issues (i.e., linguistic correspondence between two instruments to promote construct validity). For instance, the Tsui et al.'s (2007) analysis of 93 cross-cultural organizational behavior research studies showed that a large number of studies use this procedure to guarantee the internal validity. However, this procedure does not resolve issues pertaining to culture, namely, that the same notion could have different structures and meaning in different contexts. The Fahr et al. study, for instance, demonstrated that the measurement of OCB could be enriched in the Taiwanese context by some additional dimensions: In addition to the traditional dimensions of OCB including altruism and identification, they also found some other culturally specific dimensions such as sportsmanship and courtesy.

This last point could be further developed by considering the emic and the etic concepts used in cross-cultural organizational psychology (e.g., Gelfand et al. 2008). The distinction between emic and etic approaches derives from the field of linguistics. The seminal work by Pike (1967) describes the etic approach as the study of behavior and culture from outside of a particular system. In contrast, the emic viewpoint results from studying behavior and culture from inside and based on the particular system. Berry (1969) subsequently applied the emic and etic concepts to the study of cross-cultural psychology. He pointed out the value of an emic perspective for psychologists, which allows for the understanding of individuals within their own context and daily activities (with specific attitudes, motives, and personality; Berry 1989). But in addition to taking this emic approach, cross-cultural psychologists need to make generalizations across cultural groups by comparing these groups using etic approaches. There is also a third approach to the study of phenomena in a cultural context: a "derived etic" approach. This involves the comparison between the two emic perspectives and using only the filtered common constructs of the two cultures for analysis. The three approaches allow for the identification of communalities and differences across cultures (Morris et al. 1999).

In cross-cultural organizational psychology (or at least in much of I/O psychology), this distinction describes emics as the component of a concept (or behavior) that is specific to a culture compared with etics which are the universal, cross-cultural components of a concept or behavior. Going back to the previous point, the general notion of OCB could be considered to be an etic concept, given that all of the components of OCB established in Western studies do not hold up in China (Farh et al. 2004). In short, this cross-cultural literature on etics and emics identifies some of the hazards and challenges of cross-cultural research. Certain concepts identified in one culture may have a very different meaning in another culture, or may in fact be meaningless.

This last point, referred to as measurement equivalence between different national or cultural contexts, may be the more critical one. Specifically, Tsui et al. (2007) recommend that researchers "ensure construct validity beyond back translation and measurement equivalence" (p. 466). The authors show that the most frequently used tests for verifying invariance in cross-cultural studies are configural, that is, demonstrating structural equivalence using multi-sample confirmatory factor analysis. This is a good but not sufficient way to study intercultural invariance. In fact, the application of these statistical analyses is not sufficient to promote context-specific measurements. These analyses, in fact, produce a pseudo-etic approach; they start from an emic perspective (using a questionnaire produced in a specific culture, typically the US), and then through a translation approach, the researchers identify which part of the original scale is applicable to another culture, cutting the rest of the scale. As a result, the equivalence approach does not solve the emic, context-specific assumptions.

Farh, Cannella, and Lee (2006) describe some alternative approaches to the construction of measures that try to preserve cultural specificity. They consider two main dimensions that can define the construction of a scale: the source and the expectations of cultural specificity. The first well-known approach, simple *translation*

from the original language, is characteristic of the use of an existing scale and by a low expectation of cultural specificity ("imposed" etic approach; Berry 1989). The second approach, *adaptation*, also involves the translation of a scale that already exists, but with some alteration to consider (and to add) some specific cultural aspects, creating higher expectations of cultural specificity. The third approach, *decontextualization*, involves the creation of a new scale not based on existing ones, with an etic perspective (universal and culturally invariant dimensions; or the "derived" etic approach, Berry 1989). The fourth approach, *contextualization*, implies the assembly of a new scale with a higher expectation of cultural specificity (emic approach). This last approach is considered more appropriate for the study of culturally specific aspects and for understanding differences in structural aspects across cultures. At the same time, such a procedure consumes time, and scales developed in this way may not be appropriate for culture comparisons, resulting in difficulty communicating the finding to well-established journals.

Gelfand et al. (2008) note that although levels of analysis research (e.g., individual level versus unit level) have grown in recent years, it has received relatively little attention in cross-cultural organizational psychology—which is unfortunate because of its relevance and because a lack of such research can lead to confusion. For instance, different studies, all purporting to study "culture" may be measuring it quite differently, say, at the individual level or at the country level (i.e., using country as a surrogate for culture). This distinction represents an important limitation. Assuming that cultural measures (e.g., individualism) are isomorphic across individual- and unit levels is likely untrue and can lead to serious confusion. Gelfand et al. provide detailed recommendations for incorporating levels of analysis into cross-cultural organizational psychology research.

Beyond Simple Cultural Differences: Polycontextuality, Ways of Knowing, and Indigenous Research

Tsui et al. (2007) provide an excellent, practical list of recommended steps forward for research in our field, such as considering both emic and etic approaches (not just back-translation) in considering construct measurement and the need to examine issues across levels, and we point the readers to this source for a thorough discussion. In addition, we highlight two recommendations from Tsui et al. (2007) that seem to be key to moving forward in cross-cultural research in I-W/O psychology and which should benefit I-W/O psychology as a whole.

The first recommendation is to use a "polycontextual approach" (Von Glinow et al. 2004). Von Glinow et al. describe how to incorporate multiple contexts, such as economic, historic, and political contexts, which will lead to a holistic and valid understanding of that phenomenon (Tsui et al. 2008). For instance, Shapiro, Von Glinow, and Xiao (2007) point out that much of the research in our field relies on verbal media at the expense of ignoring body language; in contrast, polycontextually sensitive research methods would include many ways of knowing to achieve an

understanding of culture. Noting that nation and culture are not synonymous—that there may be multiple cultures and cultural values within a single nation—and that many factors besides culture affect organizational behavior within a country, Tsui et al. (2007) advocate for the use of polycontextual research, taking into account factors beyond culture in order to understand the effects of culture on a phenomenon within a particular nation. In short, Tsui et al. argue that these multiple contexts (such as their cultural, industry, and economic contexts) affect how workers perceive and react to their jobs and employers and how they behave in work organizations. These contexts lead to different ways of knowing, including knowing that is drawn from the physical environment (e.g., space and time), various communication media (e.g., verbal and nonverbal), sensory factors (e.g., visual and auditory), psychological factors (e.g., cognitive and affective), and philosophical approaches (e.g., spiritual and moral; Tsui et al. 2007). These different ways of knowing lead in turn to different ways in which employees interpret work. For example, "team work" may mean different things in different nations, cultures, and industries. These different ways of knowing and interpretations of work among employees are particularly challenging for researchers, who must also draw upon multiple disciplines (e.g., economics and history). For instance, we argue that a non-American would need more than a solid background in psychometrics and American culture to understand selection practice in the USA, but would also need to understand American politics, history (e.g., the civil rights movement), and law. Finally, researchers may need to supplement certain media frequently used in Western research, such as the written survey, or dispense with it entirely, as other methods, such as interviews and observations, may allow for better understanding of the multiple contexts and the behavior within it. These multiple contextual factors besides culture, such as industry, economy, and politics, can neutralize or enhance the effects of culture and thus should be taken into account in research

Second, Tsui and colleagues (Tsui, 2004; Tsui et al., 2007) emphasize the importance of what they describe as indigenous research, which they define as "country- or context-specific research that involves a high degree of contextualization or even polycontextualization when studying novel contexts. Such research does not aim to test an existing theory but strives to derive new theories of phenomena in their specific contexts" (p. 468). In short, indigenous research would involve a fairly different approach to conducting cross-cultural research. Rather than starting with an existing (often Western) theory and extending it to novel contexts, indigenous research would involve the development of new theory within the novel context, even taking into account a polycontextual approach. This indigenous research allows for the recognition of factors that may not have been taken into account by existing theory, given that the existing theory is a function of its original culture. Moreover, as indigenous research is often only published within its own language, teams of researchers using multiple indigenous approaches allow not only for the development of more complete, universal theories but also for the sharing of otherwise narrowly disseminated research across linguistic borders. Similarly, Gelfand and her colleagues (2007) point out the need for indigenous research to be a high priority for organizational behavior as a field, as in this way the researchers will be

able to capture emic (i.e., culture specific) concepts that might otherwise be missed. Capturing emic concepts is important not only for cross-cultural research projects specifically but also for the development of a more universal organizational psychology (Gelfand et al. 2008).

Conclusion and Recommendations

In our discussion, we have illustrated some differences in the approaches to research used by European and North American researchers. We have also used the literature on cross-cultural and cross-country research as a springboard for understanding differences in scientific approaches to I-W/O psychology. With this material in mind, we make a number of summary recommendations and provide additional insights for researchers working across borders.

First, in today's interconnected world, researchers should reach out to those working in other countries to assemble international teams. Language permitting, researchers should look outside of their own country and academic discipline to examine the literature related to their area of study. Studying issues only from the standpoint of North American or European employment situations is to ignore the vast majority of workers on the planet. To expand our deeper understanding of people's relationships at work, we need to look beyond our borders and challenge our assumptions about the factors affecting behavior at work. Speaking from our own experience, such work requires that researchers dig in and become close to their phenomenon and culture of interest, but this process can be immensely satisfying on multiple levels. We draw on a quote from Tsui et al. (2007) to illustrate:

> High-quality, high-impact research is the result of the scholars' deep knowledge about the phenomena they study. This is true of cross-national research as well. International studies are not for those who cannot depart from the comfort of their homes or who dislike flying for more than a few hours. Good local knowledge cannot be attained in a matter of days, weeks, or even months. We encourage scholars of any nation to spend their sabbatical year (not months) in the country that they would most like to study. An extended stay may not only deepen knowledge; it could build friendships and trust that are critical for successful and rewarding partnerships lasting for many years. Knowledge about a phenomenon does not result from a single study but requires a program of research that continues for years or even decades. Wonderful friendships may emerge from cross-national collaborations.

Second, we encourage researchers to "go native" (Tsui et al. 2007) and to study their phenomena from the standpoint of other cultures. Drawing from anthropology may be particularly helpful. Such research means not only more than just using psychometrically equivalent measures—certainly a critical issue—but also to possibly put aside established (i.e., Western) theories and look for theoretical developments within a country or culture. Such an approach can lead to the recognition of concepts that only exist in certain cultures or the elimination of fallacious applications of assumptions and constructs that do not exist in particular cultures.

Third, we underscore the recommendation to incorporate different ways of knowing into cross-cultural research activities (Tsui et al. 2007). For example, for North

American researchers this practice may mean moving away from written surveys and moving towards other research approaches such as observations and interviews. The culture and the country should guide the research approach.

Fourth, it is important to recognize that country and culture are not synonymous, and moreover, many other factors within a given country may affect workers' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors (e.g., Gelfand et al. 2008; Tsui et al. 2007). Within a country, there can be many cultural norms, and multiple factors besides culture such as politics and economics (Tsui et al. 2007) can affect worker behavior. Taking into account (and measuring) these multiple contexts (polycontextualization; Tsui et al. 2007; von Glinow et al. 2004) will supplement understanding in the range of factors that can account for differences across countries.

Fifth, researchers should increase efforts to redress such methodological concerns as measurement equivalence, levels of analysis issues, and isomorphism. A detailed discussion of how to address these is beyond the scope of this chapter—other authors have addressed these in detail (e.g., Gelfand et al. 2007, 2008; Morris et al. 1999; Tsui et al. 2007; van der Vivjer and Hambleton 1996; van der Vivjer and Tanzer 1998), but we simply name these issues here.

Sixth, as a field we need to move forward in training our next generation of researchers and explicitly incorporating these issues into graduate training. This training would include the importance of understanding the phenomena examined by I-W/O researchers from multiple perspectives and how this training can lead to better theoretical advancement, the range of factors that can affect ways of knowing across countries and cultures, and the implications for the practice of I-W/O psychology. It is important for this mindset to be incorporated into researchers' thinking early on. To avoid training new researchers to recognize these issues around globalization leaves our profession vulnerable to being less relevant and without the tools needed to deal with the world of work in the twenty-first century.

Finally, our professional organizations can act as a rich source of understanding differences in work phenomena across cultures and differences in approaching our science. Tsui (2007) notes that the increased international membership in the Academy of Management is an excellent resource for its members as a whole. Recent internationalization efforts by SIOP, EAWOP, and IAAP—manifested in the establishment of the AOP—recognize these issues and provide the resources needed to facilitate international collaborations, which often result in increased understanding of differences in scientific approaches and research issues. SIOP's recent involvement as an NGO for the UN recognizes the role our research and practice can play around the world. The establishment of the Global Organization for Humanitarian Work Psychology will help support a role in novel contexts and with different goals in mind.

In conclusion, there are many reasons to promote international research in I-W/O psychology. These reasons include the increased visibility of our field and solving real, practical problems in the work of people around the world. Moreover, such work will also lead to important differences in the way that researchers *think about* their theories, which can only enrich our understanding of the factors that affect people's relationship with their work and how their work fits in with their lives

as a whole. Such international work will lead to paradigmatic shifts in our assumptions about our theory, practice, and the way we approach our research.

References

Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95 %: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist, 63,* 602–614.

Berry, J. W. (1969). On crosscultural comarability. *International Journal of Psychology, 4,* 119–128.

Berry, J. W. (1989). Imposed etics-emics-derived etics: The operationalization of a compelling idea. *International Journal of Psychology, 24,* 721–735.

Brislin, R.W. (1970), "Back-translation for cross-cultural research", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 185-216.

Farh, J.-L., Cannella, A. A., & Lee, C. (2006). Approaches to Scale Development in Chinese Management Research. *Management and Organization Review, 2,* 301–318.

Farh, J.-L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S.-C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42,* 421–444.

Farh, J.-L., Zhong, C.-B., & Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organizational Science, 15,* 241–253.

Frese, M. (2008). The changing nature of work. In N. Chmiel (Ed.), *An introduction to work and organizational psychology. A European perspective* (2nd ed., pp. 397–413). Blackwell Publishing

Frese, M., & Zapf, D. (1994). Action as the core of work psychology: a German approach. In H.C Triandis, M.D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*: Vol. 4 (pp. 271–340).Palo Alto: Consulting psychologists press

Furnham, A. (1977). *The psychology of behavior at work*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58,* 479–514.

Gelfand, M. J., Leslie, L. M., & Fehr, R. (2008). To prosper, organizational psychology should… adopt a global perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29,* 493–517.

Glazer, S., & Beehr, T. A. (2005). Consistency of implications of three role stressors across four countries. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 467–487.

.Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16,* 250–279.

Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. (2011). Clarifying work-family intervention processes: The roles of work-family conflict and family supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96,* 134–150.

International, L. O. (2012). Decent work agenda. http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/decent-work-agenda/lang-en/index.htm. Accessed 12 Aug 2012.

Jahoda, M. (1982). Employment and Unemployment. A social psychological analysis. Cambridge University Press

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1985). *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works. Englewwod Cliffs*: Prentice Hall.

Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 1321–1339.

Morris, M. W., Leung, K., Ames, D., & Lickel, B. (1999). Views from inside and outside: Integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgments. *The Academy of Management Review, 24,* 781–796.

MOW International Research Team. (1987). *The Meaning of Working*. London: Academic Press.

Olson-Buchanan, J., Koppes Bryan, L., & Thompson, L. F.. (Eds.). (in press). *Using organizational psychology for the greater good: Helping those who help others*. Routledge.

Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour*. The Hague: Mouton.

Rizzuto, T. (2008). Katrina Aid and Relief Effort (KARE) lessons: Looking back and moving forward. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 45,* 25–32.

Salgado, J., Anderson, N., & Hulsheger, U. R. (2010). European milestones in employee selection. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of Employee Selection*. Routledge

Schuler, H. (1993). Social validity of selection situations: A concept and some empirical results. In H. Schuler, J. L. Farr, & M. Smith (Eds.), *Personnel selection and assessment: Individual and organizational perspectives* (pp. 11-26). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shapiro, D. L., Von Glinow, M. A., & Xiao, Z. (2007). Toward polycontextually sensitive research methods. *Management and Organization Review, 3,* 129–152.

Truxillo, D. M., & Bauer, T. N. (2010). Applicant reactions to organizations and selection systems. In S. Zedeck, H. Aguinis, W. Cascio, M. Gelfand, K. Leung, S. Parker & J. Zhou (Eds.), *APA Handbook of I/O Psychology, Volume II* (pp. 379-397). Washington: APA Press.

Truxillo, D. T., & Fraccaroli, F. (2011). A person-centered work psychology: Changing paradigms by broadening horizons. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 4,* 102–104.

Tsui, A. S. (2004). Contributing to global management knowledge: A case for high quality indigenous research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 21,* 491–513.

Tsui, A. S. (2007). From homogenization to pluralism: International management research in the academy and beyond. *Academy of Management Journal, 50,* 1353–1364.

Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S. S., & Ou, A. Y. (2007). Cross-national, cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations. *Journal of Management, 33,* 426–478.

van der Vivjer, F., & Hambleton, R. K. (1996). Translating tests: Some practical guidelines. *European Psychologist, 1,* 89–99.

van der Vivjer, F., & Tanzer, N. K. (1998). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment: An overview. *European Review of Applied Psychology, 47,* 263–279.

Von Glinow, M. A., Shapiro, D. L., & Brett, J. M. (2004). Can we talk, and should we? Managing emotional conflict in multicultural teams. *Academy of Management Review, 29,* 578–592.

Warr, P. B. (2007). *Work Happiness and Unhappiness*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wang, M. (2007). Profiling retirees in the transition and adjustment process: Examining the longitudinal change patterns of retirees psychological well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 455–474.

Wang, M. (Ed.). (2012). *The Oxford Handbook of Retirement*. Oxford Library of Psychology.