1-1-2009

Positive Psychology Within a Cultural Context

Jennifer Teramoto Pedrotti
California Polytechnic State University - San Luis Obispo

Lisa M. Edwards
Marquette University, lisa.edwards@marquette.edu

Shane J. Lopez
University of Kansas Main Campus

Positive Psychology Within a Cultural Context

Jennifer Teramoto Pedrotti, Lisa M. Edwards, *and* Shane J. Lopez

Abstract

As our capacity for communication with nations across the globe increases through the advances of technology, our interactions with others with different worldviews also become more frequent. This exposure to diversity on so many levels requires a better understanding of the multiple contexts in which people from different cultural backgrounds live and the strengths they possess that help them experience well-being. In order to define the characteristics that may be viewed as strengths in different groups, we must make efforts to remember that cultural rules and norms often dictate what can be called a strength versus a weakness. It is imperative that we are able to recognize that strengths may look very different in different contexts and that these diverse manifestations may come from a variety of worldviews. More work must be done in order to develop a better understanding of the way that cultural context plays a role in the operationalization, manifestation, and measurement of strengths in diverse groups. The following chapter provides a history of the connections between culture and positive psychology and discusses current issues regarding the link between cultural context and various personal characteristics. Examples from culturally sensitive positive psychological theory and research are also given in order to illustrate how researchers are better exploring positive psychology within a cultural context.

Keywords: culture, strengths, positive psychology, context

> The good citizen is a "citizen of the world ..." thinking about humanity as it is realized in the whole world is valuable for self-knowledge: we see ourselves and our customs more clearly when we see our own ways in relation to those of others. (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 59)

As nations become more and more diverse across the world, and as we interact more frequently through trade, collaboration, and advances of technology, it becomes necessary to include a discussion of cultural context in studying any human variant. Discussions of culture fit naturally within the field of psychology at large, and particularly well within the area of positive psychology and its concentration on strength as important to, and present within, the lives of all individuals. Positive psychologists have begun to recognize this importance over the last few decades and have begun to attempt to build a community "where the word 'equality' can truly be applied to the abilities of all citizens to pursue their goals" (Lopez et al., 2000, p. 238). In discussing strengths and virtues, it becomes imperative to define these variables within the appropriate cultural context, however, and to view their diverse manifestations from a variety of viewpoints.

In this chapter, we examine a variety of frameworks that can be used to understand and foster healthy functioning. We will review a brief history

of the way in which culture and positive psychology fit together, and cover current debates about the level of importance it plays today in the field. We also will describe exemplars of strengths-based theory and research that take cultural context into account.

Cross-Cultural Psychology and Multiculturalism: Definitional Clarity

Many authors have given definitions of the term "culture" but scholars often disagree in terms of which facets must be included in this definition (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Triandis, 1996). In an attempt to bring some of these definitions together, Triandis defines culture as consisting of "*shared* elements that provide the standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating, communicating, and acting among those who share a language, a historic period and a geographic location" (p. 408). These elements are then passed down through the generations allowing for small adaptations as other factors shift and change, and may include "unexamined assumptions" (Triandis, 1996, p. 408) that are taken for granted as part of a cultural group's worldview.

It is also important in our treatment of this broad topic to distinguish between the concepts of "cross-cultural psychology" and "multiculturalism." While cross-cultural psychology can be defined as "comparisons across cultures or countries, as opposed to comparisons of groups within one society" (Mio, Barker-Hackett, & Tumambing, 2006, p. 294), multiculturalism refers more to the interaction among various cultures within one context: for example that which exists within the culturally diverse United States (Mio et al., 2006). At this point, it is important that studies investigating differences between members of different nations *and* studies examining strengths of those from different cultural groups within countries continue to be conducted. It is equally important that we not confuse the cross-cultural and multicultural aspects of research as investigation of different populations and issues occurs. For example, a study about Chinese individuals and their levels of happiness (as compared to the happiness of Koreans or Japanese) may not be relevant to the reported well-being of Chinese American individuals and to their attempts to lead flourishing lives within the United States. Though it is possible that Chinese heritage may influence the views of this group of Americans, we cannot assume that these two groups are the "same." As we make efforts in the larger field of psychology to give the appropriate attention to "the fourth force," as multiculturalism is often described (Pedersen, 1990), we must in turn recognize the importance of cultural

context in discussing strengths and virtues in our teaching, research, and practice.

Culture-Free or Culturally Embedded? Perspectives on Strengths in a Cultural Context

In today's research within the field of positive psychology, two main views have emerged in terms of how to view strengths from a cultural perspective. Though both camps stipulate that all cultures have strengths, one camp proposes that some strengths exist universally across cultures, whereas the other believes that what is called a strength or a virtue is determined by cultural values and context (Snyder & Lopez, 2007).

Culture-Free Perspective

Culture-free proponents state that in research investigations across several cultural groups, universal attributes have been found that can be classified as strengths across each of these diverse cultures (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). The researchers from this viewpoint argue that the objectivity inherently present within the field of social science can "transcend particular cultures and politics and approach universality" (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, p. 5). To support their view, these researchers state that they have been able to identify 24 personal strengths and believe these to be present and viewed as beneficial in all cultures and societies (Snyder & Lopez, 2007). These 24 strengths are the basis of the Values in Action classification of strengths (VIA; Peterson & Seligman, 2004)—an assessment designed to determine personal strengths in individuals. One example is the concept of happiness; in the culture-free viewpoint it is accepted that all people want to be happy (Myers, 1992) and that in this way we are all similar despite our different cultural backgrounds. Finally, culture-free proponents also make the assumption that a researcher's own culture, and the values that accompany it, do not enter into his or her professional work. Instead, this camp of researchers believes that as scientists we should be able to move beyond these personal characteristics by using validated and reliable methods of research.

Culturally Embedded Perspective

Researchers in the other camp argue that strengths can only be viewed accurately from within a cultural context and disagree with the assertions that cultural values do not influence professional work (Constantine & Sue, 2006;

Snyder & Lopez, 2007). Though this group of researchers agrees that strengths can be found in all cultures and societies, they posit that strengths may manifest differently depending on cultural context. For example, a concept such as compassion may exist in both Eastern and Western cultures, but may be viewed differently or valued more strongly in one culture or another. A concept such as happiness may not be the goal of all individuals from all cultures (Ahuvia, 2001; Pedrotti, 2007; Snyder & Lopez, 2007) as others have previously thought. In addition, the behaviors associated with this strength in one culture may not be the same as behaviors associated with it in another culture (Sandage, Hill, & Vang, 2003). The American Psychological Association (2003) has encouraged researchers, practitioners, and academics to develop particular competencies in working with individuals from different backgrounds than their own, or in conducting research with these populations, and has in this way endorsed the culturally embedded view of psychology in general. This view can be applied directly to strengths within the culturally embedded positive psychology viewpoint.

Those operating from a multicultural framework state that human functioning cannot be considered in a vacuum; thus culture and context are a part of the everyday human experience. As such, many scholars have chosen to operate from a culturally embedded viewpoint as opposed to a culture-free stance (Pedrotti & Edwards, in press; Sue & Constantine, 2003). It seems clear that a decision regarding what types of characteristics and actions are deemed positive for a particular individual will be guided and influenced by the cultural environment and the salience of various cultural values in this individual's life (Christopher, 2005; Constantine & Sue, 2006; Leong & Wong, 2003; Pedrotti & Edwards, in press; Snyder & Lopez, 2007; Sue & Constantine, 2003).

Moving from Models of Inferiority to Models Recognizing Strengths in Diversity

Early psychological models of racial and ethnic differences examined distinctions from a deficiency perspective. Deviations from the characteristics of the dominant culture were viewed through an ethnocentric lens that interpreted any differences negatively and indicative of weakness or pathological functioning.

The "inferiority model" was an early paradigm, which was used to explain racial and ethnic differences that were based on a history of racist rationalization. This model (as described in a review by Kaplan

& Sue, 1997) attributed variability in functioning to biological differences. The "natural inferiority" argument contended that if members of certain racial and ethnic groups were inherently incapable of advancing in society, then it was useless to attempt to adjust the existing environment to provide equal or favorable opportunities. Of course, the fundamental attribution errors inherent to this model were illuminated when biological explanations for racial and ethnic differences were not supported by human genetic research (see reviews of related research in Jackson, 1992; Zuckerman, 1990).

In the "deficit model" it was proposed that ethnic differences were the result of immutable environmental mechanisms, rather than biological factors (Allport, 1954). Prejudice was purported to be a key factor in creating stress that adversely affected minority group members' ability to excel (Sue, 1983). Higher rates of distress in racial and ethnic minorities were attributed to hostile environmental circumstances (Carter, 1994) that elicited inferior or self-destructive coping strategies. Although this model focused greater attention on the effects of prejudice and unequal social conditions, it still cast minority group members in the shadow of inferiority (Kaplan & Sue, 1997), and did not adequately address the complexity of individual differences.

The field of psychology moved away from deficiency or inferiority models to explanatory models recognizing the importance of culture. These models, known as "cultural pluralism" models, acknowledged that specific cultural experiences contribute to healthy functioning and engender unique strengths. Within these models it is proposed that racial or ethnic groups should remain distinct cultural entities, while simultaneously promoting larger common goals. For example, in the United States, a Latino/an American would be expected to retain his or her culture of origin, while still promoting traditional American values such as individualism. Cultural pluralism is not a reflection of the United States' outdated "melting pot" idea (i.e., ethnic groups combine with the dominant American culture to produce a universal American identity). Instead this model champions a "unity in diversity" position that, according to Kaplan and Sue (1997), succeeds more as an idealized description of cultural group relations than as an explanatory model for viewing and working with multicultural populations.

Pedersen (1996) proposed that, rather than characterizing cultural groups in rigid categories, there is a need to combine the many different "cultural

identities" each person presents in distinct situations. The "cultural grid" is an open-ended model that matches social system variables (i.e., demographics, status, and affiliation) with patterns of cognitive variables (i.e., expectations and values). It was developed to help identify and describe the cultural aspects of a situation, assisting researchers and clinicians in the formation of hypotheses that include complex cultural perspectives, as well as intercultural differences and explanations. The result is an orientation that allows group variables to be combined with individual cognitive perspectives in a single framework for the purpose of anticipating an individual's "personal cultural" response to specific situations.

The emerging model in psychological perspectives that take culture into account establishes that each person has a unique culture, both independently and connected to the larger society (Chin, 1993). The "human diversity model" broadens the focus of research beyond merely racial, ethnic, and cultural issues to include varied groups and populations with unique differences, strengths, and histories. The umbrella of human diversity allows researchers to focus on patterns unique to specific groups or populations, and/or universal group processes. This expands conceptualization options unequivocally, allowing recognition of the importance of cultural variables upon functioning.

Chin (1993) made strides in the direction of understanding diversity by elucidating a "psychology of difference" to invoke changes in assumptive models to develop a more comprehensive framework, valuing differences and the context of culture. This requires that clinicians and researchers actively engage in (a) presenting a positive presentation of values, potentials, and lifestyle of the culturally different client; (b) shifting from a deficit hypothesis to a difference hypothesis; (c) recognizing that cultural differences exist; (d) examining frameworks that are biased against these differences; and (e) acknowledging that cultural behaviors are adaptive and have withstood the test of time. Thus, cultural behaviors should be examined for their inherent health-promoting values.

A full explanatory model that not only recognizes individual cultural strengths and weaknesses, but potentially sheds light on factors that would help maximize the strengths of all individuals, will require further expansion. It is our contention that such a model will flow out of a psychological science committed to studying what works (Lopez et al., 2002). Thus, we will cluster observations about

manifestations of psychological processes so that we can clarify what works for individuals and the broader community. This scientific review along with the recommendations offered will provide a framework for positive human diversity models.

Exemplar Research in Multiculturalism and Positive Psychology

In this section we highlight areas of research and studies that have increased our understanding of positive psychology in a cultural context, and which continue to inform our conceptualizations of optimal functioning among individuals of different backgrounds.

Specifically, we highlight exemplar investigations of strengths among racially and ethnically diverse individuals and countries, and we describe efforts to identify and elucidate culturally specific strengths.

A Multicultural Investigation of Optimism

Chang (1996a) investigated optimism and pessimism in Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans to emphasize the importance of testing whether constructs are equivalent across cultures. Chang examined the utility of optimism and pessimism in predicting problem-solving behaviors, depressive symptoms, general psychological symptoms, and physical symptoms. In general, the results of this study revealed that Asian Americans were significantly more pessimistic than Caucasian Americans (according to the Extended Life Orientation Test; Chang, Maydeu-Olivares, & D'Zurilla, 1997), but not significantly different in their level of optimism. These findings were corroborated when data from an independent sample were examined (Chang, 1996b). Chang notes that his findings might suggest that Asian Americans are generally more negative in their affectivity than Caucasian Americans; however, he found that there were no significant differences in reported depressive symptoms between the two groups. In fact, optimism was negatively correlated with both general psychological symptoms and physical symptoms for Asian Americans but not for Caucasian Americans. Also, problem solving was found to be negatively correlated with depressive symptoms for Asian Americans but unrelated for Caucasian Americans. Finally, it was revealed that while pessimism was negatively correlated with problem-solving behaviors for Caucasian Americans, it was positively correlated for Asian Americans.

Despite the utility of group difference multicultural research, Chang (1996a, 1996b) revealed the need to assess the equivalence of specific constructs

across cultures rather than merely measure differences in levels of the construct. This need clearly can be understood if one were to suggest an intervention focused on reducing pessimism in the Asian American participants in Chang's study without knowing the psychological correlates of pessimism in Asian American samples. In this case, reducing pessimism levels for Asian Americans could conceivably lead to a decreased utilization of problem-solving behaviors. These constructs must be understood in a multicultural framework in order to interpret their magnitudes in terms of their utility for the cultural group. Only after they are placed in this framework, can the development of culturally appropriate interventions proceed in a responsible manner.

Cross-Cultural Investigations of Subjective Well-Being

In colloquial terms, subjective well-being (SWB) is known as "happiness," and it is only in the past 25 years that researchers have successfully studied this variable empirically (Diener, 2000). Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith (1999) have operationalized SWB as being comprised of both cognitive-judgmental and affective components. Life satisfaction, or a person's evaluation of the quality of his or her life (Diener, 1994), represents the cognitive-judgmental component of SWB. The affective components of SWB are positive (presence of) and negative (absence of) affect.

Researchers (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003; Diener & Suh, 2000; Suh & Oishi, 2004) have investigated factors associated with SWB at the individual and cultural levels, both within and across nations. At the individual level, SWB has been found to correlate with many factors, including good health, enough education, fit between personality and culture, personal growth, purpose in life, self-acceptance, sense of self-determination, having many acquaintances, and receiving social support from many close friends (Triandis, 2000).

A large body of research exists looking at differences in SWB across groups in nations (Deaton, 2008; Diener & Diener, 1995; Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995; Howell & Howell, 2008; Suh, Diener, Oishi, & Triandis, 1998), providing clues to correlates of life satisfaction in diverse cultures. In a review of national differences in SWB, Diener and Suh (1999) reported that people living in individualistic cultures have higher levels of life satisfaction than those in collectivist cultures. While collectivist cultures give priority to the in-group and define the self in relational terms, individualist cultures, such as

the United States, encourage independence, attention to personal opinions and feelings, and autonomy. The distinctions between these cultural variables suggest that SWB may be more salient to individualists, and that attributes traditionally associated with well-being may not be as relevant for members of collectivist cultures (Suh, 2002).

Research looking at SWB across nations also has shown that individuals in wealthier nations report higher levels of life satisfaction (Deaton, 2008; Howell & Howell, 2008), though the processes by which national wealth and well-being are connected are unclear (Diener & Suh, 1999). Philosophically, material poverty should not preclude the attainment of well-being for individuals who are oppressed or disadvantaged and relegated to lower socioeconomic levels in society, and finding other approaches to happiness, including such avenues as spirituality, optimism, and flow, is essential for these individuals to reach their maximum potential (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999).

Diener (2000) noted that individuals from various societies might value happiness in different ways. Indeed, the importance placed on well-being by some cultural groups may provide clues to cross-national differences in levels of SWB, and may also reveal unique aspects of culture. For example, adults from the Pacific Rim of Asia placed less importance on SWB than respondents from Latin America, which is supported by findings that East Asians may be willing to sacrifice positive emotions in order to achieve important goals (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003). These nuances across cultures regarding the importance and predictors of SWB provide many potential areas for continued research.

Culture and the Construction of Self

Markus and Kitayama (1991) described a framework of how individuals perceive themselves in relation to their culture, and this framework has served as the basis for a number of studies about well-being. These authors suggest that one important difference among cultural groups has to do with the types of self-construals that individuals make, and that these self-construals can be "independent" or "interdependent." An independent self-construal is characteristic of Western cultures such as North America, which share a belief in independence of the self from others, and an emphasis on internal abilities, thoughts, and feelings. The independent self-construal reflects ideals of independence, self-actualization, and autonomy, and emphasizes socially disengaging behaviors such as asserting or protecting one's own rights (Kitayama, Markus, & Kurokawa, 2000, p. 95).

In contrast, an interdependent construal is understood in reference to the context or culture of which the self is related. The interdependent self-construal reflects a view on connectedness, meeting others' expectations, and facilitation of interpersonal harmony. This theory posits that those with interdependent self-construals will have an enhanced ability to blend in with the group and will likely engage in self-criticism more than self-enhancement (Heine & Lehaman, 1995; Kitayama et al., 2000). The interdependent self-construal has been associated with non-Western cultures, where socially engaging behavior, such as taking one's proper place in society, is emphasized (Kitayama et al., 2000, p. 95).

Self-construal theory has served as the basis for research about well-being, cognitions, and emotion among individuals from Western and non-Western backgrounds. As an example, Kitayama et al. (2000) studied Japanese and American college students and their reported emotional states in daily life. Consistent with theory, they found that "good feelings" were associated with interdependence of the self in Japan, but with independence of the self in the United States. These dimensions of self-construal have thus served as a useful framework for understanding different conceptions of the self in culture across groups.

Culturally Relevant Strengths

In addition to studying the applicability and relevance of certain positive constructs in the lives of culturally diverse individuals and groups, researchers also are beginning to explore strengths that emerge directly from a particular cultural background, such as ethnic identity, familism, bicultural competence, and religion/spirituality (Lopez et al., 2002; Sue & Constantine, 2003). The field has thus seen a shift from generalizing findings about strengths to all individuals, to investigating strengths within a culture or community that may be unique to that group. In many cases, this research has started with qualitative approaches that allow for the study of individual meanings within a social context (Morrow, Rakhsha, & Castaneda, 2001), but many of these areas incorporate both qualitative and quantitative methodology.

Specifically, researchers are investigating the role of cultural strengths as buffers against the negative effects of stress, and/or as variables that promote optimal functioning. For example, ethnic identity, or the meaning or importance of ethnicity to an individual at a given time (Phinney, 1992, 2003),

has been shown to buffer the negative effects of discrimination stressors in the lives of youth and adults of color (Lee, 2005; Romero & Roberts, 2003a; Yoo & Lee, 2005). Researchers are investigating how religion and spirituality may influence well-being in adults of diverse backgrounds (Blaine & Crocker, 1995; Sue & Constantine, 2003), and how familism plays a role in life satisfaction among Mexican American youth (Edwards & Lopez, 2006). Researchers are also beginning to understand how racial/ethnic minority youth and adults exhibit bicultural competence, or the ability to navigate cultural contexts (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Romero & Roberts, 2003b).

It is not difficult to imagine numerous other culturally relevant strengths that can be studied by researchers. For example, Hays (2001, p. 106) provides a useful list of culturally related personal, interpersonal, and environmental strengths. Personal strengths include bilingual or multilingual skills, pride in one's culture, and wisdom. Interpersonal supports may be extended families, traditional celebrations and rituals, and cultural or group-specific networks. Finally, examples of environmental conditions that can serve as cultural strengths include cultural foods or a space for prayer or meditation. Research focused on some of these individual- and community-level resources will likely provide more culturally relevant conceptions of well-being (Sue & Constantine, 2003).

Considering Culture in Practice

Researchers, psychologists, and educators are beginning to integrate findings about culture and positive psychology and see how worldviews, cultural frameworks, and constructs come together in work with youth and adults. In this section we describe several strategies for conceptualization and assessment of strengths/weakness and optimal human functioning that emerge from recent theory and research about positive psychology in a cultural context. Simple strategies for identifying strengths of people and environments may prove useful for researchers, practitioners, managers, and educators who attempt to make individuals, organizations, and communities more positive.

It is important to understand the diverse strengths that people possess personally and in their environment. The four-front approach (Wright, 1991; Wright & Lopez, 2002) provides a useful framework for understanding strengths and deficiencies in an individual's life. As is evident by our field's history of overlooking strengths in people

of diverse backgrounds, as well as ignoring the role of cultural context and environment (Lopez et al., 2006), there is a need to purposefully identify and acknowledge strengths and positive coping strategies of all individuals. With the four-front approach, clinicians gather information about (a) strengths and assets of the client, (b) deficiencies and undermining characteristics of the client, (c) resources and opportunities in the environment, and (d) deficiencies and destructive factors in the environment. This information can be gathered using multiple methods, including observation, discussion with the client, and standardized assessments, and clinicians are encouraged to integrate the material into the therapeutic process (Edwards, Holtz, & Green, 2007). This balanced approach allows for more holistic conceptualizations of client functioning and encourages both clinician and client to reflect on the context and its influence on the individual (Pedrotti, Edwards, & Lopez, 2008).

Understanding the multiple identities that each individual exemplifies is particularly important for appreciating their diversity. A useful framework for conceptualizing the diverse identities that individuals possess is the ADDRESSING model (Hays, 2001, 2007). Hays suggests that clients be described across the following dimensions: Age, Disability (acquired), Disability (developmental), Religion, Ethnicity, Sexual orientation, Socioeconomic status, Indigenous heritage, National origin, and Gender. Professionals who consider this variety of identities will likely have a broader, more complex understanding of an individual's background and potential strengths.

Future Directions for Studying Strengths and Well-Being in a Cultural Context

One area of investigation may be to look more closely at measures currently being used to determine personal strengths to determine if they have cultural equivalence for various groups. As discussed above, strengths may have different definitions in different cultures (conceptual equivalence), may not be measured as accurately by various instruments in different cultural groups (measurement equivalence), or may not be translated appropriately to ensure linguistic equivalence, or that the same meanings of terms and descriptions exists from group to group (Mio et al., 2006). For example, the VIA classification of strengths (VIA; Peterson & Seligman, 2004) is a widely used measure including 240 items on five-point Likert scales (Very Much Like Me to Very Much Unlike Me) and is designed

to determine an individual's top five "signature strengths." It is unclear if the questions appropriately reflect strengths for all individuals. (Ongoing research by Nansook Park of University of Rhode Island and colleagues is examining cross-national and cross-cultural strengths data.) One item, for instance, states "As a leader, I treat everyone equally regardless of experience" and if answered toward the affirmative loads on the "Fairness" scale: denoted a positive quality (or "virtue") by this scale and defined as "Treating all people the same according to notions of fairness and justice; not letting personal feelings bias decisions about others" (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). This item may be interpreted very differently, however, by members from different cultural backgrounds. While an individualistic participant might value those who treat all equally, this equal treatment for all philosophy might not be a positive trait for members of cultures that have a more stratified social structure in which treating different social groups with the status they deserve is thought to be a positive action. Another item states, "I do not like to stand out in a crowd"; this item may be viewed very differently by Western individuals (with popular sayings such as "The squeaky wheel gets the grease") and Eastern individuals (with popular sayings such as "The nail that sticks out gets hammered down"). Thus, these examples must be considered in utilizing various scales to measure strengths and scales such as this and others must be tested to determine their level of equivalence between groups. Until then, such scales must be interpreted with much client feedback and with great caution so as not to pathologize various behaviors that may be culturally appropriate in some groups (Pedrotti & Edwards, in press).

Identifying these resources and seeing how they actually function to promote well-being can provide empirically based knowledge to be applied to prevention and intervention techniques. For example, findings about different ways in which youth and adults learn to be bicultural (LaFromboise et al., 1993) can inform efforts to improve well-being among immigrants in the United States. Mixed method studies that explore phenomena qualitatively and quantitatively may be particularly useful for gaining a more complex understanding of a particular topic while simultaneously testing theoretical models (Hanson, Creswell, Plano Clark, Petska, & Creswell, 2005). As such, studies that explore the cultural context and processes of biculturalism may shed light on how many racial/ethnic minorities promote well-being in everyday life.

As the practice of measuring strengths across domains and in various contexts (school, home, workplace, etc.) becomes more common, and the calls for national well-being indices begin to resonate, understanding how the best in people manifests within and across cultures becomes imperative. Culture counts; our research and practice must reflect that.

Questions

1. How can we continue to work toward developing positive interventions that take culture and context into account? What key points should be emphasized to ensure the success of culturally competent, strength-based interventions?

2. How might our empirical understanding of biculturalism and other cultural strengths increase? What methods can be employed to gather this information?

3. How can current strength-based measures be modified and revised to be more culturally inclusive of diverse groups?

References

Ahuvia, A. (2001). Well-being in cultures of choice: A cross-cultural perspective. *American Psychologist, 56*, 77–78.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist, 57*, 1060–1073.

Blaine, B., & Crocker, J. (1995). Religiousness, race, and psychological well-being: Exploring social psychological mediators. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 1031–1041.

Carter, J. H. (1994). Racism's impact on mental health. *Journal of the National Medical Association, 86*, 543–547.

Chang, E. C. (1996a). Cultural differences in optimism, pessimism, and coping: Predictors of subsequent adjustment in Asian American and Caucasian American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*, 113–123.

Chang, E. C. (1996b). Evidence for the cultural specificity of pessimism in Asians vs. Caucasians: A test of a general negativity hypothesis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 21*, 819–822.

Chang, E. C., Maydeu-Olivares, A., & D'Zurilla, T. J. (1997). Optimism and pessimism as partially independent constructs: Relationship to positive and negative affectivity and psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 23*, 433–440.

Chin, J. L. (1993). Toward a psychology of difference: Psychotherapy for a culturally diverse population. In J. L. Chin, V. De La Cancela, & Y. M. Jenkins (Eds.), *Diversity in psychotherapy. The politics of race, ethnicity, and gender* (pp. 69–91). Westport, CN: Praeger.

Christopher, J. C. (2005). Situating positive psychology. *Naming and nurturing: The e-newsletter of the Positive Psychology Section of the American Psychological Association's Counseling Psychology Division, 17, 2*, 3–4.

Constantine, M., & Sue, D. W. (2006). Factors contributing to optimal human functioning of people of color in the United States. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*, 228–244.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). If we are so rich, why aren't we happy? *American Psychologist, 54*, 821–827.

Deaton, A. (2008). Income, health, and well-being around the world: Evidence from the Gallup World Poll. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 22*, 53–72.

Diener, E. (1994). Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities. *Social Indicators Research, 31*, 103–157.

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 34–43.

Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 653–663.

Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 851–864.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 403–425.

Diener, E., & Suh, E. M. (1999). National differences in subjective well-being. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R., & Smith, H. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*, 276–302.

Diener, E., & Suh, E. M. (2000). *Culture and subjective well-being.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Edwards, L. M., Holtz, C. A., & Green, M. B. (2007). Promoting strengths among culturally diverse youth in schools. *School Psychology Forum, 2*, 39–49.

Edwards, L. M., & Lopez, S. J. (2006). Perceived family support, acculturation, and life satisfaction in Mexican American youth: A mixed methods exploration. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 279–287.

Jackson, F. L. C. (1992). Race and ethnicity as biological constructs. *Race and Ethnicity, 2*, 120–125.

Hanson, W. E., Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Petska, K. S., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 224–235.

Hays, P. A. (2001). *Addressing cultural complexities in practice.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hays, P. A. (2007). *Addressing cultural complexities in practice: Assessment, diagnosis, and therapy* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Heine, S. J., & Lehaman, D. R. (1995). Cultural variation in unrealistic optimism: Does the West feel more invulnerable than the East? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 595–607.

Howell, R. T., & Howell, C. J. (2008). The relation of economic status to subjective well-being in developing countries: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*, 536–560.

Kaplan, J. S., & Sue, S. (1997). Ethnic psychology in the United States. In D. F. Halpern & A. E. Voiskounsky (Eds.), *States of mind. American and post-Soviet perspectives on contemporary issues in psychotherapy* (pp. 349–369). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Kurokawa, M. (2000). Culture, emotion, and well-being: Good feelings in Japan and the United States. *Cognition and Emotion, 14*, 93–124.

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: Critical review of concepts and definitions.* Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114,* 395–412.

Lee, R. M. (2005). Resilience against discrimination: Ethnic identity and other-group orientation as protective factors for Korean Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 36–44.

Leong, F. T. L., & Wong, P. T. P. (2003). Optimal human functioning from cross-cultural perspectives: Cultural competence as an organizing framework. In W. B. Walsh (Ed.), *Counseling psychology and optimal human functioning* (pp. 123–150). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lopez, S. J., Edwards, L. M., Pedrotti, J. T., Prosser, E. C., Walton, S. L., Spalitto, S. V., et al. (2006). Beyond the DSM: Assumptions, alternatives, and alterations. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 84,* 259–267.

Lopez, S. J., Gariglietti, K. P., McDermott, D., Sherwin, E. D., Floyd, R. K., Rand, K., et al. (2000). Hope for the evolution of diversity: On leveling the field of dreams. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *The handbook of hope* (pp. 220–240). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lopez, S. J., Prosser, E. C., Edwards, L. M., Magyar-Moe, J., Neufeld, J., & Rasmussen, H. (2002). Putting positive psychology in a multicultural context. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *The handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 700–714). New York: Oxford Press.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224–253.

Mio, J. S., Barker-Hackett, L., & Tumambing, J. D. (2006). *Multicultural psychology: Understanding our diverse communities.* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Morrow, S. L., Rakhsha, G., & Castaneda, C. L. (2001). Qualitative research methods for multicultural counseling. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 575–603). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Myers, D. G. (1992). *The pursuit of happiness.* New York: Avon Books.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pedersen, P. B. (1990). The multicultural perspective as a fourth force in counseling. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 12,* 93–95.

Pedersen, P. B. (1996). Intercultural counseling: U. S. perspectives. In D. W. Sue, A. E. Ivey, & P. B. Pedersen, (Eds.), *A theory of multicultural counseling and therapy.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Pedrotti, J. T. (2007). Eastern perspectives on positive psychology. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical explorations of human strengths* (pp. 37–50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pedrotti, J. T., & Edwards, L. M. (in press). The intersection of positive psychology and multiculturalism in counseling. In J. Ponterotto, M. Casas, L. Suzuki, & C. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pedrotti, J. T., Edwards, L. M., & Lopez, S. J. (2008). Working with multiracial clients in therapy: Bridging theory, research and practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39,* 192–201.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7,* 156–176.

Phinney, J. S. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 63–81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Romero, A. J., & Roberts, R. E. (2003a). The impact of multiple dimensions of ethnic identity on discrimination and adolescent's self-esteem. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33,* 2288–2305.

Romero, A. J., & Roberts, R. E. (2003b). Stress within a bicultural context for adolescents of Mexican descent. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9*(2), 171–184.

Sandage, S., Hill, P. C., & Vang, H. C. (2003). Toward a multicultural positive psychology: Indigenous forgiveness and Hmong culture. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31,* 564–592.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55,* 5–14.

Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J. (2007) *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical explorations of human strengths.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sue, D. W., & Constantine, M. G. (2003). Optimal human functioning in people of color in the United States. In B. W. Walsh (Ed.), *Counseling Psychology and optimal human functioning* (pp. 151–169). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sue, S. (1983). Ethnic minority issues in psychology: A reexamination. *American Psychologist, 38,* 583–592.

Suh, E. (2002). Culture, identity consistency, and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83,* 1378–1391.

Suh, E., Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Triandis, H. C. (1998). The shifting basis of life satisfaction judgments across cultures: Emotions versus norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 482–493.

Suh, E., & Oishi, S. (2004). Culture and subjective well-being: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 5,* 219–222.

Triandis, H. C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist, 51,* 407–415.

Triandis, H. C. (2000). Cultural syndromes and subjective well-being. In E. Diener & E. M. Suh (Eds.), *Culture and subjective well-being* (pp. 13–36). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Wright, B. A. (1991). Labeling: The need for greater person-environment individuation. In C. R. Snyder & D. R. Forsyth (Eds.), *The handbook of social and clinical psychology* (pp. 469–487). New York: Pergamon.

Wright, B. A., & Lopez, S. J. (2002). Widening the diagnostic focus: A case for including human strengths and environmental resources. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 26–44). New York: Oxford University Press.

Yoo, H. C., & Lee, R. M. (2005). Ethnic identity and approach-type coping as moderators of the racial discrimination/well-being relation in Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 497–506.

Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory on racial differences: Scientific, social, and ethical issues. *American Psychologist, 45,* 1297–1303.