Diversity in Psychology: Multiculturalism, Gender, and Sexuality
If you went to see a psychologist who was different from you, would you be concerned about the psychologist’s ability to understand you and your issues? A conversation I had with my neighbor, Gabriela, a 20-year-old Hispanic woman, highlights the importance of this question. Knowing that I was a psychologist, Gabriela asked me if I could refer her to another psychologist to help her with some personal issues. I was happy to help and gave her a list of a few names of colleagues I highly recommended. She thanked me, looked down at the list, and asked, “Um, do you know how old they are? And are any of them Hispanic? And this one whose first name is Jordan—is that a man or a woman?” Gabriela explained, “I just want to find someone like me. I’m afraid that someone who is too different—someone who is not Hispanic, someone who is much older than me, someone who is a man—won’t appreciate what I’m really going through or where I’m coming from. I just won’t be as comfortable talking to them. They might not ‘get’ me.”

Is there truth to what Gabriela was thinking? In your experience, are people of different ethnicities, ages, or genders so different that they can’t “get” each other? And if that is true about differences in those variables, is it also true about differences in religion, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, disability status, and others? If it is true between a client and a therapist, is it true in other kinds of relationships too? Simply put, how different, and how similar, are we?

These are the kinds of questions that underlie the main topic of this chapter, diversity. We’ll consider lots of issues regarding the diverse range of people that surround you in your town, your city, your country, and your planet. For example, we’ll explore what a culture is and the various characteristics of a culture. We’ll examine some of the differences that exist between, and within, cultural groups. We’ll learn how people adapt when they find themselves immersed in a different culture. We’ll investigate ways that you can maximize your ability to live successfully in a multicultural world. Lastly, we’ll take a detailed look at sources of diversity—gender and sexuality—that are especially impactful in all of our lives.
Diversity Surrounds You

You live in an increasingly diverse world. Whether you define that world narrowly like your neighborhood or town, or more broadly like your state or country, the world’s population is mixing and mingling like never before. To understand why the field of psychology has devoted so much attention to the issue of diversity, let’s consider some of the numbers that show what a varied assortment we have become. (Please note: In most chapters, Diversity Matters tags appear when the material highlights diversity issues. This entire chapter highlights diversity in many forms, so the tags are not used.)

Diversity by the Numbers

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the following is how U.S. residents collectively answered questions about themselves in terms of race and ethnicity, language, religion, age, education, income, and other topics relating to diversity (United States Census Bureau [USCB], 2011, with specific tables noted; plus other sources as marked):

Race and Ethnicity. The majority (62%) of the U.S. population describes itself as White, 18% as Hispanic, 12% as Black or African American, 6% as Asian, 1% as Native American or Alaska Native, 2% as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and 1.7% as multiracial. These numbers are changing, however, with percentages of Hispanic, multiracial, Asian, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander people rising most rapidly (Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, 2014; USCB, 2011, Table 6).

Language. With so many ethnic groups, many of which include large numbers of new immigrants, it should come as no surprise that a sizable number of U.S. residents—19.7%, to be specific—speak a language other than English at home (USCB, 2011, Table 54). The number is higher in large U.S. cities, where new immigrants tend to congregate. Of the 25 largest cities in the United States, in only four (Baltimore, Detroit, Indianapolis, and Memphis) do over 90% of residents speak English at home. In about half of those 25 largest cities, at least one-third of residents speak a language other than English at home. Most often, that language is Spanish (USCB, 2011, Table 55). See Table 10.1 for details.

Religion. The United States is primarily (81.1%) Christian, but about 1–2% of the population subscribes to each of these religions: Judaism, Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism. A number of other religious groups are represented in smaller numbers as well. Within Christianity, there is notable diversity: approximately 24% Catholic, 18% Protestant, 22.1% Independent, 12.9% Evangelical, and 15.1% unaffiliated (Keller, 2014). About 12% of people describe themselves as nonreligious. In recent years, the trends among the country’s religious diversity have included a decrease in the number of Christians and an increase in the number of non-Christian and nonreligious people (Pew Research Center, 2015).

Age. In the United States, about 5–7% of the population falls into each 5-year age range starting with the youngest children (0–4 years old) and continuing through middle age (54–59 years old). About 18% of the population is over 60, including about 6% over 75. That older demographic has grown in recent decades and is projected to continue to grow in the future. Since 1980, the average age of Americans has risen from 30 to almost 37 (USCB, 2011, Table 7).

Sexual Orientation. Sexual orientation rates depend on who is surveyed and how the surveys are conducted (as described in detail later in this chapter), but experts on
the subject typically agree that about 2–4% of the U.S. population identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual (Gates & Newport, 2013). Rates differ widely across various parts of the country, with higher gay, lesbian, and bisexual rates in certain cities (for example, San Francisco, Portland, Maine, and Austin, Texas) than in other cities or rural areas (Newport & Gates, 2015; Laumann et al., 2004).

**Education.** Two significant milestones in U.S. education are high school and college graduation. About 85% of U.S. residents graduate from high school, but only about 28% graduate from college. At the lower end, about 6% don’t even finish ninth grade. At the upper end, about 10% earn a graduate degree (USCB, 2011, Table 36).

**Income.** The median family income in the United States is about $63,000, but the range is tremendous, as illustrated in Figure 10.1. The lower end of the range (families making less than $20,000 per year) and the upper end of the range (families making over $150,000 per year) are roughly equal in number; about 11% each. When you consider that the upper end doesn’t have an upper limit—it includes some families making many millions per year—you realize the tremendous economic diversity within the U.S. population (USCB, 2011, Table 36).

**Big City or Small Town.** About half of the U.S. population lives in the country’s 39 largest cities (governing.com, 2015). Another 30% or so live in towns with at least 2500 people. The remaining approximately 20% live in rural areas, defined as towns with fewer than 2500 people (USCB, 2011, Table 29). That mix of cities, towns, and rural areas also shows up in a state-by-state comparison of population density. The roomiest states—such as Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, and Alaska—have fewer than 10 people per square mile. The most crowded states—like Massachusetts, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Connecticut—have over 70 times that many people per square mile (USCB, 2011, Table 13).

We just considered each of these diversity variables separately, but they exist in different combinations in different people. Each of us has a race or ethnicity and a religion and an economic level and a sexual orientation, and so on. To discuss that combination, psychologists often use the term *intersectionality.* The term emphasizes that each person lives at the intersection of his or her own combination of diversity factors. When psychologists (and researchers in other fields) study intersectionality, they often focus on the struggles of people whose combination of diversity factors is the least privileged or most oppressed within a society. For example, researchers might study people who face discrimination (due to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) and simultaneously live in poverty. In recent years, psychologists have increasingly explored ways to work toward social justice and equity to minimize the negative psychological consequences experienced by many people living at such unfortunate intersections (Rosenthal, 2016; Cole, 2009; Lewis et al., 2015; Carbado et al., 2013; Crenshaw, 1991).

The main point of all the numbers we reviewed in this section is to demonstrate just how much diversity surrounds you. Each of the diversity variables we considered—race and ethnicity, language, religion, age, sexual orientation, education, money, and population density—all span wide ranges. Collectively, these variables produce an incredibly diverse national profile. All of these variables can contribute to *culture* as well, a topic to which we turn now.

**What Constitutes a Culture?**

A *culture* is a set of shared beliefs, values, and patterns of behavior within a group of people. The qualities that tie a cultural group together can be any number of things. For example, culture can form around any type of diversity—including sex, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, age, education, and so on. Some of these qualities might seem
apparent when you first meet someone. Other qualities might not be so apparent, at least until you get to know them—including religious beliefs, amount of education or wealth, and even race or ethnicity. Any of those qualities, and many others too, can have an important impact on how you live your life. Specifically, those qualities can shape your worldview: a comprehensive, culturally influenced way of approaching and understanding the world around you.

To illustrate some real differences in culture and worldview, let’s consider two people of different cultural backgrounds. To keep it simple, let’s focus on just three characteristics: age, race/ethnicity, and religion. Jasmin is 25 years old, African American, and Christian. Asmita is 75 years old, Indian, and Hindu. Based on these three qualities alone, what differences might you expect between Jasmin’s and Asmita’s beliefs and behaviors? The religious difference could affect what either woman believes about higher powers and what happens after we die. The race/ethnicity difference could affect the holidays the women celebrate and the roles they fill within their families. The age difference could affect their approaches to dating, education, and technology. Even if we limit ourselves to considering just these three qualities, it is clear that Jasmin and Asmita may have very different cultural experiences. Just imagine if there were even more differences—if one were male and the other female, if one were rich and the other poor, if one lived in a huge city and the other lived in a rural area, or if one were a high school dropout and the other had a graduate degree. Their cultural worlds might be incredibly different.

Great point. We certainly don’t want our efforts to appreciate culture to accidentally morph into prejudice (or stereotyping or discrimination, for that matter). That is why it is so important to use dynamic sizing: the ability to simultaneously know the norm for a group and recognize that the norm might not apply to every member of that group. When you consider another person’s culture, you want to know what is typical for that culture, but you don’t want to assume that every person is typical (Sue, 1998, 2006).

There are differences not only between but also within cultural groups. Let’s consider Jasmin and Asmita again. Without dynamic sizing, someone might look at their ages and assume that they live in different worlds when it comes to technology: Jasmin practically lives online, while Asmita has far less interest in anything computer-related. But with dynamic sizing, you would at least consider the possibility that Jasmin or Asmita doesn’t fit the norm for her respective generation. Perhaps Asmita uses Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Skype, while Jasmin doesn’t even have a smartphone. You can’t be sure until you get to know each of them. Dynamic sizing doesn’t mean blindness to cultural norms, just flexibility in applying them to specific people.

**Defining Culture.** Over the history of psychology, there has been some debate and some change about exactly what constitutes a culture. When psychology began to give cultural issues serious attention (around the 1960s and 1970s), culture was essentially defined as race/ethnicity. In the United States and around the world, race/ethnicity has been a powerful factor in many interpersonal interactions, from education to employment to wars. But as time has gone by, psychologists have expanded the definition of culture (Triandis, 2007; Fukuyama et al., 2014; Pedersen, 1999; Sue et al., 1996; Arredondo et al., 1996).

Today, there are lots of variables besides race/ethnicity that psychologists consider culturally relevant. We discussed many of them earlier in this chapter as we considered the diversity of the population: age, religion, education level, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, and urban or rural setting. But the list can certainly expand beyond that. Gender, of course, is an important cultural variable (and one to which we will
Dynamic Sizing Is Like Appreciating Brittney Griner’s Height

Women, as a group, are shorter than men. Your experience tells you that, and so do the facts: Average height for grown women in the United States is 5 feet, 3.8 inches, compared to 5 feet, 9.3 inches for men (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012). But that doesn’t mean that every woman falls near the women’s average, and every man falls near the men’s average. Consider Brittney Griner. She’s the 6-foot, 8-inch basketball star who earned All-American honors and won an NCAA championship at Baylor, then became an all-star and a WNBA champion with the Phoenix Mercury. Brittney Griner towers over almost every woman and man she meets.

So, two things are true: (1) As a group, women tend to be about 5 feet, 4 inches tall; and (2) as an individual member of that group, Brittney Griner is much taller than that. Appreciating both of those facts at the same time is just like dynamic sizing.

When psychologists consider culture, they simultaneously consider what is common within that culture and the possibility that a particular member of that culture might not be so common. For example, someone from an individualistic country might be very collectivistic. Or, someone who is old might act very young. Or, someone from a big city might have small-town values. There is lots of variation within any cultural group, just like there is lots of height variation within a gender. Dynamic sizing reminds us that not everyone within a group has characteristics typical of that group, which helps us to avoid stereotyping and prejudice.

On average, women tend to be shorter than men. But at 6 ft 8 in, WNBA star Brittney Griner towers above almost all women and men. Her exceptional height serves as a reminder of the importance of dynamic sizing: the ability to simultaneously know the norm for a group and recognize that the norm might not apply to every member of that group. Dynamic sizing can be especially helpful in appreciating differences within a cultural group. David Sherman/Getty Images

devote significant time later in this chapter). Some have also argued for the importance of other cultural variables too, like disability status and region (within the country).

One way to determine whether a characteristic is culturally important is to ask yourself whether you would experience culture shock if you found your situation changed tomorrow. Culture shock is feeling disoriented or bewildered with an unfamiliar situation. For example, consider a 78-year-old man who lives in a retirement home. If he moved to a college residence hall, would he experience culture shock? How about a lifelong resident of the south side of Chicago? Would she experience culture shock if she found herself living in a small mining town in West Virginia? Or a prisoner who has been locked up for years: Does culture shock come with a new life on the outside? There is a good chance that these situations would cause culture shock, at least to some degree, since they would both involve significant change in some fundamental aspects of daily life.

Subcultures. Regarding the question of what constitutes a culture, the list could include what some people would consider subcultures: for example, military culture, prison culture, even cultures of specific professions or political parties. In my own therapy practice, I have learned to appreciate not only my clients’ cultures, but their subcultures as well. With Dylan, a 19-year-old college sophomore, I learned not to even offer 8 A.M. appointments. The college student culture in which he lived—in the college residence hall where students often stayed up late studying, talking, or partying—made it practically impossible for him. As he once reminded me: “You know 8 A.M. is like the middle of the night for me, right?” With Amy, a stay-at-home mom of twin 6-month-olds, I came to respect the “baby culture” in which she and so many of her friends were immersed. In this baby culture, parents’ work, sleep, and sex lives revolved around nap times, bath times, and diaper changes. And, according to Amy, almost everybody had traded in their cool cars for minivans. With David, a high-ranking executive at a Fortune 500 firm, I realized that the overriding expectation in his corporate culture was worldview

A comprehensive, culturally influenced way of approaching and understanding the world around you.

dynamic sizing

The ability to simultaneously know the norm for a group and recognize that the norm might not apply to every member of that group.
Diversity in Psychology

that the job always comes first. David often missed out on important family events and even took phone calls from his coworkers during our therapy sessions. Dylan, Amy, and David each live in a world affected not only by widely recognized cultural variables, but also specific subcultures.

Studies have shown that clients like and benefit from a therapist’s cultural sensitivity, because they feel like the therapist respects them, cares about them, and "gets" them (Fuertes et al., 2006; Constantine, 2002; Atkinson et al., 1992; Gim et al., 1991). This cultural appreciation is not just for the benefit of therapists and their clients, however. It is also for anyone who hopes to better understand the factors that influence the lives of everyone.

CHECK YOUR LEARNING:

10.1 In what ways is the United States a diverse nation?
10.2 What is culture, and how does it influence a person's worldview?

10.3 What is dynamic sizing, and why is it important to appreciating differences within a group?
10.4 How has the definition of culture changed over the years?

10.5 What multiculturalism is and how important it has become in psychology.
10.6 How the understanding of cultural differences has changed over the years.
10.7 How multiculturalism is reflected in psychology today.
10.8 What acculturation is.
10.9 About different acculturation strategies.
10.10 What acculturative stress is.
10.11 About specific ways in which cultures differ from each other.
10.12 About differences that diversity makes in everyday life.
10.13 What cultural intelligence is.
10.14 What microaggressions are.

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism is a psychological approach that highlights the importance and value of multiple cultural groups within a society. Let's explore the topic of multiculturalism, beginning with a consideration of the role multiculturalism has played over the years.

The Importance of Multiculturalism in Psychology

In the earliest years of psychology, cultural issues received almost no attention. With rare exceptions, psychology was a science by and for White men (Guthrie, 2004; Hilgard et al., 1991; Scarborough & Furumoto, 1987). In the 1960s and 1970s, issues of culture, especially race/ethnicity and gender, started to appear in the field. This happened, in part, because more ethnic minorities and women were contributing to psychological research, and their contributions were increasingly focused on topics related to their own cultural characteristics. The prominence of cultural issues grew through the 1980s and then exploded in the 1990s and 2000s, as the U.S. population and the members of the psychology profession continued to become more diverse.

Today, multiculturalism is undoubtedly a dominant movement in psychology. In fact, some have called it the dominant movement in psychology, going so far as to label it the “fourth force” in psychology’s history (Pedersen, 1990, 1999, 2008). The three major forces that came before—Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalysis, B. F. Skinner’s behaviorism, and Carl Rogers’s humanism (all of which are covered in Chapter 12)—can all be enhanced by multiculturalism (Hall, 2014; Bugental, 1964). Multiculturalism blends with other approaches to psychology, enabling them to be adapted and customized for members of diverse cultural groups.

Understanding Cultural Differences. The way that psychologists understand cultural differences has changed as multiculturalism has become more integrated in the field. This change has taken place in four stages (Leong, 2014; Leong et al., 2012a,b). At first, psychologists used a deficit model to understand cultural differences. This model suggests that a difference is a deficit—specifically, a difference from the White
male perspective. So, if psychologists recognized that women or members of racial/ethnic minorities did anything differently, that difference was seen as an inherent, built-in shortcoming in comparison to the "right" way—the way that White males did it. The obvious problem with this approach is that no one group does things in an objectively "right" way, which means that other ways shouldn't be viewed as deficits.

The deficit model was replaced by the culturally disadvantaged model, which said that the shortcomings were socially created (rather than inherent or built-in). The idea of the deficit was still there, but now the deficit was due to nurture (rather than nature)—including poverty, malnutrition, poor parenting, second-rate schooling, and so on. The same problem still existed, though: No single group's behavior should be seen as "right," with other groups being inferior by comparison.

Thankfully, a big shift came with the cultural pluralism model, the basic idea of which is that a cultural difference is not a deficiency. According to cultural pluralism, neither the White male way of doing things, nor any other particular way of doing things, is better than any other. Each cultural group brings its own unique approach, and each cultural group represents naturally occurring variation within the human species.

The most recent model is the positive psychology model, which not only rejects the idea that cultural difference is deficiency, but goes a step further and argues that the unique qualities of each culture are strengths and virtues worthy of celebration. As an example, consider speech patterns. Specifically, consider how the typical speech patterns of White men might differ from those of women or racial/ethnic minority groups—everything from sentence structure to vocabulary to the underlying purpose of conversations. Decades ago, that different style of speaking would have been viewed as an inborn deficiency, or a bit later, as a deficiency caused by an inferior environment. More recently, those different styles of speaking would be recognized as equally legitimate to any other, or applauded as uniquely impressive and worthy.

**Multiculturalism in Contemporary Psychology.** Today, the importance of multiculturalism in psychology is obvious. The American Psychological Association now includes quite a few divisions devoted to multicultural or diversity-related topics, including Division 35 (Society for the Psychology of Women), Division 36 (Society for the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality), Division 44 (Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues), Division 45 (Society for the Psychological Study of Culture, Ethnicity, and Race), and Division 51 (Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity). There are dozens of professional psychology journals that regularly publish articles on multicultural topics (see a sampling of journals in Table 10.2), and the number of books on multicultural topics is staggering.

Recent revisions of the profession’s Code of Ethics have added numerous standards requiring psychologists to do therapy, assessment, and research with sensitivity to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 10.2: Psychology Journals That Focus on Multicultural Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity &amp; Ethnic Minority Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Black Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Religion and Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Women Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Latina/o Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Men and Masculinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American Journal of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Rural Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Language and Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**multiculturalism** An approach in psychology that highlights the importance and value of multiple cultural groups within a society.
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Cultural issues (American Psychological Association, 2010). For example, if Dr. Yancey (who is Christian) has a therapy session with Aaron (who is Jewish), Dr. Yancey has an ethical obligation to appreciate and respect Aaron’s viewpoint and his experience of religiously relevant events. Likewise, if Dr. Yancey (a U.S. psychologist) is going to give an intelligence test to Reka, who recently moved to the United States from Hungary, Dr. Yancey has an ethical obligation to think about several factors as he chooses, administers, and interprets the results of the test: Reka’s linguistic abilities, Reka’s understanding of the purpose of the test, and how Reka’s cultural background might influence some of her answers.

Speaking of tests, the makers of psychology’s most widely respected intelligence tests, personality tests, and other assessment tools have gone to great lengths to make their tests more culture-fair than such tests were in the early and mid-1900s. Rather than asking questions that only people with certain cultural backgrounds might answer correctly, or using images only of one cultural group, they have deliberately created questions and images that are more accessible and recognizable to a wider range of people.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), the book that lists and defines all of the disorders that psychologists use to diagnose their clients, covers more culture than it ever has too (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Compared to earlier editions, DSM now includes lots of information about how various disorders might be experienced differently by members of different cultures. For example, in some Asian countries, social anxiety centers on making others uncomfortable in social situations rather than feeling uncomfortable yourself.

DSM also gives psychologists a heads-up about certain psychological problems that are unique to certain cultures (“Cultural Concepts of Distress”). For example, susto (an experience in which psychological and physical symptoms follow a frightening event that causes the soul to leave the body) is unique to some Latinos. For another example, maladi moun (an experience in which a malicious or envious person can “send” depression or other psychological problems to another) is unique to some Haitians. Together, all of these developments across psychology show that multiculturalism has earned a prominent place in the field.

So, is multiculturalism the same thing as the “melting pot” idea?

Not exactly. Think about a melting pot in the literal sense: The fate of the ingredients is to melt away, to lose their unique flavor as they fade into the preexisting contents of the pot (Berry, 2003; Sam, 2006). That is a metaphor that became popular in the United States for quite a while, but a patchwork quilt is a better metaphor for the multicultural approach. In a patchwork quilt, each patch retains its unique identity, while at the same time being an integral part of the whole quilt. In much the same way, multiculturalism encourages members of diverse cultural groups to both join in with the larger society and to hold on to special aspects of their own heritage.

As an example, consider the Zhang family, who immigrated from China to the United States. They might choose to watch fireworks on the Fourth of July, sign their kids up for hockey teams, and eat plenty of burgers and fries. But they might also choose to continue to celebrate the Chinese New Year, play competitive table tennis, and eat seaweed soup and Peking duck. The multicultural approach, more than the melting-pot approach, suggests that there’s room for both cultures.

Acculturation: Managing Multiple Cultures

The Zhang family’s move from China to the United States raises the issue of acculturation: managing a life that involves the coexistence of more than one culture. Acculturation is basically how much to hold on to your old culture and how much
Acculturation strategies are determined by how the person answers two questions: (1) To what extent will I retain my previous culture? (2) To what extent will I embrace my new culture? As Figure 10.2 shows, there are four distinct strategies for approaching acculturation: assimilation, separation, marginalization, and integration (Berry, 1980, 2003; Rivera, 2010):

- **Assimilation** is an acculturation strategy in which the person adopts the new culture and rejects the old culture. For members of the Zhang family, assimilation might mean dropping any connection to language, religion, customs, clothing, food, or other elements of their life in China and entering the U.S. mainstream as much as possible. Assimilation is the acculturation strategy that most closely matches the melting pot idea (Berry, 2006a).

- **Separation** is an acculturation strategy in which the person retains the old culture and rejects the new culture. For the Zhang family, separation might involve choosing to live among Chinese neighbors, to speak Mandarin rather than English, and to eat exactly what they ate in China, all without adopting any part of a more mainstream U.S. lifestyle.

- **Marginalization** is an acculturation strategy in which the person rejects both the new culture and the old culture. For the Zhang family, marginalization might mean not celebrating any U.S. or Chinese holidays, and not forming close connections with the Chinese or mainstream American communities.

- **Integration** is an acculturation strategy in which the person adopts both the new culture and the old culture. For the Zhang family, integration might mean embracing the holidays, sports, food, and other elements of both mainland U.S. and Chinese lifestyles. Integration is the acculturation strategy that most closely matches the multicultural approach (Berry, 2006a).

Think of these four approaches to acculturation along two dimensions, one that measures attachment to new culture, and another that measures attachment to old culture. Over time, people might adjust their acculturation strategies, moving up or down one of the dimensions, as they spend more time in the new culture (Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2001; Rudmin, 2003; Ryder et al., 2000).

Acculturative Stress. Living between two cultures often causes acculturative stress: the physical or psychological stress that comes from acculturation. Acculturative stress can include lots of things that immigrants and other newcomers to cultural groups often experience: language difficulties; pressure to dress, speak, or behave in a certain way; harassment and discrimination; and lack of necessary skills or knowledge (Birman & Simon, 2014; Berry, 1970, 2006b). Most of those stressors come from members of the new, larger group (in the Zhangs’ case, mainstream U.S. culture).

There can also be pressure from members of the person’s group (in the Zhangs’ case, other Chinese or Asian immigrants) to conform and stay true to their roots.
Diversity in Psychology (Contrada et al., 2001; French & Chavez, 2010). One study found that among Latino college students, pressure to conform to their own group was a significant factor in their overall life satisfaction (Ojeda et al., 2012). These pressures to conform could include dating and hanging out with other Latinos, listening to the music that other Latinos listen to, or dressing like other Latinos dress. Another study found similar results for U.S. college students of Asian descent: The pressure to conform to their own group predicted anxiety better than any other variable the researchers examined, including perceived discrimination and concern about fulfilling stereotypes (French et al., 2013). Similar observations have been made about African American students teasing each other for being “too White” when they get good grades (Contrada et al., 2000).

Among the four acculturation strategies, integration has consistently been linked with the best adaptation to stress and the fewest psychological problems. Marginalization, on the other hand, typically produces the worst results in terms of stress management and overall mental health. The two strategies that involve choosing one culture over the other—assimilation and separation—fall somewhere in between (Nguyen, 2006; Berry et al., 2006b; Berry & Sam, 1997). Other factors that predict good adjustment to acculturation stress include an agreeable, extra-verted, stable personality; young age (preschool kids adjust better than older kids and adults); plenty of education and money; and high levels of social support from both the new and the old cultures (Kosic, 2006; Ward et al., 2004; Berry, 2006b; Kealey, 1989; Berry et al., 1987).

How Do Cultures Differ?

It is pretty clear that there are differences between cultures. But how, specifically, do they differ?

Of course, there are the outward signs of culture, like the clothes people wear, the food they eat, the religious texts they read, and the customs they maintain. But what about underlying cultural values that shape those outward signs of culture and the beliefs that maintain them?

One researcher, Geert Hofstede, conducted a massive, long-term study of IBM employees beginning in the late 1960s that answers this question. In the study, Hofstede asked IBM workers from 50 different countries to describe the characteristics they noticed in their colleagues from other countries. From thousands of their responses, he started to piece together the underlying values of people from many different cultures. He then boiled these values down to just four fundamental values that diverse cultures hold (Hofstede, 1980). In recent years, Hofstede and other researchers have continued this line of research with other populations in even more countries, and the more recent research has confirmed the existence of his four original cultural values and added two more (Hofstede et al., 2010; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2001; Minkov & Hofstede, 2010, 2011; Minkov, 2013). Let’s discuss each of those six values.

**Individualism Versus Collectivism.** Individualism is a worldview that emphasizes the well-being of the individual over the well-being of the group. Its opposite, collectivism, is a worldview that emphasizes the well-being of the group over the well-being of the individual. As Figure 10.3 shows, generally, U.S. culture leans toward individualism. By contrast, some other countries, especially many from Asia, lean toward collectivism (Oyserman et al., 2002; Triandis et al., 1988). (Of course, there’s plenty of variation within the cultural groups too—some people within each culture lean the opposite way.)
The contrast between strongly individualistic cultures and strongly collectivistic cultures is striking. People from individualistic cultures tend to be driven more by this question: “What’s best for me?” People from collectivistic cultures tend to be driven instead by this question: “What’s best for us?” For people in collectivistic cultures, us can be defined in any number of ways, from a friendship to a romantic relationship to a family or a group of coworkers (Brewer & Chen, 2007; Hui & Triandis, 1986).

At one point in my psychotherapy practice, I had two clients who were each 22-year-old college seniors. Both were applying to law school, and both were equally strong applicants. David, who had more individualistic values, told me about how he decided where to apply: “Here’s what I’m looking for: a law school with a great reputation, that specializes in the areas of law I want to practice, and that’s in a big city.”

He applied to about 10 such schools, all around the country, and bought himself a congratulatory new big-screen TV when he got into his top choice, which was a thousand miles away. Mia, who had more collectivistic values, approached her application decisions differently: “I’m only applying to law schools here in town. My parents are nearby, and I might need to help take care of them. They’re getting older, you know. Plus, there’s that family I nanny for part-time. I don’t want to make them go through the hassle of finding someone else. And my boyfriend, he didn’t exactly come out and say it, but he made it pretty clear that he doesn’t want to do a long-distance thing.”

She got into a local law school and maintained all of those previous relationships while attending.

**Large Versus Small Power Distance.** A culture with a large power distance is a power structure, or hierarchy, in which the people on the top have way more power than the people on the bottom. This cultural power structure is much like that at many large corporations: The boss can make big changes that have major effects on lower-level workers and there is nothing the lower-level workers can do about it.

By contrast, in a culture with a small power distance, the distance between people with varying levels of power is much smaller. In fact, in some of these cultures, there is little difference in power: Everyone has nearly the same amount of power, and leadership is often shared or rotating. As an example, consider how a family decides when a child should get their first smartphone. In a family with a large power difference, the decision belongs to the parent absolutely. In a family with a small power difference the decision may ultimately be the parent’s to make, but the child may have much more input on the decision.

**Assertiveness Versus Caring.** Some cultures are much more assertive and cutthroat than others. In these cultures, most interactions are competitions, with clear winners and losers. Strangers are not to be helped, or even trusted. Instead, the best strategy is to remain vigilant and protect yourself. In these cultures, assertiveness is the undercurrent of daily life.

In other cultures, that undercurrent is caring. Strangers are befriended, and even those who might otherwise be called losers because of their low social or economic status are respected. Vigilance is not a pressing need, because other people are trustworthy. Hofstede often referred to the assertive approach as traditionally masculine, and the caring approach as traditionally feminine, but it is worth noting that this cultural value affects members of both genders.

**Avoidance Versus Acceptance of Uncertainty.** In some cultures, tradition is everything and it pressures people to think, feel, and behave in certain ways, depending on the situation. This way, there is no uncertainty or ambivalence to cause anxiety. Other cultures embrace that uncertainty or ambivalence. They welcome new ideas and novel situations. They have fewer laws and social guidelines (both official and unspoken) to restrict people’s behavior. They allow plenty of debate between various viewpoints, rather than insisting that one particular viewpoint is the only truth.
**Long- Versus Short-Term Orientation.** People in cultures with a long-term orientation keep an eye on distant goals, and they work hard to reach them, often by saving their money and adapting when the going gets tough. By contrast, in cultures with shorter-term orientations, quick results are more important, and goals that bring immediate results are a high priority. In other words, rather than savers, they are spenders.

**Indulgence Versus Restraint.** In some cultures, it is all about the current moment and it is OK to indulge in what feels good now. In other cultures, the mentality is much more controlled and reserved. People in these cultures tend to put off immediate pleasure and instead prefer a stoic, muted way of life.

No short list of cultural characteristics can capture all of the complex and subtle differences between cultures, but these six characteristics describe a good portion of those differences. **Figure 10.4** shows a profile for the United States on all six of these cultural characteristics. (You can compare the United States to any other country with Chapter App 10.1.) You’ll see that the United States is remarkably high in individualism, has a short-term orientation, and is a bit more indulgent than restrained. If you compare the United States to South Korea (as an example), you’ll notice drastic differences in individualism, long-term orientation, and indulgence versus restraint, as well as mild differences on the other variables. The point here is that countries around the world differ widely on some important, measurable cultural characteristics.

**What Difference Does Diversity Make?**

It is clear that cultural groups differ from each other in many meaningful ways, but what does all that difference mean in your day-to-day life? Which specific behaviors, thoughts, and feelings might relate to your membership in a particular ethnic, religious, or other cultural group? The answers are actually sprinkled throughout this book. Every chapter offers some information (usually highlighted by a Diversity Matters tag) about how culture influences different experiences. Now let’s take a look at a sampling of the many ways that diversity makes a difference.

**Differences in Defining Identity.** When people from more individualistic cultures are asked to describe themselves, they tend to do so, well, individualistically. On the other hand, when people from more collectivistic cultures are asked to describe themselves, they describe themselves in connection to others (Rhee et al., 1995). In one study, researchers gave both Mexican American and White middle-schoolers the same open-ended prompt: Describe yourself. The Mexican American kids were more likely to use adjectives that implied a relationship to another person, like helpful or cooperative. The White kids were more likely to use adjectives that described personal, independent qualities, like smart and energetic (Dabul et al., 1995).

In another study, people from Malaysia (collectivistic) were compared to people from Australia and Britain (individualistic) in terms of how they finished this sentence: “I am _____.” The Malaysians were much more likely to give responses that showed membership in a family or group, like “I am a daughter” or “I am a Muslim.” Australians and Brits were more likely to describe their personal traits or characteristics, with no reference to other people: “I am honest,” “I am intelligent,” and so on (Bochner, 1994). In a similar study, Indian college students were more likely to mention a social role when describing themselves (“I am a student,” “I am an Indian”), but Americans were more likely to evaluate themselves (“I am trustworthy,” “I am clever,” “I am good-looking”) (Dhawan et al., 1995).

**Differences in Raising Children.** Parents with low levels of education and socioeconomic status are more likely to use physical punishment such as spanking
Dietz, 2000). Physical punishment is also most common in the Southern region of the United States and least common in the Northeast; more common among certain ethnicities (African American and Latinos, in most studies) than others; and more common among people from members of certain conservative religious groups (Gershoff, 2002; Straus & Stewart, 1999). On a separate note, kids in less industrialized countries (like Guatemala and Republic of the Congo) often have very different day-to-day experiences than kids in more industrialized countries such as the United States (Medin et al., 2007). Among other things, their parents often give them more household duties, including babysitting their younger siblings, at a much younger age, even 5–7 years old (Morelli et al., 2003).

**Differences in Feelings.** Generally speaking, most people in most cultures report feeling happy in most areas of their lives (Biswas-Diener et al., 2005). This overall happiness is reflected in a study that asked residents of 149 nations around the world about their overall happiness and found that only 25% of nations had an average below 5 on a scale of 0–10. But the study revealed significant variability across cultures too. Some countries had averages above 8, and others had averages below 3 (Veenhoven, 2012a,b). (Table 10.3 has some specific examples.)

There are other cultural differences in happiness too, especially in terms of what makes people happy and just how happy they tend to get (Mesquita & Leu, 2007; Tov & Diener, 2007). For example, in one study, U.S. and Asian students read another student’s diary entry that included some positive events, like getting the highest score in the class on a test. When asked what that student was feeling when the positive event happens, U.S. students reported only good feelings. However, Asian students reported a mix of good and bad feelings—with the bad feelings often related to interpersonal consequences like jealousy or envy (Leu et al., 2010).

In another study, U.S. and Asian students filled out questionnaires about their emotions four times a day (3 P.M., 6 P.M., 9 P.M., and midnight) for 8 consecutive days. They were asked to write down and rate the last feeling they had right before completing the questionnaire. Overall, Asian students reported feelings near a neutral level (neither pleasant nor unpleasant), but U.S. students reported feelings significantly above neutral and well into the “pleasant” range (Mesquita & Karasawa, 2002).

Even particular feelings can take on different connotations in different cultures. For example, people in more individualistic cultures like the United States and Australia typically experience pride as a good feeling and guilt as a bad feeling. However, in more collectivistic cultures like China and Taiwan, pride is not always so good, and guilt is not always so bad (Eid & Diener, 2001).

**Differences in Memory.** When asked to share as many early childhood memories as they could in 5 minutes, people from the United States and Britain came up with about twice as many memories as people from China (Wang et al., 2004). The content of the memories differs as well. People from collectivistic cultures tend to remember group actions and interpersonal relationships, such as a family trip, or a special connection with a teacher. However, people from individualistic cultures tend to remember individual successes and failures, such as winning an award, or performing poorly on a test (Mullen, 1994; Wang & Ross, 2005; Wang & Conway, 2004; Wang, 2006). Also, when asked to remember past emotional experiences, people from individualistic cultures tend to focus on the positive feelings like their team winning a championship, or graduating from high school. People from collectivistic cultures, however, tend to focus more equally on positive and negative feelings (Oishi, 2002; Ross et al., 2002; Wang & Ross, 2005).

**Differences in Seeing.** People from diverse cultures actually see the world in different ways. For example, consider the Müller-Lyer illusion, which demonstrates that the figures attached to the ends of a line can influence how long you estimate the line to be. In Figure 10.5 the two lines are actually the same length, but one may look
Diversity makes a difference in many areas of our lives, including how we feel, what we experience, and how we interact with others. It even makes a difference in how we use social media sites like Facebook.

**Figure 10.6 Seeing Parts in Isolation or in Context.** People from collectivistic cultures are better at drawing the hanging line at the same proportion it was in the original square (as shown on the bottom left). However people from individualistic cultures are better at drawing the hanging line at the same absolute height it appeared in the original square, regardless of the size of the second square (as shown on the bottom right). Information from Kitayama et al., 2003.

Another cultural difference in vision appears when people of Asian or U.S. backgrounds see a square with a small line hanging from the top (see Figure 10.6). When given a blank square of a different size and asked to add the hanging line to it, Americans are better at matching the exact length of the first hanging line (regardless of the size of the new square). However, Asians are better at matching the proportion of the hanging line to the new square (one-third the length of a new side). This difference suggests that people from collectivistic cultures tend to see items in context, while people from individualistic cultures tend to see items in isolation (Kitayama et al., 2003).

**Differences in Seeking Help.** In the United States, when people struggle with mental health problems, the odds that they seek professional help and stick with it depend on ethnicity and race (Meyer & Takeuchi, 2014). In general, ethnic and racial minorities seek help at much lower rates than Whites. Specifically, African Americans and Asian Americans are least likely to seek professional help for mental health problems, with Latinos only slightly higher (Padgett et al., 1994; Virnig et al., 2004; Meyer et al., 2009; Garland et al., 2014; Dobalian & Rivers, 2008).

Ethnic and racial minorities are also more likely than Whites to end treatment early (Wang, 2007). Researchers are trying to uncover the reasons for these differences, but the possibilities are many. The reasons include turning to family, friends, or religious leaders rather than mental health professionals; lack of trust in the mental health system; inability to find therapists culturally or linguistically similar to themselves; cultural values regarding shame and stigma of mental problems; and lack of the necessary money, insurance, transportation, or time (Snowden, 2007, 2012; Snowden & Yamada, 2005; Snowden et al., 2007, 2011).

**Differences in Sex Life.** Compared to college students in the United States, college students in China are less knowledgeable and experienced with sex. Specifically, Chinese college students lose their virginity later, have less premarital sex, have less oral sex, and participate in a narrower range of sexual activities than their U.S. counterparts (Tang et al., 1997). A study of ethnically diverse medical students found that those from the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and South Africa were much more liberal, while those from the Middle East and Asia were much more conservative (Leiblum et al., 2003).

Culture even impacts why people have sex (Hatfield et al., 2010). U.S. and Chinese college students both reported a high motivation to please their partners and strengthen the relationship, but the U.S. college students reported much higher rates of self-centered motives for sex, such as pleasure, stimulation, or stress reduction (Tang et al., 2012).

For “hooking up” on college campuses, ethnicity and race don’t seem to matter much, but religion does. Specifically, students of higher levels of religious activity are much less likely to engage in hookups than the rest of their college classmates (Penhollow et al., 2007; Brimeyer & Smith, 2012; Fielder et al., 2013). Similarly, teens who attend religious services or youth activities, or whose families emphasize religion around the house, tend to become sexually active later and have fewer sexual partners (Hernandez et al., 2014; Rostosky et al., 2003; Haglund & Fehring, 2010; Miller & Gur, 2002; Manlove et al., 2008).
Differences in Facebook Pages. People from different cultural and demographic groups handle their Facebook pages in different ways (Alpizar et al., 2012; Park et al., 2012). For example, a study examining Facebook pages of 120 college students found that African American students revealed more about themselves in the About Me section, listed more group affiliations, and offered more extensive self-descriptions than White and Asian American students (DeAndrea et al., 2010).

Whites tend to post fewer selfies than African Americans or Latinos (Williams & Marquez, 2015). The specifics of selfies differ by culture too. Compared to Facebook users in Asia, Facebook users in the United States tend to post photos in which their face takes up a larger proportion of the frame, features of the background are blocked or cropped out, and their face is more emotionally expressive (Huang & Park, 2013). Facebook users in the United States tend to post far more positive self-presentations—photos and messages that emphasize how happy their life is and avoid any mention of negative events or feelings—than Facebook users in South Korea (Lee-Won et al., 2014).

There are Facebook differences with gender and age too. Women tend to disclose more to their Facebook friends than men do (just as they do with in-person relationships) (Sheldon, 2013). Older Facebook users tend to spend more time looking at family pictures and less time looking at posts from their same-age friends than younger Facebook users (McAndrew & Jeong, 2012).

Multicultural Know-How in Your Daily Life

It is great to have all of this knowledge about diversity, but it is even better to use it. Let’s consider some ways you can apply this knowledge to your day-to-day life.

Cultural Intelligence. In other words, your life can be enriched by boosting your cultural intelligence: your ability to live and interact effectively in a multicultural society. Also known as cultural competence, cultural intelligence is what enables you to get along happily and productively with people of different ethnicities, races, religions, geographic locations, genders, sexual orientations, and more. For many of you, especially if you grew up in diverse neighborhoods or went to diverse schools, cultural intelligence has already been beneficial. For others, these college years are a period of significant cultural expansion, a time when you will meet and form relationships with people from backgrounds different from your own. For others, your postcollege careers will expose you to a variety of places and people far beyond what you’ve experienced before.

For example, consider Hannah, a White Christian woman who grew up in rural Minnesota. When she was a child, the people in her life were, with rare exceptions, homogeneous—same ethnicity, same religion, same lifestyle. That remained true through high school, but when she went to Rutgers University, a big school with more diversity than Hannah’s hometown, she met and developed friendships with students from different parts of the country and different countries around the world.

After college, Hannah got a job in the marketing department at Ford Motor Company. That job not only took her to a big city (Detroit), but also introduced her to an even more diverse array of people, both at her site and on her travels around the United States and to many other parts of the world. At every step of her personal journey, Hannah relied on her cultural intelligence to appreciate the backgrounds of the people with whom she interacted, to form healthy and respectful relationships with them, and to work fruitfully together. In recent years, the realization that workers are more successful and satisfied when they have high levels of cultural intelligence has increasingly found its way into many industries, from business, military, and engineering to education, law enforcement, and health care (Livermore, 2015; Moran et al., 2009; Cushner & Mahon, 2009; Anand & Lahiri, 2009; Grandin & Hedderich, 2009; Earley & Mosakowski, 2004; Dresser, 2005).
To be culturally intelligent, you need to know information about a cultural group and apply that information correctly (Ang & van Dyne, 2008). Imagine Hannah in her first months on the job at Ford. She meets Mohammed, who is Muslim, on a business trip. Should she shake his hand? (Generally, Muslims shun body contact between men and women who are not related.) Her behavior might differ greatly when she meets Javier, from Spain, where not only a handshake but a brief hug and a kiss on the cheek are often customary. Later, Hannah hosts a business dinner, and her guests will include Namit, who is Hindu. What should she consider as she chooses a restaurant? (Generally, Hindus don’t eat beef, so a steakhouse is probably a bad idea.) Another time, she interviews Haru, a Japanese applicant for an entry-level position. Haru makes little eye contact with Hannah throughout the interview. Should Hannah consider Haru’s behavior rude? (Generally, Japanese people make less eye contact than Americans, especially toward someone in a position of authority, as a sign of respect.) A lack of cultural intelligence in these kinds of situations could offend the people with whom she is interacting, and could damage her relationships with them (Dresser, 2005; Hofstede et al., 2002; Axtell, 2007).

Studies have found that cultural intelligence correlates with all kinds of positive outcomes, including better adjustment in a new culture, more trust in relationships between members of different cultures, better negotiation skills when doing business with a member of another culture, better job performance for international employees, and simply more interactions with members of other cultures (Ng et al., 2012; Templer et al., 2006; Rockstuhl & Ng, 2008; Imai & Gelfand, 2010; Ang et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2012). You can increase your cultural intelligence by reading books or going through training specifically designed to do so. However, just having multicultural encounters—interacting with people different from yourself and learning from those interactions—raises cultural intelligence as well (Shannon & Begley, 2008; Crowne, 2008; Tarique & Takeuchi, 2008).

**Microaggressions.** One sign of an increase in cultural intelligence is a decrease in microaggressions: everyday actions or comments that, often unintentionally, contain hostile or off-putting messages for members of certain cultures. The micro in microaggressions refers to the fact that these are typically not grand actions—no physical attacks, no direct slurs, no vandalism or destruction of property. Instead, microaggressions are little things that people do or say that have a negative impact on others, often because they reveal an “ism” (racism, ageism, sexism, heterosexism, weightism, lookism, etc.) that makes the recipient feel insulted, demeaned, or marginalized (Sue, 2010a, b; Sue et al., 2007; Harrell, 2000).

Sometimes, microaggressions are explicit, like wearing a T-shirt with a distasteful, potentially offensive joke written across the front. More often, they are subtle, and may even be unconscious to the person delivering it, who believes that they are saying something neutral or kind. For example, consider Sophia, a fourth-grader who just completed her science fair project. A judge evaluating her project says to her, “Nice work! How did you get so good at science?” The way the judge emphasizes you communicates to Sophia that there is something about her, presumably her gender, that the judge finds incompatible with scientific ability—a message that could damage her self-confidence and discourage her from pursuing science in the future.

As another example, consider Sammy, a 19-year-old college student who has struggled with depression off and on, and finally decided to see a counselor in his university’s counseling center. In the first session, Sammy’s counselor asks him a series of typical background questions—family, friends, medical history, and so on. The counselor then asks about Sammy’s dating life: “Do you have a girlfriend?” By specifying “girlfriend” in the question (rather than asking “Are you dating anyone?” or “Tell me about your dating history”), the counselor subtly communicates to Sammy that heterosexuality is the expectation, the norm, the standard. Sammy, who is gay,
isn’t exactly sure how to respond, but he is sure that he feels uncomfortable with this counselor.

Here is one more example: Joe, a 45-year-old accountant, is having a conversation with coworkers at the office holiday party in mid-December. One coworker shares a fond recollection of a childhood Christmas morning with his parents. The coworker then turns to Joe: “So Joe—what did your mom and dad do for Christmas when you were a kid?” Joe feels slighted for two reasons: When Joe was a kid, he didn’t have a mom and a dad, and he is Jewish (he doesn’t celebrate Christmas). His coworker’s assumptions that everyone has two parents and that everyone celebrates Christmas were part of a well-meaning question, but they communicate an assumption of how things are that might make Joe feel marginalized and “less-than.”

Like many microaggressions, these examples are not so blatantly offensive that they would automatically cause the recipient to storm out of the room, burst into tears, or hurl insults (or fists) in retaliation. But being on the receiving end of many microaggressions—which is the experience of many members of minority groups—can be hurtful, or as one group of authors put it, “death by a thousand cuts” (Nadal et al., 2011a, p. 234). Numerous studies have examined the accumulated effect of microaggressions on minority groups, including African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, multiracial people, women, sexual minorities, and more. The findings are consistent: Higher rates of stress, depression, anxiety, anger, alcohol use, physical illness, and other negative consequences are the result of consistent microaggressions (Wong et al., 2014; Huyhn, 2012; McCabe, 2009; Ong et al., 2013; Donovan et al., 2013; Torres et al., 2010; Nadal et al., 2011b; c; Blume et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2011).

Some people believe that the best strategy is to “bite your tongue.” They argue that catching a biased or prejudiced thought before it escapes through your mouth is the way to prevent microaggressions. That can certainly help, but it doesn’t get to the root of the problem (and it also discourages you from talking to people who are different from you, which would only lessen your opportunities for increased cultural intelligence). Instead, a better strategy is to explore your underlying beliefs, including any “isms” that might linger in your mind, and change them to be more inclusive of diversity. That is easier said than done, but a noble goal nonetheless. To achieve it, open discussions with others about these issues (including humble admissions of your own less-than-ideal beliefs) and ongoing interactions with a diverse range of people can be quite helpful (Owen et al., 2011, 2014; Hook et al., 2013; Sue & Sue, 2012; Nadal, 2013).
Gender and Sexuality: Essential Examples of Diversity

Any cultural variable could have a meaningful impact in the life of any one person. Some, however, seem especially prominent. Let’s take a closer look at two variables—gender and sexuality—that play central roles in many of our lives.

Defining Gender and Sex

We’ve already listed many of the qualities around which culture can center, but one of the most fundamental is gender: your psychological and behavioral experience of maleness or femaleness. Gender is not necessarily equivalent to sex: your biological maleness or femaleness. In casual conversation, you’ve probably heard people use gender and sex interchangeably, assuming that the two always match. Maybe you’ve even filled out forms that ask for either your gender or your sex but not both, assuming that your answer for one determines your answer for the other. These assumptions are not always correct. A person’s sense of being male or female doesn’t always match the body parts with which that person was born (Eagly, 2013; Smith et al., 2013; Pryzgoda & Chrisler, 2000).

Gender has been an important characteristic across all cultures and time periods. It is one of the first things we notice about each other, and it is the thing least likely to be forgotten (McCreary & Chrisler, 2010; Fiske et al., 1991). You may not remember exactly what your kindergarten teacher looked like, or the name of the person you met at the party last Saturday night, but you probably still remember if he was a he or she was a she.

Gender plays a prominent role in our languages too. With terms like he, she, him, and her to choose from, English doesn’t make it easy to refer to a person without identifying gender. Can you imagine seeing your friend’s new baby for the first time and saying “It’s so cute!” (The newer terms ze and hir have been offered as gender-neutral options, as has the deliberate use of they to refer to one person, but their use is not yet widespread.) English even assigns gender to some nonliving objects, like ships, cars, and countries (“Stand beside her, and guide her…”). In other languages, like Spanish, the names of everyday objects are embedded with gender: el libro (the book) is masculine, but la revista (the magazine) is feminine. And when gender is assigned to an inanimate thing, we often allow it to affect our perception. One study found that there are far more deaths from the average female-named hurricane than the average male-named hurricane, largely because people (perhaps unconsciously) assume the female-named hurricanes are less powerful and evacuate less often (Jung et al., 2014).

Gender Development

Of course, gender doesn’t appear all at once at birth, or puberty, or any other particular point in a person’s life. Instead, gender evolves over time through a process called gender development, and that process depends on lots of factors beyond simple biology (Bussey, 2013; Zosuls et al., 2011; Ruble & Martin, 1998).

Parents and Gender Development. Parents play a major role in gender development. Some parents would never allow their sons to set foot in the “pink” aisle at Toys “R” Us, or might laugh at their daughters if they were interested in playing or even watching football. Other parents wouldn’t mind, and still others would
actively encourage it. These parental responses to interests that don’t conform to popular gender norms powerfully shape a child’s sense of masculinity or femininity (Bussey & Bandura, 1999). This shaping happens not just with toys and games, but also with occupational interests (engineering vs. nursing) and household responsibilities (cooking vs. lawn mowing).

**Peers and Gender Development.** Peers influence gender development too, especially as kids enter the preteen years, when fitting in and maintaining popularity become more important (Ruble et al., 2006). How would you respond if you were a fifth-grade boy getting taunted by other fifth-grade boys for your interest in fashion design? Or if you were a seventh-grade girl being teased by other seventh-grade girls for your interest in joining a football team? One study of hundreds of U.S. elementary school students found that getting hit, insulted, left out, or otherwise picked on by peers for doing things that didn’t conform to gender stereotypes produced different results for different picked-on kids. Specifically, for kids with many male friends, getting picked on led to more behaviors consistent with gender stereotypes. For boys with many female friends, however, getting picked on led to more behaviors inconsistent with gender stereotypes (Lee & Troop-Gordon, 2011).

**The Media and Gender Development.** In addition to parents’ and peers’ influence on gender development, there is the influence of the media. The way males and females are portrayed on TV, in video games, in magazines, on billboards, and elsewhere has a strong influence on kids’ gender development. Let’s consider TV as a prime example (see the Watching Psychology box as well). It might be an obvious point, but there is a real difference in the way men and women are typically portrayed on TV. Men are more often portrayed as authoritative, powerful, and physically muscular, while women are more often portrayed as lower in status, helpless, and concerned about sexual attractiveness (Coltrane & Messineo, 2000; Rivadeneyra, 2011; Turow, 2012).

Those TV portrayals make a real difference in how kids see maleness and femaleness. In fact, the more time kids spend watching TV, the more strongly they buy into the gender stereotypes they see on the screen (Durkin & Nugent, 1998; McGhee & Frueh, 1980; Ward & Friedman, 2006). The effects are evident even before kindergarten. In one study, researchers asked 4-year-old kids this question: “Who do most people think are better? Boys or girls?” The kids’ responses depended on how much TV they watched. As Figure 10.7 shows, the more TV that participants watched, the more likely they were to answer “boys.” In fact, a kid who watched 3-4 hours of TV per day was twice as likely to answer “boys” as a kid who watched no TV at all (Halim et al., 2013, p. 130).

**The Sexualization of Young Girls.** One of the riskiest parts of gender development today involves the sexualization of young girls, which encourages them to use makeup, wear sexy clothing, and behave in flirty or seductive ways well before young adulthood or even puberty (American Psychological Association Task Force on the Sexualization of Girls, 2010; Egan, 2013; Hatch, 2011). Girls who experience this pressure often come to view themselves as sex objects for others rather than independent, strong people (Calogero et al., 2011; Frederickson et al., 1998; Frederickson & Roberts, 1997).

The sexualization of girls has risen drastically in recent decades, as reflected in (and perhaps caused by) the increasing frequency of portrayals of girls as “sexy” (Stankiewicz & Rosselli, 2008; Reichert & Carpenter, 2004). For example, the pictures of girls in Seventeen and Girls’ Life magazines (both read by many girls still in elementary school and middle school) saw a remarkable shift from 1971 to 2011; far fewer childlike outfits, like polka-dot prints and Mary Jane shoes, and far more suggestive outfits, like low-cut shirts, high-heeled shoes, and tight-fitting clothes (Graff et al., 2013).
TV, Sexual Attitudes, and Sexual Behaviors

There are plenty of good reasons for parents to be concerned about how TV might affect their kids. For example, too much TV could interfere with homework or physical fitness. Recent research highlights another risk associated with excessive TV watching: negative influences on sexual attitudes and behaviors. Generally speaking, there is a correlation between how many hours teens spend watching TV and how likely they are to engage in sexual behaviors (Ward et al., 2014). More specifically, longitudinal studies that track people through the teen and young adult years find that those who watch lots of TV, especially TV with lots of sexual content, are more likely to have sex at all, have sex without a condom, and have sex with multiple partners (Fisher et al., 2009; Collins et al., 2004; O’Hara et al., 2012; Gottfried et al., 2013).

The type of sexual content matters too. When teens watch TV that promotes common sexual stereotypes (women as sex objects, men as driven primarily by sex, casual sex as safe and without negative consequences), they are more likely to believe those stereotypes are true, and also more likely to engage in sexual behaviors (Ward & Friedman, 2006). It is not just TV either. In one study, straight college men who had more exposure to a wide variety of entertainment media (TV, movies, music videos, and men’s magazines) had more casual sex partners, less consistent use of condoms, and stronger beliefs that promiscuity and hookups are acceptable (Ward et al., 2011).

It is particularly concerning that some of the common themes in the sex-laden shows targeted toward teens and adults are also common themes in shows targeted toward children and preteens. One study examined multiple episodes of seven popular Nickelodeon and Disney shows from 2004–2012: Drake and Josh, Suite Life of Zack and Cody, Wizards of Waverly Place, Hannah Montana, iCarly, Sonny with a Chance, and Jonas. The study’s results indicated a high frequency of portraying stereotypical heterosocial interactions—in some cases, as often as in shows aimed at an older audience. For example, it was common to find boys objectifying girls and valuing them for their appearance (“she is so hot…”); girls concerned about their own looks (“wait—let me fix my hair…”) and offering flirtatious compliments to boys (“my friend didn’t tell me how cute you are…”); and boys using material items (gifts) or status (as popular rock stars or TV stars) to impress girls. The shows that relied most heavily on these themes were the ones with male lead characters (Kirsch & Murnen, 2015; Kim et al., 2007). So, even younger TV viewers are being introduced to scripts of sexual interactions that, according to a growing body of research, predict early and risky sexual behavior.

The consequences of the sexualization of girls, and the self-objectification that accompanies it, are undoubtedly harmful. It contributes to higher rates of many kinds of psychological disorders, including depression, anxiety, and eating disorders (Moradi & Huang, 2008; Grabe et al., 2007, 2008). It also underlies the fact that females’ dissatisfaction, anxiety, and shame about their bodies and looks are remarkably high (especially in comparison to males’) not only as adults, but as children too (Calogero & Thompson, 2010; Grogan & Wainwright, 1996; Groesz et al., 2002; Tiggesmann & Kuring, 2004).

The sexualization of girls also makes other people take them less seriously. One group of researchers took photos of fifth-grade girls and used Photoshop to manipulate the clothes they wore. They created three looks: childlike, somewhat sexualized, and highly sexualized. College students who viewed the photos rated the definitely sexualized-dressed girls as the least intelligent, competent, capable, moral, and self-respecting (Graff et al., 2012).

Cisgender and Transgender. By adulthood, after gender development is complete, most people have a solid sense of their own gender. When someone’s sense of maleness or femaleness corresponds to the biological body parts they received at birth, that person is cisgender: a person whose gender and sex match. The opposite of cisgender is transgender: a person whose gender and sex do not match. (In Latin, cis- means on the same side, and trans- means on opposite sides.) Transgender people are not necessarily cross-dressers (people who choose to wear clothes more customary for the other gender), nor are they necessarily attracted to people of the same sex. Transgender people often experience significant distress or unhappiness from feeling female while in a male body, or feeling male while in a female body. In some cases, a person who is transgender will transition: choose to take steps to live as the gender that matches their identity rather than their biologically assigned gender. The term transsexual has been used to describe people who transition, but its use is on the decline. Transitioning can include name changes, pronoun (he/she) changes, clothing changes, long-term hormone treatments (androgens and estrogens) to cause the body to take on a different shape, or...
How Does Facebook Affect Body Image?

When you check Facebook, you check out your friends—not only what they’re up to, but how they look as well. Recent research suggests that for many Facebook users, especially females, those experiences are often followed by harsh evaluations of their own bodies.

In one study of over 1,000 eighth- and ninth-grade girls, those who used Facebook were more concerned about how thin, pretty, and physically attractive they were (Tiggemann & Slater, 2013). Similarly, among female college students, Facebook time correlates positively with worries about body image, especially among those with strong tendencies to compare their own appearance to the appearance of their friends (Fardouly & Vartanian, 2015).

One study asked women age 17–25 to spend 10 minutes either browsing their own Facebook page or browsing a “neutral” control Web site (a site about handmade crafts and other Etsy-ish ideas). Those who browsed Facebook reported a lower mood and reported more flaws with their own hair, skin, and face (Fardouly et al., 2015). Another study found that among female college students, those who use Facebook to compare and evaluate themselves against others had higher levels of body dissatisfaction as well as more frequent symptoms of bulimia, including binge eating and purging (Smith et al., 2013).

These findings connecting Facebook usage to negative body experiences aren’t limited to women. One study found that for both male and female college students, high Facebook usage correlates with self-consciousness and shame about their bodies (Manago et al., 2014). A large-scale study of over 11,000 adults (from their 20s to their 60s) in New Zealand found that both men and women who use a Facebook account have lower levels of body satisfaction than those who don’t (Stronge et al., 2013).

A few studies have zoomed in on the link between body image and photo-related activities within Facebook. One study found that it was this photo-related time (posting, viewing, tagging, commenting on photos) that predicted problems with body image and weight dissatisfaction among middle and high school girls (Meier & Gray, 2014). Another found that among seventh-grade girls, those who regularly share selfies on Facebook (or Snapchat, Instagram, or other social media) place much higher value on body shape and weight. And the more they manipulated their selfies (with Photoshop, apps that make skin look smoother or bodies look thinner, etc.), the more body-related worries they had (McLean et al., 2015).

Recent research has pointed to a relationship between Facebook usage, including viewing selfies (like this one), and problems with body image. This connection is especially evident among girls and young women (Ivanko_Brnjakovic/Getty Images).

Multiple studies point to a relationship between Facebook usage, including viewing selfies (like this one), and problems with body image. This connection is especially evident among girls and young women. (Ivanko_Brnjakovic/Getty Images)

surgeries to alter the genitals, chest, face, vocal chords, and other body parts that differ between men and women (Sánchez & Vilain, 2013; National Center for Transgender Equality, 2014).

Jennifer Finney Boylan is an English professor who was born James Boylan. She transitioned male-to-female in her early forties, years after marrying and having two children with a woman. In her memoir She’s Not There, Boylan explains how her transitioned male-to-female in her early forties, years after marrying and having children with a woman. In her memoir She’s Not There, Boylan explains how her identity with the opposite gender (and the stress that accompanied it) started decades before her sex change hormones and surgeries, when she was a 3-year-old boy (Boylan, 2003, pp. 19–22):

Since then, the awareness that I was in the wrong body, living the wrong life, was never out of my conscious mind. And at every moment as I lived my life, I countered this awareness with an exasperated companion thought, namely, Don’t be an idiot. You’re not a girl. Get over it. But I never got over it...After I grew up and became female, people would often ask me, How did you know, when you were a child?...It seemed obvious to me that this was something you understood intuitively, not on the basis of what was between your legs, but because of what you felt in your heart. Remember when you woke up this morning—I’d say to my female friends—and you knew you were female? That’s how I felt. That’s how I knew. Of course, knowing with such absolute certainty something that appeared to be both absurd and untrue [was]...a crushing burden, which was, simultaneously, invisible.

The burden that Jennifer Finney Boylan describes often translates into serious psychological problems for transgender people. One study of over 500 transgender people found that over half were clinically depressed, and about a third had attempted suicide.

Jennifer Finney Boylan is an English professor who was born James Boylan. She transitioned male-to-female in her early forties, years after marrying and having two children with a woman. In her memoir She’s Not There, Boylan explains how her identity with the opposite gender (and the stress that accompanied it) started decades before her sex change hormones and surgeries, when she was a 3-year-old boy (Boylan, 2003, pp. 19–22):

Since then, the awareness that I was in the wrong body, living the wrong life, was never out of my conscious mind. And at every moment as I lived my life, I countered this awareness with an exasperated companion thought, namely, Don’t be an idiot. You’re not a girl. Get over it. But I never got over it...After I grew up and became female, people would often ask me, How did you know, when you were a child?...It seemed obvious to me that this was something you understood intuitively, not on the basis of what was between your legs, but because of what you felt in your heart. Remember when you woke up this morning—I’d say to my female friends—and you knew you were female? That’s how I felt. That’s how I knew. Of course, knowing with such absolute certainty something that appeared to be both absurd and untrue [was]...a crushing burden, which was, simultaneously, invisible.

The burden that Jennifer Finney Boylan describes often translates into serious psychological problems for transgender people. One study of over 500 transgender people found that over half were clinically depressed, and about a third had attempted to live as the gender that matches one’s identity rather than one’s biologically assigned gender.
suicide at some point in their lives—both rates way above those found in the general population (Clements-Nolle et al., 2001). Other studies have found similar results, especially among transgender people who were socially outcast, harassed, or bullied (Bockting et al., 2013; Grant et al., 2010).

### Sexual Orientation

**Sexual orientation** is a person’s pattern of romantic attraction to a particular group (or groups) of other people. Your sexual orientation is who you’d like to date. A person with a **heterosexual** orientation is attracted to members of the other sex. A person with a **homosexual** orientation is attracted to members of the same sex. A person with a **bisexual** orientation is attracted to members of both the other and the same sex. The less formal terms *straight, gay/lesbian,* and *bi* are often used for heterosexual, homosexual, and bisexual, respectively. You’ll see them in this chapter too.

You’re probably already familiar with those terms, but it would be a mistake to think that they capture everyone. Sexual orientations can also include **pansexual** (attracted to everyone, regardless of the other person’s gender, sexual orientation, etc.), **fluid** (attracted to different people at different times), **questioning** (still in the process of examining or reexamining who is attractive), and **asexual** (sexually attracted to no one) (Zea & Nakamura, 2014). Collectively, people whose sexual orientations differ from that of the majority of the population identify as **LGBTQ**: a community of members of sexual minorities, including lesbian (L), gay (G), bisexual (B), transgender (T), queer/questioning (Q), and other people.

---

**TABLE 10.4: It Depends How You Ask about Sexual Orientation Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL PARTICIPANTS (%)</th>
<th>MEN (%)</th>
<th>WOMEN (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual?</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any sexual experience with a person of same sex?</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any attraction to a person of same sex?</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researchers trying to determine how many people are lesbian, gay, or bisexual get different answers when they ask the question in different ways. In this large-scale U.S. study, the rates were lowest when the question asked about identifying as lesbian, gay, or bisexual, higher when the question asked about same-sex behaviors, and higher still when the question asked about same-sex attraction. Data from Chandra et al., 2011; Gates & Newport, 2013.

---

It depends on both who and how you ask (Table 10.4). In terms of **who**, more open-minded cultures in which nonheterosexuality is widely accepted are more likely to produce higher estimates. In terms of **how**, questions that ask how a person labels themselves (“What’s your sexual orientation?”) produce lower estimates than questions that ask what behaviors a person has done (“Have you ever had sexual interactions with _____?”) or who they find attractive (“Have you ever been attracted to _____?”). Also, surveys conducted via the Internet tend to produce higher estimates than those conducted by other means, perhaps because of a higher sense of anonymity (Chandra et al., 2011; Harris Interactive & Witeck-Combs, 2010). But most researchers tend to settle on a range of 2–4% of the general U.S. population (give or take a percentage point or two) as a reasonable estimate of how many of us identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual (Gates, 2013). That rate also varies from state to state—check Figure 10.8.

Within that range, there are gender-based differences. Specifically, men tend to identify as gay more often than bisexual, but women tend to identify as bisexual more often than lesbian (Dworkin, 2013; Herek et al., 2010). In other words, women tend to have a nonexclusive sexuality more often than men. (Here, nonexclusive means that just because a person is attracted to one gender, that doesn’t mean that the person isn’t also attracted to the other gender (Thompson & Morgan, 2008; Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012; Bailey et al., 2000; Laumann et al., 2004; Dickson et al., 2003).) In one large-scale survey of over 14,000 young adults, the researchers gave the participants several middle ground options to define their sexuality—not just straight or gay, but in-between options like “mostly straight,” “bisexual” (presumably around 50/50), and “mostly gay.” As Table 10.5 shows, far more men placed themselves at one end of the scale or the other (definitively straight or gay), and far more women placed themselves in one of the middle categories (Udry & Chantala, 2006).

Another gender-based difference in sexual orientation has to do with **fluid** sexuality, or the likelihood for sexual attraction to change over time. Women are much more
Does Gaydar Work?

Gaydar, a term that combines the words gay and radar, is the ability to determine who's gay and who's not without being explicitly told. You may have heard people describe (or even brag about) their own gaydar, but how well does gaydar really work?

Researchers have investigated this question in a variety of ways. The most common method is to present visual information (videos, photos, etc.) to participants and ask them to identify the person as gay or straight. For example, one study found that participants who watched a 6-10-second video of a gay or straight person could correctly identify the person's sexual orientation 81% of the time (87% accuracy for straight targets, 75% accuracy for gay targets) (Rieger et al., 2010).

Another found that participants viewing facial photographs of men and women taken from dating Web sites (where they identified themselves as gay or straight) correctly identified their sexual orientation better than they could if they were blindly guessing (Lyons et al., 2014). Studies have found that the more time you have to look at the person, the better. Participants did better with a 10-second video clip than a 1-second video clip, and worst with a still photo, but the photo still produced better-than-chance accuracy (Ambady et al., 1999). Voice studies have also shown that audio, even without video, produces better-than-chance results (Llinville, 1998; Gaudio, 1994; Zimmerman, 2013). The accuracy of gaydar may depend on some qualities of the person using it. One study found that straight participants who have more real-life experiences with gay men were much more accurate than those with fewer real-life experiences with gay men (Brambilla et al., 2013).

Some researchers have offered more skeptical views about gaydar. An early gaydar study found that participants watching brief videos of gay and straight people did no better than chance when identifying their sexual orientation (Berger et al., 1987). Another study found that gaydar is little more than stereotyping—not so much about physical features or voice, but about interests, careers, and activities that a person reveals (Cox et al., 2016).

The gaydar literature is actually a new development in a long line of research on categorizing people into groups that are visually ambiguous (that is, less than obvious upon first glance). Earlier research of this type has focused on whether a person is Jewish or Mormon, Democrat or Republican. A meta-analysis of 47 articles across all of these categories found that the overall “hit rate”—the odds of correctly determining whether a person fell into the target category—was 64.5% (Tskhay & Rule, 2013). The same meta-analysis found the same rate for gaydar studies specifically. That percentage is significantly above the 50/50 rate you'd expect if gaydar were no better than flipping a coin, but far below the 100% rate you'd expect if gaydar were always accurate. In other words, gaydar works sometimes, but it’s far from perfect.

likely to experience a fluid sexuality than men over the course of their lives (Peplau & Garnets, 2000; Diamond, 2000). This is especially evident in longitudinal studies, which track people across many years. More often than men, women find their patterns of attraction changing, sometimes dividing their adult lives into two long, distinct periods, and other times dividing them into many briefer periods that involve returning to previous attractions (Diamond, 2005, 2007, 2009; Kinnish et al., 2005). An increasing recognition of the fluidity of sexual orientation has caused many experts in this field to wonder if we should stop thinking of sexual orientation as a trait—something that

sexual orientation
A person's pattern of romantic attraction to a particular group or groups of other people.

heterosexual
The sexual orientation of a person who is attracted to members of the other sex.

homosexual
The sexual orientation of a person who is attracted to members of the same sex.

bisexual
The sexual orientation of a person who is attracted to people of both the other and the same sex.

LGBTQ
A community of members of sexual minorities, including lesbian (L), gay (G), bisexual (B), transgender (T), queer/questioning (Q), and other people.

**FIGURE 10.8** State-by-State Rates of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Population. States in the Northeast and on the West Coast tend to have higher percentages of lesbian, gay, and bisexual residents than states in the middle of the country. Data from Gates & Newport, 2013.
develops early in life and remains constant—and instead consider that at least for some people, it is a characteristic that can vary throughout the life span (Diamond, 2013).

**Genes and Sexual Orientation.** The causes of sexual orientation are still being actively researched, but some interesting biological findings have emerged (Hill et al., 2013). Genes appear to play a role in determining sexual orientation (Längström et al., 2010). Studies of siblings have found relatively high rates—7–10%—of the biological brothers of gay men being gay themselves (Bailey et al., 1999).

A twin study found that identical twins had a much higher likelihood to match in terms of same-sex attraction than nonidentical twins (Kendler et al., 2000). For example, if Luke is gay and has a twin brother Jeff, the odds of Jeff being gay are over twice as great as if Jeff and Luke are identical than if Jeff and Luke are not identical. This finding suggests that the more genes you share with a gay or lesbian person, the higher the odds that you will be gay or lesbian. Current research has attempted to get more specific by identifying particular genetic markers (a “gay gene”), generating lots of buzz in the popular media but with only limited success so far (O’Riordan, 2012; Conrad & Markens, 2001; Servick, 2014; Sanders et al., 2015).

**Brain Differences and Sexual Orientation.** PET scans and other brain-viewing technologies have revealed some interesting differences in brain structure and brain function between gay or lesbian people and straight people. For example, the parts of the hypothalamus are in different proportion. The suprachiasmatic nucleus—the part of the hypothalamus that controls your 24-hour circadian rhythms (see Chapter 2)—is 70% larger in gay men than in a random sample of men (Swaab & Hofman, 1990). Also, one particular region of the anterior hypothalamus is about twice as large in straight men as in gay men (LeVay, 1991). Typically, when these kinds of brain differences are found, the differences are such that the brains of gay or lesbian people resemble brains of the opposite sex. In other words, when gay men’s brains differ from straight men’s brains, they resemble female brains in their differences. Likewise, when lesbians’ brains differ from straight women’s brains, they resemble male brains (Hill et al., 2013).

**Hands, Fingers, and Sexual Orientation.** Gay or lesbian people are much less likely to be right-handed than straight people (Lippa, 2003; Peters et al., 2006). Specifically, a meta-analysis found that gay men are 34% more likely to be left-handed or ambidextrous, and lesbian women are 91% more likely to be left-handed or ambidextrous (Lalumière et al., 2000). This non-right-handedness shows up well before puberty, and there is no evidence that parents encourage eventually gay or eventually lesbian kids to use any particular hand. Psychologists and other researchers are still trying to explain this finding.

Another puzzling finding concerns finger size. The ratio of the index finger and the ring finger differs between many (but not all) gay, lesbian, or bisexual people and straight people (Williams et al., 2000). Specifically, people who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual often have higher second-finger-to-fourth-finger ratios than people who are straight. In other words, the index finger extends further past the ring finger. This finding remains somewhat tentative, since its presence seems to depend on ethnicity and some studies produce stronger results for men and other studies, stronger for women (Manning et al., 2007; Voracek et al., 2005; Grimbos et al., 2010). To the extent that it is true, this finding about difference in finger length may relate to the amount of certain hormones in the womb during pregnancy. The key hormone may be testosterone, which is known to influence physical development of many body parts, including the hands and fingers (Bailey & Hurd, 2005).

**Birth Order among Brothers and Sexual Orientation.** For a man, the odds of being gay depend on how many older brothers he has. Specifically, the chances go up about 33% for each big brother the little brother has (Blanchard, 2008; Bogaert & Skorska, 2011). If you’re thinking this has something to do with the experience of growing up as the baby brother in a house full of older boys, that is not it. This phenomenon doesn’t happen with adopted brothers, and it does happen in younger brothers who are raised apart from their older brothers. The key variable seems to be how many boys a

---

**TABLE 10.5: Sexual Orientations of Men and Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEXUAL ORIENTATION</th>
<th>MEN (%)</th>
<th>WOMEN (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely heterosexual</td>
<td>94.03</td>
<td>85.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly heterosexual</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly homosexual</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely homosexual</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Often, questions about sexual orientation are worded in all-or-none ways. By contrast, in one large-scale study (about 14,000 participants), there were five options: completely heterosexual, mostly heterosexual, bisexual, mostly homosexual, and completely homosexual. The percentages were higher for men at the two extremes, but higher for women in the three middle-ground categories. Data from Udry & Chantala, 2006.
mother has carried through pregnancy rather than anything that happens after those
boys arrive, which suggests a strong prenatal (probably hormonal) influence on sexual
orientation (Bogeart, 2006; VanderLaan et al., 2015; Blanchard, 2012).

Other Predictors of Sexual Orientation. If prenatal hormones influence
sexual orientation, researchers should see some behavioral evidence of those hor-
mones even before puberty—and they do. Kids who act atypical for their gender; even
at young ages, are more likely to have nonheterosexual orientations as adults. One
study asked adults of diverse sexual orientations how much they agreed or disagreed
with statements about their childhood experiences. The more participants endorsed
behaviors that didn’t conform to traditional gender roles, the more likely they were to
be gay, lesbian, or bisexual. For example, gay men (much more than straight men) were
likely to agree strongly with this kind of statement: “As a child I disliked competitive
sports such as football, baseball, and basketball.” And lesbian women (much more than
straight women) were likely to agree strongly with this kind of statement: “As a child, I
usually avoided feminine clothing such as dresses” (Lippa, 2003).

Another study relied not on memories, but childhood home videos, to illustrate the
same point. The researchers asked both gay and straight adults to provide home vid-
eos taken when they were young kids. The researchers then showed those videos to
undergraduates and asked them to rate how much each kid conformed to gender-typical
expectations—how “boyish” the boys acted, and how “girlish” the girls acted. The under-
grads found more examples of gender nonconformity (for example, girls assembling
trains or boys dancing to music by a female singer) in kids who grew up to be gay or
lesbian. They found much more gender conformity (for example, boys fighting with toy
swords or girls performing ballet in tutus) in kids who grew up to be straight. So, even
when you take out the possibility of memory bias, which might push straight people
to remember certain things about their own childhoods and gay or lesbian people to
remember other things, the extent to which a child conforms to gender-typical
expectations—how “boyish” the boys acted, and how “girlish” the girls acted. The under-
grads found more examples of gender nonconformity (for example, girls assembling
trains or boys dancing to music by a female singer) in kids who grew up to be gay or
lesbian. They found much more gender conformity (for example, boys fighting with toy
swords or girls performing ballet in tutus) in kids who grew up to be straight. So, even
when you take out the possibility of memory bias, which might push straight people
to remember certain things about their own childhoods and gay or lesbian people to
remember other things, the extent to which a child conforms to gender expectations
appears to correlate at least slightly with eventual sexual orientation (Rieger et al., 2010).
Of course, this doesn’t mean that every kid whose behavior is not typical for his or her
gender will grow up to be gay nor does it mean that every kid whose behavior is typical
for his or her gender will grow up to be straight. It just means that the odds are greater.

Attitudes Toward Sexual Minorities. Attitudes toward sexual minorities
have changed drastically in recent decades—just ask your parents or your grandpar-
ents. Not long ago, any kind of same-sex romantic relationship was viewed with disdain
by most (but certainly not all) within mainstream U.S. culture. Gay marriage was illegal
across the country, and being gay or lesbian was even considered a psychological dis-

Today’s more positive and affirming views toward diverse sexual orientations are
not universal, however. According to research, those views depend on a number of fac-
tors (many of which could overlap, of course). For example, ethnicity seems to make
a difference in the United States. In general, Whites hold more favorable attitudes
toward nonheterosexual orientations than African Americans or Latinos. Age seems to
make a difference as well, with more positive attitudes held by younger adults (Horn,
2013). Other predictors of negative views toward sexual minorities include conserva-
tive religious and political beliefs; traditional beliefs about gender roles (how men and
women “should” behave); the belief that sexuality is a choice (and therefore change-
able); and lack of direct contact with lesbian women or gay men (Israel & Mohr, 2004;
Elason, 2001; Mohr & Rochlen, 1999; Haslam & Levy, 2006; Hegarty & Pratto, 2001). Negative views of same-sex relationships seem to depend on the sex of the people in
those relationships too: Gay men draw more disapproval than lesbian women, espe-
циально from straight men (Herek, 2000a; Cárdenas & Barrientos, 2008).

The fact that many people still respond to gay, lesbian, and bisexual orientations
with scorn and ridicule contributes to the high rate of mental health problems among
sexual minorities (Cochran & Mays, 2013). Depression, anxiety, alcohol and drug prob-
lems, and other psychological struggles occur in sexual minorities at two to three times

Attitudes toward same-sex relationships
have generally become more positive and
affirming in recent decades, but those
attitudes still vary widely and relate to
numerous factors such as ethnicity, age,
religious and political beliefs, and other
factors. Tetra Images/Getty Images
the rate in the general population (Fergusson et al., 1999, 2005; Cochran et al., 2003; Meyer, 2003). Unsurprisingly, the rates of unpleasant and unfortunate experiences that often contribute to mental disorders—stress, victimization, discrimination, low social support, and hopelessness, among others—are also in greater abundance in the lives of sexual minorities (Hatzenbuehler et al., 2010).

Fortunately, there is a flip side to the finding that a lack of contact with sexual minorities goes along with negative attitudes: Friendships with sexual minorities improve those attitudes. Specifically, high-quality relationships in which a straight person really gets to know a sexual minority as a real person go along with more agreeable attitudes toward sexual minorities overall (Heinze & Horn, 2009; Lemm, 2006; Vonofakou et al., 2007).

Friendship with sexual minorities isn’t the only thing that can improve attitudes toward sexual minorities. So can learning about the achievements and fame of sexual minorities. In one study, researchers showed participants pictures of gay celebrities and offered a description of each. For half of the participants, the description included the fact that the celebrity was gay; for the other half, the description omitted that fact. The celebrities—who included filmmaker Pedro Almodovar, author Michael Cunningham, singer Melissa Etheridge, U.S. Congress member Barney Frank, actor Rupert Everett, civil rights leader Bayard Rustin, and tennis star Martina Navratilova—got more favorable ratings from the participants who learned about their sexual orientations (Dasgupta & Rivera, 2008).

Another promising factor for attitudes toward sexual minorities is the presence of gay–straight alliances (GSAs) in U.S. high schools. GSAs are extracurricular organizations that offer a safe, supportive environment for teens to come together to share experiences, socialize, and engage in advocacy and activism. They welcome students who are (or who think they may be) LGBTQ, as well as students who are straight. GSAs began to appear in a few high schools on the East and West coasts around 1990. Today, there are thousands of GSAs in high schools throughout the United States and in many other countries (Petner & Kush, 2008).

A growing body of research finds that GSAs have lots of positive effects (Russell et al., 2009). One study found that belonging to a GSA made members more comfortable with diverse sexual orientations, as well as boosted academic performance, family relationships, and a sense of belonging to the school community (Lee, 2002). Another study found that schools with GSAs had lower rates of hopelessness and suicide attempts among sexual minority students (Davis et al., 2014). Other studies have also found a wide range of positive effects—not just for members of GSAs, but also for students who didn’t belong to a GSA but simply went to schools that had them (Walls et al., 2010; Toomey et al., 2011).

What Difference Does Gender Make?

There are plenty of ways in which males and females are remarkably similar—overall intelligence, self-esteem, moral reasoning, leadership capabilities, mathematical ability, and other variables (Hyde, 2005, 2014; Hyde et al., 2008; Priess & Hyde, 2010; Bussey, 2013). But there are also plenty of examples of big differences between the genders. As we consider a few of them, remember that just because these differences exist, that doesn’t necessarily mean that gender caused them. There could be other explanations, and of course, these differences don’t apply to all members of a gender. These are broad overall trends.

Differences in Communication. Often, women and men use speech for different reasons. Specifically, women tend to speak to maintain relationships, with an emphasis on listening and compassion. Men, on the other hand, tend to speak to assert dominance or to hold someone else’s attention, with an emphasis on taking control or solving problems (Carli, 2013). “For women, a conversation is a chance to make connections; for men, each interaction can result in a winner or a loser” (McHugh & Hambaugh, 2010, p. 386).

For example, picture two pairs of new college roommates meeting each other for the first time on residence hall move-in day: Sean and Alonzo, and Juliana and Zoe. There are lots of decisions to make: who gets which bed, where the mini-fridge should go, whose music plays while they unpack. For Sean and Alonzo, each of those decisions can...
feel competitive, a chance to flex some muscle and grab some control. For Juliana and Zoe, each of those decisions can feel cooperative, a chance to team up and join forces. (Of course, the opposite could be true too, but that would be the exception to the rule.)

When researchers examine specific communication behaviors in men and women, they typically find differences that make sense in terms of how men and women use speech. For example, compared to women, men interrupt more often (especially to redirect the conversation) and speak both louder and longer (West & Zimmerman, 1983; Anderson & Leaper, 1998; Mast & Sczesny, 2010). Women, compared to men, apologize more often, offer more compliments, use more verbal reinforcers of others’ speech (“mm hm,” “right,” “yeah,” etc.), and sprinkle in more terms to soften their language such as “kinda,” “sorta,” “like,” “I mean,” and “y’know?” (Farley et al., 2010; Hannah & Murachver, 2007; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995; Leaper & Robnett, 2011; Carli, 1990; Laserna et al., 2014).

Even nonverbal communication reflects clear gender differences. Women smile, nod, and lean forward more often, while men fidget, stretch out, and demonstrate visual dominance (more eye contact when speaking than when listening) more often (Mast & Sczesny, 2010; Dovidio et al., 1988a, b; Hall, 2006; Hall et al., 2000). Table 10.6 shows a summary.

**Differences in Expressing Emotion.** Around the world, women cry more often than men, not only when sad things happen to them, but also when happy things happen, or when they empathize while seeing sad or happy things happen to others (Vingerhoets et al., 2000; Vingerhoets & Scheirs, 2000; De Fruyt, 1997; Peter et al., 2001). Women also smile more often than men, for reasons that may be complex. In some situations, a woman’s smile may convey her happiness, but in others, it may communicate agreement, or even submission, in an attempt to build relationships (Fischer & Evers, 2013).

It is not just crying and smiling, either. Women generally demonstrate more emotion through facial expression than men (Kring & Gordon, 1998). People interpret facial expressions of men and women differently too, especially when the feeling being expressed is negative. In one study, researchers showed pictures of the faces of men and women feeling anger, sadness, fear, or disgust. They also offered explanations for why the person might feel that way: got yelled at by boss, heard footsteps in the dark, got some bad news, saw an animal get run over by a car, and so on. Participants were then asked whether the people in the pictures were “emotional” or simply “having a bad day.” In other words, they were asked whether their emotions were attributable to their personalities, or to their situation. Women were more often labeled as “emotional,” and men were more often labeled as “having a bad day” (Barrett & Bliss-Moreau, 2009).

**Differences in Personality.** As we will cover in Chapter 12, the most widely accepted model of personality features five separate traits (Costa & McCrae, 1992; West & Zimmerman, 1983; Anderson & Leaper, 1998; Farley et al., 2010; Hannah & Murachver, 2007; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995; Leaper & Robnett, 2011; Laserna et al., 2014; Dovidio et al., 1988a, b; Hall, 2006; Hall et al., 2000).

### Table 10.6: He Says, She Says: Gender Differences in Speaking Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN MORE OFTEN...</th>
<th>WOMEN MORE OFTEN...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interrupt (especially to change the topic)</td>
<td>Apologize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak loudly</td>
<td>Offer compliments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold the floor for long periods of time</td>
<td>Use verbal reinforcers like “mm hm” and “right”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretch out</td>
<td>Soften language with words like “kinda” and “y’know?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidget</td>
<td>Smile and nod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain visual dominance (more eye contact when speaking than listening)</td>
<td>Lean forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women and men often have different motivations for speaking: women to connect, and men to compete. Research on specific speech behaviors (both verbal and nonverbal) reflects this gender difference. Information from Mast & Sczesny, 2010; Carli, 1990; 2013; Hookham & Hartmann, 2012; West & Zimmerman, 1983; Anderson & Leaper, 1998; Farley et al., 2010; Hannah & Murachver, 2007; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995; Leaper & Robnett, 2011; Laserna et al., 2014; Dovidio et al., 1988a, b; Hall, 2006; Hall et al., 2000.
Traditionally, girls and women have been underrepresented in the STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and math), primarily because of societal norms rather than ability. Recruitment of girls and women into STEM fields has increased in recent years. Jupiterimages, Brand X Pictures/Getty Images

McCrae & Costa, 2003, 2013). In some ways, men and women have equal amounts of these five personality traits. For example, in conscientiousness (being organized, responsible, and deliberate), there are no gender differences. But in other traits, there are small but consistent gender differences. Women tend to be slightly higher in agreeableness (cooperating and complying with others) and neuroticism (experiencing negative emotions like anxiety and depression) (Lynn & Martin, 1997; Rubinstein & Strul, 2007). Men and women have roughly equal levels of openness to experience (receptiveness to new things). However, when you break that trait down into its component parts, women have greater openness to feeling new emotions, but men have greater openness to hearing new ideas. In terms of extraversion (outgoingness), women are higher in friendliness and warmth toward others, but men are higher in excitement seeking and assertiveness toward others (Stake & Eisele, 2010; Costa et al., 2001; Feingold, 1994; Lodhi et al., 2002).

Differences in Education. In both school and work, females are underrepresented in the STEM areas—science, technology, engineering, and math (Sadler et al., 2012). But that is not because of any inherent gender difference in abilities. The difference occurs because our society has traditionally steered girls away from these “boys’” fields. This has lowered both girls’ interest and belief in their capabilities. And it leads to girls fearing that if they struggle in a STEM course they will confirm stereotypes about their gender (Betz et al., 2013; Steele, 1997, 2010; Spencer et al., 1999; Bussey, 2013).

Thankfully, efforts to recruit girls into STEM fields (and women into STEM careers) have increased, but results of these efforts have been mixed (Watt, 2010; Milgram, 2011; Glass & Minnott, 2010). At the college level, women tend to be underrepresented in STEM majors, but overrepresented in education, nursing, humanities, and social sciences (including psychology) (Basow, 2010). Girls tend to earn slightly better grades throughout school, but boys tend to slightly outperform them on standardized tests (especially in math) (Duckworth & Seligman, 2006; Downey & Vogt Yuan, 2005; Legewie & DiPrete, 2012).

Differences in Following Directions. Researchers haven’t shed much light on the old stereotype about men refusing to stop for directions. However, they have found many gender differences in the strategies we use to navigate from place to place (Lawton, 1994; Saucier & Ehresman, 2010). Men tend to rely more on directions that remain constant no matter what, emphasizing distances and compass directions. For example: drive north for 3 miles, then turn east and go 2 miles. Women, on the other hand, tend to rely more on directions that depend on the person’s perspective at the time, including landmarks and relative directions. For example: go straight until you see the McDonalds, then turn right and keep going until you see the park on your left (Saucier et al., 2002; Lawton & Kallai, 2002; Choi & Silverman, 2003; Lawton, 1994; Nowak et al., 2015).

When they give directions to others, men and women reveal the same preferences as when they figure out their own routes (Dabbs et al., 1998; MacFadden et al., 2003). This gender difference in using directions shows up as early as middle school (Choi & Silverman, 2003). In one study, about 100 kids age 10–17 completed a walk-through maze set up in a huge room with big, portable wall pieces. The maze included over 30 opportunities to go right or left and over 20 landmarks. After walking through the maze five times, each kid was asked to draw a bird’s-eye-view map of the maze or make a written list of step-by-step instructions for navigating it. The girls’ drawings and written instructions included far more mentions of landmarks, and far fewer mentions of directions, than the boys’ (Schmitz, 1997).

Differences in Sex Life. Men report more interest in sex than women—more frequency, more variety, and more partners (Petersen & Hyde, 2010a; Peplau, 2003). Men also report higher rates of almost every specific sexual activity than women, with masturbation and pornography at the top of the list of things that men do more often (Petersen & Hyde, 2010b; Oliver & Hyde, 1993; Hald et al., 2014). Higher frequency of sex in males is true for gay as well as straight relationships, with gay men reporting higher rates of sex than lesbian couples (Peplau & Fingerhut, 2007). Men also report a higher frequency of orgasm than women during both sex and masturbation (Laumann et al., 1994).
The reasons for sex differ between the genders too: women more often seek emotional and interpersonal connection, while men more often seek physical gratification (Leigh, 1989; Patrick et al., 2007; Meston & Buss, 2007; Baumeister, 2013). Gender differences also apply to hookups (one-time sexual encounters between people who don’t know each other well). In college, where most hookup research is done, men are more comfortable with hookups than women (Lambert et al., 2003). Women experience more worry and distress after hookups, and they are also more interested in converting their hookups to long-term relationships than men are (Owen & Fincham, 2011; Fielder & Carey, 2010; Townsend & Wasserman, 2011). Hookups also involve a greater risk to women’s reputations than to men’s. Studies find that the responses of college students to hookup stories depend on who the story is about. If it is about a woman, there is a greater chance that they will lose respect for her. However, if the story is about a man, the odds are lower that such a negative evaluation will take place (Allison & Risman, 2013; Bogle, 2008).

CHECK YOUR LEARNING:
10.15 What is the difference between gender and sex?
10.16 What influences gender development?
10.17 What do cisgender, transgender, and transition mean?
10.18 What is sexual orientation?

10.19 What factors relate to sexual orientation?
10.20 What influences attitudes toward sexual minorities?
10.21 What aspects of daily life can be influenced by gender?

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Diversity Surrounds You

10.1 The United States is a diverse nation in terms of race, ethnicity, language, religion, age, sexual orientation, education, income, and rural or urban location.
10.2 A culture is a group of similar people who share beliefs and patterns of behavior. Culture can powerfully influence worldview, your comprehensive way of understanding the world around you.
10.3 Dynamic sizing is the ability to simultaneously know the norm for a group and recognize that the norm might not apply to every member of that group.
10.4 In the early days of psychology, culture was essentially equated to race or ethnicity. Today, psychologists consider many other variables as culturally important, such as gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status.

Multiculturalism

10.5 Multiculturalism is a psychological approach that highlights the importance and value of multiple cultural groups within a society. Multiculturalism has become increasingly important in psychology in recent decades. Some call it the dominant movement in contemporary psychology.
10.6 In earlier years, cultural differences were often defined as deficits or disadvantages of one culture compared to another. More recently, the unique qualities of each culture have been viewed as strengths and virtues.
10.7 Today, many areas of psychology reflect an emphasis on multiculturalism, including professional organizations, journals, books, ethical guidelines, assessment tools, and the DSM.
10.8 Acculturation is managing a life that involves the coexistence of more than one culture.
10.9 There are a variety of different acculturation strategies based on how much a person retains their previous culture and how much they embrace their new culture.
10.10 Acculturative stress is the physical or psychological stress that comes from acculturation.
10.11 Specific ways in which cultures differ from each other include individualism and collectivism, power distance, long-term orientation and short-term orientation, and more.
10.12 Cultural diversity can produce differences in many areas of daily life, including how you define your identity, raise children, experience feelings, remember events, and more.
10.13 Cultural intelligence is your ability to live and interact effectively in a multicultural society.
10.14 Microaggressions are everyday actions or comments that, often unintentionally, contain hostile or off-putting messages for members of certain cultures.

Gender and Sexuality: Essential Examples of Diversity

10.15 Gender is your psychological and behavioral experience of maleness or femaleness. Sex is your biological maleness or femaleness.
10.16 Gender development can be influenced by parents, peers, and the media.
10.17 Cisgender refers to a person whose gender and sex match. Transgender refers to a person whose gender and sex do
not match. Transition refers to a person taking steps to live as a member of the sex opposite their sex at birth, often through name changes, pronoun (he/she) changes, clothing changes, or significant biological changes like surgeries or hormone treatments.

10.18 Sexual orientation is a person’s pattern of romantic attraction to a particular group (or groups) of other people. Some common sexual orientations include heterosexual (toward members of the other sex), homosexual (toward members of the same sex), and bisexual (toward members of both the other and the same sex).

10.19 Numerous factors can influence or correspond with sexual orientation, including genes, brain differences, handedness, finger size ratio, birth order among brothers, and more.

10.20 Attitudes toward sexual minorities vary widely. They can be influenced by familiarity or friendships with sexual minority members, as well as by involvement in organizations like gay-straight alliances.

10.21 Gender can influence many aspects of daily life, including communication styles, expression of emotion, personality, education, direction following, and sex life.
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**SELF-ASSESSMENT**

1. Language is one way to measure diversity in the United States. Approximately ______% of U.S. residents speak a language other than English at home.
   a. 1
   b. 10
   c. 20
   d. 50

2. A ______ is a group of similar people who share beliefs and patterns of behavior.

3. ______ is the ability to simultaneously know the norm for a group and recognize that the norm might not apply to every member of that group.
   a. Dynamic sizing
   b. Microaggression
   c. Culture shock
   d. Acculturation

4. Andrzej moves from Poland to the United States. He retains his Polish culture and also adopts U.S. culture. The acculturation strategy that best describes this behavior is:
   a. assimilation.
   b. separation.

5. Amber comes from a culture that emphasizes what’s best for the individual. Kyong comes from a culture that emphasizes what’s best for the group. Which of the following descriptions most accurately characterizes this difference?
   a. Amber’s culture is individualistic; Kyong’s culture is collectivistic.
   b. Amber’s culture has a large power distance; Kyong’s culture has a small power distance.
   c. Amber’s culture is more caring; Kyong’s culture is more assertive.
   d. Amber’s culture has a shorter-term orientation; Kyong’s culture has a longer-term orientation.

6. ______ is your ability to live and interact effectively in a multicultural society.
   a. Integration
   b. Assimilation
   c. Cultural intelligence
   d. Worldview
Travis puts a bumper sticker on his car that makes a joke about a minority group. He intends it to be funny, but his next-door neighbor, who belongs to that group, finds it slightly hostile and offensive. Although he may not realize it, Travis’ behavior could be labeled as:

a. acculturative stress.
b. a microaggression.
c. collectivism.
d. dynamic sizing.

_____ is your psychological and behavioral experience of maleness or femaleness.

Heather is a person whose gender and sex match. Which of these words best describes Heather?

a. transgender
b. transition
c. heterosexual
d. cisgender

Which of the following is true regarding surveys of sexual orientation?

a. Most researchers tend to settle on a range of about 2–4% of the general U.S. population as identifying as gay, lesbian, or bisexual.
b. Compared to women, men are more likely to identify as bisexual than homosexual.
c. Compared to women, men tend to have much more fluid sexual orientations, meaning that their sexual orientations change over time.
d. Within the United States, the rates of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people are consistent across all fifty states.

Research shows quizzing is a highly effective learning tool. Continue quizzing yourself using LearningCurve, the system that adapts to your learning.

Self-Assessment Answers
1. c, 2. culture, 3. a, 4. d, 5. a, 6. c, 7. b, 8. gender, 9. d, 10. a

WHAT’S YOUR TAKE?

1. In this chapter, you’ve read what the experts have to say about cultural differences between different groups. How do your own experiences match with their descriptions? Have you traveled to places, either nearby or far away, where you met people very different from yourself?

Did those differences fit into one of the cultural characteristics described in this chapter (for example, individualism vs. collectivism)? Did you notice other important differences besides the ones described in this chapter?