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A popular video used in social science and education courses, Preschool in Three Cultures, presents highlights of a study comparing preschool teachers in the United States, Japan, and China. In the video (Tobin, Wu, & Davidson, 1989), teachers from each of the three cultural contexts comment on each others’ teaching and classroom practices. In the Japanese segment, a boy called Hiroshi is obviously disrupting his class. He stands on the table, tears around cards from a sorting game, and jokes, sings, and engages with other kids in noisy conversation while the teacher is giving a lesson. The teacher ignores him. The American teachers are alarmed by Hiroshi’s behavior, but are even more concerned by the teacher’s inaction. They wonder aloud why the teacher does not intervene to stop Hiroshi. They suggest that because he is very intelligent, perhaps gifted, and obviously bored by classroom routines, he should be given some individualized or special instruction. The Japanese teachers are taken back by this characterization. While agreeing that Hiroshi disrupts the class, they maintain how he could possibly be “very intelligent” if he does not even know how to control his behavior and fit in with his fellow students.

The example of Hiroshi is instructive about competence and motivation, American style. The American preschool teachers assume, as do many American teachers, supervisors, and employers, that intelligence displays itself in verbal output and through behavioral expressions that are in some ways distinctive. Their comments further reveal their belief that competent behavior requires that the student be personally involved and engaged. The surprise of the Japanese teachers at the American reflections highlights different understandings of competence and motivation. From their perspective, it is impossible to see Hiroshi as a competent or gifted student. Competence and intelligence, Japanese style, requires knowing how to behave properly. A sensitivity to others and their expectations is the signature of motivation.
The mutual bewilderment of the two sets of people at what is regarded as smart or motivated by teachers in the other cultural context points to the influence of invisible networks of cultural-specific assumptions about the social world. These assumptions include solutions to questions: What is a person? What are the sources of behavior? What is the good and right way to be within this social world? We call these cultural-specific sets of meanings and practices "cultural models." These typically tacit models render the actions in the Japanese classroom meaningful and coherent to the Japanese observers, and, simultaneously, puzzling to the American observers who are using different models to make sense of the classroom.

In this chapter, we examine the importance of cultural models to both scientific and lay understandings of competence and motivation. We (1) provide some examples of sociocultural diversity in models of competence and motivation, (2) describe the origins and nature of the common European American model that underlies most psychological theorizing and research, and (3) review recent comparative empirical research that illuminates the sociocultural specificity of many findings in the competence and motivation literature.

In examining cultural models, we draw on the cultural psychological literature. "Cultural psychology" is the interdisciplinary study of how cultural practices and meanings, and psychological processes and structures depend on each other (Flake, Kimmitt, Markus, & Nisbett, 1992; Markus, 1992; Shwedew, 1991). A cultural psychology approach focuses on the interpretive structures of the world within which the person is a participant. We assume that cultural models of competence and motivation as significant features of cultural contexts that fashion individual experience (Hulse, 1995; Halliday, Hirst, Croquette, & Cain, 1998). Being competent and motivated, as well as identifying the nature of competence and motivation in others, is central to social interaction.

Although a variety of models of competence and motivation are possible and indeed exist in various contexts, the most prevalent and well-documented lay and scientific models within American context represent these phenomena as innate individual properties and locate them firmly "inside" the individual. As these models are taken for granted and absorbed in the everyday practices of teaching and testing, then enacting forces are made transparent, so that the search for the sources of competence and motivation focuses on the sociocultural aspects of brains, minds, and people. There are, of course, and have always been other theories and perspectives suggesting that competence and motivation-in fact, all of human behavior-is best understood by focusing on the outside: the external, the contextual, the social, the cultural, and the historical (e.g., the Lewin, 1935; Vygotsky, 1978). Likewise, there have always been theories proposing that the self is socially constructed (Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934). Why the "inside" story tenaciously persists as the most prevalent interpretation of differences in competence and motivation is the story of this chapter.

The view that competence and motivation are primarily individual and internal forces is not the result of the unaided observation of the work humans "actually use". Instead, this view reflects the incorporation of historically derived, widely accepted systems of meanings and ideas about humans, the self, the role of culture in action, and the consequences of action. This vast interpretive matrix is essential for human behavior; it affords individual experience. Yet a comparative approach reveals that the "inside" cultural model of competence and motivation in many ways discretionary, it could have been, and perhaps could still be, otherwise.

Sociocultural Historical Models: The Invisible Foundation of Competence and Motivation

What does it mean to be competent? In many American workplaces and schools, the answer is obvious. Competence, unlike it is qualified (e.g., athletic or social competence) and engagement in valued activities is a function of an individual's knowledge and skills and the focus is on the nature of the mind, thinking, and what it knows. In the competence person is quick, sharp, able to express him or herself, has a lot of ideas, and is able to make connections and solve problems or intellectual puzzles. The social context, social skills, relationships, and other people and their expectations are largely irrelevant and external to the domain of intellectual competence. Most psychological concepts of competence (defined in this volume as ability or success, including phenomena such as attitude, intelligence, proficiency, skill, etc.) are rooted in deeply entrenched but rarely articulated cultural models of intelligence (e.g., Carusugi, 1990; Foulany, 1937). These models include tacit assumptions, images, and metaphors that carry a far-ranging set of commitments. For example, they define what competence is, what it does, where it comes from, and where to look for it.

A Machine or a Robot? Divergent Metaphors of Mind

Metaphors provide the initial blueprints for understanding competence and the sources of competence (Smedberg, 1990; Winter, 1991). For example, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1999), the mind is often conceptualized as a "consider image defining a space that is inside the body and separate from it. Viewed, the mind is given an inside and an outside. Ideas and concepts are internal, and living somewhere in the inner space of our minds, while what they refer to are out in the external, physical world. This metaphor is to deeply ingrained that it is hard to think about the mind in any other way" (p. 261).

In Western philosophy and in the science that is built on its philosophical assumptions, the mind is also often metaphorized as a mechanical device, a switchboard, a machine, a set of gears or "works" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). As people think, they can feel that the "wheels are turning" and have a sense that they are "cranking out a solution." Sometimes the mind is a calculator that counts and sums (e.g., "To do what does it all add up?" or "What is the bottom line?" or "Give me an account of what happened."). Problems are solved with "power" from the "engine" of the brain. In recent theorizing, the machine is that of a computer. The mind is the software; the brain's hardware (Minsky, 1984). When the mind machine is experiencing difficulties, it is said to be a little rusty or to be experiencing a mental breakdown. In an extreme statement, one that applies characteristics of the empirical work in psychology, Shwedew (1990) equips that psychology assures that its subject is a cultural (ab- stark and transcendent) - dead or interior or hidden) processing mechanism inhered (fixed and universal) human beings, which enables them to think clearly, infer, remember, imagine... and that "all the other stuff—stupid, contexts, resources, values, meanings, knowledge, rituals, rituals, languages, technologies, institutions—is conceived to be external or to consist of the external processing mechanisms." (pp. 61-64).

Machine metaphors are central to Western concepts of mind and thinking and they simultaneously define what is involved in being a competent person. In many European American cultural contexts, the person is represented and viewed as a separate, bounded, autonomous entry—an individual (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shwedew & Bourne, 1994). Individual actions result from the attributes or the properties of the person that are activated and then cause behavior. Competence is one such individual property. Accordingly, competence is located in the individual, in the mind, in the brain. European American competence is active in a computer, works, dreams, owns, thinks, perceives, creates, cradles, and illuminates, and outsome solutions and produce. Typically, it involves technical intelligence that is distinctly separate from socioemotional experience (Gardner, 1990; Hoffman & Chaisay, 1995). People are understood to be powered by what is inside. Whether the thing is DNA, genes, neurons, hormones, traits, abilities, motivation, drive, or talent, it is what is inside that counts. The inside view sets up the powerful inside/outside dichotomy that pervades lay thinking and scientific theorizing alike. If the inside is good, the outside (the world, others and their expectations) is irrelevant, or maybe even evil.

Minds and intellectual competence take a different form in many non-Western contexts. Goffield (1993), Harkness, Super, & Keene, 1992). In East Asian cultural contexts, minds are not containers with fixed boundaries marking inside and outside.
stead, they are entities more likely to be of the natural world, like wind or water, or conceptions, like plants or rooms, which are interdependent with the environment and require the sun and nutrients of the soil (Marcus, Kitzayama, & Heiman, 1996).

In some East Asian contexts, the "good" mind is not nourished and feeding it is instead seen as a waste of time or not worth the effort. In Western cultures, the concept of a good mind is more likely to be associated with the idea of it being a "mind" that requires nutrients or a "faculty" that needs to be fed. In the context of the relationship between the mind and the body, the idea of a good mind being a "faculty" that needs to be fed can be seen as a metaphor for the way in which the mind is nourished and sustained by the body.

In the context of the relationship between the mind and the body, the idea of a good mind being a "faculty" that needs to be fed can be seen as a metaphor for the way in which the mind is nourished and sustained by the body. This idea is particularly relevant in the context of Western cultures, where the concept of a good mind is more likely to be associated with the idea of it being a "faculty" that needs to be fed. In the context of the relationship between the mind and the body, the idea of a good mind being a "faculty" that needs to be fed can be seen as a metaphor for the way in which the mind is nourished and sustained by the body.
to others and to his socializing milieu (White & Levine, 1986). A smart child is one who is intelligent enough to know how to listen to others. According to the Japanese Ministry of Education, the goal of preschool is not academic preparation but instead to build the proper relationships and good habits that will become the bedrock of later competence (Peak, 1991; Shapiro & Asuma, 2004). In many Western schools and edu-
cuated contexts, relating to others in the aca-
demic context is fraught with potentially negative associations; for example, a reli-
ance on others to solve a problem is classi-
cated as cheating. In the everyday situations of many other cultural settings, however, not using a companion’s assistance is regarded as folly or egoism (Rogoff & Chavias, 1995).

Living in the Right Way

According to many diverse and richly elabo-
 rated Indian philosophical works (Das, 1994; Srivastava & Misra, 1999), compe-
tent persons are those who are reflective and sensitive to contexts, and who select the approp-
riate behavior for the situation. An em-
 phasis is placed on “waking up, noticing, recog-
nizing, understanding, and compre-
 hending” (Srivastava & Misra, 1994, p. 160).
Knowledge acquisition, while important, ap-
pears as a way station on the path to under-
standing. Knowing is not for its own sake; instead, thinking is for the purpose of living in the right way. Intelligence is not neutral. Instead, intelligence and morality are inter-
 woven, and good intelligence is associated with happiness, pleasure, and progress. While bad intelligence is destruc-
tive and leads to unhappiness. Competence, then, both reflects and fosters karma, the doctrine by which one’s deeds are related to the quality of one’s life both currently and in the future immortals.

Examining what it means to be intelligent in India, Srivastava and Misra (1999) identi-
fied hundreds of Sanskrit suffixes and pro-
verbs, and then ask what it means to be intelli-
gence as intelligence is (commonly) un-
derstood. These words and proverbs are coded for their meaning and then group-
ing them into a few broad categories. Across both sets of men, intelligence and compe-
tence involved being good or smart at life.

The notion of being privyly smart in a way that is not useful for life was relatively in-
consistent. A key aspect of social competence was situational sensitivity and knowing how to behave appropriately according to time, place, and person. Showing respect to par-
ents, elders, and guests was another feature of intelligent behavior.

In Chinese cultural contexts, thinking also has a very important relational function, in particular, a hierarchy-maintaining function. When thinking in the presence of an elder, for example, tradition requires acknowledg-
ing one’s relative incompetence. In such situ-
ations, one should wait to be addressed or questioned before beginning conversation. The lower status person should not direct the conversation, introduce topics, or begin a reply until the teacher or superior is fin-
ished, or answer a question if there is some-
one else for whom it is more appropriate to do so (LeGare, 1967, as described in Scollon & Scollon, 1994, pp. 144-153). Learning is less likely to be associated with evaluating, questioning, and generating knowledge, which is referred to as “critical” thinking in the West; it is instead tuned into the insights and wisdom of those in the collective who have been recognized as exemplars (Tweed & Lehman, 2002).

Within cultural contexts influenced by Confucianism, it may follow then that intelligence, competence, or good thinking, at least in the social domain, may not require snap judgments, rapid distinc-
tions, quick inferences, or going beyond the information given to impose meaning, but instead requires listening, receiving, accepting, and comprehending meanings arising or reveal themselves, even if it requires time, patience, and an extended period.

As is the case for social competence as the defining feature of competence is not con-
fined to India or to India. In fact, in vir-
tually all contexts other than middle-class American ones, competence is in large part explicitly social. For example, in a compar-
ison between Puerto Rican families in Puerto Rico and two Mexican families in New Haven, Connecticut, Hartwood, Sévigné, and Luquet (1991) reported many differences in what parents valued and how they reacted to different problems. Ap-
glo-mother valued autonomy (children ex-
ploring settings on their own), self-control (rather than control by others), initiative, and self-maximization. Puerto Rican moth-
ers, like many mothers outside of middle-
class American settings, valued displaying proper social demeanor and maintaining 
respect within the group. The proper child in Puerto Rican settings would be “calm, obedi-
tent, and respectfully attentive to the teachings of his or her elders, in order to be-
come skilled in the interpersonal and person-
also competencies that will someday be ex-
pected of the well-socialized adult” (p. 98). Indeed in some settings, beyond an emphasis on harmonious and stable interpersonal rela-
tions, there is a distinct perception for in-
telligence to come from caution. Harbus et al. (1992), report, for example, that in Kenya, parents defined intelligence as the “ability to do what is needed to be done around the household without being asked” (p. 102).

In studies conducted in Uganda, Wober (1974) asked samples of villagers, teachers, and medical students that differed in their level of education and contact with Western ideas to rank various concepts related to intel-
ligence on 9-point semantic differential scales (consisting of pairs of adjectives with opposite meanings). Although there were important differences among the samples of Ugandans, there was also considerable over-
lap. Most notably, intelligence was not asso-
ciated with haste or mental speed. Many re-
 spondents thought of intelligence as slow,
careful, straightforward, and sane. The vil-
 lagers were also likely to associate intel-
ligence with traits such as “friendly” and “public,” suggesting that a productive use of the mind is to be shared with others and in a public or public-oriented context. Wober and his colleagues, however, that with exposure to Western ideas, intel-
 ligence becomes less social, and becomes in-
stead a more individual and private entity. In contrast to the villagers, students were more likely to associate intelligence with rapid re-
sponse, and not with pause or delay.

The literature on competence is replete with compelling theoretical statements (e.g., Biglan, 1996; Larrick, 1992) and those who are interested in the nature of the mind, in-
telligence, or competence are interested in how the environment that the mind has been shaped to meet. These views, as well as a va-
ciety of recent ones (Shapiro & Asuma, 2004; Stenberg & Grigorenko, 2004), find that different ecologies and situations recruit and create different ideas of competence and intelligence; thus, competence will neces-
 sarily assume a variety of forms. Moreover, re-
cent theories of competence and motivation, for example, Gardner’s (1993) multiple intelligences, Sternberg’s (1997) empirical theory of intelligence, Cantor’s social intelli-
gence (Cantor & Kihorot, 1983), Gole-
man’s (1995) emotional intelligence and Michie and Moore’s (1995) cognitive-affect-
ive theory, increasingly reflect this. A Wenon context some of the understandings of Horki’s preschool teachers, and explicitly delineate the importance of the interpersonal context and the requirements and expecta-
tions of others in developing competence. To give the dominance of the "inside" story of competence in both lay and sci-
cific discussions, the theories of compre-
tence and most—unless they challenge the in-
side—outside dichotomy and that instead of compartmentalize them as context-dependent and fundamentally intrapsychical social phenomena (for a review, see Satt, Chua, & Hong, 2001) have tremendous difficulty tak-
ing hold (Jerv, 1996).

IMAGINING AGENCY CONCEPTIONS OF TRYING AND DOING

The Focus Within

Because competence and related concepts such as ability and intelligence often fail to ade-
quately account for variation in achieve-
ment, other explanatory constructs have be-
come important. One construct ofnote is the concept of motivation like the concept of competence, is tied to a set of curricular and curricular activities and practices that describe what motivation is and why it is important. It is gener-
ally understood as the reason for behaving in some way, or the explanation for stopping one action and beginning another (Locke, 1986). The concept of motivation serves to justify and explain the direction and pur-
poses that seem to characterize human action, at least in European American con-
texts (Jewett & Bennett, 1991).

Although the source of individual behav-
ior could theoretically be social, relational, or internalized, the person is, in the most pop-
ular lay account of motivation, an in-
side entity, a feeling of interest or en-
thusiastic.

V. DEMOGRAPHICS AND CULTURE
25. A Cultural-Historical Analysis

Although the recognition of individuality and of purposeful agency appears to be universal, Markus and Kitayama (2004) contend that this recognition does not require a commitment to the European and American ideology of individualism and its particular accumulation models of human nature. In describing the various ways in which actions can be constructed, these authors use the words "agency" to refer to the "self in action." They propose that how actions are understood is tied to conceptions of the self. They find that European American contexts reflect the implicit cultural model of agency, in which "subjective good actions originate in an independent autonomous self, and the actions of this self are directed to the realization of personal goals. In contrast, East Asian contexts often reveal another implicit cultural model of agency, in which "subjective good actions originate in an interdependent self, and the actions of this self are considered to be, in some sense, impelled by interactions with others.

The distributed view of agency is not restricted to New Guinea, Africa, Asia, or East Asia. Wherever there are contexts that encourage strong notions of relationality among people or between people and nature, agency and motivation are less likely to be viewed as abstractions detached from the world and as "properties of people, and instead are assisted to social origins and contextualized as shared experiences." Lawton (2000), for example, notes that in both French and American working-class contexts, employees have a sense that their actions and their face are intertwined with the future, and that their actions are responsive to the need to be responsible to others and to uphold the moral order. Similarly, Markus, Ryti, Cushman, & Palmer (2004) find that those engaged in working-class settings are more likely to be attracted to the requirements of others and to the demands of the institution. Given their occupations and living arrangements, they are more likely to construe themselves as intervening in their integrity and are more likely to be invested in social and work-related needs, and they therefore be less likely to view themselves as freely choosing their own actions (Hibbert & Markus, 1993).
In recent writings, achievement motivation theorists appear to be shifting the focus away from the traits, labeling the dichotomy between persons and environment. Weiner (2001) distinguishes that success and failure do not occur in a vacuum, but "in a social context which affects and is affected by achievement performance." (p. 17). He also emphasizes that motivation is a strong, interpersonal component. Other theorists are examining how the environment or the context influences the nature of an individual's goals (Stein & Sherman, 1999). Thus, task goals or social constructs such as mastery or learning goals (e.g., Dweck, 1986) draw somewhat more attention to the social nature of motivation, because they implicate others, and the expectations of others, more often than goals performance, or similar constructs such as relative shier goals or ego goals (e.g., Maehr, 1984). When learning goals are present, for example, students are more willing to seek out others for academic help. And whether or not learning goal are present depends on the goal structures of the classroom (Urdan, 2001). Research explaining the performance gap between middle and working-class students (Croiset & Clark, 1998), or between white and black students (Steele, 1997), is a more explicitly theoretical and empirical attention to more external, contextual factors in motivation. Thus, Graham (2001) suggests that motivation is interpreted, and that the broader context of cultural and social influences may provide a set of organized class for understanding minority achievement. Whether the "A's" what's going on in the context of motivation, with its focus on interaction among persons, will help all scholars more effectively understand how certain conditions can create metaphors, narratives, and models that can effectively communicate and represent their more social perspectives on motivation.

HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

Why is the inside story of competence and motivation so powerful in many European American contexts? Why is it difficult for a more contextual, social, or relational account to take hold? The historical and ideological foundation of the inside story has been forged out of a net of powerful and sometimes conflicting collective beliefs, including beliefs in inherited traits, in the nature of the environment, and in the need for the self to feel autonomy and control to develop its full potential.

Inmates Faculties

The notion of inmate faculties takes root in the ancient Greek concept of essentialism—that objects have inherent qualities. For example, Aristotle spoke of God creating people: people of gold, silver, or brass, and iron, which defined their place in society (e.g., a conqueror vs. a craftsman) and that of their offspring. This concept of innate competencies is that nature is actually containing properties of a person has survived in some form throughout American history. The belief that people have innate faculties figured prominently in the discourse of the Founding Fathers during and after the formation of the American republic (Wiley, 1994). They believed, for example, that a natural aristocracy existed among men (Lemans, 1999) and that some (e.g., white persons) were fit for self-government, whereas others (e.g., Indians and slaves) were not (Jacobson, 1999).

The notion that certain desirable qualities were heritable gained prominence in the latter part of the 19th century with the rise of Social Darwinism. This movement proposed the existence of "survival of the fittest," a concept that became familiar with the growth of the knowledge of the work of British scientists Darwin and Wallace, theory Mendel's genetics, and Galton's statistical genetics. In particular, in Hereditary Genius (Galton, 1869/1976), explored the importance of genetics for the transmission of "social characteristics," which in turn, Galton also promoted the use of selective breeding. Social scientists, such as McDougall, who conducted studies on inherited characteristics and believed that individuals are motivated by inherent instincts, helped to introduce the study of essentialism and heredity to the United States. For example, the early 1890s to the 1920s, the "expressive" movement spread through American academic and political institutions. The movement, which hailed the biological engineering of the body politics, was motivated in large part by attempts to engineer waves of immigration to the United States from Southern and Eastern Europe, and the companionship fear that these immigrants would pollute the American genetic pool.

The significant immigration during this time period, together with the establishment of compulsory education and American involvement in World War I, also produced a perceived need for identifying and classifying large numbers of people (Chapman, 1993)—a need soon satisfied by the development and widespread use of mental tests. American psychologist J. Cartell (1916), who had briefly worked with Galton, originated the term "mental test." At the turn of the century, Thordike, one of his students, was developing a variety of intelligence means. The American initiative to develop mental tests was also advanced by similar work in Europe. In 1904, the French government asked Binet and Simon to develop a test to identify slow learners, so that they could be given special help. The resulting Binet-Simon Intelligence Scale (1905, 1911) was deemed a measure of current performance, not innate intelligence. In 1916, Terman, a Stanford professor known to have eugenics predilections, adapted the Binet-Simon scale for the United States, and the "local basal in performance and shifted to interest in intelligence in the first years of his and was renamed the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale. Many psychologists received a further boost during World War I, when the military needed a way to assess quickly and classify large numbers of new recruits. The last large-scale mental test was an IQ test administered to nearly 2 million recruits. With the use of large-scale group testing, the American public began to accept the idea of measuring mental abilities, and the idea of "intelligence" could be sorted into different levels of "ability" to abilities in various areas. Testing was also widespread in schools and industry. A variation of the IQ test—the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)—was first administered in 1926. Broad-scale SAT testing emerged soon after wars, aided by World War II, the GI Bill, the Cold War, the founding of the Educational Testing Service, and the victory of Har- vard administrators of an elite democratically chosen on the basis of mental test scores (Lemans, 1999).

Testing has not been confined to the United States. In China, for example, civil service tests have long been used to assess knowledge of geography, law, military, and agriculture. In France, Germany, and Great Britain, students must pass the Baccalaurea, Abitur, and A-levels, respectively, to gain admission to university. In contrast to American text, however, these tests are primarily knowledge-based. In the United States, the culture of testing has focused more on assessing how "smart" a person is rather than how much knowledge he or she has accumulated, or how much he or she has learned. The concern with native intelligence has transformed itself in the development and widespread administration of intelligence tests throughout the 20th century, and both IQ tests and the SAT are still in use today. For many intelligence testing has had appeal, because it provided a way to assess and sort students according to their capabilities. According to Lemans (1999), testing touched upon the deepest mythic theme: the ability to see the invisible (what was inside people's heads), the ocular ability to predict the future (what someone's grades would be in courses he hadn't even chosen yet). (p. 28).

These themes were made real when they were incorporated into practice. Once people were given intelligence score, by definition, they were given intelligence potential and potential within them," or not. Other countries have never rejected American-style mental testing, often because of its social implications. In the Soviet Union, for example, mental testing was abandoned, because it was believed to reintroduce class structure. In the United States, the relationship of mental testing with race—either by design or by accident—has deeply influenced this form of testing. Instead, eugenics ideas and biological theories have been applied to medicine, particularly in understanding mental and physical disabilities, perhaps owing to the widespread acceptance of the infallible model of competence.
The Power of the Environment

Despite its predominance, the "inside" story has been paralleled by an "outside" story. Many scholars have voiced the opinion that while it is not a small culture, perhaps it is small. The culture has a significant influence on individuals' behavior and development. For example, in the 17th century, the idea of a blank slate, written on by experience, was introduced by Locke (1690/1970), who wrote:

"Let us suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper, void of all characters, without any ideas. How comes it to be furnished? Whence comes it by that vast store of common ideas and general notions, which is necessary to us in order to think on any subject at all?" (p. 190)

Locke believed education, not natural genes, to be the prime determinant of success: "I think it may be said, that all the Men we meet with, Nine Parts of Ten are what they are, Good or Evil, useful or not, by their Education." (In that which makes the great Difference in Mankind" [1693/1989], p. 83).

Locke's influence in academic psychology came in part from his empiricism, the idea that knowledge must be built on observable things and events. He proposed that people do not possess innate ideas but experience the world through their senses, that a person's ideas are mental models of experienced reality, and that mind is a repository of input meanings. Locke believed that unequal faculties were the effect unequal environments (Wiley, 1991).

The Rise of the Self

While the study of environmental and cultural influences, which shifted focus away from the self and articulated a more external and social view, did penetrate the American public and academic discourse, other ideologies and psychological theorizing sustained a powerful American belief that the key to being successful lay within the self. In the 19th century, in an address on the elements of success, R. Cushman stated: "If things which are really essential for a successful life are not circumstances, but qualities, not the things which surround a man, but the things which are in him, not the address of the position, but the attributes of his character" (1846, as quoted by Wythe, 1954, p. 21).

In the 20th century, although it was acknowledged that intelligence and aptitude tests could shed light on the inner contours of the mind, success was still seen as emerging from a person's willpower, perseverance, ambition, and industry. Through a combination of American ideology and psychological theorizing, the self became seen as the key to being successful and well motivated. In particular, ideas about the self's independence and self-reliance, personal responsibility and control, and psychological theories of optimal self-development were fueled and informed by the foundational ideologies of independence, the Protestant ethic, and the American Dream. Independence and Self-Reliance

American institutions, practices, and psychological tendencies reflect an ethos of independence and individualism (Baumeister, 1987; Plaut, Markus, & Lachman, 2002). Locke's "liberal individualism"—the idea that societies are made up of autonomous individuals who form governments in order to protect their natural rights—forms the philosophical foundation of the U.S. Declaration of Independence. Lockeans philo- sophy reflects an individualist worldview whereby the individual is seen as prior to society. Moreover, this philosophy is ascendant, so that it views society as an aggregation of independent entities. This model of the person as independent and free from others has survived throughout American history (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985; Putney et al., 1994). Freedom is, according to Bellah et al., "perhaps the most persistent, deeply held American value" (1985, p. 23). American notions of freedom and autonomy include wanting to be left alone by others and not to be imposed upon by other people's values, beliefs, or lifestyles. Whereas some cultural contexts may stress the importance of tradition and meeting social standards, U.S. culture emphasizes a "socially assimilated self" that thrives on "separating oneself from the values imposed one's past or by convention or one's social milieu, so that one can discover what one really wants" (p. 24). In American contexts, this emphasis on independence leads to respect for the individual and fosters initiative and creativity (Bellah et al., 1985).

Independence and self-reliance became key to the American understanding of success in the 19th century. Transcendentalists such as Emerson and Thoreau articulated and helped popularize these concepts. For example, Emerson (1850) wrote in his 1841 "Self-Reliance" essay: "You cannot philosophize like a dwarf with the meed of every one of its members," said that to be a man: "Be a man of mystery" (p. 148). Moreover, Emerson espoused the belief that the key to success lay within the person, evidence, for example, in the following statement: "The reason why this man or that one should do this thing or that thing in the man" (p. 367). In his 1840 com- mencement address at Harvard College, Emerson (1840/2000) made the following observation: "The law of the habit of always considering themselves in isolation, and they willingly fancy that
their whole destiny is in their hands" (p. 484). Indeed, the independent, self-reliant, self-made man, who rose out of obscurity on his own personal merit without external help, soon became a powerful image in American society (Weible, 1954).

Personal Responsibility and Control

Notions of personal responsibility and control have contributed significantly to American models of competence and motivation. Two ideologies in particular, the Protestant ethic and the American Dream, have contributed to the individualistic focus of current conceptions of success and achievement in American culture (Spence, 1983).

The Protestant Ethic

Success in America has long been associated with moral superiority. Success and morality are linked under the Protestant ethic, which emphasizes the duty to pursue one's calling and the moral superiority of industriousness and hard work. According to Weber (1904/1958) under the Protestant ethic, the individual's highest moral obligation is to fulfill his duty in worldly affairs. This idea is derived from the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, which holds that God predetermines who will be saved from damnation. People can not work toward becoming one of the few "elect"; however, they should regard themselves as chosen, as sin/s of faith, and should demonstrate that faith by pursuing success in a calling. Attaining that success was to be regarded as a sign that a person had been chosen as a saint of grace. Calvinist doctrine allowed to Weber, supplies the moral energy and drive of the capitalist entrepreneur. This is in contrast to a religion such as Confucianism, for example, where sex is the ideal of the harmonious adjustment of the individual to the established order of things (Munro, 1969).

The link between religion, hard work, and success has a long history in American discourse, reflected in, for example, the lessons of Benjamin Franklin, Pauline Prouty, and other Puritan women. However, it was the Dutch Reformed Church that approved of business achievements and rewarded the desire with wealth (Weible, 1954). Franklin's adage, such as "Early to bed and early to rise, makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise" and "Remember that time is money," reflected a can-do ideology—the idea that one can get ahead on one's own initiative. They also implied that virtues (e.g., industry, frugality, honesty, and integrity) both lead to and reflect success. This ideology, called utilitarian individualism (Belli et al., 1985; Spence, 1983), is considered to be a secular version of the Protestant ethic.

Weber (1904/1958) claimed that Frankl's time, the religious basis of capitalism had died away (p. 180). Others have demonstrated a strong link between the church and economic practices. Many Congregational clergy wrote on success, and both clergy and secular writers continued to stress the importance of the secular calling, the pursuit of wealth as a religious duty, the importance of frugality, and the moral superiority of the rich (Weible, 1934). Dr. Tocqueville (1840/2000) remarked that, in America, the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom united inseparably with one another: they reign together on the same soil" (p. 282). More recently, psychologists have commented that religion in U.S. culture is still to be regarded as the ideal of personal control and independence (Cohen, Hall, Koegel, & Madsen, 2002; Snibbe & Markus, 2002).

Regardless of whether the Protestant ethic endures in a religious or secular form, the ideology continues to influence ideas about the person. Well into the 20th century, "pursuit of happiness," not so much as a search for individual salvation or as a celebration of the virtues of thrift and industry, but as a means of reaching success and of the hard work one's own industry and divinity of his duty to achieve both spiritual and secular goals (Kohn, 1990, p. 410), so that the Protestant ethic remains a cornerstone of American values (Spender, 1985, 1972). Lamont's (1992) cultural sociological study comparing American and French workers in the 1970s reveals that in the United States, ambition and hard work are seen as central to national character, that dynamism and energy signal competence, and that religion contributes as strong signs of moral purity (at least in upper-middle-class life). The Protestant ethic ideology continues to be reflected in American parables, psychological well-being, and attitudes toward work (Haut et al., 2002; Quinn & Crockett, 1999).

The American Dream

American notions of competence and motivation have also been shaped by the American Dream ideology. The American Dream is a central ideology in American culture and is considered an American individualism, combining success and self-interest, and promoting the idea that the greatest good is to be achieved individually as possible (Bellah et al., 1985; Hochschild, 1993). This ideology has provided a perspective of optimism in one's capacity for success and of personal control and determination in achieving success.

The American Dream took root in the promise of "a new world where anything can happen and good things might" (Hochschild, 1995, p. 15). From the colonial period to the present, the United States has been perceived as a land of opportunity and plenty (Potter, 1954), and many immigrants have come with hopes of improving their economic status (Takaki, 1993). The United States has long promoted the idea that it is not where one came from or what one did before that matters, but what one does now. One can start the past and invent a better future. This emphasis on opportunity, reimagining the future, and starting over has been embodied in many American institutions (e.g., western land grants of the 19th century, the Civil Rights Acts, in combination with practices (e.g., political campaigns run on "change," change management), in cultural artifacts (e.g., Horatio Alger's rag-to-riches stories), and in popular ideas (e.g., the frontier, Manifest Destiny) (McBride, 1999; Turner, 1920).

A central assumption of the American Dream is that people can remodel themselves if they possess a strong identity seeking success is under their control. Nineteenth-century regulations for success, rooted in the maximus as "We are and it is the same" and "To do the impossible; there are few impossibilities" (quoted in Weible, 1954, p. 497). More recently, in his 1993 speech, President Clinton remarked: "The American Dream that we thought we were all raised on is a simple but powerful one—if you work hard and play by the rules you should be given a chance to go as far as your God-given ability will take you" (quoted in Hochschild, 1995, p. 183). The American Dream promises that everyone, regardless of ascended traits, family background, or personal history, may reasonably seek success through actions and traits under their own control (Hochschild, 1995), and implies that it is important to process such a mind-set.

In addition, the American Dream ideology's focus on optimism, control, and determination fosters an expectation of success and an association between success and individual satisfaction. Success is central to American self-image, and Americans not only expect or hope to achieve but also are not gracious about failure (Hochschild, 1993; Spindler & Spindler, 1990). De Tocqueville (1840/2000) famously wrote that every American is "devoured by the desire to rise" (p. 239). In a 19th-century business self-help book, Master said, "The Creator made man a success-machine, and failure is as abominable to him as a disease is to harmony" (quoted in Weible, 1954, p. 37). Although the American Dream's emphasis on material rewards may seem to suggest that focus is solely on external compulsions, it is a thoroughly "inside" story. The American Dream involves doing better and getting ahead not just for the sake of material wealth but also out of a sense of personal investment in and commitment to one's work and to personal advancement. Feeling personally satisfied and fulfilled, and that one has "made it," are intrinsic to this ideology.

The American Dream is not just a relic of the past; it is still alive and well. For example, a recent television commercial for the financial services company American States, "American determination, American enlightenment, American optimism," while showing a graduate crossing a college campus, with a new pine-time dream, American Dreams; and multimillion-dollar...
practical, stressing that the meaning of a belief depends on the practical difference it makes in one’s life. Thus, Pragmatism emphasized personal experience, the effect of one’s thoughts or actions, and changing existing realities. Pragmatism therefore re- defines qualities in the American character: “It assigned to each individual, as it were, a leading role in the drama of salvation, gave him a share and a responsibility in making what he held good come true ... and decreed that he succeed or fail through his own efforts ... [and] emphasized his uniqueness rather than his conformity” (Comroe, 1930, p. 91). Pragmatism suggested that people held the future in their own hands and encouraged optimism.

Drivers and Needs. Many theories of motivation developed in the United States have conceived of motivation as the internal pro- cesses that cause individuals to move toward a goal. For example, Hull (1943), arguably the most influential drive theorists, believed that human behavior could be reduced to the drive—the major underlying instigator of behavior. Also depending on a view of motivation as emanating from within the individual, McClelland and colleagues (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell, 1953) developed a theory of motivation based on intrinsic motivational needs. Building on the work of Murray (1938), who developed the concept of achievement motivation and the Thematic Apperception Test, McClelland et al. (1953) distinguished between people high in need for achievement (n Ach) and those low in n Ach. This theory of achievement motivation captured the spirit of the traditional work ethic (Spence, 1958), and it is reminiscent of de Toqueville’s observation that Americans are eaten up with longing to rise.

Self and Psychological Development Self-Actualization. Although it opposed drive theories and incentive-goal theories, the humanist perspective on motivation also fixed on processes within the autonomous individual. According to humanism (e.g., Maslow, 1970; Rogers, 1977), people’s ac- tions are influenced by a need for personal growth and fulfillment, and people have free will to determine their destiny. People create their own perceptions of the world and actively choose their own life experiences. A key concept in humanism is self-actualization, which is thought to be a fundamental need that motivates people to fulfill their po- tential and is seen as the ultimate level of psychological development. Self-actualization theory has been influential in business, psychotherapy, and education. Perhaps its popularity outside of academic psychology stems in part from its focus on the indepen- dent, self-determined, satisfaction-seeking individual, consistent with the American Dream ideology. After all, self-actualization theory regards the individual as capable of overcoming oppressive social constraints in order to achieve the highest level of psycho- logical development (Hewett, 1989). And, although it was influenced in part by Bud- dhism and Hinduism (Wilson, 1997) and stimulated by a rejection of materialist goals, self-actualization has been referred to as “another facet of unbridled individual- ism” (Spence, 1945, p. 1290).

Competence, Self-Efficacy, and Control. Theories of competence (White, 1959) and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1997) also hinge on a model of the person as autono- mous and in control of his or her environ- ment and actions. White introduced to the study of motivation the notion of “competence,” defined as the capacity to interact ef- fectively with the environment. According to White, the motivation needed to attain com- petence could not come from drives alone and required effective motivation to pro- duce a feeling of efficacy. The need for effi- cacy was considered to be a fundamental need that motivates people to fulfill their po- tential and are oriented toward the per- ceived growth of personality. “Self-efficacy” is de- fined as the belief that one possesses the capabilities to organize and execute the course of actions required to produce given amounts” (p. 3). It is provided as neces- sary for success. A strong relationship has been established between self-efficacy beliefs and cognitive engagement, academic perfor- mance, and persistence (Pascual & Schuss- man, 1992; for a meta-analysis, see Mullan, Brown & Jones, 1991).

A vast literature on control has also evolved in the past decades. Researchers have worked on locus of control and Weiner’s (1985) model of attribution, for example, center on notions of personal responsibility and beliefs about the individual’s ability to control events (Miller, 1996). Research on li- mitation of control emphasizes the positive consequences of believing that one has con- trol over one’s outcomes (Taylor & Brown, 1988). Other work has introduced a distinc- tion between primary and secondary control, the former involving behaviors aimed at changing the world to fit the needs of the individual, and the latter involving behav- iors aimed at fitting in with the world (Rothbaum, Wildes, & Snyder, 1982). Block- hausen and Schulte (1995) have claimed that across cultures and history, primary control has functional primacy over secondary con- trol in development, while secondary control takes on a support role. In response to notions of control as indi- vidual and primary, cross-cultural research has suggested some important cultural varia- tion. Some have suggested that people in East Asian countries emphasize secondary control more than do people in Western coun- tries (Gould & Fikes, 1995; Weiss, Rothblum, & Blackburn, 1984). Others believe that the important distinction is between indirect and direct primary control, and argue that the Japanese values more indirect primary control, which involves the modification of existing reality not through direct confronta- tion but by deliberately using tactics that are expected eventually to modify behavior in appropriate directions (Kojima, 1988). Others have suggested that the Japanese meaning of success is control over one’s in- terior state as opposed to achieving control over external circumstances (Masuda & Nitta, 2004; Akiyama & Katayama, 2004) have distinguished between disjoint and conjoint self-connection agencies preoccupying U.S. consti- tuents, suggesting that agency occurs more frequently in East Asian contexts. Researchers have also looked at variation in the United States by comparing the models of agency that are prevalent in working-class and high school-funded versus middle-class and college- educated contexts (Smith & Markus, in press).

Self-Determination and Intrinsic Motiva- tion. A class of theories of motivation has rested on the assumption that human beings have an inborn need to exert mastery, or control, over their external environment (deCharms, 1968, Deci, 1975). It is gener- ally assumed that these innate intrinsic mo- tives serve as the starting point of which operate intrinsic motivation (Spence, 1985). Accord- ing to to Spence, the belief in the intrinsic value of work is a permutation of the Protestant work ethic. This view encourages the notion that work should be engaged in primarily because it is inherently satisfying, and it as- signing greater value to intrinsic than to ex- trinsic motivation.

Researchers have constructed a dichotom- ous between motivation that comes from internal as opposed to external sources and have repeatedly demonstrated that external sources can undermine intrinsic motivation (e.g., Deci, 1971; Lepper, Mooney, & Nisbett, 1975). According to cognitive eval- uation theory (Deci & Ryan, 1980), choice that negatively affects a person’s experience of autonomy or competence diminishes intrin- sic motivation, whereas events that support perceived autonomy and competence en- hance intrinsic motivation. To the degree that the controlling aspect of an external re- ward is salient, the reward will undermine intrinsic motivation because of the perceived external locus of causality (deCharms, 1968), which is the sense that the behavior stems from a source outside the self. Fur- thermore, according to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), external goals and rewards (e.g., social recognition and money) can provide only indirect satisfac- tion of basic psychological needs for autono- my, competence, and relatedness. Focusing on external cues and contingencies as drivers of regulating external control is seen as a way to win internal and feelings can have sig- nificant personal and instrumental con- sequences (Ryan & Connell, 1989). Decades of re- search has revealed that people (at least in U.S. contexts) are most motivated when able to initiate and direct their own behavior (Coyne, 1977; Rotter, 1966). Choice and control have been found to al- low enhanced achievement positively (Corcoran & Lepper, 1996; Deci & Ryan, 1985). In contrast, removing choice (Brown & Wicklund, 1974) or imposing someone else’s choice (Brown & Krueger, 1979) has been shown to affect intrinsic motivation nega- tively.
Models of competence and motivation are not easily cultural constructs used to interpret behavior after it has occurred. Rather, they are found in laws that are institutionalized and given a material form, thereby structuring behavior. For example, in the American models of the "must-read humanities" career, the heroes are men "who show competence and motivation," American style. Their competence and motivation spring from private, internal storms, and they are capable of standing out of the group and going their own way. Many educational practices, such as testing and ability tracking, also reflect the commitments of these models, and rely on a role in identifying and fostering competence and motivation as personal, internal entities.

People live their lives in terms of the blueprints provided by these models, thereby making them reality (Adams & Markus, 2004). If people's worlds are set up in such a way as to foster a particular model of competence and motivation, then, on average, the behavioral tendencies of many people engaged with these contexts will reflect that model. Through people's actions, which reproduce the models, the inside story becomes the real story and the true story.

Yet the inside story is a particular one, a historically and socioculturally specific one. In other contexts, there are other models of competence and motivation. A growing number of empirical studies carried out in contexts other than European and American ones reveal patterns of behavior that reflect these different models. Marked variation in cultural orientations is evident in the achievement values of the Japanese and Chinese Americans (Bennett, 1983). In Chinese American culture, students are often highly motivated to achieve academically, whereas in Japanese American culture, motivation to achieve academically is less prevalent. These differences in achievement motivation are reflected in the effectiveness of educational programs designed to foster achievement in these cultures. For example, in a study of Chinese American students, it was found that students from Chinese American families were more likely to achieve high levels of academic success than students from Japanese American families. This difference was attributed to the high levels of parental involvement and the strong emphasis on educational achievement in the Chinese American culture.

Similarly, in African American culture, the emphasis on academic achievement is often lower than in other cultures. This difference is reflected in the lower levels of achievement observed among African American students compared to European American students. These differences in achievement motivation are reflected in the effectiveness of educational programs designed to foster achievement in these cultures. For example, in a study of African American students, it was found that students from African American families were less likely to achieve high levels of academic success than students from European American families. This difference was attributed to the lower levels of parental involvement and the lower emphasis on educational achievement in the African American culture.

Achievement An Individual or Social Construct?

Empirical evidence suggests that cultural contexts differ in the extent to which people seek more affiliative, or social, as opposed to individual goals. This line of inquiry notes, in part, in response to the need for achievement literature that was prevalent in the 1970s and deemed to reflect individualistic achievement values (Salili, 1996). The subsequent three decades, researchers have explored cross-cultural differences in the achievement construct, arguing that this construct takes on different meanings in different cultures, and that it is important to understand these sociocultural variations (Fryxell, Salili, Mathi, & Dessen, 1983; Mathi, 1974; Niles, 1996).

Divergent Goals: Individual versus Social Research in this area has generally revealed more individual-oriented achievement motivation in U.S. and other Western contexts than in Asian and Latin American contexts, where a social-oriented motivation is more prevalent. For example, Japanese and Native Hawaiians have been found to associate achievement with goals of affiliation and social belonging more than with individual goals (De Vos, 1973; Gallimore, Boggs, & Jordan, 1974). Research in India also had revealed more emphasis on group-related goals than on individual ones (Agarwal & Mina, 1987; Singhal & Mina, 1989). Similarly, Niles (1996) found that Chinese American students were more focused on social goals than on individual goals.

In a study comparing Chinese and Australian students, the Chinese rated affiliation motives as more important than did the Australians (Kirkby, Kolt, & Lin, 1999). In a recent study of achievement in Asian contexts, Salili (1996) argued that socially oriented achievement motives are more common in Asian than in Western cultures because of cultural differences in attitudes toward learning and education, for Asian students, success is defined in terms of recognition and smooth social relationships. In Japanese contexts, "success only for oneself has been considered a sign of excessive, immoral egotism" (De Vos, 1973, p. 181).

Some research suggests that individual and social motivation may be more entangled than formerly thought. For example, when affiliative and individualistic achievements are seen as mutually exclusive. In a study of
obtain in Asian and Asian American contexts. One study revealed that although Tai-
wanese children rated themselves signifi-
cantly lower on perceived competence than American children, they outperformed the Americans academically (Stigler, Smith, & Ma, 1985). In a similar study, Keew (1995) found that Chinese children down-
graded their competence, as compared with Canadian children. Eaton and Debo (1997) examined differences in motivation beliefs and performance on a word scram-ling task among Asian American and non-
Asian (mostly Anglo) ninth graders. While Asian American students reported lower lev-
els of self-efficiency beliefs, they performed their non-Asian counterparts similarly. Similarly, Whang and Hunsorn (1994) found that Asian American students scored higher than non-Asian students on standardized math tests but reported lower self-concepts for mathematical ability relative to non-Asian students. According to Eaton and Debo (1997), Asian American focus less on self-
efficacy, or perceptions of capability to com-
plete a task, and more on the importance of excelling at a task. In contrast, non-Asian children in U.S. contexts may overestimate their abilities. Children in these contexts are encouraged to maintain self-esteem regard-
less of their academic performance, which may contribute to self-protective illusions, or overestimating one's competence rela-
tive to actual performance (Ottenga, Little, Lindenberg, & Baltes, 1994; Taylor & Brown, 1986).

Whereas self-efficacy concerns individuals in non-Asian U.S. contexts, failure seems to weigh on the minds of individuals in Asian contexts. In a study by Steinberg, Doen-
neke and Brown (1987), Asian American students showed simultaneously the highest academic achievement and the highest fear of failure. Eaton and Debo (1997), in the same study described earlier, discovered that fear of the consequence of academic failure best explained the performance of Asian American participants but least explained results for non-Asian students. Their main explanation for these results is the previous discussion of parental pressure: Fear of academic failure stems from Asian American parental stress on academic suc-
cess for their children (Su, 1992).

Self-enhancing versus Self-improving Motivations

Whether self-efficacy is tied to motivation may depend on whether motivation centres on enhancing the self, reflective of an internal, individualistic model of motivation, or on im-
proving the self and meeting expected stan-
dards, reflective of a more relational model. In a study of Filipino and American university students, for example, Church and Kangshu (1992) found that approval and self-improve-
mnt motives ranked higher for Filipinos col-
lege students than for American students. Similarly, Heise et al. (2001) found the hy-
pothesis that Japanese students focus more on self-improving motivations, while North American students focus more on self-en-
harmonizing motivations. Results confirmed their hypothesis: North Americans possessed more on a creativity task after success than after failure, whereas Japanese possessed more after failure than after success. Moreover, North Americans, but not Japanese, were more likely to view creativity as important for life success if they had done well, while Japanese were more likely to view creativity as impor-
tant for life success if they had done poorly. Finally, North Americans felt better after suc-
cess than did Japanese. The authors con-
cluded that although individuals in both cul-
tures want to do their best, North Americans pursue this goal by focusing on their strengths, while Japanese pursue this goal by focusing on their shortcomings. Oaks and Darner (2003) likewise found that European Americans' choice of a second task was based on how well they thought they had done on an earlier task, but this did not hold for Asian Americans. Furthermore, choice was related more to personal goals in the European Americans, but not for the Asian Americans.

If one is interested in self-advancement, one will work harder to stick out, which is more common in American cultural con-
texts. In contrast, if self-improvement is the goal, one will work harder to avoid sticking out, which is more prevalent in Asian cul-
tural contexts. Most likely, the full range of fulfilling role obligations may be a more salient goal, requiring more attention to meet a minimum standard than to surpass the standard (Su et al., 1999).

Perceived Determinants of Success: Ability or Effort?

If an individual assumes that motivation is linked to actualizing one's potential and dis-
playing one's ability, as is more common in American contexts, then he or she likely will view ability as relatively fixed and more predictive of success (Heine et al., 2001). However, if one believes that motiva-
tion is linked to discovering shortcomings and correcting them, as is more prevalent in Japanese contexts, one most likely will view ability as malleable and may believe that ef-
fort plays a larger role in determining suc-
cess than does innate ability. Heine et al. tested the hypothesis that cultures differ in their emphasis on effort versus incremental theories and found cultural variation on the Beliefs in Incremental Abilities Scale. This scale asked participants to respond to con-
textual behavioral scenarios (e.g., "Imagine that Michelle, a sophomore, scored the high-
cut grade in her history class. Only knowing this about Michelle, please do your best to estimate what percentage of her performance in the class was due to her inherent ability and how much was due to her effort and studying"). The Japanese believed that abilities were more incremental (i.e., more effort-based) than did European Ameri-
cans. Moreover, on an item that asked what percentage of intelligence is due to natural ability versus effort, European Americans re-
ported on average that 36% was due to ef-
fort, Japanese reported 53%, and Asian Americans reported 43%.

Although implicit theories of intelligence are conceptualized primarily as an individ-
ual difference construct (e.g., Dweck & Leggett, 1988), it is likely that they will also vary by cultural context, insofar as models of competence and motivation also vary. Moreover, if an incremental view per-
tains, tasks will likely be understood as reflecting process (e.g., effort), and perfor-
mance will not likely be linked with underly-
ing traits and self-worth. If an effort view prevails, however, tasks will likely be under-
stood as measuring permanent intelligence and, intelligence may be linked to related traits and achievement. Empirical observations in-
dicate that Japanese and Chinese respon-
dents' beliefs about achievement outcomes

counter primarily on effort, while American respondents assign more importance to abili-
ty (Lewis, 1995; Stevenson & Stigler, 1992; White, 1987). Thus, one reason Han's teachers' surprise at the Americans' insist-
tence that he was gifted, as described earlier, is that in Japanese contexts, "the notion that children's success and failure and their pos-
tential to become successful versus failed adults has more to do with effort and char-
acter and thus with what can be learned and taught in school than with raw inborn abil-
ity" (Teah, et al., 1985, p. 24).

Research on attributions for academic achievement also has suggested cultural vari-
ation in perceptions of the importance of ability and effort, with individuals in U.S. contexts generally seeing ability as the pri-
mary determinant of success, and individu-
als in Asian contexts attributing academic success and failure to effort (Holloway, 1983; Stevenson & Stigler, 1992). In one study, American undergraduate and graduate-
school students attributed academic achieve-
ment significantly more often to ability than did Asian (Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and South American) students (Yan & Gaine, 1994). American students also believed that effort was more important for success than lack of effort was for failure, whereas Asian students believed effort to be equally impor-
tant for success and failure. Hess, Chang, and McDowell (1987) compared the attribu-
tions of Chinese mothers living in China, Chinese American mothers, and Caucasian American mothers. Whereas Chinese moth-
ers in China viewed lack of effort as the major cause of their children's low perform-
ance, Caucasian American mothers attrib-
uted lack to effort and disinterested respon-
sibility. Chinese American mothers also viewed lack of effort as important but assigned consider-
able responsibility to other sources. Hollo-
way, Kashou, Hess, and Anitra (1986) examined attributions for math performance by Japanese and American mothers and chil-
dren. Whereas American mothers and chil-
dren attributed performance to ability, Japanese respondents emphasized effort, particularly when attributing success to others.

Studies also show that Americans sup-
port rewarding people for their accom-
plishments rather than for their efforts
Internal and External Sources of Control

Lyengar and Lepper (1999) questioned the assumption that intrinsic motivation and the provision of individual choice and self-determination go hand in hand by examining the relationship between choice and motivation across cultures. In one study, Anglo American and Asian American grade-school children were asked to work on anagrams task. Anglo American children performed best and spent more time working on the anagrams when they chose which anagrams they would work on themselves. While Asian American children performed best and spent more time working on the anagrams when they thought that their mothers had chosen the anagrams for them. Lyengar and Lepper observed similar results when children were told that an outgroup (children at another school) or ingroup (their own classmates) had made the selections.

Asian American children may perform best and expect to enjoy tasks more when valued ingroup members choose for them, because of the different models of motivation that permeate their cultural contexts. It is not surprising that children are more motivated by "what others think" in a cultural context that stresses the relational nature of motivation than in one that stresses the independent, internal sources of motivation. Moreover, boundaries between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are culturally defined (Unger & Brockwa, 2001; Lyengar & Lepper, 1999). Lyengar and Lepper note that in American society, if someone chooses in order to please someone else or to conform to their ideals, then that behavior is viewed as extrinsically motivated (deCharms, 1968; Deci, 1975). In East Asian settings, external motivations are less likely or alternatively contrasted or intertwined with internal motives. For example, Church and Karioglu (1992) found a closer relationship between intrinsic task motives and affective motives among Filipino than among American university students. Sallis, Chou, and Lu (2001) observed that in Chinese cultural contexts, extrinsic motives are more likely to be associated with work beside by side. According to Tweed and Lepper (1999), studies on intrinsic and extrinsic goals, such as social recognition, are positively associated with mastery goals, suggesting that the Chinese emphasis on pragmatic learning does not preclude learning-related goals.

Principe of Choice and Control

Differing cultural contexts also provide varying degrees of opportunity for exercising choice and control. For example, whereas in American contexts, choice can figure prominently in daily life, having and making choices is not part of a student's normal daily routine in Japanese contexts (Leuva, 1993). Instead, conforming to the preferences of a social group or adjusting to others is more prevalent. Furthermore, according to Tweed and Lepper (2002), the sociocultural approach to learning contexts in Western cultures is associated with a desire for well-delineated tasks, but culture that stress Chinese approaches to learning may not better self-regulation to the same extent. A recent study by Morling Kinayama, and Subero (2001) showed cultural variation in the allowance of street conditions. They asked American and Japanese students to describe actual social situations in which they have influenced or changed the surrounding people, events, or object according to your own wishes. Respondents also indicated when the events had occurred. American respondents reported more recent influencing events than adjusting events, but Japanese respondents reported more recent adjusting that influencing events.

The inside story, although common in American cultural contexts, is not without having a more complex interaction upon the world by expressing their own preferences through choices, and are perhaps more likely to be adjusting to the world by conforming to relational norms and market obligations (Kosstera, 1999; Lamont, 2000). As a result, working-class participants may respond differently to choice than do middle-class participants. For example, unlike and Marks (in press) examined social class differences in personal identity and in the United States. Results indicated that college-educated participants, but not high school-educated participants, like an object better if they have chosen it themselves.

Compensation: Competing Perspectives

Different Levels of Competence

Models of competence and motivation can also be linked to the styles of thinking that people a cultural context (Gol & Scollan, 1976; Nisbett, Peng, Choi, & Norenzayan, 2001). Consistent with the more relational models in Eastern cultures, holistic or relational-contral thought predominates in these cultures. In holistic thought, there is greater attention to the field in which objects are embedded. In contrast, and consistent with the inside story, an analytic approach to the world is more characteristic of Western cultures. Analytic thought emphasizes paying attention primarily to the object and to the categories to which it belongs. For example, and Nisbett (2001) examined Chinese and American participants' use of relations versus categories as bases for grouping objects together. They found that Chinese participants were more likely to group objects on the basis of relationships (e.g., "because the sun is in the sky"), while Americans were likely to group objects on the basis of category (e.g., "the object is a cube"). While the Chinese stimuli were the same, the American stimuli were the same, the American participants were more likely to group objects based on the object's functional or relational properties (e.g., "because the sun is in the sky"). In a study by Nisbett and Nisbett (2001), which also examined cultural variation in thinking styles, Japanese and American students saw animated vignettes of undergraduate scenes. Subsequently, they were asked questions that had to be only very recently reviewed or not seen, and that were either in their original setting or in some other setting. Japanese students recognized previously presented figures more accurately when seen with the original background, whereas the new background, wherein the latter manipulation had no effect on American subjects.

Awareness of Difference

Within American contexts, some researchers who focus on examining differences between individuals and interpersonal social class differences in personal identity and in the United States. Results indicated that college-educated participants, but not high school-educated participants, like an object better if they have chosen it themselves.
mance (Jones, 1999; Markus, Steele, & Steele, 2001; Steele, 1997). Mainstream con-
texts typically inscribe the ideas and practices of the majority. Thus, those who examine these contexts from the perspective of the mi-
nority are often in a good position to see the context, which is often invisible to the major-
ity. The mainstream context can facilitate per-
formance for some and impair it for others. Without acknowledging that the context of learning and motivation may differ for those in the majority and those in the minority, expla-
ning the gap among students and employ-
ees from different backgrounds in terms of in-
ternal factors can seem reasonable. And historically, researchers have pursued this ex-
ploratory path, thereby continually rein-
ferring the inside story. Even social psy-
chologists have leamed toward explanations that focus on internal basic premises. As Steele andSherman (1999) argue, despite the initial impact of Lewin's theoretical formul,
ations, researchers have paid relatively little atten-
tion to the "life-space" contents of per-
son's live—their socioeconomic position in society, their position in a family, their group identities, the cultures they are immersed in, the status they enjoy, the stigma they endure, and the opportunities and resources they pos-
ten" (p. 393-394).

Charting the particulars of the relevant contexts reveals, for example, that those in the majority, compared to those in the mi-
nority (e.g., white students compared to black students in a predominantly white school), are not in the same context. They are often assumed by teachers, principals, and other students to be able to succeed, and they are expected to succeed. Furthermore, whites are likely to be benefited from con-
texts with relatively better schools and more-
prepared teachers, to have better educated parents, and to live in homes and neighbor-
hoods with more-school-relevant resources (Lares et al., 1988). Whites also are relatively free from a whole context of negative stereotypes and limiting evaluations that are often associated with minority students in schools (Crocker & Major, 1989). Steele and col-
leagues (Steele, 1997; Steele & Aronson, 1995) found that if negative stereotypes of academic ability of black students are pre-
ent in a context, they well-qualified black students can experience a threat in

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As with all psychological phenomena, com-
petence and motivation are highly affec-
ted and maintained. Surely, both individual and group differences in capacities identified as internal, as well as differences in individual engagements with the social context, will prove to be significant in the analysis of competence and motivation. The main point of the chapter, however, is that the story of being smart and motivated in America has been, and continues to be, primarily an in-
side story. It is an inside story, not because the weight of the evidence overwhelmingly supports this perspective, but because the in-
side understanding of competence and moti-
vation fits like Cinderella's slipper to the predominant cultural model of behavior. When parents, teachers, and students seek to explain variations in competence and moti-
vation, they most commonly look to what is beheld to be inside the person—"an en-
tity or a set of entities, or a force or en-
ergy that governs and controls behavior.

Whether these entities or forces are pre-
sumed to be intrinsically given facets or as the result of effort and persistent engagement with the relevant tasks, the 11e' are believed to reside inside the person and to be subject to individual, willful control.

Given the historical and ideological foun-
dations of the Americas and European con-
texts in which these theories have developed, peering toward is natural and obvious. In di-
versity cultures that persist, above all, freedom (both freedom from the constraint of others and the freedom to express one's self through choice and control), it is un-
thinkable to locate the sources of positive, desirable behavioral outcomes in in-
currents with achievement and success any-
where but inside the person. Many indicators of competence and motivation then quite essen-
tially 'weark and find these phenomena processes which the person. Given the ideological landscape and the extensive sys-

The case study of an American Indian stu-
dent provides a cautionary tale. The student

Our argument is that the inside model is prominent and powerful, not that it is the only model of competence and motivation that has been theorized in American and Eu-
ropen contexts. Certainly, the role of the social context, particularly the expectations of others, has been explored. However, these views are "re-inventing" means against a dense and forceful flow of meanings and practices, both in science and in the every-
day world, and these more social views of competence and motivation have not caught on and have not stuck. Our review of the liter-
are views reveals that in contexts in which the person is regarded as an interdependent part of an encompassing social network, the so-
cial nature of competence and motivation is decidedly more obvious and natural. Our re-
view of these studies serves primarily to un-
nerstand how the prevalent, implicit cultural models in a given context shape the scientific search, analysis, and interpretation strate-
gies in ways that are important to identify and situate. As a science, we have searched for the sources of competence and motivation and found them "inside" be-
cause they are there, or have we searched where the cultural spotlight is brightest? Is it a problem that an "it's what's inside that counts" cultural context has "it's what's inside that counts" views and practices of competence and motivation? Our view is that it is a problem if the scientific and/or to develop a comprehensive human psycho-
tology, not a particular or a partial one. So-
cially and practically, within European and American contexts, it matters because, as a growing number of empirical studies sug-
gest, the social context is important for com-
petence and motivation, but this matter interacts with this cultural main-
stream contexts—those who embrace or have engaged in cultural contexts different from the middle-class European American one—
and for those who have been historically marginalized and excluded from full partici-
patiation in mainstream contexts. For these in-
dividuals, failure to manifest competence or motivation can have powerful effects on their experiences and approaches to motivation, but there is little likelihood of being explained with inside accounts: (e.g., these people are stupid or lazy because they did not study enough, or with the potential mismatch between the preva-
len models in a context and those that em-
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dents or employ—to bring with them, may be relatively invisible and unidentifiable. To be competent and motivated in a given context requires behaving in a culturally appropriate manner. Those who are motivated by ambivalence and family more than by their own interests may be judged as followers; those who are very receptive to others, and in relation with others, may be seen as dependent and those who criticize those whom they themselves may be judged as uncon- trial or may not be treated at all. Moreover, those who expect that a positive and effective context is an interdependent, relational one may not respond well in contexts requiring separation, independence, and rela- tive autonomy from others. Finally, failures to manifest competence and motivation that arise because people are required to contend with the pressure of being stereotyped, de- valued, and otherwise limited may go con- spicuously undetected. Under the influence of the inside model, this in the phenoclass models may be badly labeled as incompetent or un- motivated.

The situation of Hirschi, whom Americans judged as gifted and Japanese judged as un- intelligent, is a powerful reminder of the impor- tance of explicitly examining the prevail- ing implicit cultural models of competence and motivation. What does it mean to be competent or motivated in this situation? What is the source of this understanding? Does the arrangement of classroom and workplaces foster one model of competence and motivation at the expense of others? Who is privileged by this arrangement of the context, and who is disadvantaged? What is missing among many European American con- stants is the idea that competence and motiva- tion arise from social interactions between people and their social environment. Sociological research with a more social view will serve to generate more competence and motivations. The insi- de story, while a belle-se-est, is not the full story, and it leaves a lot of competence and motivation on the table.

NOTES
1. When we refer to "American" or "American style," we mean pertaining to "mainstream" U.S. cultural processes and to those who have engaged with them, middle-class U.S. ideas and practices and participated in U.S. en- strumtions. Depending on the literature being examined or the study being monitored, in some cases we use the term "American Ethnicity;" in other American American. References to "American Economics;" and "American" to mean American workers. American, British, and European, and have been strongly influenced by Czech and Roman culture and Christianity.
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CULTURE: DYNAMIC PROCESSES

CHAPTER 26

Cultural Competence
Dynamic Processes

CHI-YUE CHIU
YING-W HONG

The rapid increase in global interconnectedness has created a pressing demand for a model of cultural competence in many areas, including management, medical professions, counseling, social services, and education (e.g., Reisel & Couros, 1994; Sue, 1993). Experts in the field have different opinions on what "cultural competence" is, but the strong agreement on its importance (Cunningham, Foster, & Hargreaves, 2007). Most practitioners believe that cultural competence involves self-understanding, knowledge of others whose cultural origins and values are different from one's own, and adapting one's own behaviors to the needs of culturally diverse groups (e.g., Himmelfarb, Arredondo, & Christie, 2005). However, little is known about the roles of awareness, knowledge, and skills in enabling people to function effectively in a variety of cultures.

In this chapter, drawing on recent research in cultural and cross-cultural psychology, we offer a framework for conceptualizing the nature of cultural competence, and for identifying its major components. We also discuss the relationships between multicultural experiences and cultural competence, and the implications of our conceptual framework for studying the preclinical culture of medicine.

THE NATURE OF CULTURAL COMPETENCE

There is a lesson that cultural competence researchers can learn from the social competence literature. In his seminal paper, Edward Thummler (1972) defined "social competence" as a kind of intelligence analogous to abstract academic intelligence. Whereas abstract academic intelligence is "the ability to understand and manage ideas and symbols," social intelligence is "the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls—to act socially in human relations" (p. 228). Inspired by Thummler's idea, numerous attempts have been made by researchers to identify the specific expertise and skills (e.g., expertise in decoding communicative behaviors, expertise in judging people, team knowledge about