

In Search of Cultural Diversity, Revisited: Recent Publication Trends in Cross-Cultural and Ethnic Minority Psychology

William E. Hartmann, Eric S. Kim, Jackie H. J. Kim, Teresa U. Nguyen, Dennis C. Wendt,
Donna K. Nagata, and Joseph P. Gone
University of Michigan

Given the increasing proportion of ethnic minority individuals in the United States and psychology's historical reliance on theories derived from Euro American populations, it is important to monitor the status of cultural diversity research. We conducted a 10-year follow-up to Hall and Maramba's (2001) report of cross-cultural (CC) and ethnic minority (EM) publication trends. Comparing data from 1993–1999 and 2003–2009, we found that research on CC and EM issues continues to be underrepresented in the literature, particularly in top-tier journals. The American Psychological Association and Association for Psychological Science journals mirrored this discouraging trend, and the absence of top CC and EM authors on their editorial boards may point to a structural barrier to broader inclusion of cultural diversity research. We also found that fewer top CC and EM researchers are employed in psychology departments than one might hope, reflecting predominant attitudes within psychology of CC and EM research as peripheral to the larger field. Although clear that few gains have been made despite numerous awareness-raising efforts, the precise deficits were somewhat obscured, because the CC and EM terminology employed by Hall and Maramba (2001) did not fully capture the breadth of cultural diversity research currently underway in psychology. Thus, future attempts to assess the field would benefit from wider-reaching search terms. Additionally, we suggest that attention to reorganization within the evolving fields of cultural diversity research and to developing new categories of inquiry for research on cultural diversity that maintain focus on minority statuses in the United States may be productive routes forward for psychology as a discipline.

Keywords: ethnic minority psychology, cross-cultural psychology, psychology publication trends

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, racial and ethnic minority births now outnumber non-Hispanic White births (Tavernise, 2012), and non-Hispanic Whites will likely comprise a minority of Americans by 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). This growing diversity may pose a problem for psychology, in light of historical assumptions that psychological knowledge could be generated without ethnic minorities as research participants, or by treating their experiences as deviant or inferior (Cundiff, 2012). Moreover, cultural, racial, and ethnic concerns have been treated as subsidiary

to presumably more universal biological, psychological, and social processes (Arnett, 2008; Hall & Maramba, 2001). These problems are further exacerbated by an underrepresentation of ethnic minorities among psychology full-time faculty (Cundiff, 2012).

In recent decades, there has been increased awareness that greater attention to ethnic minority individuals and issues is crucial to guarantee the relevance of psychology (Arnett, 2008; Cundiff, 2012). Recognition of ethnic minority concerns grew beginning in the 1960s as increasing numbers of minority psychologists entered the field (Abreu, Chung, & Atkinson, 2000). These developments led to the formation of ethnic minority psychology associations in the late 1960s, the creation of the American Psychological Association (APA) Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs in 1979 and the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues (APA Division 45) in 1986, and revision of the APA Ethics Code in 1992 to include multicultural awareness.

Scholars have also begun monitoring publication trends pertaining to ethnic minorities, and reports have detailed several disconcerting findings that highlight the marginalization of ethnic minority research. According to Graham's (1992) analysis, the percentage of empirical articles about African Americans in a variety of high-profile APA journals decreased from 5.2% in 1970 to 2% in 1989. Graham attributed this shift to increased fears of publishing socially sensitive research, changes in "bandwagon effects" that draw temporary attention to specific African American topics, and shifts in psychology's "zeitgeist" toward explanatory models (e.g., cognitive process-

This article was published Online First August 12, 2013.

William E. Hartmann, Eric S. Kim, Jackie H. J. Kim, Teresa U. Nguyen, Dennis C. Wendt, Donna K. Nagata, and Joseph P. Gone, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan.

This research was undertaken as a follow-up to a 2011 conference at the University of Michigan titled "Reconciling Evidence-Based Practice & Cultural Competence in Mental Health Services." Both the research and the conference were supported by the Center for Advancing Research & Solutions for Society at the University of Michigan.

We would like to acknowledge Dr. Gordon C. Nagayama Hall for providing consultation to help ensure the accuracy of our replication procedure, and University of Michigan Psychology and Sociology Librarian Susan Turkel for her consultation in data collection and management.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to William E. Hartmann, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, 2257 East Hall, 530 Church Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1043. E-mail: williaha@umich.edu

ing) for which social context is assumed to be less relevant (p. 637). In 2001, Hall and Maramba reported trends for ethnic minority (EM) and cross-cultural (CC) publications indexed in the PsycINFO bibliographic database from 1993–1999. They found that although certain specialty journals had relatively high rates of articles focusing on EM and CC issues, very little EM (6%) and CC (2%) research was published in APA and Association for Psychological Science (APS) journals, especially among higher-impact journals. They construed these findings as a “wake-up call” (p. 28) for the field of psychology to pay more attention to issues of cultural diversity and EM status. Similar results have been shown for high-impact clinical psychology journals, in which only 2% of articles from 1980–1997 focused on EM groups (Iwamasa, Sorocco, & Koone, 2002).

These studies suggest that as of the late 1990s, attention to cultural diversity has lagged behind what might be expected of a discipline earnestly seeking to assure its demographic relevance. As such, it is important to continually monitor these publication rates, in light of the historically dynamic nature of racial, ethnic, and cultural considerations within psychology and society at large. Within the last decade, the prevalence of numerous social issues related to race, ethnicity, and culture (e.g., debates over immigration policy, increasing globalization, the election and reelection of our nation’s first African American president) might suggest increased attention to these themes within U.S. society. Similarly, within psychology, the past decade has witnessed several disciplinary developments that may have led to increased rates of EM and CC publications. For example, in 2001 the U.S. Surgeon General published a report, *Mental Health: Culture, Race, and Ethnicity* (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2001) that drew attention to massive health disparities between European Americans and American ethnic minorities. In the wake of this report and other awareness-raising efforts, the APA (2003) published comprehensive multicultural guidelines in education, training, research, practice, and organizational change; these guidelines included “the importance of conducting culture-centered and ethical psychological research among persons from ethnic, linguistic, and racial minority backgrounds” (p. 388). Considering America’s growing diversity, these publications reflect greater recognition that the existing theories, models, and interventions for addressing issues of cultural diversity are inadequate.

In light of these developments over the past decade, we provide a status update on EM and CC publications. We do so through a replication of Hall and Maramba’s (2001) study described above. Not only is Hall and Maramba’s study the most recent investigation of publication rates for psychology generally, it is also the most comprehensive. It includes a wide range of publications as opposed to only a few journals, and it reports both top publishing journals and authors in EM and CC psychology. By replicating this study, our aim is to directly compare any differences in publication trends between the two time periods, 1993–1999 and 2003–2009, in terms of publication rates, representation in high impact journals, and representation of scholars of CC and EM issues on journal editorial boards. In short, this comparative approach will provide an update on the current status of the field.

Method

Replication

In order to assess whether we could reliably compare results across decades, we began by attempting to replicate Hall and Maramba’s (2001) findings for the years 1993–1999. We used Hall and Maramba’s same search terms for these years in the PsycINFO database in January, 2012. Although individual percentages for certain journals and authors varied slightly, the pattern of top journals and authors was the same (results available upon request). This variation was likely due to PsycINFO database updates (e.g., backfilling of newly included journals). Because the general findings were replicated, we are confident in the integrity of our comparison between the two time periods.

Present Study

For our analysis of the years 2003–2009, we compiled and analyzed CC and EM publications indexed in PsycINFO and published between January 1, 2003, and December 31, 2009. As Hall and Maramba (2001) explained, CC and EM research was chosen because they constituted two nonoverlapping domains that addressed issues of culture, race, and ethnicity. CC research is understood to focus on diversity between cultural groups, traditionally looking beyond U.S. borders to other nationalities for cultural comparison (e.g., studying similarities and differences between American and Japanese populations; for more information on CC research see Berry, Portinga, Segall, & Dasden, 2002). EM research, in contrast, is understood to focus on diversity within a society, most often exploring psychological processes relevant to members of an EM group (e.g., impact of stereotype threat on African Americans; for more information on EM research see Bernal, Trimble, Burlew, & Leong, 2002). Assessing these domains using PsycINFO, the primary database of psychology literature, we can assess change in trends of knowledge production around cultural diversity issues across national borders (CC) and within U.S. society (EM). Moreover, searching top publishing authors in these areas can provide a sense of who is creating knowledge about cultural diversity, and searching publication venues (i.e., journals) can shed light on sociological processes related to knowledge production.

To facilitate multiple comparisons between 1993–1999 and 2003–2009, methodological decisions were guided by the precedent set by Hall and Maramba (2001). Thus, our procedure required four initial searches in PsycINFO (EBSCO platform) for the 2003–2009 time period: two searches for the most productive authors of CC and EM publications, and two searches for the top journals publishing articles on CC and EM issues. Each search combed the title, key words, article subject, and abstract for specific CC and EM search terms as outlined by Hall and Maramba. Following these initial searches, we identified the scientific impact of the resulting EM and CC psychology publications using PsycINFO, the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), and the Sciences Citation Index (SCI). Although PsycINFO provided a broad, inclusive combing of the literature, the SSCI/SCI database holds more stringent inclusion criteria and only includes journals considered influential to the social science and science fields. Thus, discrepancies between PsycINFO and SSCI/SCI statistics

may speak to the impact of particular journals, authors, and articles on the larger field of psychology (e.g., a significantly larger PsycINFO statistic would suggest a greater proportion of publications in journals viewed as less reputable by researchers in psychology and related social science disciplines).

Cross-cultural searches. The search for authors who published the most on CC issues took place in January 2012. The data compiled for this list were retrieved using the search terms “cross cultural” and “cross national.” Furthermore, “English only” and “peer reviewed” search delimiters were used. The search for journals that published the most CC articles was identical, but included an additional search delimiter for the type of publication (“journal articles”) and occurred in March 2012.

Ethnic minority searches. The search for authors who published the most on EM issues took place in January 2012. Search terms included “ethnic minority,” “immigrant,” and “multicultural,” in addition to terms for specific American racial/ethnic minority groups (Latino/a, Cuban American, Puerto Rican, Mexican American, Native American, American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian American, Chinese American, Japanese American, Korean American, Pacific Islander, Filipino American, and African American). Search delimiters included “English only” and “peer reviewed.” The search for journals that published the most EM articles was identical but included an additional search delimiter for the type of publication (“journal articles”) and occurred in March 2012. Although we followed the lead of Hall and Maramba (2001) in listing Native American, American Indian, and Alaska Native categories under the “ethnic minority” heading, it is important to acknowledge that these labels represent political identification with independent indigenous nations, not simply categories of race or ethnicity (Gone & Trimble, 2012). Nonetheless, research with indigenous communities represents an important area of cultural diversity research.

Additional details on search and compilation. Results from all four searches were exported through Refworks into Excel where the data were used to create lists of top authors and journals. These data were then supplemented with the following additional information. Journal websites were searched to document researchers, from the top author lists, who were serving on APA and APS journal editorial boards as of April 2012. For each top journal, PsycINFO was used to calculate the total number of articles published; this count was also used to calculate citation-publication ratios (CC or EM publications over total publications). For each top author, demographic details, such as departmental descriptors and racial/ethnic identification were solicited via email. For authors who did not respond, departmental websites were used to document departmental descriptors and racial/ethnic identification was left blank. Finally, for each top author, an additional search was performed in the SSCI to determine the total number of citations for all journal publications during the 2003–2009 time period.

Although the number of PsycINFO references, number of SSCI citations, and a “PsycINFO citations over SSCI references” ratio was available in Hall and Maramba (2001), we added additional data including: the number of SSCI citations, the number of PsycINFO citations, a ratio of “PsycINFO citations over PsycINFO references,” and a ratio of “SSCI citations over SSCI references.” These additional ratios draw their numerators and denominators from the same database, thus clarifying interpreta-

tion of the observed publication trends by reflecting top authors’ impact on the field while effectively eliminating the influence of between-database differences. Accordingly, they reflect top authors’ impact on the field without being confounded by database discrepancies. By reporting publication statistics from both the more inclusive psychology-specific PsycINFO database and the more exclusive wider-reaching SSCI database, we obtained a better sense of how works by top authors of CC and EM research fare within two important databases for psychology researchers that employ distinct information-dissemination techniques. All self-citations, defined as the first author of the primary article being listed in one of the first three author positions of the citing article, were excluded from these calculations to adjust for inflation.

Journal impact factors. We referenced the SSCI and SCI to determine the most recent (2010) impact factors for each of the top journals to assess scope of readership. Using APA and APS journal SSCI impact factors as a guideline, Hall and Maramba (2001) considered journals with an impact factor of 1.0 or higher as “first-tier.” The impact factors of these journals have since multiplied by an average of 1.67. Thus, we designated journals with an SSCI impact factor of 1.7 or higher as “first-tier” for the 2003–2009 time period. We also found it appropriate to consider journals with an SCI impact factor of 1.7 or higher as “first-tier.” This cutoff point provides a number of first-tier journals comparable to the number reported in Hall and Maramba (2001) and reflects broader trends of increased readership of the psychology literature.

Results

The following results outline findings from the search performed on CC and EM publications in 2003–2009.

Journals Publishing the Most CC and/or EM Articles

Representation of CC issues. Of the English, peer-reviewed publications in PsycINFO, 2% addressed CC issues. Table 1 lists journals publishing the most articles about CC issues. One first-tier journal, the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (70%), allotted a majority of its publications to CC issues. The six remaining first-tier journals in Table 1 allotted 2–14% of their publications to CC issues.

Representation of EM issues. Of the English, peer-reviewed publications in PsycINFO, 4% addressed EM issues. Table 2 lists journals publishing the most articles about EM issues. No first-tier journals allotted a majority of its publications to EM issues. Six of the top non-first-tier journals in Table 2 (i.e., with impact factors less than 1.7), were specifically focused on EM issues. These journals allotted 75–98% of their articles to EM-related articles.

APA/APS Journals Publishing the Most CC and/or EM Articles

Representation of CC issues. Table 3 lists APA and APS journals and their representation of CC issues. The APA/APS journal that devoted the highest percentage (6%) of its articles to CC psychology was the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (APA). No other APA/APS journal allotted more than 5% of its publications to address CC issues.

Table 1
Journals Publishing the Most Cross-Cultural Articles (2003–2009)

Journal	Cross-cultural publications	Cross-cultural/all publications	SSCI impact factor (2010)
<i>Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology</i>	230	0.70	1.9
<i>International Journal of Intercultural Relations</i>	136	0.49	1.1
<i>Cross Cultural Management</i>	98	0.62	
<i>Psychological Reports</i>	92	0.05	0.4
<i>International Journal of Cross Cultural Management</i>	92	0.73	
<i>International Journal of Human Resource Management</i>	74	0.11	0.9
<i>Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science</i>	73	0.56	0.6
<i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> ^a	63	0.06	5.2
<i>Social Science and Medicine</i>	63	0.02	3.5
<i>International Journal of Psychology</i>	62	0.21	1.1
<i>International Marketing Review</i>	54	0.39	1.4
<i>Asian Journal of Social Psychology</i>	52	0.32	0.9
<i>Social Indicators Research</i>	51	0.08	1.0
<i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>	50	0.04	1.1
<i>Personality and Individual Differences</i>	47	0.02	1.8
<i>Journal of Business Research</i>	47	0.06	1.8
<i>International Journal of Behavioral Development</i>	46	0.12	1.3
<i>International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling</i>	44	0.22	
<i>Journal of Transcultural Nursing</i>	43	0.17	0.7
<i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>	43	0.05	2.5
<i>Journal of Pragmatics</i>	41	0.07	0.9
<i>Ethos</i>	41	0.26	1.3
<i>Transcultural Psychiatry</i>	38	0.18	1.0
<i>Journal of Social Psychology</i>	37	0.11	0.7
<i>Social Behavior and Personality</i>	37	0.05	0.3
<i>Journal of Comparative Family Studies</i>	37	0.17	0.0
<i>Sex Roles</i>	37	0.04	1.2
<i>Journal of Counseling and Development</i>	37	0.1	0.6
<i>Applied Psychology: An International Review</i>	33	0.14	2.8

Note. SSCI = Social Sciences Citation Index; APA = American Psychological Association.

^a Journal published by APA.

Representation of EM issues. Table 4 lists APA and APS journals and their representation of EM issues. The APA/APS journals that had the highest coverage of EM issues were *Journal of Counseling Psychology* (23%), *Health Psychology* (10%), and *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* (10%)—all APA journals. No other APA/APS journal allotted more than 9% of publications to address EM issues.

Authors With the Most Publications

Representation in CC publications. In Table 5, the mean citations-per-publication ratio was 25.07 for PsycINFO citations and publications, 33.55 for the SSCI citations and publications, and 26.36 for SSCI citations over PsycINFO publications. Among the 21 authors whose ethnicity was obtained, 24% identified as ethnic minorities (3 men, 2 women)—2 men were residing outside the U.S. and not of European descent—and 66.7% were of European descent (13 men, 1 woman). Three top publishing authors (Drs. Steven Heine, Shigehiro Oishi, and Robert McCrae) currently serve (as of April 29, 2012) on APA journal editorial boards, while none were on APS journal editorial boards. It was also found that 65% of the top contributors to the CC literature held appointments in psychology departments.

Representation in EM publications. In Table 6, the mean citations-per-publication ratio was 9.59 for PsycINFO-listed

citations and publications, 8.88 for the SSCI-listed citations and publications, and 8.06 for SSCI-listed citations over PsycINFO-listed publications. Among authors whose ethnicity was obtained, 50% of the 24 authors identified as ethnic minorities (7 men, 5 women) and 50% were of European descent (7 men, 5 women). Two top authors (Drs. Bryan Kim and Christine Yeh) currently serve (as of April 29, 2012) on APA journal editorial boards, while none are on APS journal editorial boards. It was found that 33% of top contributors to the EM literature held appointments in psychology departments.

Discussion

In light of repeated calls for greater attention to cultural differences and EM issues (e.g., Surgeon General, 2001), we gathered data on CC and EM publication trends to better understand the state of CC and EM psychology research.

Trends in Publications

Our findings highlight that although CC and EM articles appear in numerous journals, the vast majority of venues that regularly publish on these topics has limited readership, evidenced by their considerably low impact factors. Most often, these articles appear in specialty journals (e.g., *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, impact factor 1.0; *Cross Cultural Management*, no impact

Table 2
Journals Publishing the Most Ethnic Minority Articles (2003–2009)

Journal	Ethnic minority publications	Ethnic minority/all publications	SSCI-SCI impact factor (2010)
<i>American Journal of Public Health</i>	332	0.26	3.9
<i>Journal of the National Medical Association</i>	270	0.67	1.1*
<i>Social Science and Medicine</i>	232	0.09	3.5
<i>Journal of Black Studies</i>	223	0.75	0.2
<i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i>	211	0.17	3.1
<i>Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology</i> ^a	210	0.85	1.6
<i>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</i>	190	0.94	1.0
<i>Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved</i>	181	0.49	1.0
<i>Journal of Black Psychology</i>	159	0.98	1.0
<i>Journal of General Internal Medicine</i>	156	0.16	2.8*
<i>Psychiatric Services</i>	150	0.09	2.4
<i>Preventive Medicine</i>	149	0.15	3.3*
<i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i>	144	0.28	1.8
<i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i>	135	0.15	4.1*
<i>Journal of Negro Education</i>	133	0.78	
<i>Maternal and Child Health Journal</i>	133	0.35	2.1
<i>Social Science Quarterly</i>	132	0.35	0.8
<i>Journal of the American Geriatrics Society</i>	115	0.10	3.9
<i>Ethnic and Racial Studies</i>	113	0.29	1.3
<i>AIDS Education and Prevention</i>	113	0.41	1.4
<i>Journal of Hispanic Higher Education</i>	111	0.86	
<i>Animal Behaviour</i>	109	0.05	3.1*
<i>Journal of Womens Health</i>	108	0.08	1.5
<i>Drug and Alcohol Dependence</i>	108	0.20	3.4*
<i>Journal of Transcultural Nursing</i>	107	0.43	0.7
<i>Health Education and Behavior</i>	105	0.26	1.7
<i>Nicotine and Tobacco Research</i>	105	0.11	2.8
<i>Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse</i>	103	0.66	
<i>AIDS Care</i>	101	0.10	1.6
<i>Obesity</i>	100	0.11	3.5*

Note. SSCI = Social Sciences Citation Index; SCI = Sciences Citation Index; APA = American Psychological Association.

^a Journal published by APA.

* Impact factor from Science Citation Index (SCI).

factor) which are either not “first-tier” or have no associated impact factor. Only one “first-tier” (impact factor >1.7) journal (*Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*; impact factor of 1.90) had a high CC publication rate (70%). In comparison, no “first-tier” venue published nearly as frequently on EM issues. These impact factors can be compared to the more extensive readership of leading APA and APS journals (e.g., *American Psychologist*, impact factor 6.0; *Psychological Science*, impact factor 4.7). Considering trends of increasing racial and ethnic diversity in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010) and globalizing trends in the larger field of psychology (Beebe, 2010), it is problematic that less than 6% of psychology articles in the last decade addressed CC or EM issues.

It is also worth noting that although CC and EM articles have not managed to find their way into high-impact venues, neither did they wane in relative strength. Comparing our data against Hall and Maramba's (2001) results reveals that the average number of CC publications among top scholarly producers increased from 9.25 (1993–1999) to 15.96 (2003–2009), and the average number of times they were cited more than tripled from 19.86 citations (1993–1999) to 66.19 citations (2003–2009). Similarly, the average number of EM publications among top scholarly producers increased from 11.27 (1993–1999) to 17.58 (2003–2009), and the average number of times they were cited more than doubled from

24.15 citations (1993–1999) to 54.54 citations (2003–2009). Thus, in step with the larger trend of rapid increases in the quantity of publications and citations within psychology (Adair & Vohra, 2003), the number of CC and EM publications and citations also increased since 1993–1999 but maintains a similar degree of marginality.

Trends in Psychology Organizations

Similar patterns of marginalization were observed in both APA and APS publication trends and editorial board membership, as well as in top authors' departmental affiliations. Within APA and APS, we found that although each organization sponsors numerous high impact journals, few of these journals serve as regular venues for CC and EM articles. The combined median percentage of articles addressing CC and EM issues was extremely low: 1% for CC articles and 3% for EM articles. The APA and APS journals similarly allotted 1% of their articles for CC research, but the percentage of EM articles in APA journals was double the percentage in APS journals (4% vs. 2%). This latter statistic may suggest that, in distinguishing themselves from APA, APS researchers have inadvertently further limited attention to EM issues. Further investigation into the processes behind this troubling trend is certainly merited.

Table 3
 Cross-Cultural Articles in APA/APS Journals (2003–2009)

Journal	Cross-cultural publications	Cross-cultural/all publications	SSCI-SCI impact factor (2010)
<i>American Psychologist</i>	21	0.03	6.0
<i>Behavioral Neuroscience</i>	0	0.00	2.5*
<i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> ^a	8	0.02	3.5
<i>Developmental Psychology</i>	23	0.03	3.4
<i>Emotion</i>	13	0.03	3.0
<i>Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology</i>	0	0.00	2.7
<i>Health Psychology</i>	5	0.01	4.0
<i>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</i>	4	0.01	5.2
<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	19	0.03	4.0
<i>Journal of Comparative Psychology</i>	0	0.00	2.1
<i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>	10	0.01	5.2
<i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i>	26	0.01	2.5
<i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>	18	0.04	3.6
<i>JEP: Animal Behavior Processes</i>	0	0.00	1.8
<i>JEP: Applied</i>	1	0.01	2.2
<i>JEP: General</i>	2	0.01	5.0
<i>JEP: Human Perception and Performance</i>	1	0.00	2.8
<i>JEP: Learning, Memory, and Cognition</i>	2	0.00	2.8
<i>Journal of Family Psychology</i>	17	0.03	1.9
<i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>	63	0.06	5.2
<i>Neuropsychology</i>	0	0.00	3.2
<i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i> ^a	6	0.04	5.3
<i>Professional Psychology: Research and Practice</i>	18	0.03	1.2
<i>Psychological Assessment</i>	15	0.04	2.6
<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	6	0.02	12.0
<i>Psychological Methods</i>	1	0.01	3.2
<i>Psychological Review</i>	6	0.02	7.8
<i>Psychological Science</i> ^a	26	0.02	4.7
<i>Psychological Science in the Public Interest</i> ^a	0	0.00	
<i>Psychology and Aging</i>	5	0.01	3.1
<i>Psychology of Addictive Behaviors</i>	2	0.00	2.1
<i>Psychology, Public Policy, and Law</i>	1	0.01	2.2
<i>Rehabilitation Psychology</i>	5	0.01	1.7

Note. APA = American Psychological Association; APS = Association for Psychological Science; SSCI = Social Sciences Citation Index; SCI = Sciences Citation Index; JEP = *Journal of Experimental Psychology*.

^a Journal published by APS.

* Impact factor from Science Citation Index (SCI).

The composition of APA and APS journal editorial boards echoed the marginal status of CC and EM research within psychology. Only 5 of the 52 top publishing authors from Tables 5 and 6 (Heine, Oishi, McCrae, Kim, and Yeh) currently serve (as of April 29, 2012) on APA journal editorial boards. None of the top publishing authors are on APS journal editorial boards. This low representation in editorship has not changed since the 1993–1999 time period covered by Hall and Maramba (2001). These trends within APA and APS are particularly disconcerting given the central role these institutions play in organizing the field by managing disciplinary boundaries, prioritizing certain forms of knowledge creation, and lobbying for resources.

Similar trends of marginality were observed at the level of departmental affiliation. Fewer top CC and EM authors are currently employed in psychology departments than one might expect (CC: 65% in 1993–1999 and 56% in 2003–2009; EM: 24% in 1993–1999 and 38% in 2003–2009). Outside psychology departments, top authors of CC research appear scattered across various university-based departments and independent research organizations, whereas top authors of EM research are heavily concentrated in schools of education and interdisciplinary health departments.

As departmental affiliation can serve as an indicator of institutionalized understandings of disciplinary boundaries, this suggests that, like APA and APS, psychology departments continue to see CC and EM research as noncentral to the larger discipline.

Promising Trends

Despite the lack of significant progress in bringing CC and EM issues out of the margins of psychology research, some positive developments have occurred. One such development has been the increased representation of EM psychology in medical and health journals, which publish a moderate percentage of EM articles (e.g., *Preventative Medicine*, 15% EM articles; *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 17% EM articles). As reflected by PsycINFO's expansion to include a greater number of medical and health journals in the last decade (Beebe, 2010), psychologists today operate in a more interdisciplinary field with greater access to research from these disciplines that more regularly include EM participants. The increased accessibility of publications in related disciplines allows for psychologists to draw from an expanded pool of EM research. However, this has

Table 4
Ethnic Minority Articles in APA/APS Journals (2003–2009)

Journal	Ethnic minority publications	Ethnic minority/all publications	SSCI-SCI impact factor (2010)
<i>American Psychologist</i>	33	0.04	6.0
<i>Behavioral Neuroscience</i>	5	0.00	2.5*
<i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> ^a	2	0.00	3.5
<i>Developmental Psychology</i>	52	0.07	3.4
<i>Emotion</i>	11	0.03	3.0
<i>Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology</i>	5	0.02	2.7
<i>Health Psychology</i>	65	0.10	4.0
<i>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</i>	10	0.02	5.2
<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	22	0.03	4.0
<i>Journal of Comparative Psychology</i>	11	0.03	2.1
<i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>	65	0.08	5.2
<i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i>	79	0.23	2.5
<i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>	25	0.06	3.6
<i>JEP: Animal Behavior Processes</i>	3	0.01	1.8
<i>JEP: Applied</i>	1	0.01	2.2
<i>JEP: General</i>	2	0.01	5.0
<i>JEP: Human Perception and Performance</i>	4	0.01	2.8
<i>JEP: Learning, Memory, and Cognition</i>	2	0.01	2.8
<i>Journal of Family Psychology</i>	55	0.10	1.9
<i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>	78	0.08	5.2
<i>Neuropsychology</i>	2	0.00	3.2
<i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i> ^a	3	0.02	5.3
<i>Professional Psychology: Research and Practice</i>	62	0.10	1.2
<i>Psychological Assessment</i>	14	0.04	2.6
<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	4	0.02	12.0
<i>Psychological Methods</i>	0	0.00	3.2
<i>Psychological Review</i>	0	0.00	7.8
<i>Psychological Science</i> ^a	59	0.05	4.7
<i>Psychological Science in the Public Interest</i> ^a	0	0.00	
<i>Psychology and Aging</i>	12	0.02	3.1
<i>Psychology of Addictive Behaviors</i>	25	0.06	2.1
<i>Psychology, Public Policy, and Law</i>	5	0.05	2.2
<i>Rehabilitation Psychology</i>	11	0.03	1.7

Note. APA = American Psychological Association; APS = Association for Psychological Science; SSCI = Social Sciences Citation Index; SCI = Sciences Citation Index; JEP = *Journal of Experimental Psychology*.

^a Journal published by APS.

* Impact factor from Science Citation Index (SCI).

not led to significant increases in CC and EM research *within psychology*, and although medical and health studies seem to have openly embraced inclusion of research subjects across all racial census categories, the degree to which EM issues are engaged beyond recruitment efforts is unclear. A similar trend was observed in the CC literature, where marketing and business management journals with moderate to high percentages of CC research displayed an increased presence (e.g., *International Marketing Review*, 34% CC articles; *Cross Cultural Management*, 64% CC articles).

A second notable development was the percentage of top EM authors who are themselves EMs, which has declined from 58% to 46%. This may suggest that White researchers have developed more of an interest in EM issues and cultural difference, a trend encouraged by leading multiculturalist researchers (e.g., Cox, 1990), or it could simply be the result of a higher prevalence of white researchers in medicine and management. Regardless, it will be important to ensure that ethnic minorities maintain a strong voice within the discipline, especially in issues of particular interest to ethnic and racial minority communities.

Implications for the Field

With only these minimal advances to answer Hall and Maramba's (2001) "wakeup call" (p. 28), our data suggest that most of the concerns voiced in their 2001 article remain unaddressed. This lack of progress points toward three important systemic issues in the practice of psychology research that deserve attention. First, our data show that CC and EM articles are much less likely to appear in high impact journals. Considering the importance given to high impact publications in academic hiring/promotion committees and grant review boards, our data may support the practice of differentially evaluating CC and EM researcher publication records (see also Lau, Cisco, & Delgado-Romero, 2008). Leong and Kalibatseva (2010) voiced similar concerns, explaining that researchers involved in less developed fields such as EM research are at a disadvantage when placed in competition with researchers working with European American populations, who benefit from differential (i.e., unequal) research infrastructure. They explain that the latter group of researchers can draw from substantially larger bodies of evidence, promote theoretical advancement more

Table 5
Authors With the Most Publications in Cross-Cultural Psychology (2003–2009)

Author	Institution ^a	Race/ethnicity	PsycINFO pubs.	SSCI pubs.	PsycINFO citations	SSCI citations	PsycINFO citations/ pubs.	SSCI citations/ pubs.	SSCI citations/ PsycINFO pubs.	PsycINFO citation rank	SSCI citation rank	SSCI/ PsycINFO citation rank
Shah, Ajit	University of Central Lancashire, Dept. of Psychiatrics	NR	35	31	13	5	0.37	0.16	0.14	23	23	23
Peterson, Christopher	University of Michigan, Dept. of Psychology	European American	25	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	25	25	25
Swami, Viren	University of Westminster, Dept. of Psychology; HELP University College, Kuala Lumpur	Malaysian Indian	25	19	33	26	1.32	1.37	1.04	19	21	19
Matsumoto, David	San Francisco State University, Dept. of Psychology	Asian American ^b	22	15	89	89	4.05	5.93	4.05	12	13	11
Berry, John	Queens University, Dept. of Psychology	European Canadian ^b	21	5	71	50	3.38	10.00	2.38	13	6	15
Wang, Qi	Cornell University, Dept. of Human Development	Chinese	18	12	129	138	7.17	11.50	7.67	5	5	4
Butcher, James	University of Minnesota, Dept. of Psychology	European American	18	5	42	21	2.33	4.20	1.17	15	15	18
Heine, Steven	University of British Columbia, Dept of Psychology	European Canadian	17	14	119	116	7.00	8.29	6.82	6	7	5
Oishi, Shigehiro	University of Virginia, Dept. of Psychology	Japanese	17	14	88	111	5.18	7.93	6.53	10	8	6
Furnham, Adrian	University College London, Division of Psychology and Language Sciences	European	16	12	29	41	1.81	3.42	2.56	16	17	12
Abdel-Khalek, Ahmed	Kuwait University, Dept. of Psychology	Egyptian	15	12	26	19	1.73	1.58	1.27	18	20	17
McCrae, Robert	National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Aging	NR	15	11	186	222	12.40	20.18	14.80	3	3	2
Keller, Heidi	University of Osnabrueck, Institute of Psychology	European	14	13	117	81	8.36	6.23	5.79	4	12	7
Schmitt, David	Bradley University, Dept. of Psychology	European American	14	11	351	349	25.07	31.73	24.93	1	1	1
Smith, Peter	University of Sussex, School of Psychology	European	14	5	85	76	6.07	15.20	5.43	8	4	8
Voracek, Martin	University of Vienna, Dept. of Basica Psychological Research	NR	14	14	6	8	0.43	0.57	0.57	22	22	21
Barber, Nigel	Independent Scholar	Irish	12	11	21	29	1.75	2.64	2.42	17	18	14
Cole, Michael	University of California, San Diego, Dept. of Communication	European American	12	3	12	11	1.00	3.67	0.92	21	16	20
Kitayama, Shinobu	University of Michigan, Dept. of Psychology	Japanese	12	6	182	167	15.17	27.83	13.92	2	2	3

Table 5 (continued)

Author	Institution ^a	Race/ethnicity	PsycINFO pubs.	SSCI pubs.	PsycINFO citations	SSCI citations	PsycINFO citations/ pubs.	SSCI citations/ pubs.	SSCI citations/ PsycINFO pubs.	PsycINFO citation rank	SSCI citation rank	SSCI/ PsycINFO citation rank
Lonner, Walter	Western Washington University, Dept. of Psychology	NR	12	7	0	1	0.00	0.14	0.08	25	24	24
Peterson, Gary	Miami University, Dept. of Family Studies and Social Work	European American	12	0	4	0	0.33	0.00	0.00	24	25	25
Constantine, Madonna	Colombia University, Teachers College	African American ^b	11	4	49	27	4.45	6.75	2.45	11	11	13
Fischer, Ronald	Victoria University of Wellington, School of Psychology/Centre for Applied Cross-Cultural Research	German	11	8	69	55	6.27	6.88	5.00	7	10	9
Kirmayer, Laurence	McGill University, Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry	European Canadian ^b	11	4	27	20	2.45	5.00	1.82	14	14	16
Sternberg, Robert	Oklahoma State University, Dept. of Psychology	NR	11	3	14	6	1.27	2.00	0.55	20	19	22
Vazsonyi, Alexander	University of Kentucky, Dept. of Psychology	European American, European	11	7	64	53	5.82	7.57	4.82	9	9	10

Note. SSCI = Social Sciences Citation Index; NA = not available; NR = no response, referring to authors who did not respond to our request for information on their ethnicity; Dept. = Department; Pubs = Publications.

^a Most recent institutional affiliation. ^b Race/ethnicity also cross-checked with or based on Hall and Maramba (2001)'s findings.

quickly, and accrue data more rapidly because a greater number of research colleagues and significantly more grant money have been (and continue to be) devoted to their topics of interest. As such, concern might be raised that unless psychology departments have clear and transparent ways to fairly account for decreased productivity in these marginalized fields, they may implicitly communicate that this scholarship is not valued.

Second, the absence of top CC and EM researchers on editorial boards of psychology's two flagship organizations (APA and APS) raises concern about whether "first-tier" journals can fairly evaluate the importance and quality of CC and EM manuscripts. Findings by Cundiff (2012) indicated that the percentage of ethnic minorities on editorial boards is roughly representative of tenured psychology department faculty but less than half that of the general U.S. population and suggest that this disparity may apply to the presence of both EM identities and EM research expertise. It is certainly possible that these deficits in the composition of editorial boards may contribute to higher rejection rates for CC and EM articles for these high-impact journals. At the same time, CC and EM researchers may also avoid submitting their manuscripts to these journals in favor of specialty journals that have reviewers with the appropriate expertise in CC and EM topics. Such system-level processes help to perpetuate the marginalization of cultural diversity research beyond the limited readership of specialty journals.

Third, although the flagship journal for CC research, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, continues to reach a wide audi-

ence, EM specialty journals appear to have made minimal gains in broadening their readership. Recent additions to the list of EM specialty journals (e.g., *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, inaugurated in 2009; *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation*, inaugurated in 2012) are encouraging as these venues typically serve important roles in generating knowledge about topics central to the lives of EMs. However, their ubiquitously low impact ratings point to a systematic lack of receptivity or interest from the larger field of psychology.

Limitations

Two limitations of our study should be considered. First, we adopted our specific search terms directly from Hall and Maramba (2001) in order to accurately assess change over time, but these terms may not have fully captured the extent of cultural diversity research occurring today. For example, only 75% of articles from the *Journal of Black Studies* were identified as EM topics according to our search when a higher percentage might be expected. Informal ad hoc investigation into this issue suggests that while this journal does publish a number of articles that do not explicitly address EM issues (e.g., studies from countries where the majority of the population is Black; literary analyses of a Black author's works), other EM articles were simply not picked up by the search terms (e.g., studies of Afro-Caribbean populations in the United States). Search terms related to EM research that might be important to

Table 6
Authors With the Most Publications in Ethnic Minority Psychology (2003–2009)

Author	Institution ^a	Race/Ethnicity	PsycINFO Pubs.	SSCI Pubs.	PsycINFO Citations	SSCI Citations	PsycINFO Citations/ Pubs.	SSCI Citations/ Pubs.	SSCI Citations/ PsycINFO Pubs.	PsycINFO Citation Rank	SSCI Citation Rank	SSCI/ PsycINFO Citation Rank
Constantine, Madonna	Colombia University, Teachers College	African American	35	13	198	106	5.66	8.15	3.03	6	4	13
Leong, Frederick	Michigan State University, Dept. of Psychology	Asian American ^b	24	7	23	15	0.96	2.14	0.63	26	24	25
Pedersen, Paul	Syracuse University, School of Education, Dept. of Counseling and Human Services	European American ^b	21	0	12	0	0.57	0.00	0.00	29	26	26
Padilla, Amado	Stanford University, School of Education, Developmental and Psychological Sciences	Latino	20	16	43	39	2.15	2.44	1.95	22	22	20
Peltzer, Karl	University of the Free State, HAST Research Programme, Human Sciences Research Council	German	20	13	20	23	1.00	1.77	1.15	25	25	23
Brook, Judith	New York University School of Medicine, Dept. of Psychiatry	European American	19	18	55	61	2.89	3.39	3.21	15	16	10
Caetano, Raul	University of Texas, School of Public Health	Hispanic	19	16	115	127	6.05	7.94	6.68	5	5	3
Ehlers, Cindy	Scripps Research Institute, Molecular and Integrative Neurosciences Dept.	European American	19	14	55	70	2.89	5.00	3.68	15	11	8
Utsey, Shawn	Virginia Commonwealth University, Dept. of African American Studies	NR	19	10	55	27	2.89	2.70	1.42	15	20	22
Kim, Bryan	University of Hawaii at Hilo, Dept. of Psychology	Asian American	18	10	187	54	10.39	5.40	3.00	1	8	14
Schwartz, Seth	University of Miami (Florida), Dept. of Epidemiology and Public Health	European American	18	13	58	32	3.22	2.46	1.78	13	21	21
Brody, Gene	University of Georgia, Center for Family Research	European American	17	16	163	137	9.59	8.56	8.06	2	3	1
Compton, Michael	Emory University School of Medicine, Dept. of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences	NR	17	16	83	71	4.88	4.44	4.18	7	14	7
Cokley, Kevin	University of Texas at Austin, Dept. of Educational Psychology	African American	16	10	57	50	3.56	5.00	3.13	10	11	12
Ma, Grace	Temple University, Dept. of Public Health	Asian American	16	12	39	73	2.44	6.08	4.56	21	7	5

Table 6 (continued)

Author	Institution ^a	Race/Ethnicity	PsycINFO Pubs.	SSCI Pubs.	PsycINFO Citations	SSCI Citations	PsycINFO Citations/ Pubs.	SSCI Citations/ Pubs.	SSCI Citations/ PsycINFO Pubs.	PsycINFO Citation Rank	SSCI Citation Rank	SSCI/ PsycINFO Citation Rank
Holt, Cheryl	University of Maryland, Dept. of Behavioral and Community Health	Caucasian	15	13	51	65	3.40	5.00	4.33	12	11	6
Hwang, Wei-Chin	Claremont McKenna College, Dept. of Psychology	Asian American	15	10	54	39	3.60	3.90	2.60	9	15	17
Jang, Yuri	University of South Florida, Dept. of Aging and Mental Health Disparities	Asian	15	15	12	41	0.80	2.73	2.73	27	19	15
Verkuyten, Maykel	Utrecht University, Dept. of Interdisciplinary Social Science	European	15	10	39	52	2.60	5.20	3.47	19	9	9
Whaley, Arthur	Jackson State University, Dept. of Psychology	African American	15	12	41	40	2.73	3.33	2.67	18	17	16
Brown, Emma	Coalition for the Health and Advocacy of Rural Minorities, Inc., Lake City, Florida	African American	14	6	22	13	1.57	2.17	0.93	24	23	24
Fulgini, Andrew	University of California, Los Angeles, Dept. of Psychology	European American	14	5	57	44	4.07	8.80	3.14	8	2	11
Jones, Deborah	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Dept. of Psychology	European American	14	11	55	35	3.44	3.18	2.50	11	18	19
Rushton, J.	University of Western Ontario, Dept. of Psychology	European American ^b	14	13	87	97	6.21	7.46	6.93	4	6	2
Unger, Jennifer	University of Southern California, Keck School of Medicine, Dept. of Preventive Medicine, Institute for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Research	European American	14	8	36	71	2.57	8.88	5.07	20	1	4
Yeh, Christine	University of San Francisco, Counseling Psychology Dept.	Asian American	14	7	100	36	7.14	5.14	2.57	3	10	18

Note. SSCI = Social Sciences Citation Index; NA = not available; NR = no response, referring to authors who did not respond to our request for information on their ethnicity; Dept. = Department; Pubs. = Publications.

^a Most recent institutional affiliation. ^b Race/ethnicity also cross-checked with or based on Hall and Maramba (2001)'s findings.

include in future assessments of the literature could focus on additional, fast growing EM groups (e.g., Vietnamese Americans), identities related to immigration (e.g., undocumented immigrants), religious affiliations (e.g., Muslim), SES (e.g., middle class), sexual minority identities (e.g., LGBTQ), as well as indigenous identities (e.g., Native Hawaiian).

Second, it came to our attention in these ad hoc analyses that the adoption of CC methods into the study of EM populations led to some cross-listing of articles as both CC and EM (e.g., a cross-cultural analysis of attitudes toward upward mobility

among Mexican Americans and African Americans). It follows that the categories of CC and EM research employed by Hall and Maramba (2001) may no longer be ideal for fully canvassing the world of cultural diversity research in psychology today. One likely explanation is that the recent emergence and development of culture-focused fields such as global psychology, cultural psychology, international psychology, indigenous psychology, transcultural psychology, and transnational psychology have muddied what previously existed as a more clear-cut binary between the CC and EM categories. However, it is

unlikely that inclusion of these emerging fields in the search process would bear any significant impact on this study's major findings.

Future Directions

Considering how much the terrain of cultural diversity research has changed over the past decade, future assessments of publication trends in this area would benefit from adopting wider-reaching search terms that better access diverse forms of cultural diversity research. Attention to the ways in which categories of cultural diversity research evolve over time, either in response to theoretical advancement or constraints within the field (e.g., lack of support from professional organizations and psychology departments), may also prove informative. We also suggest that cultural diversity researchers could benefit from developing new categories of investigation that rescue the important focus on ethnoracial minority status offered by EM research, as well as attend to other forms of minority status, while offering more meaningful labels. The creation of better fitting categories may offer more clearly defined channels of communication among cultural diversity researchers and an organizational framework with which students, professional researchers, and evaluative committees (e.g., hiring committees, granting agencies) could better locate particular forms of cultural diversity research within psychology and related social sciences.

Conclusion

Because of the increasing proportion of EM individuals in the United States and psychology's historical reliance on theories derived from Euro American populations, it is important to monitor the status of cultural diversity research, especially within the United States. We conducted a 10-year follow-up on Hall and Maramba's (2001) report of CC and EM publication trends and found that research on CC and EM issues continues to be under-represented in the literature, particularly in top-tier journals. The APA and APS journals both mirrored this discouraging trend, and the absence of top CC and EM authors on their editorial boards points to a structural barrier to broader attention to cultural diversity research. We also found that fewer top CC and EM researchers are employed in psychology departments than one might expect, reflecting predominant views within psychology that CC and EM research are peripheral to the larger field. In sum, it seems few gains have been made for CC and EM research despite numerous awareness-raising efforts.

References

Abreu, J. M., Chung, R. H. G., & Atkinson, D. R. (2000). Multicultural counseling training: Past, present, and future directions. *The Counseling Psychologist, 28*, 641–656. doi:10.1177/0011000000285003

Adair, J. G., & Vohra, N. (2003). The explosion of knowledge, references, and citations: Psychology's unique response to a crisis. *American Psychologist, 58*, 15–23. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.58.1.15

American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58*, 377–402. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.58.5.377

Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist, 63*, 602. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602

Beebe, L. (2010). *PsycINFO's growth*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/news/2010/12/psycinfo-growth.aspx>

Bernal, G., Trimble, J. E., Burlew, A. K., & Leong, F. T. (2002). *Handbook of racial and ethnic minority psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (2002). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cox, T. (1990). Problems with research by organizational scholars on issues of race and ethnicity. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 26*, 5–23. doi:10.1177/002188639002600103

Cundiff, J. L. (2012). Is mainstream psychological research “womanless” and “raceless”? An updated analysis. *Sex Roles, 67*, 158–173. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0141-7

Gone, J. P., & Trimble, J. E. (2012). American Indian and Alaska Native mental health: Diverse perspectives on enduring disparities. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 8*, 131–160. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143127

Graham, S. (1992). “Most of the subjects were White and middle class”: Trends in published research on African Americans in selected APA journals, 1970–1989. *American Psychologist, 47*, 629–639. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.47.5.629

Hall, G. C. N., & Maramba, G. G. (2001). In search of cultural diversity: Recent literature in cross-cultural and ethnic minority psychology. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*, 12–26. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.7.1.12

Iwamasa, G. Y., Sorocco, K. H., & Koonce, D. A. (2002). Ethnicity and clinical psychology: A content analysis of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review, 22*, 931–944. doi:10.1016/S0272-7358(02)00147-2

Lau, M. Y., Cisco, H. C., & Delgado-Romero, E. A. (2008). Institutional and individual research productivity in five nominated multicultural psychology journals. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 36*, 194–205. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2008.tb00082.x

Leong, F. T. L., & Kalibatseva, Z. (2010). Comparative effectiveness research on Asian American mental health: Review and recommendations. *AAPI Nexus, 8*, 21–38.

Tavernise, S. (2012, May 17). *Whites account for under half of births in U.S.* *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/17/us/whites-account-for-under-half-of-births-in-us.html>

U.S. Census Bureau P. I. Office. (2010). *US Census bureau newsroom: Population: Most children younger than age 1 are minorities, Census Bureau reports*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb12-90.html>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2001). *Mental health: Culture, race, and ethnicity—A supplement to mental health: A report of the Surgeon General*. Rockville, MD: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Office of the Surgeon General.

Received December 8, 2012

Revision received February 12, 2013

Accepted February 18, 2013 ■