JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES

A Journal of the
Society for the
Psychological Study
of Social Issues

The What, Why, Who, and How of Globalization: What is Psychology to Do?

Isaac Prilleltensky*

University of Miami

Globalization is an amorphous construct that requires demarcation. To do that, I attempt to answer the what, who, why and how of globalization. The first question consists of three elements: people, products, and processes. The second question contains two parts: by whom and for whom. The third answer consists of an agentic response and a socio-historical one. Finally, the last question contains several answers, ranging from the psychological to the political. The second part of the paper deals with the implications of globalization for psychology. I call on psychology to embrace (a) an ecological and multidimensional view of well-being, (b) an ecological and multidimensional view of justice, and (c) a systematic approach to personal, organizational, and societal change. These changes will be more likely if psychology renounced its support for the societal status quo.

As amply shown by the preceding papers, globalization is a concept pregnant with multiple meanings. For some, globalization connotes exploitation; for others, opportunity (Bhagwati, 2007; Marsella, 2012; Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001; Stiglitz, 2003, 2007; Wolf, 2004). Whereas some talk about the globalization of capital, others talk about the import and export of ideas. To navigate this cacophony of meanings, I suggest we discuss globalization in four sections, answering the following questions: The what, who, why and how of globalization. This will allow us to define the elements of globalization, the parties affected by it, its sources and goals, and the mechanisms that make it happen. Psychology, itself an object of globalization and a big part of how individuals, groups, and communities react to it, will figure prominently in our discussion. But in addition to its epistemic role in explaining aspects of globalization, we will also talk about what psychology can do in this transnational era.

*Correspondence should be sent to Isaac Prilleltensky, School of Education, University of Miami, P.O. Box 248065, Coral Gables, FL 33124 [e-mail: isaac@miami.edu].

In an effort to integrate the various contributions to this special issue, it makes the most sense to engage in conceptual mapping. This exercise will allow us to appreciate to the fullest the contributions of the various authors.

Globalization

Globalization may be defined by its elements, actors, sources, consequences, and mechanisms, but in essence, it is about the exchange of people, products and processes throughout the world, and about the consequences of that trade (Bhagwati, 2007; Stiglitz, 2007; Wolf, 2004). This is a process through which material and social phenomena generated in one or more parts of the world become part of the lives of people in other parts of the globe. This process, massively accelerated through new technologies, has widespread ramifications for ways of living, for peace and conflict, and eventually for justice and well-being. The next four sections amplify on (a) the elements, (b) actors, (c) causes, and (d) dynamics of globalization.

What: Elements of Globalization

According to our definition, globalization is about the transmission of persons, processes, and products from one part of the world to another. Needless to say, the three elements—persons, processes and products—are intimately related to each other, but for the sake of clarity, they merit individual attention.

Individuals and groups have been traveling the world for millennia. However, transportation has become much more affordable in the last century, facilitating migration and closer exchanges. In this volume, we saw how French explorers colonized and exploited Haiti (Diaz, Schneider, & Pwogwam SantéMantal, 2012) and how Chinese migrants moved to the United States over 150 years ago (Shimpi & Zirkel, 2012). These examples are prototypical of globalization: one nation invading another to extract raw materials; another sending its people to settle in greener pastures. The dispersion of people around the globe, then, constitutes the first object of globalization.

The second object is products, broadly conceived. By products we mean not only materials objects like electronic products, cars, food, equipment and all manner of goods, but also ideas, cultural norms, and information. Of course, new products—material and cultural—are co-created by the intersection of energies from various parts of the world; the vector is not unidirectional. As Jensen and Arnett (2012) discuss, adolescents the world over navigate identity formation in light of international and transnational trends. Their paper illustrates how global dissemination of ideas taxes the process of identity formation. Breckenbridge and Moghaddam (2012), also in this issue, show the confluence of stereotypes and fears associated with globalization. Their paper reveals contradictions among

various globalization products and processes, such as trade liberalization, on one hand, and impediments to migration on the other. Hitherto we have claimed that globalization entails the dispersion and absorption of people and products; and products, as shown above, entail material and cultural goods.

The third object of globalization is processes, in business, information, and conservation, among others. The liberalization of trade and the imposition of structural adjustment processes by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are a clear manifestation of globalization, as shown in this volume in the case of Haiti (Diaz & Schneider, 2012). Aneesh (2012), in turn, describes the business and information processes involved in call centers in India. This is a prime example of how information channels facilitate commercial processes. Call centers constitute about 6% of India's growth domestic product, a growing business process indeed. In the case of conservation, Swim and Becker (2012) demonstrate the differential uptake of environmental processes and practices across Germany and the United States. In the former, a context of support for environmental preservation enables citizens to engage in more environmentally friendly behaviors.

In summary, one approach to grasp globalization entails the demarcation of its three main elements: people, products, and processes. Push and pull factors impel people to transcend borders. Products, in the form of material goods and cultural norms also transcend borders, as do business, information, and conservation processes. In this special issue, we have seen examples of all them.

The dispersion and adoption of products and processes throughout the world, not to mention the migration of individuals, have psychological repercussions. In the case of willful or forced migration through economic deprivation or political persecution, newcomer and host communities learn to adapt (or not) to each other's presence. A few psychological theories help us understand reactions to contact with newcomers and minorities. Using Berry's (1997, 1998, 2001) typology of adaptation to migration we can see four potential scenarios for newcomers: integration, assimilation, segregation, and marginalization. The first option is the most desired one, as groups retain their cultural heritage at the same time that they acquire a new one. This model has proven helpful in understanding the stress and coping associated with migration as well as globalization (Jensen & Arnett, 2012).

Stereotypes are often invoked to preserve positive individual and collective images. This psychological process results in exclusionary policies and practices and divides peoples (Fiske, 2011). On the positive side, we can readily see how the dissemination of new ideas and products can open up amazing opportunities for people, not to mention travel to new destinations where people can experience a number of positive outcomes, such as learning, freedom, education, and personal development (Buettner, 2008, 2010; Seligman, 2011). Having lived in five countries, I can attest to the benefits of fleeing a dictatorship (Argentina), experiencing great universal health care (Israel, Canada, and Australia), and seeking new occupational opportunities (USA). In all instances, new

doors and experiences contribute to positive well-being (Seligman, 2011). As Marsella (2012) noted, globalization has positive and negative repercussions. In great part, this depends on whom we are talking about and the amount of power they have (Prilleltensky, 2008).

Who: Actors of Globalization

Next to its elements, actors constitute the second pillar of globalization. In essence, we need to answer two questions: globalization by whom and for whom. Actors can take themselves, as well as products and processes, to new places. Although all players in the globalization game have some degree of power, some have more than others, as authors in this issue have shown (Diaz, Schneider, & Pwogwam Santé Mantal, 2012; Marsella, 2012; Shimpi & Zirkel, 2012). The gross inequality in power among players determines, to a great extent, who are the people who will benefit from globalization. Depending on who you talk to, globalization is a bonus to the local workforce in India (Aneesh, 2012) or a curse to the unemployed whose job was taken to Asia (Pink, 2009). Psychologists have known for a long time that the combination of great power, rationalizations, and self-interests tends to obscure moral judgment (Fiske, 2011; Lammers & Stapel, 2009; Lammers, Stapel, & Galinsky, 2010). Psychologists have also known for some time that painting exploitive practices as universally beneficial are handmaiden to the powerful (Prilleltensky, 1994). Thus, it is not uncommon to praise the achievements of globalization while ignoring its deleterious consequences for local farmers (Diaz, Schneider, & Pwogwam Santé Mantal, 2012), for the environment (Swim & Becker, 2012), and for poor people (Marsella, 2012).

While goods, services, ideas and people travel in all directions throughout the world, there is little doubt that economic policies have been pretty much dictated by Euro-American institutions like the IMF and the World Bank (Stiglitz, 2003, 2007). Also, there is little doubt that migration patterns have continued to be from poor to rich countries. In all cases, the powerful dictate the terms of the game, and the powerless adjust or escape (Marsella, 2012; Stiglitz, 2003). This is not to paint citizens in developing nations as powerless, for they have shown ingenuity and great resilience, but rather to crystallize the point that globalization, like many other human processes, is largely determined by the relative power of its actors. Therefore, we cannot ignore power dynamics and differentials when we try to answer the question by whom and for whom (Prilleltensky, 2008).

Why: The Reasons and Goals of Globalization

The question why elicits two responses. The first concerns the reasons of globalization. In other words, what are its origins? That question requires a socio-historical response. The second response concerns the goals of globalization.

While the two questions are closely related, the latter requires a more agentic response.

As Diaz and Zirkel (2012) demonstrate, socio-historical processes concerning new technologies and means of transportation and communication have resulted in internationalization and Westernization of culture. These processes emanate from developments in science, technology, engineering, and communication. Progress in these domains presented opportunities for people to explore the universe in new, accessible, and often more affordable ways. Instead of traveling to remote places to study or explore nature, you can have electronic access to them. Without scientific and technological advances, we would not be talking about globalization the way we are now. But socio-historical and technological advances can take different directions depending on the agents of change involved, which leads us to the agentic response.

The benefits and burdens of globalization could be more equally distributed if the goal of globalization was distributive, procedural, retributive, information, and relational justice (Prilleltensky, 2011); but instead of justice, globalization has often been driven by profit and extractive colonialism, the precise opposite of justice (Marsella, 2012; Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001; Prilleltensky, 2003). Structural adjustment impositions on poor countries mean fewer services, poorer education and health care (Dias, Schneider, & Pwogwam Santé Mantal, 2012). Exporting jobs to countries with fewer environmental regulations means more pollution for residents, and fewer protections for workers (Aneesh, 2012). These are decisions being made by people, agents of control personified in directors of the IMF and the World Bank. The agentic response to the goals of globalization, then, lies in profit maximization. This is not to say that there are not others whose goals for globalization is justice and well-being, but their voices are faint compared to the megaphones of corporations and their government agents (Solnit, 2004).

Christens and Collura (2012), as well as Swim and Becker (2012) demonstrate the role of agents of change. People who fight climate change or inequality struggle to redirect globalization towards more humane, just, and sustainable ends. The psychology of activism, which did not receive much coverage in this issue, could elucidate how to energize and sustain resistance to pernicious global trends. What we know from that literature is that group consciousness and social support can help recruit, motivate, and sustain activists (Duncan, 1999, 2010; Kottler, 2000), and that activism can contribute to mental health (Boehnke & Wong, 2011).

In synthesis, globalization got started and is maintained due to social, scientific, and historical processes that enabled people to communicate better and to buy each other's goods. These elements and processes, which could be used to promote justice and well-being, or exploitation, are in the hands of people, groups, corporations, institutions and governments. To steer globalization towards justice and well-being a collective social movement is needed (Solnit, 2004).

How: The Workings of Globalization

Globalization works through social, economic, political, cultural, and psychological means. If the object of analysis is trade policies, the system works through penalties, loans, and transnational institutions. If the object is cultural internationalization, means of communication and the internet explain much of it. If the object is ideas and identity, elaborate processes of psychological comparisons, self assessment, and decision making are required. This meaning- making process is nuanced and complex. Dreaming of a life without oppression can instigate decisions to migrate, change jobs, and otherwise take control of your life. For many, this is a process of righteous comparisons; which is the act of evaluating your life in light of better opportunities (Prilleltensky, 2011).

Economic, geopolitical, cultural, and psychological processes intersect in the lives of individuals, just as Aneesh (2012) demonstrated in the lives of call center workers in India, and Shimpi and Zirkel (2012) showed in the lives of Chinese immigrants in the United States. People around the world put on the scale their dignity, the future of their children, economic opportunities and huge personal sacrifices to decide whether to migrate, to go on strike, or to work within systems of injustice. As the many papers in this issue document, globalization forces individuals to confront opportunities and risks that challenge emotional stability and sense of coherence.

What, whom, why and how are important questions that help us frame the globalization debate. Implicit in our discussion looms the question of who benefits and who suffers from globalization. The answer lies generally in who holds the power and who frames the discourse. Beneath incantations of progress and development lie layers of suffering and dislocation (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001; Solnit, 2004). If, as many critics have argued, globalization can and should do better for people with less power, what can psychology do to foster a globalization of justice and well-being?

What is Psychology to Do?

The foregoing framed globalization in terms of four key questions: what, who, why and how. The papers in this special issue showed, respectively, that globalization deals with people, products, and processes; that it affects people the world over and that those with more power usually get to frame the discourse; that it emanates from scientific advances and political pursuits; and that it operates at economic, geopolitical, cultural and psychological levels. Now the question is what can psychology do to push globalization towards justice and well-being? I offer three suggestions.

Embrace an Ecological and Multidimensional View of Well-Being

If anything, globalization makes it abundantly clear that well-being is multidimensional and ecological. Despite calls for multilevel analyses going back to Bronfenbrenner (1977, 1979) psychology has often remained at the micro level of analysis (Marsella, 2012; Shinn & Toohey, 2003). There are at least four levels of analysis that should be kept in mind when understanding the impacts of globalization: the personal, interpersonal, organizational, and communal. We could further divide the communal into regional, national and international, but for the sake of simplicity we will treat it as one. Each one of the four levels, starting with individuals and ending in communities, consists of six synergizing domains of well-being: Interpersonal, Communal, Occupational, Physical, Psychological, and Economic. The six domains form the acronym I COPPE (Prilleltensky, 2011).

At the personal level, much research has shown that I COPPE domains predict emotional well-being, life satisfaction, and longevity (Diener, Helliwell, & Kahneman, 2010; Graham, 2009; Rath & Harter, 2010). To enjoy supportive relationships, a sense of community, occupational enjoyment and economic prosperity, we need to grow and live in supportive environments, not only in our families, but also in our organizations and communities (Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2006). We want to have friends who support us in time of need and celebrate us in times of success. We want to live in communities where there is equality and respect, where we have opportunities to develop mastery and meaning, and where we could have decent employment. Moreover, we want to live in safe and healthy neighborhoods. The more we foster economic prosperity, health promotion, effective functioning, freedom, equality, and inclusion at the community level, the higher our life satisfaction (Inglehart, 2010; Inglehart, Foa, Peterson, & Welzel, 2008). When optimal conditions in I COPPE are present across ecological levels, we can expect flourishing and thriving. Unfortunately, critics of globalization contend that more people are joining the ranks of the poor, depriving them of the technological and scientific advances that fewer and fewer people can now enjoy (Stiglitz, 2003, 2007). Increased poverty, less access to health care, corruption, lack of political freedom, inequality and exclusion are the hallmark of suffering. To the extent that globalization has exacerbated poverty and remained silent in the face of oppression, it gets a failing grade (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001).

The problem with psychology has been that we have concentrated on subjective well-being, only one of the six elements of well-being, and have neglected the other five (Prilleltensky, 2011). These five domains are important on their own, but also instrumental in the pursuit of subjective well-being. Higher levels of economic, interpersonal, community, physical and occupational well-being enhance meaning and life satisfaction (Rath & Harter, 2010). This

conceptualization calls for a truly interdisciplinary science of well-being. The papers in this issue show how economic and political policies in Haiti contributed to more poverty and less services, and how the pursuit of economic prosperity creates psychological and physical challenges for call center workers in India, where occupational, economic, physical, and psychological well-being are intertwined.

Embrace an Ecological and Multidimensional View of Justice

Justice is a pillar of well-being (Prilleltensky, 2011). To understand this claim, we must review the ecological and multidimensional nature of justice. Like well-being, justice is present at the personal, interpersonal, organizational, and community levels. Starting with the latter, we readily see four types of justice: distributive, procedural, retributive and cultural. Distributive justice is about the fair and equitable allocation of burdens and resources in society. Moral and political philosophers usually assign goods and obligations based on two criteria: merit and need (Facione, Scherer, & Attig, 1978; Sandel, 2009). In contexts of equality, where most people have access to similar opportunities in life it makes sense to allocate pains and gains based on merit; but in contexts of inequality, where people have vastly differential access to opportunities—due to disadvantage, and through no fault of their own—it is rational to allocate resources based on need. Despite this logical argument, proponents of unfettered capitalism and globalization contend that the only valid criterion is merit, regardless of contextual consideration. This pernicious twist in conceptualizing justice results in billions of people suffering because they are, in the eyes of powerful elites, not deserving (Levine, 2011; Schwalbe, 2008).

Procedural justice, in turn, refers to fair, transparent and impartial decision making processes (Tornblom & Vermunt, 2007). When money can buy favors and corruption reigns, procedural justice suffers. In working in developing countries, many corporations are used to bribing government officials to obtain permits, contracts, and access. Corruption is probably one of the main antagonists of social trust, essential to building community cohesion (Inglehart, 2010). Procedural justice is closely related to retributive justice, according to which groups who transgress the law are held accountable for their crimes. In many ways, the struggle of aboriginal peoples with colonizers is about retributive justice, demanding recognition of treaties, as in the case of New Zealand (Huygens, 2006). Cultural justice refers to the preservation of aboriginal cultures, which had been decimated over history by powerful invaders. These four types of justice, when present, create conditions for stable and orderly communities which enable individuals to operate freely.

At the organizational level, in addition to distributive and procedural justice, we also encounter informational and relational justice (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt,

Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Informational justice refers to access to vital knowledge about the status of an organization, and to vital information to perform one's job. When access to vital information is withheld, workers perceive this as an injustice. Relational justice, in turn, implies being treated fairly and with respect. When relational justice suffers, so does the health of workers (DeVogli, Brunner, & Marmot, 2007; DeVogli, Ferrie, Chandola, Kivimaku, & Marmot, 2007; Kivimaki et al., 2004). Overall, the well-being of employees is contingent on the presence of distributive, procedural, relational, and informational justice at work (Prilleltensky, 2011).

At the interpersonal level we face developmental justice, in addition to distributive, procedural and relational (Prilleltensky, 2011). Developmental justice is about expecting from children behaviors concordant with their developmental stage. Parentification of children is an example of developmental injustice whereby expectations of offspring do not match their maturational stage. Similarly, economic exploitation of elderly parents is developmentally unjust.

Finally, at the personal level, I argue that distributive justice and procedural justice are also present. At this level, justice is about the way we treat ourselves. I maintain that we can be unfair to ourselves, as in the case of people with self-injurious behaviors, eating disorders, and suicidal conduct. In these cases, people are not giving themselves the resources they deserve, such as food in anorexia nervosa, and are not treating themselves with the respect their merit, as in self-mutilation.

The various forms of justice, at the various ecological levels, predicate conditions of well-being. In the absence of relational justice, there cannot be much interpersonal well-being, as victims feel abused, exploited, and maltreated. At the organizational level, employees cannot thrive when they feel marginalized. The same applies at the community level, when groups are deprived of land and cultural traditions. Justice is a requisite for well-being, and insofar as globalization affects all levels and types of justice, we would do well to pay attention to the multidimensional and ecological nature of justice.

Embrace a Systematic Approach to Personal, Organizational, and Community Change

If much should change to make globalization concordant with justice and well-being, we better adopt a systematic method of challenging and rechanneling it. Just like Prochaska, Norcross, and DiClemente (1994) proposed a transtheoretical model of psychotherapy I believe we should embrace an integrative model of personal, organizational, and social change. The model I recommend is called BET I CAN and stands for Behaviors, Emotions, Thoughts, Interactions, Context, Awareness, and Next steps. These factors, which form the acronym BET I CAN, are present in efforts to modify personal and social systems. Whereas the first three

refer to personal factors, the next two refer to external ones. Awareness is about knowledge of self and the issue at hand. Finally, next steps is about the progression from one stage of change to the next, as Prochaska et al. (1994) recommended in the progression from precontemplation to contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance.

Understanding how all these factors influence our well-being and global behavior is important, but even more important is to know what to do. We all know that our eating habits are essential to maintaining a healthy weight and prevent disease. Yet many people struggle with their weight. If we apply the BET I CAN principles to this challenge, we understand it better. To change behaviors, we first need to analyze them. What is it about eating that is a problem? Is it that my portions are too big, or that I eat too many snacks in between meals? Or is it perhaps that what I eat is unhealthy and fatty? Perhaps I only eat poorly when I'm with certain people, or in certain occasions. All these are behaviors subject to the laws of conditioning. The same analysis can be applied to environmental or social activism. What reinforces me to participate in conservation? What prevents me from behaving in environmentally conscious ways? Analyzing antecedents, behaviors and consequences can help focus our change efforts (Watson & Tharp, 2007).

Emotions are the second element of BET I CAN. Many people overeat when they are feeling depressed or frustrated. But emotions are not just a source of negative behaviors. We can have exhilarating feelings and emotions such as love, excitement, and engagement with a hobby. The feelings associated with these activities are wonderful and reinforcing. Feeling loved, for instance, has many positive health effects (Cohen, 2004; Fredrickson, 2009). Feeling useful and valued by helping others is also healthful, causing a "helpers high" (Kottler, 2000). Being part of a social movement to challenge the negative effects of globalization can also be rewarding and meaningful (Kottler, 2000; Levine, 2011).

Now we come to thoughts, which are also powerful determinants of well-being. People talk to themselves all the time. Positive statements like "I'm proud to recycle," or "I helped to organize a protest" enhance our well-being through self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

Interactional factors are the fourth component of BET I CAN. Other people influence us in positive and negative ways. When our loved ones support us and encourage us, we feel great, valued, and appreciated. These feelings, in turn, make us healthier and happier (Cohen, 2004). But when our friends and relatives criticize us and reject us, we feel diminished and dejected. Relationships in a social movement can dictate whether we sustain our efforts or we quit (Levine, 2011; Stout, 1996).

Context is the situation in which we find ourselves. The context of our lives consists of people, places, situations, and elements. We are surrounded by folk at work and at home. We are surrounded by objects, such as chocolate chip cookies

and burgers, and we are besieged by ads that tell us what to buy and how to dress. Context matters (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). Marketing experts know all about context. They know where to place ads, where to place products in supermarkets, and they certainly know what to put in ads. We ignore context at our own peril. People, places and things send signals to us all the time. Awareness is about knowing certain facts and about knowing how behaviors, emotions, thoughts, interpersonal factors and context interact. An effective agent of change needs information and must see connections among events (Levine, 2011). For instance, we may not know that burgers have tons of calories, or that fries can contribute to high cholesterol levels; or that supporting a new plant that creates job also supports high levels of pollution. Awareness is about how all the previous factors in BET I CAN interact to cause positive or negative outcomes.

The last part of BET I CAN is next steps. Recognizing how all these factors intersect should inform what we do next about challenging and rechanneling globalization at the personal, organizational, and social levels. People do not change overnight. This is a serious mistake that many people make when they try to quit smoking or start recycling. They go from thinking "I need to do something about this" to "I will quit tomorrow" or "I will start a community environmental group next week." People need preparation, planning, and careful consideration of barriers. Furthermore, they need to change in small steps. An ideal process of change is one that goes from (a) awareness that I need to do something, to (b) preparing for change, to (c) starting a new behavior, to (d) maintaining it (Prochaska et al., 1994).

Any effort to change personal habits, organizational structures, or global policies should take into account the seven aspects of BET I CAN. This framework offers a methodic way to analyze your personal behavior as well as the behavior of groups and communities. Changing beliefs without accompanying behaviors is futile. Changing behaviors without changing contexts is equally pointless. This model offers a comprehensive method of understanding the interaction between psychological and sociological variables involved in globalization, justice, and well-being.

Implications for Research

To resist the pernicious effects of globalization, cope with its implications, and maximize its opportunities, as appropriate, I propose a three pronged research agenda. My agenda consists of studies into (a) people's understanding of the impact of globalization on their daily living, (b) effective interventions to mitigate the negative impacts and utilize the opportunities of globalization, and (c) barriers to action.

To move from victim of globalization to agent of change, individuals and groups need to understand what globalization "is doing to them," for good or

ill. For as long as globalization remains a remote construct that concerns only politicians or social activists, lay people, who are the most affected by globalization, and who have the power to move governments for action, will not get involved (Levine, 2011). Globalization is a multi-layered phenomenon that is not easy to comprehend. I believe that once people understand how subsidized corn production in another part of the world impacts obesity within their own families, more groups will act to push for healthier foods. Similarly, once people understand that more heavy industry may bring not only jobs but also a great deal of pollution, more environmental controls will be pushed for.

At present, it seems that demagogical agendas control popular reaction to oil exploration, eating, and job creation. Psychologists can help research how people make sense of globalization and how they think it impacts their daily living. If we learn through research that people do not see the connection between government lobbying of global financial institutions and their mortgage bankruptcy, or between the pharmaceutical industrial complex and their addictions to pills, we would know what type of education is needed to help people make rational decisions about their lives instead of following corporate dogma. I am often perplexed by people who believe that, for example, any type of universal health care will mean poor service and long waiting lists. These people are merely parroting corporate agendas without any knowledge of the actual facts. I lived in Canada for 15 years, in two separate provinces, and we always received stellar medical care (and we never received a single medical bill). We lived in Australia for 3 years, another universal health care system, and it was the same. I lived in Israel for nine years, in yet another example of universal health care, and the system was similarly superior. These are examples from three countries, three different universal health care systems, over a period of 27 years, with uniform excellent service. If people believe that universal health care does not work, try talking the Canadians or the Australians into giving that up. It is obvious that there are many misconceptions ingrained in the popular discourse about what globalization is and what is does to people at the local level. I strongly recommend studying people's understandings of how globalization affects them daily.

The second research agenda I recommend has to do with effective interventions to (a) mitigate the negative effects of certain globalization policies and (b) maximize the possibilities of globalization. Obviously, this would have to be done according to domains of well-being. Trying to tackle all domains at once would be overwhelming. It might be fruitful to think of the I COPPE domains of life to concentrate our efforts. For example, I would recommend studying what effective interventions may deal with the impact of food production on physical health, diabetes and obesity. If corn subsidies mean more corn syrup in a growing number of products, what local alternatives can be found to counteract that obesity producing trend? To mitigate the negative effects perhaps communities can make use of all the new technologies to learn what others are doing through social media. It

stands to reason that once local communities can deal effectively with one issue, such as obesity, that they will feel empowered to deal with others, such as the global push to privatize public education. Successful community interventions have well-identified targets of action, achieve small wins, engage the local community in participatory processes, and celebrate their success (Bracht & Tsouros, 1990; Rubin & Rubin, 2008).

Although many globalization processes, such as global financing systems, seem beyond the reach of the local community, the impacts are often felt locally, as in the closing of plants and the establishment of nuclear reactors in their region. There is a need to systematize the lessons of local and global communities in fighting the negative effects of globalization and maximizing its opportunities. In recent months we have seen students and middle class families set up tent cities in Israel protesting economic policies that further divide the country into the super rich and the diminishing middle class. A similar movement, Occupy Wall Street, spread across the United States. After a few weeks the effort grew to over fifty cities. Psychologists need to learn from these efforts.

Finally, we need to study what are the barriers that people encounter in trying to support social action. There is definitely a media driven effort, both in Israel and here in the United States to delegitimize protesters by saying they do not have a clear agenda, they lack organization, they are disaffected, and with nothing better to do. These messages certainly discourage the population from supporting these efforts. Other barriers may include low self-efficacy, lack of transportation, fear of job loss, and others.

Implications for Education

There are two educational imperatives for psychology with regards to globalization: a cognitive imperative and a compassion imperative. Psychology, as a social and behavioral science, has made tremendous gains in making connections between social and psychological phenomena. We educate our students and the public about the connections between *proximal* contexts, behaviors, emotions, cognitions, and overall mental health. It would be wonderful if psychologists embarked on a grander vision to link *distal* contexts and behaviors, emotions, cognitions, and well-being outcomes. Whereas psychologists have explicated the impact of parenting, occupational environments, schools, and relationships on many outcomes, such as self-efficacy, self-esteem, self-regulation, attachment styles, and the like, they have not done a great job at elucidating and communicating the impact of social and global policies on similar outcomes.

Thinking about spheres of influence in concentric circles, from the person in the innermost to international context at the outermost; individuals experience the transitive effect of structural adjustment policies at the international level, to national government policies cutting social services, to local communities lacking

essential services, to individual families lacking basic necessities such as emergency medical care. This is an educational process that requires knowledge of the transitive effects that traverse from one ecological sphere to the next. Our students need to see these connections without ideological interference. Pedagogically, this means enlarging the explanatory context from the micro sphere to the macro sphere. This is the heart of the cognitive imperative: make explicit the connections among global dynamics.

The compassion imperative concerns empathy for the people who, though removed from us, suffer from globalization's pernicious effects. The cognitive imperative will not succeed if we do not pair it with the compassion imperative. Intellectual understanding of how globalization works may become a subject of study without impelling us to action. To our advantage, today we have instant access to web based resources that show the impact of suffering on peoples around the globe. As educators, we have to make that suffering palpable to our students, not to generate guilt, but emotional understanding.

Implications for Policy

Environmentalists have achieved notable successes in the last few decades introducing environmental impact assessments. Many pieces of legislation now require an environmental impact study before approval. While these studies may not be as comprehensive or binding as many environmentalists would like them to be, they have certainly forced governments to take ecology into account before mounting construction, zoning, or industrial projects. I submit that we need two more kinds of equivalent policies: well-being impact assessments and emancipatory impact assessments.

National and global policies, as amply demonstrated in this special issue, have local impacts. Whenever psychologists have a sit at the table of power, or inform policy makers, we have to make it our business to push for the well-being impact of new educational, housing, economic, and health policies. To do that, we can start with the I COPPE domains of interpersonal, community, occupational, physical, psychological, and economic well-being. If you localize these domains to the area affected by a new policy, you can study what impact such policy will have on the I COPPE levels of well-being of the people in the area. The Gallup Corporation now tracks the levels of subjective well-being of people around the world, demonstrating a potential avenue to pursue in well-being assessments (Rath & Harter, 2010).

The second type of assessment is an emancipatory impact. This means that major new policies and practices enacted at the local, regional, national, and international levels would have to demonstrate how they increase, or at the very least maintain, the level of control and self-determination of the people affected by said policies. If emancipatory assessments would have been present when

colonizers arrived in North America, Australia, or New Zealand, they would not have been allowed to set foot on the continents.

Conclusion

To understand the multifaceted nature of globalization, I framed it in terms of its elements, actors, origins, ends, and mechanisms. Together, these elements answer the what, who, why, and how of globalization. Throughout my analysis, power emerged as a preeminent factor in determining the outcomes of globalization, leading us to conclude that the benefits of globalization are mostly enjoyed by the rich and powerful, and that its burdens are mostly born by the vulnerable.

The challenge of globalization for justice and well-being is too big to bear by any one discipline, but psychology has much to contribute. First, psychologists can help by embracing a multidimensional and ecological view of justice and well-being; and second, by adopting a systematic method of personal, organizational, and social change. But for psychologists to realize that they can be part of the solution, they first need to realize that they have often been part of the problem; individualizing problems, arrogating power, neglecting context, blaming victims of injustice, and extolling the virtues of the status quo (Levine, 2011; Marsella, 2012; Prilleltensky, 1994). For psychologists to serve a more helpful role in mitigating the pernicious effects of globalization, and maximizing its opportunities, they must engage in research, education, and policies that foster understanding of ecological connections, and that promote emancipatory policies.

References

Aneesh, A. (2012). Negotiating globalization: Men and women of India's call centers. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 514–533.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *46*, 5–34.

Berry, J. W. (1998). Intercultural relations in plural societies. *Canadian Psychology*, *40*, 12–21.

Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 615–631.

Bhagwati, J. N. (2007). *In defense of globalization*. Oxford, UK; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Boehnke, K., & Wong, B. (2011). Adolescent political activism and long-term happiness: A 21-year old longitudinal study on the development of micro- and macrosocial worries. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *37*(3), 435–447.

Bracht, N., & Tsouros, A. (1990). Principles and strategies of effective community participation. *Health Promotion International*, *5*(3), 199–208.

Breckenbridge, J., & Moghaddam, F. (2012). Globalization and a conservative dilemma: Economic openness and retributive policies. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 559–570.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward and experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, *32*, 513–531.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Buettner, D. (2008). *The blue zones: Lessons for living longer from the people who've lived the longest*. Washington, DC: National Geographic.

Buettner, D. (2010). *Thrive*. Washington, DC: National Geographic.

Christens, B., & Collura, J. (2012). Local community organizers and activists encounter globalization: An exploratory study of their perceptions and adaptations. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 592–611.

Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist*, *59*, 676–684.

Colquitt, J. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 386–400.

Colquitt, J., Conlon, D., Wesson, M., Porter, O., & Ng, K. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 425–445.

De Vogli, R., Brunner, E., & Marmot, M. (2007). Unfairness and the social gradient of metabolic syndrome in the Whitehall II study. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *63*(4), 413–419.

De Vogli, R., Ferrie, J., Chandola, T., Kivimäki, M., & Marmot, M. (2007). Unfairness and health: evidence from the Whitehall II study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *61*, 513–518.

Diaz, J., & Schneider, R. (2012). Globalization as re-traumatization: rebuilding Haiti from the spirit up. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 493–513.

Diaz, J., Schneider, R., & Pwogwam, Santé Mantal (2012). Globalization as re-traumatization. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 493–513.

Diaz, J., & Zirkel, S. (2012). Globalization, psychology, and social issues research: An introduction and conceptual framework. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 439–453.

Diener, E., Helliwell, J., & Kahneman, D. (Eds.). (2010). *International differences in well-being*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Duncan, L. (1999). Motivation for collective action: Group consciousness as mediator of personality, life experiences, and women's rights activism. *Political Psychology*, *20*(3), 611–635.

Duncan, L. (2010). Using group consciousness theories to understand political activism: Case studies of Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and Ingo Hasselbach. *Journal of Personality*, *78*(6), 1601–1636.

Facione, P. A., Scherer, D., & Attig, T. (1978). *Values and society: An introduction to ethics and social philosophy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Fiske, S. (2011). *Envy up, scorn down: How status divides us*. New York, NY: Russel Sage Foundation.

Fredrickson, B. (2009). *Positivity*. New York, NY: Crown Publishers.

Graham, C. (2009). *Happiness around the world: The paradox of happy peasants and miserable millionaires*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Huygens, I. (2006). Discourses for decolonization: Affirming Maori authority in New Zealand work-places. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *16*(5), 363–378.

Inglehart, R. (2010). Faith and freedom: Traditional and modern ways to happiness. In E. Diener, J. Helliwell, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *International differences in well-being* (pp. 351–397). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C., & Welzel, C. (2008). Development, freedom, and rising happiness. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*(4), 264–285.

Jensen, L.A., & Arnett, J. L. (2012). Going global: New pathways for adolescents and emerging adults in a changing world. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 473–492.

Kivimäki, M., Ferrie, J., Head, J., Shipley, M., Vahtera, J., & Marmot, M. (2004). Organisational justice and change in justice as predictors of employee health: The Whitehall II study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *58*, 931–937.

Kottler, J. A. (2000). *Doing good: Passion and commitment for helping others*. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

Lammers, J., & Stapel, D. (2009). How power influences moral thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*(2), 279–289.

Lammers, J., Stapel, D., & Galinsky, A. (2010). Power increases hypocrisy: Moralizing in reasoning, immorality in behavior. *Psychological Science*, *21*(5), 737–744.

Levine, B. (2011). *Get up, stand up: Uniting populists, energizing the defeated, and battling the corporate elite*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Marsella, A. (2012). Psychology and globalization: Understanding a complex relationship. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 454–472.

Petras, J., & Veltmeyer, H. (2001). *Globalization unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st century*. London, UK: Zed Books.

Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.

Prilleltensky, I. (1994). *The morals and politics of psychology: Psychological discourse and the status quo*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Prilleltensky, I. (2003). Poverty and power: Wellness and suffering in collective, relational, and personal domains. In S. Carr & T. Sloan (Eds.). *Psychology and poverty* (pp. 19–44). Kluwer/Plenum.

Prilleltensky, I. (2008). The role of power in wellness, oppression, and liberation: The promise of psychopolitical validity. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *36*(2), 116–136.

Prilleltensky, I. (2011). Wellness as fairness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. doi: 10.1007/s10464–011-9448–8.

Prilleltensky, I., & Prilleltensky, O. (2006). *Promoting well-being: Linking personal, organizational, and community change*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Prochaska, J., Norcorss, J., & DiClemente, C. (1994). *Changing for good*. New York, NY: Avon Books.

Rath, T., & Harter, J. (2010). *Well being: The five essential elements*. New York, NY: Gallup Press.

Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (2008). *Community organizing and development* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Sandel, M. (2009). *Justice: What's the right thing to do*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Schwalbe, M. (2008). *Rigging the game: How inequality is reproduced in everyday life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Shimpi, P., & Zirkel, S. (2012). One hundred and fifty years of "The Chinese Question:" Perspectives on immigration, globalization, and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 534–558.

Shinn, M., & Toohey, S. (2003). Community contexts of human welfare. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*, 427–459.

Solnit, D. (Ed.). (2004). *Globalize liberation: How to uproot the system and build a better world*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2003). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2007). *Making globalization work*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co.

Stout, L. (1996). *Bridging the class divide and other lessons for grassroots organizing*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Swim, J., & Becker, J. (2012). Country context and individuals' climate change mitigating behaviors: A comparison of U.S. versus German individuals' efforts to reduce energy. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(3), 571–591.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tornblom, K., & Vermunt, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Distributive and procedural justice: Research and social applications*. Burlington, VT: Ashagate.

Watson, D. L., & Tharp, R. G. (2007). *Self-directed behavior: Self-modification for personal adjustment* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Wolf, M. (2004). *Why globalization works*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

ISAAC PRILLELTENSKY is Dean of the School of Education at the University of Miami, where is also the inaugural Erwin and Barbara Mautner Chair in Community Well-Being. His interests are in community psychology, the prevention of psychosocial problems and the promotion of well-being in individuals,

organizations, and communities. Isaac is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, and of the Society for Community Research and Action. In 2002 he was a visiting fellow of the British Psychological Society. He is the recipient of the 2011 "Distinguished Contribution to Theory and Research Award" of the Community Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association. He is also the recipient of the 2010 "John Kalafat Applied Community Psychology Award" from the same division of APA and the recipient of the 2010 Educator Catalyst Award from the Human Services Coalition of Miami. He is a board member of the Children's Trust of Miami Dade County.