

The Individual in the Collective: An Examination of Individual Complexity in Modern Social Science Theories

Bryce Petofi Towne
brycepetofitowne@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper reviews the importance of individual complexity in the development and application of social science theories. It underscores the need for a balanced approach, acknowledging both individual differences and collective phenomena. Drawing from a broad range of literature, including seminal and contemporary studies, the paper identifies the intricate interplay between individual agency and societal structures. It suggests future research directions that emphasize logical coherence, interdisciplinary approach, and comprehensive inclusion of cultural and societal contexts. It also addresses inherent challenges related to subjective interpretation, methodological consistency, and the integration of logical reasoning with statistical analysis. This review concludes that recognizing individual complexity remains a crucial frontier for social sciences, requiring a delicate equilibrium between individual and collective understandings.

Keywords: Individual complexity; Social science theories; Collective dynamics; Structuration theory; Ecological systems theory; Kartus Principle

Introduction

The academic exploration of social science theories is significantly enriched by the introduction of a novel principle: "singular instances may not necessarily epitomize the collective, and by the same token, the collective might not always adequately depict singular instances." For convenience, the principle is named as Kartus Principle. This seminal concept forms the bedrock of our investigation into the realm of individual complexity in relation to broader social constructs.

This paper represents the pioneering endeavor to elaborate on this principle and integrates it into a comprehensive understanding of social sciences. The prevalent tension in the literature between broad theoretical applicability and the accommodation of individual differences has prompted an in-depth examination of the intersection between these distinct dimensions (Allport, 1962; Flyvbjerg, 2001). Concurrently, there has been a noteworthy emphasis in recent research on individual behavioral patterns in the context of theoretical frameworks (Back, Schmukle, & Egloff, 2009; Bleidorn et al., 2018). The interplay of individual agency and societal structures, as highlighted by theories such as Giddens' structuration theory (1986) and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979), further underscores the centrality of individual complexity in social science theories.

While celebrating the singularity of individuals, it is critical to balance this with Durkheim's (1897) caution against overemphasizing individuality at the cost of understanding collective phenomena. The nexus between individual behaviors and societal conditions (Van Lange, Rinderu, & Bushman, 2017), and the cultural dimensions elucidated by Hofstede's (1984) model form integral aspects of this intricate tapestry.

This paper, in its pioneering role, endeavors to critically review the existing literature on this principle, propose future research directions and invite constructive feedback for a deeper

understanding. As we journey through this scholarly exploration, we remain steadfastly committed to rigorous academic discourse, the co-creation of knowledge, and an unwavering pursuit of truth.

Reassessing Individual and Collective Constructs

The discourse on individual and collective constructs within social sciences has largely been influenced by an interactive representational model. Initially endorsed by Durkheim (1897), this model postulates that personal actions reflect societal norms, facilitating the translation of individual phenomena into group behaviors and vice versa (Lukes, 1973).

While this classical approach serves as the bedrock of social science, it stimulates a modern debate centering on methodological individualism versus holism. Supporters of individualism contend that societal events stem from cumulative individual actions, while holists perceive societal events as unique entities beyond mere amalgamations of individualistic traits (Udehn, 2002). This schism continues to be a thriving area of scholarly exploration (Hodgson, 2007).

Despite these animated dialogues, some limitations persist in our understanding of social phenomena. For example, perceiving a single event as representative of a group implies homogeneity, thereby overlooking the importance of human diversity. On the other hand, extrapolating from group to individual shrouds individual nuances (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2013). These oversimplifications potentially blur the intricate interplay between individual and collective behaviors.

Recent advances in personality and social psychology have underlined these concerns. Studies by Bleidorn et al. (2018) and Yarkoni and Westfall (2017) emphasize the dynamic nature

of personal and group identities, which are often overshadowed by traditional methodologies. Recent literature, such as Srivastava and Banaji (2011), reinforces the call for inclusive statistical methods that encapsulate the inherent diversity and complexity of personal and group behaviors.

These issues extend beyond psychology. In sociology, Abbott (2016) and Vaisey and Lizardo (2016) cautioned against the oversimplification of intricate societal phenomena. Anthropologists like Henrich (2016) and Norenzayan (2016) urged for the integration of individual and collective perspectives for understanding social and cultural dynamics.

This paper, for the first time, introduces the principle of “獨行之例未可代眾，眾體亦未必足代獨行之例。” translated as "singular instances may not necessarily epitomize the collective, and by the same token, the collective might not always adequately depict singular instances". This concept underlines the imminent necessity for a paradigm shift in conventional views, moving towards broader recognition and consideration of the inherent diversity and complexity in social sciences research

This new orientation incorporates insights from other disciplines such as political science, economics, and law. Works like Fukuyama's (1996), Hart et al., (2012), and Keynes (1936) have underscored the intricacies of individual and collective entities on societal structures. More recent contributions, like those by Haslanger (2017) extend these discussions by probing the interaction between individual actions and societal norms and macroeconomic trends.

Culture, as highlighted by Hofstede (1984), plays a pivotal role, given the significant variances among societies in balancing individual and collective behaviors. Ethical considerations, as per the American Psychological Association's guidelines (2017), are crucial as our analysis should respect individual autonomy and collective identities. Power dynamics,

discussed by Lukes (1974) and revisited by Hurd (2018), are also fundamental to understanding individual and collective relationships.

Despite the arguments presented, counterarguments exist. For instance, some argue that traditional methodologies, despite their limitations, provide valuable insights into social phenomena (Homans, 1961). Nevertheless, even these voices stress the need for more nuanced and diverse analytical tools, thereby indirectly supporting this work's primary argument.

Decoding the Concept: An Examination of Recent Literature

Kartus Principle:

"獨行之例未可代眾，眾體亦未必足代獨行之例"

Original drafted by the author in Chinese, later the principle was rewritten by ChatGPT to ancient Chinese and then translated as "singular instances may not necessarily epitomize the collective, and by the same token, the collective might not always adequately depict singular instances," this principle beckons for a reconsideration of traditional paradigms within social sciences, particularly within sociology and social psychology. It pushes for a renewed examination of the intricate relationship between individual instances and collective groups, an area often streamlined in conventional narratives.

Historically, scholarly dialogue has predominantly dwelled on the idea that individual instances may not necessarily embody the collective (Giddens, 1986). This focus recognizes the unique and divergent characteristics inherent in individual instances, thereby attenuating risks of overgeneralization and the potential for subsequent marginalization (Becker, 1963). Still, it's

critical to note that the principle's alternate aspect—that the collective might not adequately embody singular instances—has earned relatively less focus. This equally vital aspect necessitates in-depth investigation and articulation, as this paper endeavours to offer.

Empirical evidence bolsters this claim, demonstrated in studies traversing various domains. For example, Zhou and Fishbach (2016) investigated individual donation behaviors, indicating that individual choices didn't consistently mirror broader trends. This evidence spotlights the imperative of examining individual instances distinctly, abstaining from merely considering them as reflections of the collective.

Recent literature within the past decade has further substantiated this viewpoint. Specifically, Nook et al. (2018) accentuated the complexity of individual emotional experiences and their divergence from broader emotional norms. Similarly, Jachimowicz et al. (2018) illustrated how personal career choices frequently veer from societal expectations.

For a comprehensive understanding of this principle's potential implications, it is paramount to employ a nuanced perspective when scrutinizing social phenomena, ensuring neither to dissolve individuality into a homogenous collective nor to diminish the collective into a straightforward aggregation of detached individuals. Grasping this dual perspective is indispensable for a holistic social analysis.

In conclusion, this paper proffers a timely exploration of an often-overlooked facet of this principle, contesting traditional frameworks and contributing to the unfolding discourse in social sciences about the interplay between individual instances and the collective. This innovative and substantial contribution aspires to enrich the theoretical landscape of social sciences.

Shaping the Discourse on Individual and Collective Dynamics in Social Sciences

The novel principle this review proposes, that individual instances may not consistently represent the collective, and similarly, the collective may not invariably depict individual instances, introduces a spectrum of crucial insights. This perspective is deeply intertwined with human diversity, reverberating the ethos of scholars such as Neisser and Jopling (1997), who outline humanity's countless facets including personality, cognitive abilities, values, interests, and socio-cultural contexts. Given this rich diversity, extrapolating a single instance to the collective may yield an overly simplistic perspective, possibly neglecting the collective's inherent heterogeneity.

The past decade has seen significant contributions evolving this discourse. Recent studies by researchers like Fraley and Vazire (2014), Bleidorn et al. (2019), and Yarkoni and Westfall (2017) stress the importance of recognizing individual differences in exploring human behavior. The integration of these contemporary theories provides a holistic framework, capturing the diverse individualistic manifestations within any collective.

Similarly, the contention that collectives may not accurately reflect individuals remains a fundamental pillar in research on individual differences. Therefore, the author advocates for considering individual nuances in psychological studies, cautioning against over-reliance on average behavioral responses that can lead to partial or misleading interpretations.

Henrich's influential work (2020), as a renowned cultural anthropologist, bolsters this dialogue by highlighting the necessity for individual-level analysis in cross-cultural studies. His

arguments reaffirm that individual instances and collectives are interconnected dimensions requiring balanced exploration for comprehensive understanding of social phenomena.

The implications of this novel concept are profound for social science research. This perspective fundamentally challenges traditional methodologies that might unintentionally overlook individual variability, thus prompting the development of innovative approaches better suited to capture the complexity and diversity of human behavior. Furthermore, it may encourage researchers to acknowledge their study limitations more openly, accepting that their conclusions may not generalize beyond their specific samples (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010).

Despite the advancements, counter-arguments exist, with works like Homans (1961) advocating for conventional methodologies despite recognized limitations. Ethical considerations, as outlined by the American Psychological Association (2017), underline the importance of respecting individual and group identities during research.

In conclusion, this review crystallizes the proposed principle: individual instances cannot wholly represent the collective, and the collective may not provide a comprehensive depiction of individual instances. Therefore, a paradigm shift towards this concept is essential for better understanding the intricacies inherent in social sciences.

The Interplay between Individual and Collective Dynamics in Social Sciences

Understanding the subtle diversity inherent within and between individuals and groups in social sciences holds significant intrigue. This pursuit is nestled within the novel principle this

review proposes, stating that singular instances may not necessarily epitomize the collective, and conversely, the collective might not always adequately depict singular instances. This principle appreciates that human behavior is the product of a complex tapestry of elements, including individual biology, personal experiences, cultural dimensions, and socio-political contexts, culminating in unique behavioral patterns.

Major studies within the last decade, including the work of Lucas and Donnellan (2011), and Bleidorn et al. (2018), have underscored the dynamic nature of individual personality traits, illuminating the diversity that resides within each individual. Similarly, the complexity of group diversity, as Harrison and Klein (2007) highlighted, shows how factors like age, ethnicity, gender, and expertise can shape a group's internal diversity, significantly impacting group dynamics, interactions, and outcomes.

Subsequent research by Joshi and Roh (2009) and more recent contributions by Guillaume et al. (2017) have delved into how this diversity influences group performance and decision-making processes, thereby enriching our understanding of group dynamics.

Recognizing such diversity has profound implications for social science research methodologies. Maxwell (2012) proposed a range of methodologies, such as qualitative interviews and multivariate statistical analysis, which can provide deeper insights into diverse human experiences. This recognition expands the scope of social science disciplines and paves the way for more comprehensive theories (Diez Roux, 2002).

Moreover, case studies across various social science disciplines further expand our understanding of this novel principle. For instance, the works of Gneezy, Leonard, & List (2009) in economics highlight the impact of societal contexts on individual behaviors. Contributions

from computational social science, including the work of Lazer et al. (2009), emphasize the role of digital footprints in capturing individual and collective behaviors.

Political science literature also provides valuable insights. The study by Gilens & Page (2014) illuminates the disparities in political influence among the masses and elites, reflecting the complexities inherent in group dynamics.

Lastly, cultural differences, as explored by Hofstede (1984), can significantly impact individual and collective behaviors. The ethical aspects of researching these behaviors, as emphasized by the American Psychological Association (2017), should also be taken into account. Moreover, engaging with potential counterarguments, like Phillips and Loyd's critique (2006) on the overemphasis on diversity factors, could offer a more holistic investigation of this concept.

Assessing the Role of Individual Complexity in Contemporary Social Science Theories

The importance of individual complexity in formulating and applying social science theories is a vital principle aligned with the concept that singular instances may not necessarily epitomize the collective, and conversely, the collective might not always adequately depict singular instances. This approach echoes the teachings of Allport (1962) and invites us to consider potential pitfalls when broad theoretical constructs overlook individual complexities and the rich tapestry of traits, experiences, and socio-cultural backdrops that make up a person. Therefore, in constructing theories, a delicate balance is needed between the breadth of the theory and its ability to account for individual differences (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

Contemporary research, including work by Back, Schmukle, and Egloff (2009), along with Bleidorn et al. (2018), has amplified this discussion. These studies highlight the necessity of recognizing individual behavioral patterns in developing theoretical frameworks.

Incorporating individual complexity has profound implications for the formulation and application of theories in social sciences. Theories such as Giddens' structuration theory (1986) and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) underline the interplay between individual agency and societal structures. Recent contributions such as by Petersen et al. (2018) provide further insights into the role of individual personality traits in driving social and economic outcomes.

Numerous case studies across various social science disciplines amplify this perspective. The inclusion of work such as Mullainathan's (2000) study on the importance of individual differences in behavioral economics further strengthens this point.

The discourse on power relations by Foucault (2012) and the Foucauldian perspective on law (Hunt & Wickham, 1994) offer valuable insights on the role of individuality within societal structures. In contrast, Sen's (1999) development as freedom paradigm on the importance of individual agency in tackling societal problems, underline the importance of individual agency in social development.

With regard to cultural variances, Hofstede's (1984) model provides insight into how cultural differences can impact individual and group behavior. Ethical considerations in research on individual and group behaviors should also follow guidelines such as those proposed by the American Sociological Association (2018).

Critiques against overemphasizing individuality at the expense of understanding collective phenomena, as posited by Durkheim (1897), need to be considered. The work of Van Lange, Rinderu, and Bushman (2017) that explores the interaction between societal conditions and individual behaviors, as well as the recent study by Ratner et al. (2018) on cultural psychology, should also be given due attention.

The creation of universally applicable theories that acknowledge human cognitive diversity remains a significant challenge. However, striking a balance between broad applicability and respect for individual differences is key.

Future Directions

As we navigate the implications of the principle that asserts "unique cases may not consistently represent the collective, and reciprocally, the collective may not always adequately depict unique instances," several directions for future research materialize. These avenues hold potential to refine and extend our understanding of this principle, thereby fostering its application in the field of social sciences.

A future direction which the author wishes to emphasize involves a critical investigation of the relationship between unique instances and collectives, surpassing mere statistical representation borders. Despite providing a quantifiable perspective, statistics often miss capturing the complex subtleties governing these relationships (Desrosières, 1998). Hence, advocating for research endeavors that probe the logical coherence of these relationships is not merely appropriate but necessary.

Furthermore, social sciences should prioritize logical coherence over mere statistical associations. The presence of statistically significant correlations does not automatically denote logical or causal relationships (Sullivan & Feinn, 2012). For example, a study by Mervis and Rosch (1981) pointed out statistically significant correlations between ice cream consumption and drowning incidents. Logically, however, one does not trigger the other; rather, an underlying variable—hot weather—accounts for both events. Recent research by Vigen (2015) further demonstrates this point, highlighting spurious correlations that arise when disregarding logical associations. Therefore, the need for social sciences to adopt a holistic approach that amalgamates logical reasoning with statistical analysis is pressing.

Additionally, exploring how this principle operates across diverse societal contexts, including various cultural settings, different socioeconomic statuses, and distinct time frames, could yield valuable insights. Such an investigation would require an interdisciplinary approach, engaging fields like anthropology, economics, history, and others (Giddens, 1986).

More recent research, such as by Nishi et al. (2020), underlines the importance of considering cultural and societal contexts when interpreting statistical associations. Similarly, work by Greenfield (2016) highlights how societal context influences individual psychological processes. The inclusion of such recent studies aligns the manuscript with current developments in the field.

In conclusion, the principle of individual complexity presents an exciting frontier for future research in social sciences. The task for forthcoming studies is not merely to further explore and validate this principle but to do so in a manner that advocates for logical coherence and meaningful interpretation beyond simplistic statistical correlations.

Limitations

This paper suggests a rigorous exploration of the relationship between unique instances and collective entities, extending beyond statistical representation. However, the identification and interpretation of such relationships without the help of quantifiable metrics present substantial challenges. Moreover, the reliance on logical coherence, while valuable, can be subjective, thus risking potential bias (Johnson, 1998).

Additionally, the manuscript advocates an interdisciplinary approach to exploring this principle across varied societal contexts. While the merit of this recommendation is undeniable, it requires careful consideration of potential complexities. The integration of diverse disciplinary perspectives, though potentially enlightening, can pose significant challenges in terms of methodological consistency and theoretical compatibility (Rosenfield, 1992). Furthermore, the examination of this principle across different cultural settings, socioeconomic statuses, and timeframes implies an extensive scope that may be difficult to accomplish comprehensively within a single research study.

The manuscript also emphasizes the importance of a holistic approach, merging logical reasoning with statistical analysis. While a novel proposition, the successful integration of these two facets may prove demanding. The existence of a 'third variable problem' is well-documented, where both the unique instance and the collective may be influenced by an unobserved common cause, thereby complicating causal interpretations (Kenny, 1979).

Despite these challenges, it is important to note that the limitations presented herein should not deter researchers from exploring this principle further. Instead, these limitations highlight

areas where additional methodological rigor and theoretical sophistication will be particularly valuable.

Conclusion

In conclusion, This review marks the initial exploration of the principle that "singular instances may not necessarily epitomize the collective, and vice versa". It is a principle that, while simple in essence, is complex in its application within the realm of social sciences. As attested by Allport (1962), Giddens (1986), Bronfenbrenner (1979), among others, individual complexities constitute a central pillar of understanding in any social science theory.

An understanding of individuality as not just a standalone entity, but an integral part of larger collective dynamics, as emphasized by Ratner & Hui (2003), is indispensable. The strong association of individual traits with economic and societal outcomes (Petersen et al., 2013) further solidifies this claim.

Acknowledgement

During the preparation of this work the author used ChatGPT in order to cite literature, proofread and improve the language clarity and structure of this report. After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Funding Statement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of Interest Statement

The author declares no competing interests, financial or non-financial, related to this study.

References

1. Abbott, A. (2016). Processual sociology. In *Processual Sociology*. University of Chicago Press.
2. Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*.
3. Allport, G. W. (1962). The general and the unique in psychological science. *Journal of personality*.
4. American Psychological Association. (2017). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code>
5. American Sociological Association. (2018). Code of ethics and policies and procedures of the ASA Committee on Professional Ethics. <https://www.asanet.org/about/governance-and-leadership/code-ethics>
6. Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2013). *Social Psychology* (8th ed.). Pearson.

7. Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2009). Predicting actual behavior from the explicit and implicit self-concept of personality. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 97(3), 533.
8. Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders*.
9. Bleidorn, W., Hill, P. L., Back, M. D., Denissen, J. J., Hennecke, M., Hopwood, C. J., ... & Roberts, B. (2019). The policy relevance of personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 74(9), 1056.
10. Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., & Lucas, R. E. (2018). Life events and personality trait change. *Journal of personality*, 86(1), 83-96.
11. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard university press.
12. Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. sage.
13. Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., Hendren, N., Jones, M. R., & Porter, S. R. (2018). *The opportunity atlas: Mapping the childhood roots of social mobility* (No. w25147). National Bureau of Economic Research.
14. Cronbach, L. J. (1957). The two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American psychologist*, 12(11), 671.
15. Cumming, G. (2014). The new statistics: Why and how. *Psychological science*, 25(1), 7-29.
16. d'Ancona, M. (2017). *Post-truth: The new war on truth and how to fight back*. Random House.
17. Dahl, R. A. (2008). *Democracy and its Critics*. Yale university press.

18. DellaVigna, S. (2018). Structural behavioral economics. In *Handbook of Behavioral Economics: Applications and Foundations 1* (Vol. 1, pp. 613-723). North-Holland.
19. Desrosières, A. (1998). *The politics of large numbers: A history of statistical reasoning*. Harvard University Press.
20. Diez, R. (2002). A glossary for multilevel analysis. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, 56(8), 588.
21. Durkheim, E. (1897). *Le suicide: étude de sociologie*. Alcan.
22. Durkheim, Emile. "Suicide: a study in sociology [1897]." Translated by JA Spaulding and G. Simpson (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951) (1951).
23. Elliott, H., Ryan, J., & Hollway, W. (2012). Research encounters, reflexivity and supervision. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 15(5), 433-444.
24. Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge university press.
25. Foucault, M. (2012). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage.
26. Fraley, R. C., & Vazire, S. (2014). The N-pact factor: Evaluating the quality of empirical journals with respect to sample size and statistical power. *PloS one*, 9(10), e109019.
27. Fukuyama, F. (1996). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. Simon and Schuster.
28. Funder, D. C., Levine, J. M., Mackie, D. M., Morf, C. C., Sansone, C., Vazire, S., & West, S. G. (2014). Improving the dependability of research in personality and social

psychology: Recommendations for research and educational practice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 18(1), 3-12.

29. Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures* (Vol. 5043). Basic books.

30. Gelman, A. (2016). The problems with p-values are not just with p-values. *The American Statistician*, 70(10).

31. Giddens, A. (1986). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration* (Vol. 349). Univ of California Press.

32. Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. *Perspectives on politics*, 12(3), 564-581.

33. Gneezy, U., Leonard, K. L., & List, J. A. (2009). Gender differences in competition: Evidence from a matrilineal and a patriarchal society. *Econometrica*, 77(5), 1637-1664.

34. Goodman, S. N. (1999). Toward evidence-based medical statistics. 1: The P value fallacy. *Annals of internal medicine*, 130(12), 995-1004.

35. Graeber, D. (2012). *Debt: The first 5000 years*. Penguin UK.

36. Greenfield, P. M. (2016). Social change, cultural evolution, and human development. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 84-92.

37. Guillaume, Y. R., Dawson, J. F., Otaye-Ebede, L., Woods, S. A., & West, M. A. (2017). Harnessing demographic differences in organizations: What moderates the effects of workplace diversity?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 276-303.

38. Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of management review*, 32(4), 1199-1228.

39. Hart, H. L. A., Hart, H. L. A., Raz, J., & Green, L. (2012). *The concept of law*. oxford university press.
40. Haslanger, S. (2017). Racism, ideology, and social movements. *Res Philosophica*, 94(1), 1-22.
41. Henrich, J. (2016). *The secret of our success: How culture is driving human evolution, domesticating our species, and making us smarter*. princeton University press.
42. Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRDest people in the world: How the West became psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Penguin UK.
43. Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world?. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83.
44. Hodgson, G. M. (2007). Meanings of methodological individualism. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 14(2), 211-226.
45. Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values (Vol. 5)*. sage.
46. Homans, G. C. (1961). The humanities and the social sciences. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 4(8), 3-6.
47. Hunt, A., & Wickham, G. (1994). *Foucault and law: Towards a sociology of law as governance*. Pluto Press.
48. Ioannidis, J. P. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS medicine*, 2(8), e124.
49. Ishii, K. (2013). Culture and the mode of thought: A review. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 16(2), 123-132.

50. Jachimowicz, J. M., Wihler, A., Bailey, E. R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2018). Why grit requires perseverance and passion to positively predict performance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(40), 9980-9985.
51. Joshi, A., & Roh, H. (2009). The role of context in work team diversity research: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of management journal*, 52(3), 599-627.
52. Keynes, J. M. (1936). „The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money“, Mac Millan. Houndsmills, UK.
53. Kruschke, J. K., & Liddell, T. M. (2018). The Bayesian New Statistics: Hypothesis testing, estimation, meta-analysis, and power analysis from a Bayesian perspective. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 25, 178-206.
54. Lazer, D., Pentland, A., Adamic, L., Aral, S., Barabási, A. L., Brewer, D., ... & Van Alstyne, M. (2009). Computational social science. *Science*, 323(5915), 721-723.
55. Levitt, S. D., & List, J. A. (2007). What do laboratory experiments measuring social preferences reveal about the real world?. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 21(2), 153-174.
56. Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2011). Personality development across the life span: longitudinal analyses with a national sample from Germany. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 101(4), 847.
57. Lukes, S. (1973). *Emile Durkheim: His Life and Work: a Historical and Critical Study*.
58. Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. Macmillan.
59. Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Sage publications.

60. McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American psychologist*, 52(5), 509.
61. Meehl, P. E. (1990). Why summaries of research on psychological theories are often uninterpretable. *Psychological reports*, 66(1), 195-244.
62. Mervis, C. B., & Rosch, E. (1981). Categorization of natural objects. *Annual review of psychology*, 32(1), 89-115.
63. Mullainathan, S., & Thaler, R. H. (2000). Behavioral economics.
64. Neisser, U., & Jopling, D. A. (Eds.). (1997). *The conceptual self in context: culture experience self understanding* (Vol. 7). Cambridge University Press.
65. Nisbett, R. E., & Miyamoto, Y. (2005). The influence of culture: holistic versus analytic perception. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 9(10), 467-473.
66. Nook, E. C., Sasse, S. F., Lambert, H. K., McLaughlin, K. A., & Somerville, L. H. (2018). The nonlinear development of emotion differentiation: Granular emotional experience is low in adolescence. *Psychological science*, 29(8), 1346-1357.
67. Norenzayan, A. (2016). Theodiversity. *Annual review of psychology*, 67, 465-488.
68. Oishi, S., Graham, J., Kesebir, S., & Galinha, I. C. (2013). Concepts of happiness across time and cultures. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 39(5), 559-577.
69. Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716.
70. Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 57, 401-421.

71. Petersen, M. B., Sznycer, D., Sell, A., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (2013). The ancestral logic of politics: Upper-body strength regulates men's assertion of self-interest over economic redistribution. *Psychological science*, 24(7), 1098-1103.
72. Phillips, K. W., & Loyd, D. L. (2006). When surface and deep-level diversity collide: The effects on dissenting group members. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 99(2), 143-160.
73. Piketty, T. (2017). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. In *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.
74. Ratner, C., & Hui, L. (2003). Theoretical and methodological problems in cross-cultural psychology. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 33(1), 67-94.
75. Ratner, C. (2018). The genesis of macro cultural psychology's culture theory from traditional cultural psychology. In *The Challenges Of Cultural Psychology* (pp. 368-395). Routledge.
76. Rawls, J. (2020). *A theory of justice: Revised edition*. Harvard university press.
77. Reis, H. T., & Judd, C. M. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
78. Salganik, M. J. (2019). *Bit by bit: Social research in the digital age*. Princeton University Press.
79. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press
80. Small, M. L. (2009). *Unanticipated gains: Origins of network inequality in everyday life*. Oxford University Press.
81. Srivastava, S. B., & Banaji, M. R. (2011). Culture, cognition, and collaborative networks in organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 76(2), 207-233.

82. Sullivan, G. M., & Feinn, R. (2012). Using effect size—or why the P value is not enough. *Journal of graduate medical education*, 4(3), 279-282.
83. Treier, S., & Hillygus, D. S. (2009). The nature of political ideology in the contemporary electorate. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73(4), 679-703.
84. Udehn, L. (2002). *Methodological individualism: Background, history and meaning*. Routledge.
85. Vaisey, S., & Lizardo, O. (2016). Cultural fragmentation or acquired dispositions? A new approach to accounting for patterns of cultural change. *Socius*, 2, 2378023116669726.
86. Van Lange, P. A., Rinderu, M. I., & Bushman, B. J. (2017). Aggression and violence around the world: A model of CLimate, Aggression, and Self-control in Humans (CLASH). *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 40, e75.
87. Vazire, S. (2018). Implications of the credibility revolution for productivity, creativity, and progress. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(4), 411-417.
88. Vigen, T. (2015). *Spurious correlations*. Hachette UK.
89. Western, B., & Jackman, S. (1994). Bayesian inference for comparative research. *American Political Science Review*, 88(2), 412-423.
90. Wimmer, A., & Lewis, K. (2010). Beyond and below racial homophily: ERG models of a friendship network documented on Facebook. *American journal of sociology*, 116(2), 583-642.
91. Yarkoni, T., & Westfall, J. (2017). Choosing prediction over explanation in psychology: Lessons from machine learning. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(6), 1100-1122.

92. Zhou, H., & Fishbach, A. (2016). The pitfall of experimenting on the web: How unattended selective attrition leads to surprising (yet false) research conclusions. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 111(4), 493.

93. Zimbardo, P. G. (1971). The power and pathology of imprisonment. *Congressional Record*. (Serial No. 15, 1971-10-25). Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 92nd Congress, 1st Session on Corrections, Part II, Prisons, Prison Reform and Prisoner's Rights: California. U.S. Government Printing Office.