Registered in Germany **Europa Revue Journal**
ISSN: 1862-6564 **Vol. 6 No. 5 (2026) Published May 31, 2026**

COLLECTIVISM BEYOND HOFSTEDE: INDIGENOUS DIMENSIONS OF CENTRAL ASIAN CULTURE

Ganiev Akhrorjon

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Psychology Social Psychology and Ethnopsychology

Abstract

Collectivism has long been regarded as one of the defining characteristics of Central Asian societies, with most empirical studies interpreting regional cultural patterns through Hofstede's individualism–collectivism dimension. Although this framework has substantially advanced cross-cultural psychology, it provides only a broad categorization of collectivist cultures and pays limited attention to indigenous psychological structures that distinguish one collectivist society from another. Central Asia represents a particularly important case because its cultural development has been shaped by the interaction of nomadic heritage, Islamic ethics, extended family systems, Soviet collectivization, and post-independence nation-building. These influences have produced culturally specific psychological characteristics that cannot be fully explained by conventional models of collectivism. This theoretical review synthesizes findings from cross-cultural psychology, ethnopsychology, anthropology, and sociology to examine indigenous dimensions of Central Asian culture that extend beyond Hofstede's framework. The paper argues that concepts such as kinship obligation, communal reciprocity, hospitality, honor, intergenerational responsibility, respect for elders, and collective resilience constitute distinct ethnopsychological dimensions rather than simple manifestations of collectivism. A conceptual model is proposed to organize these indigenous cultural characteristics into an integrated framework for future empirical investigation. The article contributes to indigenous psychology by highlighting the need for culturally grounded theories capable of explaining psychological functioning within Central Asian societies and provides a foundation for developing region-specific measurement instruments and comparative cross-cultural research.

Keywords

Central Asia; Collectivism; Indigenous cultural dimensions; Ethnopsychology; Indigenous psychology; Cross-cultural psychology

Introduction

Understanding cultural differences has become increasingly important in psychology, sociology, and intercultural communication as globalization intensifies interactions among diverse societies. Among the theoretical models developed to explain cultural variation, Hofstede's cultural dimensions remain the most influential framework in cross-cultural research. In particular, the individualism–collectivism dimension has been widely used to distinguish societies according to the relative importance assigned to personal autonomy or group interdependence. Countries in Central Asia are commonly classified as highly collectivistic, and this characterization has informed research on family relationships, leadership, education, organizational behavior, migration, and psychological well-being. Despite its widespread application, Hofstede's conceptualization has several limitations when applied to culturally complex regions such as Central Asia. The framework primarily positions societies along a single continuum ranging from individualism to collectivism, implicitly assuming that collectivistic cultures share similar psychological characteristics. However, collectivism is not a homogeneous phenomenon. Different societies develop unique cultural systems based on their historical experiences, religious traditions, ecological environments, and social institutions. Consequently, two societies may both be classified as collectivistic while differing substantially in interpersonal relationships, family organization, social obligations, moral expectations, and emotional norms.

Central Asia presents a compelling example of this limitation. The region has been shaped by centuries of interaction among Turkic, Persian, and Mongolian civilizations, the spread of Islam, nomadic and sedentary lifestyles, Soviet political and educational systems, and contemporary processes of modernization and globalization. These overlapping influences have produced distinctive ethnopsychological characteristics that extend beyond conventional notions of collectivism. Cultural concepts such as unconditional hospitality, strong kinship obligations, reverence for elders, communal responsibility, honor, reciprocity, and collective resilience continue to influence everyday psychological functioning and social behavior across the region. Recent developments in indigenous psychology emphasize that psychological theories

should emerge from local cultural realities rather than relying exclusively on universal models developed in Western contexts. From this perspective, Central Asia remains significantly underrepresented within cross-cultural psychology, despite its unique historical and cultural heritage. Existing research has largely adopted externally developed theoretical frameworks instead of identifying indigenous psychological constructs that accurately reflect regional experiences.

The purpose of this theoretical review is therefore to examine the indigenous dimensions of Central Asian culture that are insufficiently represented within Hofstede's individualism–collectivism framework. Drawing upon evidence from ethnopsychology, anthropology, sociology, and cross-cultural psychology, the paper proposes a broader conceptualization of collectivism that recognizes culturally specific psychological mechanisms. By integrating indigenous perspectives into contemporary cultural psychology, this review seeks to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of Central Asian societies while providing a theoretical foundation for future empirical research and the development of culturally appropriate measurement instruments.

Theoretical foundations: Hofstede and collectivism

The systematic study of culture in psychology gained significant momentum through the pioneering work of Geert Hofstede, whose cultural dimensions theory remains one of the most influential frameworks in cross-cultural research. Based on extensive surveys of employees working for IBM across more than 70 countries, Hofstede proposed that national cultures differ along several value dimensions that influence social behavior, organizational practices, and interpersonal relationships. Among these dimensions, the individualism–collectivism continuum has become the most widely applied construct for explaining cultural differences in psychological processes, leadership, education, communication, and decision-making.

According to Hofstede, individualistic societies emphasize personal autonomy, independence, self-realization, and individual achievement. Individuals are expected to prioritize their own goals and develop identities that are largely independent of family or social groups. In contrast, collectivistic societies encourage strong interpersonal ties, group cohesion, shared responsibilities, and loyalty to family or community. Personal

identity is understood primarily through social relationships, and individuals are expected to subordinate personal interests to collective welfare when necessary.

The influence of Hofstede's framework extends far beyond organizational psychology. Researchers have employed the individualism–collectivism dimension to explain variations in parenting styles, educational practices, conflict resolution, emotional expression, mental health, political attitudes, consumer behavior, and migration experiences. The model has also provided a common language for comparing cultures across diverse disciplines, making it one of the most frequently cited theoretical frameworks in the social sciences. Despite its widespread acceptance, collectivism itself has evolved into a more complex construct than Hofstede originally proposed. Harry Triandis argued that collectivism cannot be adequately represented as a single continuum opposite individualism. Instead, he distinguished between horizontal collectivism, characterized by equality and cooperation among group members, and vertical collectivism, in which group loyalty coexists with hierarchical social structures and acceptance of unequal authority. This distinction demonstrated that societies classified as collectivistic may differ substantially in the organization of social relationships, authority patterns, and interpersonal obligations.

Subsequent scholars further expanded the theoretical understanding of collectivism by emphasizing relational identity, interdependent self-construal, and culturally specific social norms. Markus and Kitayama proposed that individuals in collectivistic societies develop interdependent selves, defining themselves primarily through relationships with significant others rather than through individual characteristics. Similarly, Schwartz's theory of basic human values introduced additional cultural dimensions such as embeddedness and hierarchy, providing complementary perspectives on how collective values shape behavior across societies.

These theoretical developments collectively demonstrate that collectivism is not a single psychological characteristic but rather a broad cultural orientation encompassing multiple social, cognitive, and emotional processes. Family obligations, reciprocity, conformity, mutual dependence, social harmony, and collective responsibility may all be expressions of collectivism, yet they do not necessarily emerge with equal strength

across different societies. Historical experience, religion, ecology, political institutions, and economic organization all contribute to shaping distinct forms of collectivist culture.

Within Central Asia, Hofstede's framework has generally classified countries as collectivistic because of their strong family orientation, communal traditions, and emphasis on interpersonal loyalty. While this classification captures an important aspect of regional culture, it offers only a broad description of social organization. It does not fully explain why collectivism in Central Asia differs from collectivism observed in East Asian Confucian societies, Arab societies, or African communal cultures. Consequently, although Hofstede's theory provides an indispensable foundation for cross-cultural comparison, it should be viewed as a starting point rather than a comprehensive explanation of the ethnopsychological characteristics that distinguish Central Asian societies.

Limitations of universal cultural models

Universal models of culture have significantly advanced psychological science by providing standardized frameworks for comparing societies across the world. Theories developed by Hofstede, Schwartz, Trompenaars, and the GLOBE Project have generated substantial empirical evidence regarding cultural differences in values, behavior, and social institutions. Nevertheless, these frameworks have increasingly been criticized for their tendency to simplify complex cultural realities into broad, universally applicable dimensions.

One of the principal limitations of universal cultural models is their assumption that national cultures can be adequately represented through a relatively small number of quantitative dimensions. Although such dimensions facilitate international comparisons, they inevitably reduce the richness of local cultural systems. Countries sharing similar scores on collectivism may nevertheless differ dramatically in family organization, moral obligations, emotional expression, religious practices, and community structures. Consequently, numerical cultural indices often mask important psychological differences that emerge from unique historical and social experiences.

Another limitation concerns the treatment of nations as culturally homogeneous units. Most universal models assume that each country possesses a relatively stable and

coherent national culture. However, many societies consist of multiple ethnic, linguistic, and regional communities whose psychological characteristics vary considerably. Central Asia exemplifies this complexity. While Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan share important historical and cultural traditions, each country has developed distinctive institutions, ethnic compositions, and social norms that cannot be fully captured through national averages.

Universal cultural theories have also been criticized for their Western epistemological foundations. Many influential psychological theories were developed using research conducted primarily in North America and Western Europe before being generalized to other cultural contexts. As a result, theoretical constructs considered universal may actually reflect assumptions rooted in particular historical and philosophical traditions. Indigenous psychologists argue that this approach risks overlooking locally meaningful concepts that organize psychological life in non-Western societies. Methodological concerns further complicate the application of universal models. Large-scale international surveys often rely on standardized questionnaires translated across languages. Although statistical techniques can improve measurement equivalence, linguistic translation does not always ensure conceptual equivalence. Cultural concepts embedded within one language may possess meanings that cannot be directly translated into another, leading to incomplete or distorted interpretations of psychological constructs. These limitations are particularly relevant for understanding Central Asian cultures. Historical experiences including nomadic traditions, Islamic ethical systems, Soviet collectivization, and post-independence nation-building have produced psychological characteristics that differ from those found in many other collectivistic societies. Universal frameworks acknowledge collectivism as a dominant orientation but provide limited explanation for culturally specific phenomena such as extensive kinship obligations, ceremonial reciprocity, communal hospitality, and intergenerational social responsibility. Addressing these limitations requires complementing universal theories with culturally grounded perspectives capable of identifying indigenous psychological dimensions that emerge from the lived experiences of Central Asian populations.

Indigenous Psychology and Ethnopsychology

Indigenous psychology emerged as an intellectual response to the dominance of Western theories within psychological science. Rather than assuming that psychological principles are universally applicable across cultures, indigenous psychology argues that human behavior, cognition, emotion, and social relationships should be understood within their specific cultural, historical, and ecological contexts. This perspective emphasizes that psychological knowledge should originate not only from universal scientific principles but also from concepts, values, and social practices that develop within particular societies. The development of indigenous psychology reflects broader debates concerning the universality of psychological theories. While universal approaches seek common principles shared by all human populations, indigenous psychologists argue that cultural contexts fundamentally shape psychological functioning. Consequently, concepts developed within one society may not accurately describe behavior or mental processes in another. This position does not reject universal psychology; instead, it advocates integrating universal scientific methods with culturally grounded theories that emerge from local experiences.

Ethnopsychology provides an important methodological and theoretical foundation for indigenous psychological research. It examines how cultural traditions, collective beliefs, historical experiences, language, customs, and social institutions influence psychological processes within specific ethnic or cultural communities. Unlike traditional cross-cultural psychology, which often compares predefined psychological variables across nations, ethnopsychology seeks to identify culturally meaningful concepts before attempting comparative analysis. This bottom-up approach allows researchers to discover indigenous constructs that may not exist within conventional psychological frameworks. Research conducted in East Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Arab world has demonstrated the scientific value of indigenous approaches. Concepts such as guanxi in China, amae in Japan, ubuntu in Southern Africa, and simpatía in Latin America illustrate psychological phenomena that cannot be fully understood through Western theoretical categories alone. These culturally specific constructs have substantially enriched international psychological theory by

revealing alternative ways of conceptualizing interpersonal relationships, identity, morality, and social responsibility. Despite growing interest in indigenous psychology globally, Central Asia remains one of the least explored regions within this tradition. Existing psychological research has largely interpreted Central Asian societies through externally developed cultural dimensions rather than investigating indigenous concepts that organize everyday social life. Yet the region possesses a rich cultural heritage shaped by centuries of interaction among nomadic traditions, Islamic civilization, Turkic and Persian cultural influences, Soviet social institutions, and contemporary globalization. These historical processes have generated distinctive psychological orientations that deserve independent theoretical examination. From an ethnopsychological perspective, concepts such as hospitality, kinship solidarity, collective honor, reciprocal obligation, respect for elders, communal responsibility, and adaptive resilience should not merely be viewed as indicators of collectivism. Rather, they represent culturally embedded psychological systems with unique meanings, social functions, and behavioral consequences. Identifying and conceptualizing these indigenous dimensions is essential for constructing a more accurate understanding of Central Asian psychology. Such an approach not only enriches regional scholarship but also contributes to the broader goal of developing a genuinely global psychological science that recognizes cultural diversity as a source of theoretical innovation rather than merely a variable for comparison.

INDIGENOUS DIMENSIONS OF CENTRAL ASIAN CULTURE

Although Central Asian societies are frequently categorized as collectivistic within established cross-cultural frameworks, such classification provides only a general description of their cultural orientation. Collectivism alone cannot adequately explain the culturally specific psychological mechanisms that organize interpersonal relationships, community life, and individual behavior across the region. The historical interaction of nomadic traditions, Islamic values, kinship systems, Soviet social structures, and post-independence national development has produced distinctive ethnopsychological characteristics that deserve recognition as indigenous cultural dimensions rather than secondary expressions of collectivism.

One of the most prominent indigenous dimensions is **kinship obligation**. Family relationships in Central Asia extend far beyond the nuclear household and encompass broad networks of relatives who maintain continuous social, economic, and emotional responsibilities toward one another. Decisions concerning education, employment, marriage, migration, and financial support are often understood as collective family matters rather than purely individual choices. This extensive kinship system strengthens social security while simultaneously creating reciprocal obligations that shape individual decision-making throughout the life course. A second dimension is **communal reciprocity**, referring to the expectation that individuals provide mutual assistance during significant life events. Weddings, funerals, childbirth, illness, migration, and periods of economic hardship commonly involve coordinated support from relatives, neighbors, friends, and community members. Reciprocity functions not merely as voluntary altruism but as a culturally institutionalized mechanism that reinforces long-term social trust and collective solidarity. Participation in reciprocal exchanges strengthens interpersonal relationships and maintains social cohesion across generations.

Another defining characteristic is **hospitality as a moral institution.** In many Central Asian societies, hospitality represents a moral obligation grounded in cultural tradition rather than a simple expression of politeness. Guests are regarded with exceptional respect regardless of their social status or prior relationship with the host. Providing generous hospitality enhances family reputation, strengthens social networks, and symbolizes moral integrity. Consequently, hospitality serves important psychological functions by fostering interpersonal trust, reducing social distance, and reinforcing communal identity. **Respect for elders and intergenerational responsibility** constitute another central ethnopsychological dimension. Older family members are generally viewed as custodians of cultural knowledge, moral authority, and collective experience. Their guidance influences family decision-making, conflict resolution, and child socialization. Respect is expressed not only through linguistic forms and behavioral etiquette but also through caregiving responsibilities and lifelong family obligations. These practices facilitate the transmission of cultural values while reinforcing continuity between generations.

The concept of **collective honor** also occupies an important position within Central Asian social life. Individual behavior frequently reflects upon the reputation of one's family, relatives, or community. Personal achievements enhance collective prestige, whereas socially inappropriate behavior may affect the standing of the broader kinship network. Honor therefore functions as both a motivational system and an informal mechanism of social regulation, encouraging conformity to shared moral expectations while strengthening collective identity.

Closely related is the dimension of **community solidarity.** Although community structures differ across countries and regions, neighborhood-based cooperation continues to play a significant role in everyday life. Local communities frequently organize collective celebrations, charitable activities, conflict mediation, and mutual assistance during emergencies. Such community networks contribute to psychological well-being by fostering belongingness, shared responsibility, and social support beyond immediate family relationships. Another indigenous characteristic is **adaptive resilience.** Central Asian societies have experienced repeated historical transformations, including imperial expansion, colonial administration, Soviet collectivization, economic transition, labor migration, and globalization. These experiences have encouraged flexible coping strategies that combine cultural continuity with practical adaptation to changing social conditions. Psychological resilience in this context is expressed not solely through individual perseverance but through collective problem-solving, family cooperation, and community support.

Finally, **cultural continuity and identity preservation** represent important ethnopsychological processes across the region. Traditional customs, ceremonies, oral narratives, language, and religious practices continue to shape psychological identity despite rapid modernization. Rather than opposing modernization, many Central Asian communities integrate contemporary social and technological changes while preserving core cultural values that provide stability and meaning across generations.

Together, these indigenous dimensions illustrate that collectivism in Central Asia is not a singular cultural characteristic but a multidimensional psychological system rooted in historical experience and cultural practice. Kinship obligation, communal

reciprocity, hospitality, respect for elders, collective honor, community solidarity, adaptive resilience, and cultural continuity interact to shape interpersonal behavior, identity formation, and social organization. Recognizing these dimensions contributes to a more culturally grounded understanding of Central Asian psychology while providing a theoretical basis for future empirical research and the development of indigenous measurement instruments.

Future research directions

The present conceptual review highlights several opportunities for advancing ethnopsychological research in Central Asia. First, future studies should move beyond applying universal cultural frameworks and prioritize the identification and empirical validation of indigenous psychological constructs. Qualitative methodologies, including in-depth interviews, focus groups, ethnographic observation, and grounded theory approaches, can facilitate the discovery of culturally meaningful concepts that may not be represented within existing psychological models.

Second, there is a clear need to develop standardized measurement instruments specifically designed for Central Asian populations. Most available cultural scales have been constructed within Western or East Asian contexts and may not adequately capture indigenous dimensions such as kinship obligation, communal reciprocity, hospitality, or collective honor. Developing reliable and valid psychometric instruments would enable researchers to examine these constructs systematically and compare them across different cultural settings.

Third, comparative research should investigate both similarities and differences among Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. Although these countries share historical and cultural foundations, variations in language, religion, economic development, urbanization, and political history may influence the expression of indigenous psychological characteristics. Cross-national studies would therefore provide a more nuanced understanding of cultural diversity within the region.

Future investigations should also examine how indigenous cultural dimensions relate to important psychological outcomes, including mental health, subjective well-being, resilience, educational achievement, leadership, organizational behavior,

migration experiences, and intercultural adaptation. Such research would strengthen the practical relevance of ethnopsychology by demonstrating how culturally grounded constructs influence everyday psychological functioning. Finally, interdisciplinary collaboration among psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists, historians, and linguists will be essential for constructing comprehensive theories of Central Asian psychology. Integrating perspectives from multiple disciplines can facilitate the development of culturally authentic theoretical models that contribute not only to regional scholarship but also to the broader advancement of global psychological science.

Conclusion

Hofstede's individualism–collectivism dimension has provided an influential foundation for understanding cultural differences across societies and has significantly contributed to the development of cross-cultural psychology. However, as this review has argued, the complexity of Central Asian cultures cannot be fully understood through a single continuum that categorizes societies as either individualistic or collectivistic. Such classifications offer valuable comparative insights but overlook the culturally specific psychological systems that emerge from unique historical, social, and cultural experiences. Drawing upon perspectives from indigenous psychology and ethnopsychology, this article has proposed that Central Asian culture encompasses multiple indigenous dimensions, including kinship obligation, communal reciprocity, hospitality, respect for elders, collective honor, community solidarity, adaptive resilience, and cultural continuity. These dimensions should not be regarded simply as indicators of collectivism but as distinct psychological constructs that organize interpersonal relationships, identity formation, moral expectations, and community life throughout the region. Recognizing these indigenous dimensions contributes to a more culturally grounded understanding of Central Asian psychology while addressing broader concerns regarding the universality of existing psychological theories. Rather than replacing universal cultural models, indigenous perspectives complement them by revealing forms of psychological organization that remain invisible within generalized frameworks. Integrating universal and indigenous approaches therefore represents a productive direction for future cross-cultural research. Ultimately, developing an

ethnopsychological framework specifically for Central Asia has implications extending beyond regional scholarship. It contributes to the ongoing international movement toward a more inclusive and culturally representative psychological science in which theoretical innovation emerges from diverse cultural traditions rather than a limited number of dominant research contexts. By recognizing the distinctive psychological heritage of Central Asian societies, future research can enrich global understandings of culture, identity, and human behavior while establishing a stronger empirical foundation for indigenous psychology in the region.

References:

1. Allwood, C. M., & Berry, J. W. (2006). Origins and development of indigenous psychologies: An international analysis. International Journal of Psychology, 41(4), 243–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590544000013

2. Aminjonov, A., & Akhrorjon, G. LANGUAGE ANXIETY AND SPEAKING FLUENCY: A PSYCHOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF UZBEK LEARNERS OF ENGLISH. O ‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY TA’LIM, FAN VA INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI, 119.

3. Axrorjon, G. A. (2025). COMMUNITY INTEGRATION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING: ADDRESSING ACCULTURATIVE STRESS IN SOUTH KOREA’S IMMIGRANT POPULATIONS. News of the NUUz, 1(1.2. 1), 74-75.

4. Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46(1), 5–34.

5. Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Breugelmans, S. M., Chasiotis, A., & Sam, D. L. (2011). Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

6. Chakkarath, P. (2012). The role of indigenous psychologies in the building of basic cultural psychology. In J. Valsiner (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of culture and psychology (pp. 71–95). Oxford University Press.

7. Ganiev, A., Ahmedov, D. S. U., Boltaboyev, A. K. U., & Turamov, M. R. U. (2026, February). Cognitive load theory and AI integration: Optimizing educational

technology for enhanced learning outcomes. In AIP Conference Proceedings (Vol. 3393, No. 1, p. 060053). AIP Publishing LLC.

8. Ganiev, A. (2024). Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Variation in Complaint Speech Acts: A Comparative Study of Uzbek and American English Discourse. 외국학연구, (70), 11-52.

9. Ganiev, A. (2023). THE ROLE OF DIRECTNESS LEVEL AND SOCIAL FACTORS IN THE REALIZATION OF COMPLAINING SPEECH ACT: A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY. Interpretation and researches, 1(11).

10. Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

11. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

12. Hwang, K. K. (2012). Foundations of Chinese psychology: Confucian social relations. Springer.

13. Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2007). Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theory and applications (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

14. Kim, U. (2000). Indigenous, cultural, and cross-cultural psychology: A theoretical, conceptual, and epistemological analysis. Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 3(3), 265–287.

15. Kim, U. (2001). Culture, science, and indigenous psychologies: An integrated analysis. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), The handbook of culture and psychology (pp. 51–76). Oxford University Press.

16. Kim, U., & Berry, J. W. (Eds.). (1993). Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context. Sage Publications.

17. Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., Choi, S. C., & Yoon, G. (Eds.). (1994). Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications. Sage Publications.

18. Kim, U., Yang, K. S., & Hwang, K. K. (Eds.). (2006). Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context. Springer.

19. Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98(2), 224–253.

20. Matsumoto, D., & Juang, L. (2022). Culture and psychology (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

21. Nisbett, R. E. (2003). The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently... and why. Free Press.

22. Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. Psychological Bulletin, 128(1), 3–72.

23. Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 85–119). Sage Publications.

24. Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and collectivism. Westview Press.

25. Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(1), 118–128.

26. Abashin, S. (2011). The rise and fall of Soviet Central Asia. In A. Paksoy (Ed.), Central Asia Reader. M. E. Sharpe.

27. Kamp, M. (2006). The new woman in Uzbekistan: Islam, modernity, and unveiling under communism. University of Washington Press.

28. Khalid, A. (2007). Islam after communism: Religion and politics in Central Asia. University of California Press.

29. Khalid, A. (2015). Making Uzbekistan: Nation, empire, and revolution in the early USSR. Cornell University Press.

30. Laruelle, M. (2018). Central Asia: A new map of the geopolitical landscape. Lexington Books.

31. Schatz, E. (2004). Modern clan politics: The power of "blood" in Kazakhstan and beyond. University of Washington Press.

32. Soucek, S. (2000). A history of Inner Asia. Cambridge University Press.