

Culture and Human Development

The importance of cross-cultural
research for the social sciences

Edited by

*Wolfgang Friedlmeier,
Pradeep Chakkarath
and Beate Schwarz*

 Psychology Press
Taylor & Francis Group
HOVE AND NEW YORK

**Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details**

Culture and Human Development

Culture and Human Development

The importance of cross-cultural research for the social sciences

Edited by

*Wolfgang Friedlmeier,
Pradeep Chakkarath
and Beate Schwarz*

 Psychology Press
Taylor & Francis Group

HOVE AND NEW YORK

First published 2005 by Psychology Press
27 Church Road, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 2FA

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or
Routledge's collection of thousands of eBooks please go to
www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Psychology Press
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Psychology Press is a part of the Taylor & Francis Group

Copyright © 2005 Psychology Press

Cover design by Jim Wilkie

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or
reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic,
mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any
information storage or retrieval system, without permission in
writing from the publishers.

The publisher makes no representation, express or implied,
with regard to the accuracy of the information contained in
this book and cannot accept any legal responsibility or
liability for any errors or omissions that may be made.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Culture and human development: the importance of cross-cultural
research for the social sciences/[compiled by] Wolfgang Friedlmeier,
Pradeep Chakkarath, and Beate Schwarz.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-84169-568-8

1. Developmental psychology—Cross-cultural studies—Congresses.
2. Ethnopsychology—Congresses. I. Friedlmeier, Wolfgang, 1960
II. Chakkarath, P. (Pradeep), 1960—III. Schwarz, Beate. IV. Title.

BF712.5.C86 2005

155.8-dc22

2004022494

ISBN 0-203-01505-3 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 1-84169-568-8 (Print Edition)

Contents

<i>Biographical Notes</i>	viii
<i>Preface</i>	xv
Introduction	1
Part I: Theory and Methods in Cross-Cultural Research	
<i>The Psychological Study of Culture: Issues and Questions of Enduring Importance</i>	9
Walter J. Lonner	
<i>What can Western Psychology Learn From Indigenous Psychologies?—Lessons From Hindu Psychology</i>	30
Pradeep Chakkarath	
<i>Using Cross-Cultural Psychology to Design Afterschool Educational Activities in Different Cultural Settings</i>	50
Michael Cole	
Part II: On the Development of Developmental Theories	
<i>Universal and Culture-Specific Aspects of Human Behavior: The Case of Attachment</i>	71
Klaus E. Grossmann, Karin Grossmann, and Anika Keppler	
<i>Attachment and Culture: Bridging Relativism and Universalism</i>	92
Fred Rothbaum and Gilda Morelli	
<i>Emotional Development and Culture: Reciprocal Contributions of Cross-Cultural Research and Developmental Psychology</i>	114
Wolfgang Friedlmeier	
<i>Spatial Language and Cognitive Development in India: An Urban/Rural Comparison</i>	137
Ramesh C. Mishra and Pierre R. Dasen	
Part III: Intergenerational Relationships	
<i>Changing Value of Children: An Action Theory of Fertility Behavior and Intergenerational Relationships in Cross-Cultural Comparison</i>	166

Bernhard Nauck	
<i>Relations between Value Orientation, Child-Rearing Goals, and Parenting: A Comparison of German and South Korean Mothers</i>	184
Beate Schwarz, Esther Schäfermeier and Gisela Trommsdorff	
<i>Adolescent Future Orientation: Intergenerational Transmission and Intertwining Tactics in Cultural and Family Settings</i>	208
Rachel Seginer	

Part IV: Social Change

<i>Modernization Does Not Mean Westernization: Emergence of a Different Pattern</i>	230
Çigdem Kagitçibasi	
<i>Modernization and Value Change</i>	246
Helmut Klages	

Part V: Acculturation

<i>Acculturation</i>	263
John W. Berry	
<i>Long-Term Effects of International Student Exchange Programs</i>	274
Alexander Thomas	
<i>Collective Self-Esteem and Acculturation: A Case Study of European and Japanese Internship Students</i>	291
Makoto Kobayashi	
<i>Author Index</i>	310
<i>Subject Index</i>	325

Biographical Notes

John Berry is Professor Emeritus of Psychology at Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. He received his B.A. from Sir George Williams University, Montreal, Canada (1963) and his Ph.D. from the University of Edinburgh, UK (1966). He was Lecturer at the University of Sydney, Australia, for three years, Fellow at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study and Visiting Professor at a number of universities in Estonia, Finland, France, India, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, and the UK. He is Past Secretary-General, Past President, and Honorary Fellow of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology. In 2001, he received honorary doctorates from the universities of Geneva, Switzerland, and Athens, Greece. He is the Senior Editor of the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (rev. ed., 1997), co-author of two textbooks in the field, and author or editor of thirty books in the areas of cross-cultural, social, and cognitive psychology. He is particularly interested in the application of cross-cultural psychology to public policy and programs in the areas of acculturation, multiculturalism, immigration, health and education.

Address: Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6, Canada

Pradeep Chakkarath is Lecturer at the Department for Cultural Sciences of the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, and co-organizer of the university's East Asian Studies Program. He is also a free research associate at the Department for Developmental and Cross-Cultural Psychology at the University of Konstanz, Germany, where he has served as a research assistant and lecturer (1996–2003). He teaches courses in Developmental and Cultural Psychology, Asian studies, and Intercultural Training. He received his M.A. in Philosophy and History (1986) and his Ph.D. in Psychology (2000) at the University of Konstanz. His main interests are the philosophy of science with a focus on psychological theory and methodology, cultural psychology, and the role worldviews play in societal and individual development.

Address: University of Konstanz, Department of Psychology, Box D 14, 78457 Konstanz, Germany

Michael Cole is Professor of Communication, Psychology, and Human Development at the University of California, San Diego, USA. He received his Ph.D. in Psychology at Indiana University, USA (1962). He is Director of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition at the University of California, San Diego. M.Cole received honorary doctorates from Copenhagen University, Sweden (1996) and from the University of Helsinki, Finland (2000). He is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Education (USA) and the Russian Academy of Education. His major research interest is the role of culture in human development, currently with an emphasis on the study of culturally mediated learning and development in children, and mediational theories of mind.

Address: Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, 0092, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

Pierre R.Dasen is Professor of Anthropology of Education and Cross-Cultural Psychology in the Department of Psychology and Education at the University of Geneva, Switzerland. He studied Developmental Psychology in Geneva, was assistant to J.Piaget, and received his Ph.D. (1971) from the Australian National University. He studied the cognitive development of Aboriginal children in Australia, Inuit in Canada, Baoulé in Côte d'Ivoire, and Kikuyu in Kenya. He has also contributed to research in cognitive anthropology in Bali and among the Yupno of Papua-New Guinea. His research topics have included visual perception, the development of sensorimotor intelligence, the causes and effects of malnutrition, the development of concrete operations as a function of eco-cultural variables and daily activities, definitions of intelligence, number systems, and spatial orientation. His current interests are in everyday cognition, informal education, and parental ethnotheories. He heads a research team working on intercultural education, concerned with the access of migrant adolescents to professional training. P.Dasen is co-author and co-editor of several volumes and textbooks on cross-cultural psychology and intercultural education.

Address: FPSE, Université de Genève, 9 rte de Drize, CH-1227 Carouge, Switzerland

Wolfgang Friedlmeier received his master's degree in Psychology from the University of Bamberg, Germany (1988), and his doctorate in Psychology from the University of Konstanz, Germany (1993). He obtained a grant for a research stay at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA (1993) before he became Assistant Professor at the University of Konstanz (1993–1999). There he was appointed University Lecturer ("Habilitation") in 2001. He was Visiting Chair at the University of Osnabrueck, Germany (2002–2003) and a Visiting Professor at Nagoya City University, Japan (2003–2004). He obtained several grants for research stays in Brazil and Japan. W.Friedlmeier is currently Assistant Professor for Cross-Cultural Psychology at the Grand Valley State University in Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA. His main research areas are emotional and social development, socialization, and cross-cultural psychology.

Address: Grand Valley State University, Department of Psychology, 140 Lake Michigan Hall, Allendale, MI 49401, USA

Karin Grossmann, studied Mathematics and English at the University of Arkansas, USA (B.A. 1965), Psychology in Freiburg and Muenster (M.A. 1977) and in Regensburg, Germany (Ph.D. 1984). She is a "free" senior researcher at the Department of Psychology, University of Regensburg, and a Lecturer at the Department of Psychology, University of Salzburg, Austria. She has done extensive research in longitudinal and cross-cultural studies on attachment (together with Klaus E. Grossmann) and several research stays at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development in Bethesda, at the University of Colorado in Denver, USA, and at Hokkaido University in Sapporo, Japan. Her publications focus on the application of attachment theory on family matters.

Address: University of Regensburg, Department of Psychology IV, Universitätsstr. 31, 93040 Regensburg, Germany

Klaus E.Grossmann studied Psychology in Hamburg, Germany (M.A. 1961), obtained a Fulbright grant for New Mexico State University (1961–1962), and received

his Ph.D. from the University of Arkansas, USA (1965). He continued in comparative ethology towards his “Habilitation” in psychology and behavioral biology in Freiburg, Germany. He was full professor in Bielefeld (1970–1977) and in Regensburg, Germany (from 1977–2003). Research stays in Minneapolis, Bethesda, San Diego (all USA) and in Sapporo, Japan. His research emphasis is on Developmental Psychology, Comparative and Cross-Cultural Psychology and on attachment development in humans under a life-span perspective (together with Karin Grossmann).

Address: University of Regensburg, Department of Psychology IV, Universitätsstr. 31, 93040 Regensburg, Germany

Gustav Jahoda is Professor Emeritus of Psychology at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland. He studied at the University of London and received his PhD at the London School of Economics (1951). After a spell as a lecturer at the University of Manchester he went to the then University College of the Gold Coast (now Ghana). There, in the 1950s, he conducted fieldwork in cross-cultural psychology before that term existed. His subsequent research was mainly in Africa, but also India and Hong Kong. His varied interests included the psychological effects of social change, space perception and illusions, and socio-cognitive development. Past president of IACCP, he was Visiting Professor at the universities of Cape Town, Geneva, Harare (Zimbabwe), Legon (Ghana), New York, Osaka, Paris and Tilburg. After retiring he retreated to the library and is writing on theoretical and historical themes. He has published several books, many chapters and numerous research papers.

Address: University of Strathclyde, Department of Psychology, Graham Hills Building, 40 George Street, Glasgow G1 1QE, Scotland, United Kingdom

Çiğdem Kagitçibasi is Professor of Psychology at Koc University in Istanbul, Turkey. She received her Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley, USA. She has served as Vice President of the IUPsyS and President and Honorary Fellow of the IACCP. She is a member of the Turkish Academy of Sciences and received the American Psychological Association and the International Association of Applied Psychology Awards for Distinguished Contributions to the International Advancement of Psychology. Her extensive publications include *Family and human development across cultures* (1996) and (co-editor) *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, Vol.3 (1997).

Address: Koc University, College of Arts and Sciences, Istinye, 80860 Istanbul, Turkey

Anika Keppler is a research and teaching assistant at the Department of Psychology, University of Regensburg, Germany, where she received her master's degree (2000). Currently a Ph.D. candidate, she is doing longitudinal and cross-cultural research together with Klaus E. and Karin Grossmann with a special interest in attachment theory.

Address: University of Regensburg, Department of Psychology IV, Universitätsstr. 31, 93040 Regensburg, Germany

Makoto Kobayashi received his master's degree in Educational Psychology at Keio University in Tokyo, Japan (1989) and his doctorate at the University of Konstanz, Germany (1994) under the supervision of Gisela Trommsdorff and with the support of a DAAD scholarship. He obtained a grant for a research stay at the University of Konstanz (1995–1997) and was Lecturer at Keio University (1997–2001). He was appointed Associate Professor for developmental psychology at Kyoto Koka Women's University

(2001). Currently, he is an Associate Professor for Developmental Psychology at Tamagawa University, Japan and a research advisor for the educational program "Culture of Peace" by the National Federation of UNESCO Associations in Japan (NFUAJ). His main research areas are self and moral development in cross-cultural comparison, self-esteem, and psychological research for intercultural tolerance.

Address: Tamagawa University, College of Education, Tamagawa-Gakuen 6-1-1, Machida, Tokyo 194-8610, Japan

Helmut Klages received his master's in Macroeconomics at the University of Erlangen, Germany (1953) and his doctorate in Economics at the University of Hamburg, Germany (1955). He was appointed University Lecturer ("Habilitation") in sociology at the University of Erlangen-Nuernberg (1960) and University of Muenster (1961). He became a Full Professor at the Technical University of Berlin in 1964 and declined several calls from other universities before he accepted to take the Chair of Sociology at the German University of Administrative Sciences in Speyer (1975). He is now Professor Emeritus. He was frequently invited for guest professorships and research stays in USA, Japan, and the Republic of Korea. His main research areas are social change, value change, modernization, organizational dynamics, institutional reform, strategies of innovation, strategies and techniques of empowerment, and actualization of human potentialities.

Address: Deutsche Hochschule für Verwaltungswissenschaften Speyer, Postfach 1409, 67324 Speyer, Germany

Walter J. Lonner is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Psychology, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington. He is also Director of Western's Center for Cross-Cultural Research. W. Lonner has been involved in cross-cultural psychology for over 35 years. A charter member of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, he has served as the Association's President (1986-88) and in 1994 was made an Honorary Fellow. He is Founding Editor and currently Senior Editor of the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* and has been involved with many books in the area of cross-cultural psychology. Among the books, which he has either authored or edited, are *Cross-Cultural Research Methods* (1973), the six-volume *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (1980), and *Counseling across Cultures*, which now appears in its 5th Edition. For more than 25 years he was co-editor of the Sage Publications book series, *Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology* (later changed to Cross-Cultural Psychology). W. Lonner was a Fulbright Scholar in Germany (1984-85) and has collaborated in research and scholarship with colleagues in numerous countries.

Address: Center for Cross-Cultural Research, Department of Psychology, Western Washington University, Miller Hall 328A, Bellingham, WA 98225-9089, USA

Ramesh C. Mishra is Professor of Psychology at Banaras Hindu University, India. A D. Phil. from Allahabad University, India, he has been Post-doctoral Research Fellow, Shastri Research Fellow and Visiting Professor at Queen's University, Canada. He has also been Visiting Professor at the University of Geneva and Jean Piaget Archives, Switzerland. His principal interest is in cultural influence on human development, and he has contributed numerous articles to professional journals, both in India and abroad, in the fields of cognition, acculturation, schooling, and crosscultural studies. He has extensively contributed chapters to books, including the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural*

Psychology and Handbook of Culture and Psychology. He is the co-author of *Ecology, Acculturation and Psychological Adaptation: A Study of Adivasis in Bihar*, and co-editor of *Psychology in Human and Social Development: Lessons from Diverse Cultures*.

Address: Department of Psychology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221005, India

Gilda A. Morelli received her Ph.D. from the University of Massachusetts-Amherst in 1986 and was a NIMH Postdoctoral Fellow, University of Utah (1986–1989). She is an Associate Professor in Psychology (1989–present) and Acting Associate Dean (2002–present) at Boston College, SRC Policy Fellow and consultant to Department Health and Human Services on welfare reform and children's learning and development (1996–present). She has written numerous articles on culture and young children's social and emotional development, especially of children of hunting gathering and horticultural societies in the Democratic Republic of Congo. She is also a Co-director of the "Ituri Forest People's Fund."

Address: Department of Psychology, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA

Bernhard Nauck received his master's degree in Educational Sciences (1972) and his doctor's degree in Sociology (1977) from the University of Cologne, Germany. He was an Assistant Professor at the universities of Cologne, Bonn, and Oldenburg, Germany (1972–1984) and was appointed University Lecturer ("Habilitation") at the Universities of Bonn (1983) and Augsburg, Germany (1987). Professorships followed for Sociology at the Universities of Wuppertal (1985/86) and Cologne (1988/1989), and at the Pädagogische Hochschule Weingarten (1990/92). Nauck was the founding Head of the Department of Family Research at the Bavarian State Institute for Early Education and Family Research (1986/88). Since 1992 he has been Founding Professor of the Department of Sociology at the University of Technology in Chemnitz, Germany. His main research areas are family, population, life course, migration, minorities, social structure and social reporting, cross-national and cross-cultural comparisons.

Address: Chemnitz University of Technology, Department of Sociology, Reichenhainer Str. 41, D-09107 Chemnitz, Germany

Fred Rothbaum received his Ph.D. from Yale University, USA, in 1976. He was an Assistant Professor at Bryn Mawr College (1976–1979) and at Tufts University, USA (1979–1982) where he became Associate Professor later on (1982–1992) and has been a Professor of Psychology since 1992. He has written many articles on parental caregiving and child functioning. He is Principal Investigator of a study on "Web based information about children and families" from the William T. Grant Foundation, 2001–2004. His main research areas are parenting and child functioning; culture and parent-child closeness, Web-based dissemination of child development information.

Address: Tufts University, Eliot-Pearson Dept. of Child Development, 105 College Ave., Medford, MA 02155, USA

Esther Schäfermeier received her master's degree (1999) and her doctorate in Psychology (2003) from the University of Konstanz, Germany. She was an exchange student at the Université René Descartes in Paris (1994 and 1998) and was a research intern at Princeton University, USA (1997). As a research assistant at the Department of Developmental and Cross-Cultural Psychology at the University of Konstanz (1999–2003), she obtained a grant for a research stay at the Federal University Fluminense,

Brazil (2001). Currently she is undergoing child psychotherapist training. Her main research areas are cross-cultural psychology, socialization and social development, stereotypes and prejudices.

Address: University of Konstanz, Department of Psychology, Box D 14, 78457 Konstanz, Germany

Beate Schwarz received her master's degree (1989) at the Technical University of Berlin, Germany, and her doctorate in Psychology (1996) at the University of Giessen, Germany. She worked as a research assistant in the Berlin Youth Study and in longitudinal studies on adolescent development in East and West Germany after unification at the University of Giessen and on family development after separation and divorce at the University of Munich, Germany. Since 2000 she has been Assistant Professor at the University of Konstanz. Her main research interests focus on social relationships and problem behavior in adolescence, children and adolescents in divorced and stepfamilies, parent-child-relationship in adulthood, and cross-cultural psychology.

Address: University of Konstanz, Dept. of Psychology, Box D 14, 78457 Konstanz, Germany

Rachel Seginer received her B.A. in Psychology and Sociology from Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Israel, her M.Sc. in Child Development from Cornell University, USA, and her Ph.D. in Psychology from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Her research interests focus on socio-cultural and familial contexts of adolescent development, mainly applying to future orientation and school functioning. She teaches developmental psychology at the Faculty of Education, University of Haifa, Israel. Her teaching, as her research, focuses on adolescent development in the family and the school with special emphasis on the relevance of sociocultural settings to these issues.

Address: University of Haifa, Faculty of Education, Mount Carmel, Haifa 31905, Israel

Alexander Thomas received his master's degree (1968) and his doctorate (1973) in Psychology at the University of Muenster, Germany. He was a professor of Sport Psychology at the Free University of West-Berlin (1973–1979) and has been Professor of Psychology (Social Psychology and Applied Psychology) at the University of Regensburg, Germany (since 1979). A.Thomas has conducted cross-cultural research in many European and non-European countries, e.g., in China, India, Japan, and the USA. His main research areas are action psychology, cross-cultural psychology, psychology of intercultural action, and organizational psychology.

Address: University of Regensburg, Institute of Experimental Psychology, 93040 Regensburg, Germany

Gisela Trommsdorff studied Sociology and Psychology at the University of Göttingen, Germany, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA, and at Mannheim University, Germany, where she received her doctorate (1970) and her "Habilitation" (1976). In 1978 she became a Professor in Educational Psychology at the Technical University (RWTH) in Aachen, Germany, and holds the Chair for Developmental and Cross-Cultural Psychology at the University of Konstanz, Germany (since 1987). G.Trommsdorff was a Visiting Professor at Keio University and Kansai University, Japan, and was invited for several research stays at foreign universities, e.g., in India, Indonesia, Japan, and the Republic of Korea. Her research interests cover cross-cultural psychology, future orientation, lifespan development, intergenerational

relationships, social change, subjective developmental theories, motivation and intentionality.

Address: University of Konstanz, Department of Psychology, Box D 14, 78457 Konstanz, Germany

Preface

The famous work of Rivers during the Cambridge Expedition to the Torres Strait is usually regarded as the origin of cross-cultural psychology. Less well known are some of the German antecedents of ideas in this field. Already Herbart warned against undue concentration on the unrepresentative “cultured person,” and speculated about the psychological consequences of educating a Maori in Europe. Waitz, who put forward the notion of “psychic unity” at a time when biological racism was in the ascendant, noted that there are many reports on the mental life of “uncivilized” peoples, but they are far from conveying a complete picture. He commented that one has looked on their religion and customs as mere curiosities, without trying to understand them.

Early in the 20th century Thurnwald, working in the Solomon Islands, undertook empirical research on higher cognitive functions which Rivers, influenced by Wundt, had at that time regarded as beyond the capability of “natives.” There followed an interregnum of almost half a century when very little was done, until a fresh start was made in the 1950s and ’60s.

As far as I know there was at that time little interest in Germany in issues of psychology and culture, the sole exception being Ernest Boesch at Saarbrücken who established an Institute. Injecting a personal note, I might mention that one of my former Ghanaian students spent some time there and found the experience greatly enriching.

Things began to move in Germany during the 1970s and ’80s, and one of the earliest and most active people in the field was Gisela Trommsdorff who is being honored by the present volume. Like several now prominent cross-cultural researchers, she began as a social psychologist, soon moving from “social” to “cultural.” Her contributions are impressive in terms of quality, quantity, and range of topics covered, from general theory to specific comparative studies, the *Schwerpunkt* being in the developmental sphere. It is therefore appropriate that it should be the major theme of this volume.

The book itself is a felicitous mélange. On the one hand it offers an excellent and very welcome, though of course by no means comprehensive sample of what is going on in culturally oriented developmental psychology in Germany today. On the other hand it is adorned by contributions from a sample of the most outstanding exponents from the rest of the world, who are thereby paying homage. Generally, this book reflects the variety and liveliness of current cultural/developmental psychology and thereby constitutes a valuable source for both scholars and students.

Gustav Jahoda

Introduction

In March 2002, several social scientists from various corners of the world gathered together in Konstanz, Germany, on the picturesque shore of Lake Constance, to celebrate Gisela Trommsdorff's 60th birthday and honor her academic work by participating in a conference on the relationship between "Culture and Human Development." Focusing on central themes in their colleague's work, the participants discussed important contributions that cross-cultural research has made to the social sciences as well as its relevance for future research in the field. The group itself also reflected these two aspects, as some of the participants number among the most renowned scholars in the field of psychological and sociological cross-cultural research and others were Gisela Trommsdorff's former pupils.

In order to pay tribute to Gisela Trommsdorff's achievements as a researcher and a teacher as well as highlight some of the major topics in current cross-cultural investigation, the meeting focused on four main goals:

The first goal was to provide a forum for discussion aimed at resolving seemingly irresolvable *theoretical and methodological disputes* in the field of crosscultural research, thus improving our insight into the relationship between culture and human development. The symposium's second goal was to examine different theoretical and methodological approaches to the *analysis of psychological and sociological mechanisms and processes* involved in the relationship between culture and human development. The combined use of psychological and sociological theories and methods should help us to better understand the nature of the intergenerational transmission of culture as well as socialization and internalization processes. The third goal was to discuss the meaning of such an analysis for a *better understanding of social change and modernization* and to consider how to take transformation processes into account when describing and explaining the relationship between societal and individual development. The fourth goal was to reflect on how the rapid societal change of today's world affects the ecological niches in which individuals develop, thus emphasizing *potential practical uses of cross-cultural research*, e.g., with regard to the increasing frequency and perhaps importance of intercultural encounters.

This volume aims to capture some of the ideas and results presented at the conference in order to show how intriguing and challenging cross-cultural research has been and will continue to be for the further investigation of human development. Of course, the following chapters cannot cover the entire range of research topics currently being discussed in the scientific community, but these chapters will point to very different areas and at the same time illustrate how they are interrelated with regard to theoretical, methodological and interdisciplinary aspects. To this end the volume has been divided into five parts. In accordance with the symposium's main goals, each part is interconnected with the preceding as well as the following part.

The first section deals with theoretical and conceptual problems that cross-cultural

research has to face and to which it must also offer solutions. It begins with Walter J. Lonner's synopsis of key issues and questions that have guided scientists who study human thought and behavior and who often differ with regard to their theoretical positions that he calls the three "isms": absolutism, relativism, and universalism. While summarizing historical factors as well as contemporary perspectives, he shows how enduring the importance of the ongoing debates are when considering (1) the assumptions one makes when conducting research in other cultures, (2) the questions one asks (or doesn't ask) in such research, (3) how researchers interpret data and other information that have been gathered, and (4) what is viewed as important as opposed to trivial in culture-oriented psychological inquiries. In the second chapter, Pradeep Chakkarath deals with the increase in attention to so-called "indigenous psychologies," i.e., psychologically relevant concepts that were not developed in mainstream Western psychology, but in the cultures being studied, thus also reflecting the particular way of thinking inherent in these cultures. Using Hindu psychology as an example, the focus is on the question concerning what impact different worldviews, images of man, self-concepts, and values as well as their relevance to action orientations on an individual level may have for theories and assumptions developed in Western psychology. In the last chapter of this section, Michael Cole summarizes the basic principles of an approach to cultural psychology which understands the mediation of human action through artefacts as the defining characteristic of *homo sapiens*. He presents results from a decade-long experiment in designing afterschool activities that has been run in different institutions in a number of different countries with children from different home cultures. These results serve as an example of the need for new methodological approaches that help to gain more insight into the processes and dynamics involved in children's development and the role of the cultural contexts they live in. At the same time, this chapter gives an example of how culture-sensitive aspects of research and application can gain from each other.

The second section presents examples for more recent insights and refinements within some of the classical developmental theories. First, Klaus E. Grossmann, Karin Grossmann, and Anika Keppler take on the case of attachment in order to show how universal as well as culture-specific phenomena influence human behavior. Based on empirical evidence from different cultures, including the authors' own studies on infant attachment behaviors in Japan and on the Trobriand Islands, it is claimed that the four core concepts of attachment theory, i.e. the concept of universality, of security being the norm, of parental sensitivity leading to secure infant attachment, and of security leading to higher competence, are universally valid. In a second chapter on attachment theory, Fred Rothbaum and Gilda Morelli review cross-cultural evidence that supports but in some cases also questions the relevance of some of the theory's central hypotheses in non-western cultures. The authors propose ways in which the hypotheses might be revised to accommodate extant evidence and discuss the kinds of research needed to definitely test the revised hypotheses adequately. In his chapter on the development of emotions Wolfgang Friedlmeier also points to more recent attempts to identify culture-specific emotional reactions based on different cultural norms and values. At the same time, the developmental perspective sharpens the attention for the relation between individual and culture, because it includes the question of transfer and mediation. Thus, there are reciprocal effects between cross-cultural research and developmental

psychology that can provide a more fruitful perspective on the development of human emotions. The section is concluded by a chapter on cross-cultural and related ecological differences on the development of language and spatial concepts. Pierre Dasen and Ramesh Mishra present new empirical findings from urban and rural regions of India and Nepal that serve as the starting point for a critical review of classical, e.g., Piagetian and neo-Piagetian theories on cognitive development. The authors try to show how culture-sensitive research can help to detect some general methodological shortcomings in psychological research and help to more adequately explain internal processes that most have considered universal by definition.

The third section takes up different psychological and sociological aspects of intergenerational relations, a topic that has gained some attention lately, especially against the background of social change within a growing number of rapidly changing countries. In his chapter on the value that children have for their parents, Bernhard Nauck tries to provide a more thorough sociological explanation of fertility behavior than proposed by demographic and micro-economic approaches. Here, children are seen as strategic intermediate goods that fulfill basic needs of their (potential) parents and that are oriented towards (1) work and income needs, (2) insurance needs, (3) status needs, and (4) emotional needs. The author unfolds his theory's explanatory potential for six essential dimensions of the culturally varying family system (size, durability, context opportunities and restrictions, resources, intergenerational relationships, and gender). In their cross-cultural comparison of German and South Korean samples Beate Schwarz, Esther Schäfermeier, and Gisela Trommsdorff investigate the interplay between value orientation, child-rearing goals, and parenting as well as the role that cultural factors may have on related psychological processes. Discussing their empirical findings within the concept of the developmental niche, they also elaborate on the role of subjective child-rearing theories for human socialization, including intergenerational and intercultural differences. The role of intergenerational relationships for adolescent future orientation is at the centre of the study conducted by Rachel Seginer. Her main proposition is that the development of future orientation requires both the freedom to make choices and the support of knowledgeable others and that these are differentially provided by cultural blueprints and by the family. The analyses of the relationships between these two developmental milieus and future orientation are based on comparisons between Jewish and Arab adolescents in Israel and complemented by a discussion of the implications the findings may have for intergenerational transmission.

While the topic of social change already surfaced in some of the preceding chapters, it is at the core of the fourth section, especially since it is the classical concept of modernization that once promoted cross-cultural scientific research and at the same time provided some of its most aggravating pitfalls. In this section a psychologist and a sociologist take a critical look at modernization theory and research and propose a more adequate view with regard to concepts and research methods. In the first chapter, Çigdem Kagitçibasi portrays the modernization paradigm as a social evolutionist worldview that considers whatever is different from the Western pattern as deficient and bound to change (e.g., towards Western individualism) with socio-economic development. With regard to social groups, she shows that what really emerges in "modernizing" societies is a more complex pattern in family/human relationships which can be seen as "cultures of

relatedness.” The author discusses the implications of this revised model for a better understanding, e.g., of the processes of social change and the resultant development of the self. From a sociological point of view, Helmut Klages deals with two major questions concerning value change in modernizing societies: first, the question concerning causality in the relationship between modernization and value change; second, the question concerning the qualitative character and the consequences of a possibly mutual causal interaction between modernization and value change. Moreover, the author shows that analyses and interpretation of the available cross-cultural data can be interpreted in a perspective quite different from classical and influential interpretations offered by Inglehart, Hofstede and others.

The last section of this volume takes the investigation of acculturation processes as an example to show in more detail the application-related potential of cross-cultural research. Starting with an overview of the unidimensional and unidirectional conceptualizations of acculturation, John Berry uses new empirical findings in order to identify the more complex and variable processes and the factors on which they depend. One factor is what collectives and individuals are attempting to do during their acculturation. These acculturation strategies (assimilation, integration, separation, marginalization) are defined, and evidence for their role in acculturation is reviewed. In addition, the author shows how these concepts and empirical findings can be applied to politics and social work. Alexander Thomas presents results of a study conducted in order to investigate the long-term effects of international exchange programs on Australian and German children and teenagers. Following Epstein’s theory of personality and based on his own empirical findings, the author outlines a theory concerning how such exchange programs can affect the development of self-efficacy as well as self-decentralization. Besides the effects on personality development and individual variations in the chronology of influential effects will be discussed. Makoto Kobayashi explores the role of collective self-esteem for acculturation processes during international internships. His study was conducted among European students who were on a 2-month internship in Japan. The comparison of the data with their as well as their host company’s evaluation of the internship revealed certain discrepancies between the two evaluations. On account of the results, the author proposes a process model according to which a stable collective identity fosters a positive image of the host country, which in turn intermediates positive communicational grounds for acculturation.

Taking these sections and the individual chapters together, the volume aims to show the interrelationship of interdisciplinary theoretical and empirical approaches, exemplifying it through a broad range of topics in different areas of current cross-cultural and developmental research, including perspectives from various cultures and cultural groups. Thus, it not only represents the academic interests and work of Gisela Trommsdorff, but also reflects the state of the art and the future tasks of social scientific cross-cultural research.

We would like to thank a number of people who helped us to organize the symposium and put this volume together. We especially wish to thank Hans-Joachim Kornadt for his support and advice during our preparation of the symposium. We are grateful that he and Doris Bischof-Köhler participated in the meeting and enriched it by serving as discussants. For offering their various skills and thus contributing to the symposium’s

success we thank Esther Schäfermeier, Rozalia Horvath, Bert Neidich, Marian Jimenez, Christine Stellfeld, Tamara Herz, and Dong-Seon Chang. The stimulating atmosphere in which the discussions took place was due in part to the wonderful venue, Schloss Akademie Seeheim, and we thank Ariane Zettier for her hospitality and for her patiently fulfilling our every wish.

As for the volume itself, our thanks go first and foremost to all the participants who presented the papers that laid the groundwork for this volume. In addition, we thank John Berry and Alexander Thomas for adding to the selection although they were not able to attend the meeting, and we express our great appreciation to Gustav Jahoda for writing the foreword. We are also indebted to Walt Lonner for his helpful advice and encouragement concerning this volume. We could not have completed this book without the help of Gabriella von Lieres, who participated in revising and editing most of the manuscripts. We would also like to thank Rozalia Horvath and Agnes Günther, who assisted in preparing figures and tables and the final copies of the manuscripts, as well as Tamara Herz, who helped us put the finishing touches to the volume. Hale Ruben and Lizzie Catford from Psychology Press deserve special acknowledgement for patiently accompanying the editors at every step.

We hope that this book will find many interested readers among scholars as well as students from all fields of the social sciences. Moreover, we hope that they will benefit from reading it.

Wolfgang Friedlmeier, Pradeep Chakkarath, Beate Schwarz

Part I
**Theory and Methods in Cross-
Cultural Research**

The Psychological Study of Culture: Issues and Questions of Enduring Importance

Walter J.Lonner

Introduction

This chapter gives a brief overview of the nature and purpose of cross-cultural psychology. The celebratory nature of the gathering for which this chapter was prepared permits comments that are both historical and somewhat autobiographical. It also permits brief commentary on contemporary perspectives in topical areas of interest to cross-cultural psychologists as well as an overview of several methodological issues and problems that are of enduring importance. The gathering converged precisely to the month with the publication in March 1970 of the inaugural issue of the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (JCCP) and almost exactly with the 30th anniversary of the founding of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP), formed in 1972. As founding editor of JCCP as well as a charter member of IACCP, I have witnessed for over 35 years the growth of what has often been called the “modern movement” in cross-cultural psychology. All participants in this symposium have had discussions with various proponents who identify either with cross-cultural psychology, cultural psychology, indigenous psychology, ethnic psychology, or psychological anthropology and, occasionally, other perspectives such as semiotics, evolutionary psychology, ethnopsychiatry, and multicultural psychology. The latter is primarily identified with gender, ethnicity and other “diversity” issues within the United States (Bronstein & Quina, 2003). Division 45 (Society for the Study of Ethnic Minority Issues) of the American Psychological Association is active in the great diversity within a single country. All the others are more concerned with the “big picture” in global, pancultural scale. All psychologists affiliated with these “culture-oriented” perspectives generally agree that any psychology or neighboring discipline that fails to take culture into account, regardless of geographic scope, is bound to give an incomplete and inconclusive picture of human behavior in its many and complex forms.

By dint of historical developments, most of my involvement in cross-cultural psychology has been through activities associated with JCCP. I continue to measure the progression of cross-cultural psychology in terms of JCCP’s growth and continued success. For instance, it is now published six times a year, its trim size and overall appearance have received several facelifts, and there has been about a four-fold increase in publication space. These changes can mainly be attributed to the growing interest in cross-cultural psychology, but also to the formation of IACCP. Commencing with the 1973 issue (Volume 4), JCCP has been published by Sage Publications. With the

exception of yours truly, who is now Senior Editor, none of the members of original interdisciplinary Editorial Advisory Board is currently associated with it. Several have died, but a few are still quite active in the field. Moreover, while manuscripts with an interdisciplinary focus are still welcome, the current Editorial Advisory Board consists mainly of psychologists. The EAB consists of an Editor, Founding and Senior Editor, five Associate Editors, about 46 Consulting Editors, and a Book Review Editor. Approximately 20 countries are currently represented on the EAB.

Despite these changes at the operational level, a strong thread of continuity governs the Journal's policy. The key parts of the original publication policy include the following: That it will publish exclusively cross-cultural (transcultural, cross-national) research; that studies focusing on psychological phenomena (motivation, learning, attitudes, perception, etc.) as they are influenced by culture, as well as other social and behavioral research which focuses on the individual as a member of the cultural group, rather than the macroscopic groups. Studies that were not replicable were discouraged, and the criterion of relevance of the research for cross-cultural comparisons of psychological variables must be clear. The printed policy also stated that while JCCP is "broadly a psychological journal, the closely related disciplines of anthropology, sociology, criminology, psychiatry...are expected to contribute heavily to the cross-cultural understanding of human behavior," and papers from these disciplines were invited, Casting a broad interdisciplinary net, our early promotional flyers contained the phrase "...to consult all that is human."

A Historical Perspective on Cross-Cultural Psychology

Cross-cultural psychology prior to JCCP and IACCP

Historical details about cross-cultural efforts in psychology have been the subject of reviews by Jahoda (1980, 1990); Klineberg (1980), Hogan and Tartaglini (1994), Jahoda and Krewer (1997), and Adamopoulos and Lonner (2001). However, sandwiched between these earlier efforts and the "modern era" of cross-cultural psychology, interest in culture's influence on behavior was generally diffuse and disorganized, and characterized by sabbatical opportunism and "jet-age" forays into different and often exotic cultures. More often than not, researchers (usually from the United States) would design a study where culture or cultures were essentially treated as (quasi-) independent variables and dependent variables were various "instruments" such as so-called intelligence tests, personality or values inventories and attitude scales, visual illusions, and devices designed to measure stages of human development, factors associated with learning and thinking, and so on. Typically, researchers would make a brief trip to some other place requiring a valid passport and then return to their comfortable offices to analyze the data and publish the results in mainstream journals whose editors and readers warmly welcomed manuscripts featuring reports of cultural differences (a strong interest in the nature and origin of similarities has emerged in recent years). It was largely because of this prototypical research and the way it has been imitated and reified over the years (in contrast to the more sophisticated nature of contemporary cross-cultural

research) that cross-cultural psychology has often been described and even criticized as being “nothing more than” or “nothing but” an extension of the logical positivistic ways in which psychologists trained in the EuroAmerican tradition have conducted psychological research (e.g., Gergen, Gulerce, Lock, & Misra, 1996; Tyler, 1999, 2001).

Nevertheless, and despite the many methodological and conceptual errors that in retrospect most psychologists made when studying behavior in other cultures, these earlier efforts clearly demonstrated that some psychologists, regardless of when and where they were conducting research, have always been interested in how culture influences behavior. Research forays and other inquisitive ventures, in some instances, go back hundreds of years (Jahoda, 1980). The problem is that their efforts were neither guided by solid research guidelines nor supported by a network of like-minded and sympathetic colleagues.

The modern movement in cross-cultural psychology

Several independent events or factors converged to create what is now regarded as organized, institutionalized cross-cultural psychology. The first seems to have been a small conference of approximately 100 social psychologists from numerous countries who met at the University of Nigeria during the Christmas/New Year holiday period of 1965–66. A major product of that meeting was the inauguration of the mimeographed *Cross-Cultural Social Psychology Newsletter*. Harry Triandis, one of the key figures at that meeting, briefly edited it. It is the predecessor of the much more sophisticated *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*, thanks to the creative editorship of William K. Gabrenya, Jr. Another factor was the publication of the first of a continuing series of directories of psychologists who were identified as serious scholars of culture and behavior. The first Directory, assembled by John Berry, listed the names and addresses of approximately 110 psychologists from numerous countries. It appeared as a small appendix in a 1968 issue of the UNESCO-sponsored *International Journal of Psychology*, which began publication in 1966. Over the years a series of IACCP-sponsored and -oriented membership directories have been published, the most recent of which was in 1998. Another influencing factor was a meeting in Istanbul, Turkey that featured the cultural adaptation of “mental tests” (Cronbach & Drenth, 1972). And in 1966 a meeting held at the East-West Center in Hawaii was attended by psychologists representing the Western world and the Eastern world. No publications resulted directly from that meeting, but it did stimulate collaboration. I only recently learned that a small conference sponsored by UNESCO, held in Bangkok, Thailand in 1958 might have predated all post-World War II conferences that were explicitly concerned with various problems and methodological issues in cross-cultural (Boesch, 1958). It would not surprise me to learn that solid and sophisticated conferences took place even earlier than this.

An important component in the development of modern, organized cross-cultural psychology was JCCP (see above). The picture was completed when IACCP was formed. At the initiative of the late John L.M.B. Dawson, the inaugural IACCP meeting took place in August 1972 at the University of Hong Kong, where Dawson was Head of the

Department of Psychology. Although records are conflicting, apparently approximately 110 people attended that meeting. The conference proceedings contain all the papers that were delivered (Dawson & Lonner, 1974). As an example of continuity and dedication, the same person—Gustav Jahoda, an acknowledged pioneer in the area who has been a significant presence and somewhat of a super-ego for many cross-cultural psychologists for nearly half a century—wrote a foreword for that book just as he has written one for the present volume. At that meeting it was also agreed that, with the permission of the copyright holder, Western Washington State College (now Western Washington University), IACCP could call JCCP one of its official publications (see Lonner, 2004, for an historical overview of JCCP).

These converging factors ushered in an impressive outpouring of books, monographs, meetings, and other efforts. Why these independent events took place in the mid- to late-1960s—or earlier (see Boesch, 1958)—has been the subject of much discussion. Was it because two relatively recent, horrible world wars and then the Viet Nam conflict triggered many further questions about humanity and the state of the world? Did an increasing number of scholars recognize more than ever before that nations of the world had better recognize that an interdependent and mutually understanding world gives all nations a better chance of survival? Were better communication and the ubiquity of international air travel making collaboration more possible than ever before? Was psychology maturing as a science, finally ready and able to address psychological questions of universal concern? Whatever the cause, psychologists, like never before, were focusing on the construct of “culture” as an important factor in shaping human behavior. While the number of truly dedicated cross-cultural psychologists still tends to be small, a growing number of psychologists are giving the phenomenon increased respect and attention.

Central Issues in Cross-Cultural Psychology

What is cross-cultural psychology?

Despite nearly 30 years as an organized, institutional entity, there is no crisp and clear definition of cross-cultural psychology with which everyone agrees. However, a popular recent definition, included in a chapter reviewing culture and human development (Gardiner, 2001), states that it is “the systematic study of relationships between the cultural context of human development and the behaviors that become established in the repertoire of individuals growing up in a particular culture” (Berry, Poortinga, & Pandey, 1997, p. x).

Other definitions abound, but primarily cross-cultural psychology is an enterprise involving research and scholarship whose goal it is to help psychology develop into a more mature and broad-banded science. Its purpose is to help contribute to the development of a more global understanding of human thought and behavior. This means that all topics or domains with psychology and their dynamic interactions within and between individuals from any culture are candidates for inclusion in an extensive and increasing network of research projects involving a variety of methods. Table 1 shows

what would be involved in this effort. *

Column A in Table 1 lists many of the domains and topics within Psychology (the topical areas of psychology without which the discipline would hardly have anything to study and which almost certainly transcend culture). All of these domains and their constituent parts are, as in "mainstream" psychology, candidates for an unlimited number of within-culture and cross-cultural explorations.

Column B includes some examples of rationale for making meaningful comparisons. Aberle, Cohen, Davis, Levy, & Sutton (1950) argued that there nine "functional prerequisites of society"—that is, for a society to exist (and therefore qualify for comparison with other functioning societies) it must have all of these elements. Examples of numerous additional common denominators or guidelines include Piaget's hypothesized stages of cognitive growth, Super and Harkness's (1986) "developmental niche," various models such as those developed by Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1993) McClelland (1961), and Berry (1995), Hofstede's (2001) or Schwartz's (1994) perspectives on human values, and Cole's (1996) "garden metaphor." These and many other views on the nature of human nature as it interacts with culture ostensibly guarantee meaningful comparisons across cultures (provided methodological care is taken to produce valid results). Column C could potentially include conducting exhaustive research in a large number of (theoretically all) cultures, making sure in each that multi-methods are used, that representative and equivalent samples of persons are selected in each, and that researchers representing different philosophical perspectives (e.g., cognitive, psychodynamic, behavioral, etc., to guard against method bias) are used, not only for each society (here labeled A, B, C ...Z) but across them all. In this way one could have multiple indigenous psychologies (i.e., looking down each column separately) with no aspirations to be comparative. While these must be understood on a column-by-column basis, one should also be able to find the common denominators by going across the columns. This is where the frameworks in Column B may be instructive as guidelines. Column D would then be involved in trying to determine what is shared or common (U, tentatively universal) across all cultures as well as what is unique or specific (S) in each society. Summing all the elements across the rows and down the columns (the lower right-hand corner), we potentially would have a truly universal psychology.

* Components of Table 1 were influenced by numerous discussions of "emics and etics" that for many years have been part of the "insider" versus "outsider" debate regarding approaches that one may take in the study of culture by behavioral and social scientists (Berry, 1989; Headland, Pike and Harris, 1990). However, Table 1 was primarily influenced by the methodological insights of D.T.Campbell and D.W.Fiske (1959) who recommended the use of convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Campbell and Fiske outline what should be taken into account when "traits" (concepts, ideas, hypotheses, etc.) and "methods" (e.g. questionnaires, rating scales, systematic observations, interviewing, experiments, etc.) interact with researchers who differ with regard to the paradigms, theories, or assumptions they bring into an inquiry or research project. One would be on relatively safe ground if findings from multiple "traits" using multiple "methods" as employed by multiple researchers converged to validate some aspects of human behavior in question. Among other things, such considerations would help guard against "own-culture bias" in culture-comparative research.

Table 1 An Idealized Theoretical Framework for a Potentially Complete Understanding of the Relationships Between Culture and Appropriate and Relevant Psychological Topics

Column A Topical Domains of Modern Psychology	Column B Example of Possible Comparative Bases	Column C Target or Focal Cultures, A through Z, Selected Either for Single Culture (Columns) or Culture (Rows) Research	Column D Outcome (Col. AxBxC Interactions)
Abnormal Biological Bases Cognition Developmental Emotion Motivation Perception Personality Psychotherapy Sensation Social Etc.	<p>1)Aberle et al. (1950) Relationships with environment Role assignment Communication Common world view Shared goals Social norms Emotion regulation Socialization Controlling disruptive behavior</p> <p>2)Models such as Berry's, Bronfenbrenner's, Super & Harkness'</p> <p>3)Cole's "Culture as Garden" metaphor</p> <p>4)Cultural Syndromes (Triandis)</p> <p>5)Dimensions</p> <p>6)Schwartz's and others' values orientations</p> <p>7)Social Axioms</p> <p>8)Other "templates" with broad appeal as valid comparative bases both across and</p>	<p>The diagram illustrates the relationship between culture and psychology. It shows a grid of boxes representing research outcomes (R_{A1}, R_{A2}, R_{A3}, R_{A4}, R_{A5}, R_{B1}, R_{B2}, R_{C1}, R_{C3}, R_{CN}) for different cultures (A, B, C, ..., Z) and methods (S, U, S). The diagram includes labels for 'SUBJECTS', 'METHODS', and 'CULTURE'. It also shows a summary box for 'Derived Multiple "Ethics" Leading to a Universally Valid Psychology'.</p>	<p>Σ S U S</p> <p>Σ Σ METHODS</p> <p>Σ Σ R_{A,Z}</p> <p>Σ Σ SUBJECTS</p> <p>Derived Multiple "Ethics" Leading to a Universally Valid Psychology</p>

within societies
are possible

Notes: For example, RA_1 would be Research Report No. 1 for Culture A, which would use a specific sample and a specific method or theory. RA_2 would be Research Report No. 2 for Culture 4 using its specific (and different) sample and specific (different) method or theory. S=Specific, U=Universal.

Obviously it would be impossible to complete what the overall structure in Table 1 implicitly demands; encouraging a huge number of replications of many studies and experiments across a large number of societies. It would, in fact, be a logistical nightmare to take just one topic—infant development for instance—and deal with it exhaustively both within and across cultures. Two reminders: First, when we talk about culturally unique and non-comparative psychological characteristics of a specific culture we are only “reading” down a specific column. Second, when we talk about “universals” we are generalizing across the collection of cultures. These strategies may represent, respectively, cultural psychology (and/or indigenous psychology) and cross-cultural psychology.

Three “isms” in the psychological study of culture

Probably the most familiar and debatable conceptual issue in conducting research across cultures is the “emic-etic,” or insider versus outsider, debate (Headland, Pike, & Harris, 1990). While many dislike this simple dichotomy, it does pose an important question: Can anyone outside any specific human group (culture) understand completely the workings of the group (culture) to the same degree an insider does? Is the internal structure of any specific group so intricately learned and dynamically subtle that only an insider can truly understand the complexities of the interactions? Even worse, is it an imposition and possibly a major blunder for an outsider to be so pretentious as to think that he or she knows exactly what to study inside a group about which he or she may know so little that he or she cannot respectably research on it? Many psychologists have disavowed and/or avoided research in other cultures for these reasons, preferring to let anthropologists deal with culture—ironically a concept that many anthropologists say doesn’t exist in the first place.

This debate is one of the more pervasive issues in the psychological study of other societies. Regardless of one’s allegiance in the cultural sciences, it is often a central part of methodological and conceptual issues. Discussions often feature the three “isms” mentioned earlier—absolutism, relativism, and universalism. Table 2 depicts the basic details of this simple yet highly debatable situation.

Table 2
The Three “Isms” in the Psychological Study of Culture

		Is the phenomenon of one’s culture an important factor in influencing one’s thought and behavior?	
		No	Yes
Is it reasonable to assume that there are commonalities, continuities, and patterns in thought and behavior across cultures?	No	N/A	Relativism
	Yes	Absolutism	Universalism

Unabashed absolutists rigorously follow the stringent demands of hardheaded experimentation and no-nonsense empiricism (e.g., Skinner’s radical behaviorism). Absolutists believe that cultures are essentially vaguely defined superficial and colorful groups of people that are remarkable only because they have such things as quaint languages, different music and interesting clothing. It has often been said that absolutists are culture-bound and culture-blind, and many of them seem content to stay that way. Absolutists may also argue that there is no such thing as tangible and static “culture” to which someone can be bound or toward which someone can be blind (e.g., Hermans & Kempen, 1998). The “orange peel” analogy is often used in this context: the extremely thin and colorful skin of an orange merely masks a wealth of commonalities among all humans throughout the world. This allegation of relatively superficial aspects of culture implies that it really doesn’t matter in psychology. John Berry (personal communication) has often reported a pertinent story: An absolutistic psychologist once said to him that culture is nothing more than “noise” that has to be tuned out in “real” psychological research. Berry’s response: “Culture may be noise to you, but to me it is music.” Culture-oriented psychologists would quickly agree. At the other extreme are the radical relativists. Relativists tend to reject comparativism or reductionism and believe that culture and mind are coconstructed. All cultures are totally unique (the S in Column 4 of Table 1), constructed from within and must be understood on their own terms and preferably by individuals who are either members of the group being studied or completely familiar with the group’s history, language, and so forth. This leaves universalism, a position that is somewhat of a compromise and a position with which most cross-cultural psychologists strongly identify or, at minimum, understand and endorse. At the risk of being over-inclusive, I would say that all cross-cultural psychologists believe that humans and their interactions with their cultures are much more similar than they are different, but that culture exerts such a strong force on the behavior and thought of all sentient individuals that to disregard it runs the risk of having a narrow and incomplete psychology. This idea of universalism corresponds to the U in Column 4 of Table 1.

Cross-cultural psychological research: The standard approach

When cross-cultural psychologists design and conduct research, a relatively standard method of inquiry is usually followed. As indicated above, they tend to more comparative and universalistic in their thinking than most other psychologists. However, because the assumption of universality without strong evidence would be incautious and presumptuous, a major goal of the cross-cultural psychologist has been to cast a broad net by using a more or less standard “transfer and test” approach (Berry et al., 2002). In this strategy psychologists essentially take (transfer) previously culture-bound hypotheses and findings to other cultures in an effort to test their generalizability. However, there is also a “discovery” or “exploration” aspect in the standard design. Because it is quite possible—indeed, more or less expected and welcomed—that new and unusual (to the outsider) phenomena will be observed in other societies, it is the obligation of cross-cultural psychologists to try and understand what dynamic processes have been encountered or uncovered. In the final process, the goal of the cross-cultural psychologist is to “fold back” into mainstream psychology the findings of research projects elsewhere. If nothing else happens, the results of cross-cultural research will help enrich psychology by indeed “studying all that is human.”

The standard model of research is, however, not the only one used by cross-cultural psychologists. Van de Vijver and Leung (1997) described a taxonomy of cross-cultural studies. As shown in Table 3, this taxonomy includes four common types of comparative approaches.

Hypothesis-driven studies aim to contribute to (or refute) the generalizability of some psychological finding or principle. They are among the most common procedures used in cross-cultural research (e.g., do social psychology “laws” generalize across cultures?) Primarily because psychological theory and principles of behavior as studied for over a century in the “highly psychologized” western world were used to develop research strategies, these approaches may also have received the most criticism as being “nothing more” than an extension of the western model of logical positivism by treating cultures as “quasi-independent variables.” This is especially true of theory-driven studies that paid little attention to the cultural context or to the implications of such to the inhabitants of the cultures in question.

Table 3

Four Common Types of Cross-Cultural Studies

	Orientation more on	
Should contextual factors be considered?	Hypothesis Testing	Exploration
Yes	Generalizability	Psychological Differences
No	Theory-Driven	External Validation

Source: van de Vijver and Leung, 1997, p. 20.

In studies that are oriented more toward exploration, those that assess psychological differences are the most frequently cited in the cross-cultural literature. Because they are “instrument-driven,” this approach typically involves selecting some personality, attitude, or values scale and collecting responses from individuals in two or more cultures. Means, standard deviations, response sets, factor structures and other aspects of measurement are then examined. Usually not propelled by some overarching theory, post hoc explanations may then be invoked to help interpret the differences as well as the similarities.

The Ongoing Maturation of Cross-Cultural Psychology

Prior to the mid-1960s, psychologists who designed and conducted research in other cultures had little guidance from the psychological literature. There were no books on cross-cultural research methods and there were few journal articles to serve as solid methodological models. Research done in other cultures was published in scattered journals throughout the world. In the U.S., only the *Journal of Social Psychology*, which in the mid- 1960s began publishing a short section, entitled “Cross-Cultural Notes,” offered occasional insights. A few journals scattered among British Commonwealth countries published occasional reports, especially those based on research conducted in Asia and the Pacific or in Africa. When the “modern movement” of cross-cultural psychology started about 35 years ago, a groundswell of published resources began. Influential books such as Segall, Campbell, and Herskovits (1966), Naroll and Cohen (1970), Przeworski and Teune (1970), Triandis (1972), Cole, Gay, Glick, and Sharp (1971), Brislin, Lonner, and Thorndike (1973), Berry and Dasen (1974), Cole and Scribner (1974), among others, became increasingly numerous. JCCP was inaugurated, joining the *International Journal of Psychology* as a publication with a truly international focus. These efforts begat even more publication activity, such as the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (Triandis et al., 1980) the inauguration of the Sage Publications series, *Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology*, and, of course, the biennial publication of the proceedings of the IACCP, the most recent of which is Lonner, Dinnel, Forgays, and Hayes (1999) and Boski, Van de Vivjer, and Chodynicka (2002) and the pending volume containing selected papers from the IACCP conference held in Yogyakarta, Indonesia in July, 2002 (Setiadi, Supratiknya, Lonner, & Poortinga, 2004). More recent publications include the second edition of the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (Berry et al., 1997), the *Handbook of Culture and Psychology* (Matsumoto, 2001), and many other authored and edited books. Various overviews have appeared (e.g., Segall, Lonner, & Berry, 1998). In addition, a number of texts aimed for undergraduates have been written (e.g., Brislin, 2000; Matsumoto, 2000; Segall, Dasen, Berry, & Poortinga, 2000). A free and easily accessible web-based project entitled “Online Readings in Psychology and Culture” was recently inaugurated (Lonner, Dinnel, Hayes, & Sattler, 2001). Several journals are now part of the established literature, such as the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, the *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, *Cross-Cultural Research*, *Culture and Psychology*, the *International Journal of Testing*, and of course the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Different associations have emerged, including the Association pour la Recherche Interculturelle